**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)**

**CENTRAL MONITOR AND CONTROL SYSTEM FOR A VIDEO LOTTERY TERMINAL PROGRAM**

**#2021-06**

**RESPONSES TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS (Q&A #1)**

**October 23, 2020**

This list of questions and responses #1 (Q&A#1) is being issued to clarify certain information contained in the above named Request for Proposals (RFP). The statements and interpretations of Contract requirements, which are stated in the following responses are not binding on the State, unless the State expressly amends the RFP. Nothing in the State’s responses to these questions is to be construed as agreement to or acceptance by the State of any statement or interpretation on the part of the entity asking the question as to what the Contract does or does not require. Some questions have been edited for brevity and clarity, and duplicate questions may have been combined or eliminated.

The following are questions submitted pursuant to the RFP and the State Lottery and Gaming Control Agency’s (“MLGCA”) responses to those questions:

**1. QUESTION:** 2.3.4.A.2 Primary and Back-up SiteRequirements, Page 31;

While the Primary and Backup hardware will be new and independent hardware, would it be acceptable to use a cloud environment for testing the hardware?

**ANSWER: Using a cloud based testing environment is acceptable but processor speeds and storage shall be as close to what will be used in Production as possible.**

**2. QUESTION:** 2.3.10 Acceptance Testing, Page 45; Would the MLGCA provide a list of approved testing labs?

**ANSWER: GLI, BMM, Eclipse**

**3. QUESTION:** 2.3.11 Implementation, Page 46; Section 2.3.11 states that the contractor “shall include a brief description, start and end dates, roles and responsibilities, dependencies, input and outputs and deliverables, and shall ensure a smooth start-up of the Central System. This Plan shall include a timeline (Gantt chart), beginning with the Contract award date.”

Would the MLGCA provide an anticipated contract award date that the implementation timeline (Gannt chart) should reflect?

**ANSWER:** **It is anticipated that the Contract will be presented to the Board of Public Works for review/approval in mid-April, 2021. If approved at that meeting, the Contract start date would be on or about April 30, 2021.**

**4. QUESTION:** 2.3.11.2.b, Definition of Business Requirements, Page 47; The RFP indicates the Business Requirements Document (BRD) will be approved within 30 days of receipt from the Contractor. The System Requirement Specification (SRS) states “Upon receiving the MLGCA-approved Business Requirements Documents, the Contractor shall develop corresponding Software Requirements Specification ("SRS") documents and deliver these documents to the MLGCC for approval within forty-five (45) Days.

Would the MLGCA confirm our understanding that (1) the MLGCA will approve the BRDs within 30 days from the MLGCA's receipt of the BRD from the Contractor, and (2) the MLGCA will then send the approved BRDs to the Contractor and the Contractor will have 45 days from receipt of the approved BRDs from the MLGCA to deliver the corresponding SRS to the MLGCA?

If this is correct, how long after receipt of the SRSs from the Contractor will the MLGCA require to approve the SRSs?

**ANSWER:** **Your understanding is correct. The MLGCA will approve the SRSs within 30 days.**

**5. QUESTION:** 3.1.1., Page 62; This Section states the “Contractor shall schedule and hold a kickoff meeting within 10 Business Days of NTP Date.”

Would the MLGCA provide the anticipated Notice to Proceed Date (NTP) that may be used for the Implementation timeline (Gannt chart)?

**ANSWER: It is anticipated that the NTP date will be on or about May 1, 2021. (See Answer to Question #3)**

**6. QUESTION:** 3.6.1 C Crime Insurance/Employee Theft Insurance, Page 71, and 4.38.4 Fidelity Bond, Page 109; Section 3.6.1 C requires Crime Insurance/Employee Theft, Section 4.38.4 Fidelity Bond (Crime Insurance) requires the same thing.

Can Section 3.6.1 C be deleted so that it is clear that Section 4.38.4 prevails and the RFP be amended accordingly?

**ANSWER: Yes. The RFP will be amended to delete Section 3.6.1. C. (See Amendment #1 to the RFP)**

**7. QUESTION:** 3.10.1.B.3 VLT Implementation Specialist, Page 82; Would the MLGCA confirm the internal MLGCA role that the “VLT Implementation Specialist” would align with? The Implementation Specialist’s responsibilities are broad and seem to incorporate more than one role/resource

**ANSWER: The Implementation Specialist will likely interface with several different MLGCA staff. The most significant interaction will probably be with various IT staff.**

**8. QUESTION:** 4.26.5, 4.27.1 B., Pages 102 & 103; Can the MLGCA provide a searchable list or directory of approved Veteran Business Enterprises that is as useable as the directory you provided (in Section 4.26.5) for Minority Business Enterprises? https://mbe.mdot.maryland.gov/directory/ – This MBE site is clear and searchable. http://www.va.gov/osdbu – This Veterans site seems to be for those businesses that want to become certified veterans’ resources.

**ANSWER: The VSBE database is located in the eMaryland Marketplace Advantage (eMMA) website:**

**https://emma.maryland.gov/page.aspx/en/usr/login?ReturnUrl=%2fpage.aspx%2fen%2fbuy%2fhomepage**

**Specifically, go to Vendor Search; then check the VSBE box to filter only these certified vendors:**

**https://emma.maryland.gov/page.aspx/en/sup/supplier\_public\_browse**

**Offerors needing assistance specifically with MBE or VSBE issues may contact directly the MLGCA’s MBE/VSBE/SBR Coordinator: Roslyn Fuller at** **Roslyn.Fuller@maryland.gov****; (410) 230-8887.**

**9. QUESTION:** 4.38.1 Proposal Bond, Page 108 and Attachment P, Page 171; Section 4.38.1 states the Proposal Bond amount is $250,000. However, Attachment P states it is $500,000. Would the MLGCA clarify which amount is correct?

**ANSWER: The amount of $250,000 as stated in the RFP Section 4.38.1 is correct. If the Offeror intends to use the example form provided in Attachment P, the Offeror should revise the form to indicate the correct amount of $250,000 when providing it to the Surety for completion in preparation for submission with its Proposal.**

**10. QUESTION:** 4.38.1 Proposal Bond, Page 108 and Attachment P, Page 171; Would the MLGCA accept a Proposal Bond form from a Surety Company in which the Surety uses its own form in lieu of the bond form provided in Attachment P?

**ANSWER: Use of the forms provided in the RFP Attachments is encouraged in order to avoid an Offeror’s substitute form being determined to be unacceptable. However, industry standard bond forms containing all provisions of the forms provided in the RFP Attachments and underwritten by a surety company authorized to do business in the State may be acceptable, subject to the MLGCA’s review and approval.**

**11. QUESTION:** 4.38.2 Litigation/Protest Bond, Page 108 and Attachment Q, Page 175; Section 4.38.2 states the Litigation Bond amount is $1,000,000. However, Attachment Q states it is $500,000. Would the MLGCA clarify which amount is correct?

**ANSWER: The amount of $1,000,000 as stated in the RFP Section 4.38.2 is correct. If the Offeror intends to use the example form provided in Attachment Q, the Offeror should revise the form to indicate the correct amount of $1,000,000 when providing it to the Surety for completion in preparation for submission with its Proposal.**

**12. QUESTION:** 4.38.2 C. Litigation/Protest Bond, Page 108 and Attachment Q, Page 175; Would the MLGCA accept a Litigation Bond form from a Surety Company, in which the Surety uses its own form in lieu of the bond form provided in Attachment Q?

**ANSWER:** **Use of the forms provided in the RFP Attachments is encouraged in order to avoid an Offeror’s substitute form being determined to be unacceptable. However, industry standard bond forms containing all provisions of the forms provided in the RFP Attachments and underwritten by a surety company authorized to do business in the State may be acceptable, subject to the MLGCA’s review and approval.**

**13. QUESTION:** 4.38.3. Performance Bond, Page 108 and Attachment R, Page 176; Would the MLGCA accept a Performance bond form from a Surety Company, in which the Surety uses its own form in lieu of the bond form provided in Attachment R?

**ANSWER:** **Use of the forms provided in the RFP Attachments is encouraged in order to avoid an Offeror’s substitute form being determined to be unacceptable. However, industry standard bond forms containing all provisions of the forms provided in the RFP Attachments and underwritten by a surety company authorized to do business in the State may be acceptable, subject to the MLGCA’s review and approval.**

**14. QUESTION:** 5.2 Proposal Delivery and Packaging, Page 117; Would the MLGCA confirm that there are no restrictions for Proposal delivery options (i.e., hand delivery) due to Covid-19?

**ANSWER:** **Hand delivery is acceptable, as is delivery by a common carrier. Offerors intending to hand-deliver are encouraged to contact the Procurement Officer to coordinate a delivery time and expedite the delivery process.**

**15. QUESTION:** 5. 5.2 Proposal Delivery and Packaging, Page 117; Section 5.2.5 states that "Offerors shall submit their Proposals in two separately sealed and labeled packages as follows:

A. Volume I - Technical Proposal consisting of:

1) One (1) original executed Technical Proposal and all supporting material marked and sealed,

2) Eight (8) duplicate copies of the above separately marked and sealed,

3) An electronic version of the Technical Proposal in Microsoft Word format, version 2016 or greater,

4) The Technical Proposal in searchable Adobe PDF format, and

5) A second searchable Adobe PDF copy of the Technical Proposal with confidential and proprietary information redacted (see Section 4.8).”

Is it acceptable for the MLGCA to receive multiple Microsoft Word documents that make up the entirety of Volume I – Technical Proposal?

**ANSWER: Yes, that would be an acceptable format for submission, provided that all are clearly labeled and the sequence is identified, and that all is searchable.**

**16. QUESTION:** 5.3 Volume I –Technical Proposal, Page 118; Section 5.3.1 states, "All pages of both Proposal volumes shall be consecutively numbered from beginning (Page 1) to end (Page "x").”

Would the MLGCA consider allowing Offerors to break the required subsections of Section 5.3 into individual sections, each with its own easily identified consecutive page numbering as shown below? (This way of numbering pages would still allow the MLGCA to easily follow the organization of a proposal and make the beginning and end of each section clearer to readers.)

For example:

5.3.3.1 – Page 5.3.3.1-1 to Page 5.3.3.1-X

5.3.3.2 – Page 5.3.3.2-1 to Page 5.3.3.2-X

5.3.3.3 – Page 5.3.3.3-1 to Page 5.3.3.3-X

**ANSWER: Pages may be numbered consecutively within each Section only if the page numbering contains a section designation, such as A-1, A-2, B-1, B-2, C-1, C-2, etc. Each page must be numbered such that it is uniquely identified.**

**17. QUESTION:** 5.3 Volume I –Technical Proposal, Page 118; Section 5.3.1 states that “All pages of both proposal volumes shall be consecutively numbered from beginning (Page 1) to end (Page "x").”

Would the MLGCA allow foldouts, pre-printed inserts, etc. to have their own numbering scheme?

**ANSWER: Fold-outs may be numbered separately, provided that the numbering method uniquely identifies the fold-out and where it fits into the document.**

**18. QUESTION:** 5.3.2, Page 118; The RFP states:

“5.3.2.1 Title Page and Table of Contents (Submit under TAB A) The Technical Proposal should begin with a Title Page bearing the name and address of the Offeror and the name and number of this RFP. A Table of Contents shall follow the Title Page for the Technical Proposal, organized by section, subsection, and page number.

5.3.2.2 Claim of Confidentiality (If applicable, submit under TAB A-1) Any information which is claimed to be confidential and/or proprietary information should be identified by page and section number and placed after the Title Page and before the Table of Contents in the Technical Proposal, and if applicable, separately in the Financial Proposal. An explanation for each claim of confidentiality shall be included (see Section 4.8 “Public Information Act Notice”). The entire Proposal cannot be given a blanket confidentiality designation - any confidentiality designation must apply to specific sections, pages, or portions of pages of the Proposal and an explanation for each claim shall be included.”

Would the MLGCA confirm that, based on these requirements, TAB A-1 should follow the Title Page and that the Table of Contents is therefore part of TAB A-1?

**ANSWER: Tab A should contain the Title Page and Table of Contents; Tab A-1 should contain the Claim of Confidentiality. The first sentence in Section 5.3.2.2 is incorrect and has been revised to delete the word “before” as follows:**

**“Any information which is claimed to be confidential and/or proprietary information should be identified by page and section number and placed after the Title Page and *~~before~~* the Table of Contents in the . . . .”**

**(See Amendment #1 to the RFP)**

**19. QUESTION:** 5.3.2, Page 118; This Section says “The Technical Proposal shall include the following documents and information in the order specified as follows. Each section of the Technical Proposal shall be separated by a TAB as detailed below:”

The requirements extend from 5.3.11 (TAB M) to 5.3.12 (TAB O).

Would the MLGCA confirm there is no TAB N requirement?

**ANSWER: Correct. TAB N has been omitted and there is no TAB N requirement.**

**20. QUESTION:** 5.3.8 Financial Capability, Page 126; Due to the potential volume and size of the financial statements, would the MLGCA confirm that submission of financial statement on electronic media only is acceptable?

**ANSWER: Yes, submission of Financial Statements by electronic media such as a USB or CD is an acceptable format.**