

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)**OREGON RESEARCH COLLABORATORY INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ROADMAP****For****Portland State University
(RFP No. 25923)****ADDENDUM Number 1**

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL: ADDENDUM Number 1

RFP NO: 25923

TITLE: Oregon Research Collaboratory Information Technology Roadmap

DATE RFP ISSUED: February 3, 2014

DATE ADDENDUM 1 ISSUED: February 28, 2014

CONTACT PERSON: William C. Terry
PHONE: 503-725-9869
Email: contract@pdx.edu

PURPOSE OF THIS ADDENDUM 1:

The purpose of this Addendum 1 is to respond to those questions or requests for clarification/change (or protest) submitted by potential Proposers pursuant to the RFP. The questions or requests for clarification/change (or protest) are in italics. PSU's response is underlined.

1. VENDOR QUESTION:

Do the sponsoring organizations have in any one or multiple locations a summary of existing research collaborations that exist? Absent such lists, it seems that surveys of research faculty are the only feasible method of accomplishing the project's goals related to research collaborations. If lists of existing collaborations do not exist, will the sponsoring institutions support the use of surveys to their research faculty? Would such support include the active effort of senior research administrators (Provost, Vice President for Research) to promote faculty participation?

PSU's RESPONSE:

While blanket surveys are not part of what we expect to be done, the sponsoring institutions will provide appropriate information regarding existing research collaborations between institutions.

2. VENDOR QUESTION:

Will the sponsoring organizations identify to the consultants and make accessible to them staff and faculty who are knowledgeable about the existing state of technology infrastructure?

PSU's RESPONSE:

Yes, all four institutions will make technical staff accessible during this process.

3. VENDOR QUESTION:

Will the sponsoring organizations facilitate the consultants' access to documentation of the existing state of this infrastructure?

PSU's RESPONSE:

Yes, documentation about existing statewide infrastructure will be provided.

4. VENDOR QUESTION:

Does the RFP anticipate that the consultant work would include contact with government leaders?

PSU's RESPONSE:

Yes, contact with State government leaders is anticipated during the consultant work.

5. VENDOR QUESTION:

Will the sponsoring organizations provide meeting and office spaces for the consultants' use when conducting project work at sponsor's locations?

PSU's RESPONSE:

Yes, all four institutions will provide appropriate meeting and office space.

6. VENDOR QUESTION:

Are there specific people at any of the Oregon universities, industries, or state government that you want us to meet with?

PSU's RESPONSE:

Yes. Each VPR will identify up to a half dozen representative high performance computing users and a half dozen faculty with data-intensive research projects among the research active faculty at their university; CIOs will similarly identify their most HPC-savvy staff members.

7. VENDOR QUESTION:

The RFP warns that the "internal mail system sometimes experiences delays in distributing mail to campus departments and, upon rare occasion, loses mail intended for campus departments." It goes on to warn that using the U.S. mail to submit proposals is done at the Proposer's risk. What is the preferred manner of delivering hard copy proposals? Can overnight mail (FedEx, UPS, etc.) be delivered reliably to the listed 1600 SW Fourth Avenue, Suite 260, address?

PSU's RESPONSE:

THERE IS NO PREFERRED DELIVERY METHOD. WE ARE ONLY CAUTIONING THAT THE U.S. MAIL DELIVERS ALL PSU MAIL TO A CENTRAL PSU LOCATION AND THIS MAIL IS THEN DISTRIBUTED BY CAMPUS WORKERS TO EACH DEPARTMENT. EXTRA TIME NEEDS TO BE ALLOWED FOR THIS STEP. OVERNIGHT DELIVERY VIA FEDEX, UPS, OR SIMILAR, IS VERY RELIABLE TO 1600 SW FOURTH AVENUE, SUITE 260.

8. VENDOR QUESTION:

The RFP states: "Payment for completion of PSU contracts are normally made within 30 days following the date the entire order is delivered or the date the accurate and complete invoice is received, whichever is later." Are we correct that this contract term refers to the "final payment" and that progress payments will be allowable?

PSU's RESPONSE:

IF PROGRESS PAYMENTS ARE PROPOSED AND SUBSEQUENTLY NEGOTIATED INTO THE CONTRACT, ANY ACCURATE AND COMPLETE INVOICES SUBMITTED (THAT MEANS WITH ALL INFORMATION ON THE INVOICE SUCH AS CONTRACT NUMBER, REMIT TO, DESCRIPTION OF SERVICES, ETC) TO PSU ARE GENERALLY PAID WITHIN THIRTY (30) DAYS AND THE CONTRACTOR WILL NOT BE SUBJECTED TO EXTENDED PAYMENTS AGAINST THEIR INVOICE.

9. VENDOR QUESTION:

Who is the executive sponsor(s) for this project?

PSU's RESPONSE:

Jonathan Fink, Vice President for Research and Strategic Partnerships, Portland State University.

10. VENDOR QUESTION:

Will the University provide the selected consultant with a project liaison or coordinator to assist with the coordination, planning, and communications of this project?

PSU's RESPONSE:

Yes.

11. VENDOR QUESTION:

Section 2 of the RFP (page 10) states: "This initiative would create new social benefits for Oregon's citizens including improved health care delivery, advanced training and education opportunities, as well as considerable acceleration of Oregon's economic engine." Can the University provide any additional detail and/or expectations regarding this statement?

PSU's RESPONSE:

While the universities could probably come up with illustrations of these kinds of outcomes, our hope is that the consultant will be familiar with examples from elsewhere around the country that we can use to garner additional legislative and industry support for future IT investments.

12. VENDOR QUESTION:

Section 3 of the RFP (page 11) states: "Only those Proposals meeting the Minimum Mandatory Requirements of this RFP, as listed in Section 1, Instructions to Proposers, will be deemed responsive to this RFP." Please provide more information regarding the Minimum Mandatory Requirements. We do not see any information regarding "Minimum Mandatory Requirements" listed in Section 1, or elsewhere in the RFP document. Please advise.

PSU's RESPONSE:

ALL OF "SECTION 1: INSTRUCTIONS TO PROPOSERS", MUST BE CONSIDERED MINIMUM MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS WHERE THE LANGUAGE IN THIS SECTION DEFINES TO THE

PROPOSER INSTRUCTIONS FOR HOW TO SUBMIT THE PROPOSAL AND PRICING PROPOSAL,
THE NUMBERS OF COPIES, PACKAGING, DISCS REQUIRED ETC.

13. VENDOR QUESTION:

Does the University have a specific format or sequences in which information should be organized in the proposal?

PSU's RESPONSE:

No. Whatever the consultant feels is the most effective way to convey the information.

14. VENDOR QUESTION:

Does the Collaboratory currently utilize shared research administration tools such as research administration software? If yes, please describe?

PSU's RESPONSE:

No.

15. VENDOR QUESTION:

Does the Collaboratory have an IT governance process implemented today? If yes, please describe?

PSU's RESPONSE:

No.

16. VENDOR QUESTION:

What role, if any, does the Oregon Innovation Council or other state entity(s) have on this project? Please describe?

PSU's RESPONSE:

While this initiative is not directly overseen by Oregon InC, the universities anticipate that implementation of any recommendations will be closely coordinated with them. The investments that are expected would benefit all of the other activities supported by Oregon InC, including the three Signature Research Centers.

17. VENDOR QUESTION:

Has the State of Oregon attempted any effort similar to this in the past? If so, please elaborate?

PSU's RESPONSE:

The State may have assessed IT infrastructure in the past, but not from the standpoint of increasing the competitiveness of its research universities and their public and private sector partners.

18. VENDOR QUESTION:

Does the State of Oregon have an example from another State that it's modeling this RFP on? If yes, please elaborate?

PSU's RESPONSE:

The RFP is not modeled on an RFP from another state, but discussion of the collaboratory has been informed by an awareness of cyber-infrastructure investments in Washington State, Ohio, Arizona, Massachusetts, and other states.

19. VENDOR QUESTION:

SOW component #1 and #2: What are the specific applications that we need to consider?

PSU's RESPONSE:

Current areas of research strength are identified on university websites. The focal areas for this RFP will be a combination of those for which Oregon has existing competitive advantages (due to faculty expertise, exceptional facilities, or geographic or historical factors) and ones that offer strong economic development and industry-university partnership potential.

20. VENDOR QUESTION:

SOW component #1 and #2: How much documentation of existing technology/infrastructure of all of the listed entities will be available before or after we submit proposal?

PSU's RESPONSE:

Current information about research and technology infrastructure at the four universities is available through their websites. Specific information about existing collaborations across the universities and between the universities and the Signature Research Centers can be provided by the four university Research Offices after the winning proposal has been selected. Additional documentation will be provided after an RFP is awarded.

21. VENDOR QUESTION:

SOW component #2: Are there any further details available on key drivers?

PSU's RESPONSE:

This is something that we are looking to the consultant to identify, based on national and international experience and forecasts.

22. VENDOR QUESTION:

SOW component #6 and summary content: What return is expected? Can you be more clear on the expected results? For example, what is the connection of this effort to future returns, grant money attainment, etc., as specific deliverables of this engagement vs. future uses of the deliverables?

PSU's RESPONSE:

Here again, we are looking for examples from other states where comparable investments have been made and associated specific returns have been identified. We expect that any initiatives resulting from this report will be implemented over multiple legislative sessions. Generating political support based on tangible, substantial returns will be essential for this exercise to be considered a success.

23. VENDOR QUESTION:

General question on the SOW section #2: For each of the seven elements of the Section 2, Scope of Work, what level of detail do you expect in the deliverables? For example, are you looking for detailed strategy document documents with executable plans? Or, more of a high level plan/roadmap that would be further iterated as a living document?

PSU's RESPONSE:

The more specific the proposal can be, and the more evidence of successes in other states that can be provided, the better.

24. VENDOR QUESTION:

General question on the SOW section #2: To what extent do you intend to leverage existing technology/investments, such as the Nero network? Can you provide existing details of those?

PSU's RESPONSE:

We would expect to leverage all existing technology investments, as appropriate. However, some of those were originally created with different goals. The primary intent here is to increase the competitiveness of the universities and their partners.

25. VENDOR QUESTION:

General question on the SOW section #2: What level of sponsorship/ownership does Oregon Research Collaboratory have in this effort?

PSU's RESPONSE:

The Oregon Research Collaboratory is not an independent entity--it refers to the combined efforts of the Research Vice Presidents and Chief Information Officers of OHSU, OSU, PSU, and UO.

26. VENDOR QUESTION:

General question on the SOW section #2: Does Oregon Research Collaboratory have additional goals/direction that should be considered into this effort?

PSU's RESPONSE:

See the answer to Question 25.

27. VENDOR QUESTION:

General question on the SOW section #2: Is the idea to pool existing equipment owned by any particular entity for this effort?

PSU's RESPONSE:

Not necessarily, but where it makes sense to do so, the institutions will be supportive.

28. VENDOR QUESTION:

General question on the SOW section #2: How much access will we have to stakeholders? Will there be a coordinating resource provided to manage those communications and aid in identification of the right people for interviews, workshops and other data gathering?

PSU's RESPONSE:

The successful proposer will have good access to the VPRs, the CIOs and their immediate staff members. Access to faculty and outside public and private sector partners will be as good as we can make it, although we have less control over their time.

NOTICE: PSU assumes no liability for inadvertent errors or mistakes in this document. PSU has answered all vendor questions to the best of our ability with the information we have readily available at the time of issuance of this document.