



GAIL FARBER, Director

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

"To Enrich Lives Through Effective and Caring Service"

900 SOUTH FREMONT AVENUE
ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91803-1331
Telephone: (626) 458-5100
<http://dpw.lacounty.gov>

ADDRESS ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO:
P.O. BOX 1460
ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91802-1460

IN REPLY PLEASE

REFER TO FILE: **AE-3**

September 15, 2015

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – ADDENDUM 1 NEXT GENERATION MAINTENANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (NEXTGEN MMS) MAXIMO UPGRADE AND SERVICES (2015-IT011)

Please take note of the following revisions to the Request for Proposals (RFP). (Please note that the changes that have been added are in **boldface** and changes that have been omitted are ~~struckthrough~~.) Section A is the Addendum and Section B is the Questions and Answer.

Please take note that the deadline to submit proposals has been extended to **Tuesday, October 6, 2015, 5:30 p.m.**

A. Addendum:

1. Form PW-2 (Schedule of Prices) of Appendix C (Required Forms), of the RFP is deleted in its entirety and replaced with a revised form entitled Form PW-2.1 (Schedule of Prices). Please use the revised Form PW-2.1 (Schedule of Prices), attached hereto as Enclosure A, in your proposal.
2. Form PW-20 (Proposer's Compliance with the Minimum Requirements of the RFP), of Appendix C (Required Forms), of the RFP is deleted in its entirety and replaced with a revised form entitled Form PW-20.1 (Proposer's Compliance with the Minimum Requirements of the RFP). Please use the revised Form PW-20.1 (Proposer's Compliance with the Minimum Requirements), attached hereto as Enclosure B, in your proposal.
3. Item 5 of Minimum Requirements listed in County's Notice of Request for Proposals for Next Generation Maintenance Management System (NextGen

MMS) Maximo Upgrade and Services (2015-IT011), dated July 15, 2015, has been revised to read as follows:

5. Proposer's planned staff, **including the Contractor's Project Manager, who will have responsibility for advising, planning, or working on the new Maximo system** must submit a copy of a valid and active certification to perform Maximo system implementations as evidenced by holding one or more of the following IBM certifications applicable to Maximo v 7.1 or greater:
 - IBM Certified Advanced Deployment Professional
 - IBM Certified Infrastructure Deployment Professional
 - IBM Certified Deployment Professional
 - IBM Certified Solution Advisor
 - IBM Certified Solution Designer
4. The Appendices Table of Contents for the RFP (page v) has been revised to read as follows:

APPENDIX B

Statement of Work

Attachment 1	Asset Class and Asset Counts Summary Glossary of Terms
Attachment 2	Initial Partial List of DPW User Requirements Asset Class and Asset Counts Summary
Attachment 3	List of Workshops Initial Partial List of DPW User Requirements
Attachment 4	Existing Application Extensions and Triggers List of Workshops
Attachment 5	Deliverable Acceptance Existing Application Extensions and Triggers
Attachment 6	Deliverable Acceptance
Attachment 7	Summary of Existing Reports

5. Section 1.4 (Minimum Requirements) of the RFP, Item No.5 (page 4), has been revised to read as follows:

5. The Proposer's planned staff, **including the Contractor's Project Manager, who will have responsibility for advising, planning, or working on the new Maximo system** must submit a copy of a valid and active certification to perform Maximo system implementations as evidenced by holding one or more of the following IBM certifications applicable to Maximo v 7.1 or greater:

- IBM Certified Advanced Deployment Professional
- IBM Certified Infrastructure Deployment Professional
- IBM Certified Deployment Professional
- IBM Certified Solution Advisor
- IBM Certified Solution Designer

6. The last sentence of the first grammatical paragraph of Section 1.9 (Days of Operation) (page 5), of the RFP has been revised to read as follows:

Work hours and days may be altered, when necessary, with the ~~Contract~~ **County's Project Manager's** sole discretion.

7. Section 2.9.6 (Proposer's Qualifications and Work Plan (Section B)) of the RFP, Item 2, subsection 2 (page 23), has been revised to read as follows:

2. Of the asset classes the Proposer lists in its PCR hierarchy, at least one shall be equivalent to an asset class actually maintained by DPW (refer to Appendix B (Statement of Work), Attachment 42 (Asset Class and Asset Counts Summary). In the PCR hierarchy and for the asset class that is equivalent to one at DPW, the Proposer shall briefly discuss how the Proposer's PCR hierarchy for that asset class could be applied in DPW's IBM Maximo system to help provide root cause analyses, performance metrics, predictive asset management and analytics and/or asset lifecycle management.

8. Section 2.9.6 (Proposer's Qualifications and Work Plan (Section B)) of the RFP, Item 3, provision pertaining to Required Forms half way through (page 24) has been revised to read as follows:

Each Proposer must complete and include the following ~~forms~~ Required Forms in its proposal:

1. *Form PW-6 (Proposer's Reference List), of Appendix C (Required Forms)*, Proposer must provide at least four references where the same or similar scope of services was provided. The listing must include all Public Entities contracts for the last three years. Use additional sheets if necessary.
 - 3.2. *Form PW-14 (Proposer's List of Terminated Contracts,) of Appendix C (Required Forms)*, Listing must include contracts terminated within the past three years with a reason for termination.
9. Section 2.9.7 (Required Licenses and Certifications (Section C), of the RFP, Item 1 (Required Licenses and Certifications) (page 26), has been revised to read as follows:

1. Professional Licenses and Certifications (Section C.1)

The selected Contractor shall be required to provide Services based on the qualifications specified in this RFP, including the Minimum Requirements specified in *Section 1.4 (Minimum Requirements)*. The proposer's planned staff **who will have the responsibility for advising, planning, or working on the new Maximo system** must submit a copy of a valid and active certification to perform IBM Maximo system implementations as evidenced by holding one or more of the following IBM certifications applicable to IBM Maximo v 7.1 or greater:

- IBM Certified Advanced Deployment Professional
- IBM Certified Infrastructure Deployment Professional
- IBM Certified Deployment Professional
- IBM Certified Solution Advisor
- IBM Certified Solution Designer.

Failure by the Proposer to provide such certification shall deem its proposal nonresponsive and subject to disqualification from consideration.

10. Paragraph 32.3 (Optional Services), of Appendix A (Required Contract) (page 22), to the RFP has been revised to read as follows:

Upon the written request of **the Director, or his/her designee** ~~County's Project Director or designee~~ following Go Live and mutual agreement of the parties, Contractor shall provide to County Optional Services using Pool Dollars in accordance with Section 4 (Optional Services) of the Statement of Work.

11. Paragraph 49.2, of Appendix A (Required Contract) (page 30), to the RFP has been revised to read as follows:

49.2 If, after County has given notice of termination/suspension under the provisions of this paragraph 49, it is determined by County that Contractor was not in default under the provisions of this paragraph 49, or that the default was excusable ~~under the provisions of Paragraph Error! Reference source not found.~~, the rights and obligations of the parties shall be the same as if the notice of termination/suspension had been issued pursuant to paragraph 48 (Termination/Suspension for Convenience).

12. New paragraph 64 (Dispute Resolution Procedure), has been added to Appendix A (Required Contract) (page 36), to the RFP to read as follows:

64. DISPUTE RESOLUTION PROCEDURE

64.1 Contractor and County agree to act immediately to mutually resolve any disputes, which may arise with respect to this Contract. All such disputes, shall be subject to the provisions of this paragraph 64 (such provisions shall be collectively referred to as the "Dispute Resolution Procedure"). Time is of the essence in the resolution of disputes.

64.2 Contractor and County agrees that, the existence and details of a dispute notwithstanding, both parties shall continue without delay their performance hereunder.

64.3 Neither party shall delay or suspend its performance during the Dispute Resolution Procedure.

64.4 In the event of any dispute between the parties with respect to this Agreement, Contractor and County shall submit the matter to their

respective Project Managers for the purpose of endeavoring to resolve such dispute.

- 64.5** In the event that the Project Managers are unable to resolve the dispute within a reasonable time not to exceed ten days from the date of submission of the dispute to them, then the matter shall be immediately submitted to Contractor's Project Executive and the Director or his/her designee. These persons shall have ten days to attempt to resolve the dispute.
- 64.6** In the event that at these levels, there is not a resolution of the dispute acceptable to both parties, then each party may assert its other rights and remedies provided under this Contract and/or its rights and remedies as provided by law.
- 64.7** All disputes utilizing this Dispute Resolution Procedure shall be documented in writing by each party and shall state the specifics of each alleged dispute and all actions taken. The parties shall act in good faith to resolve all disputes. At all two levels described in this paragraph 64, the efforts to resolve a dispute shall be undertaken by conference between the parties respective representatives, either orally, by face to face meeting, by telephone, or in writing by exchange of correspondence.
- 64.8** Notwithstanding the foregoing, in the event of County's infringement of Contractor's intellectual property rights under the Agreement or violation by either party of the confidentiality obligations hereunder, the violated party shall have the right to seek injunctive relief against the other without waiting for the outcome of the Dispute Resolution Procedure.
- 64.9** Notwithstanding any other provision of this Contract, County's right to seek injunctive relief to enforce the provisions of paragraph 40 (Confidentiality and Security) shall not be subject to this Dispute Resolution Procedure. The preceding sentence is intended only as a clarification of County's rights and shall not be deemed to impair any claims that County may have against Contractor or County's rights to assert such claims after any such injunctive relief has been obtained.

The provisions of renumbered paragraph 65 (Survival), of Appendix A (Required Contract) (page 37), to the RFP will follow the provisions of newly added paragraph 64 (Dispute Resolution Procedure).

13. Section 2.2.1.2 (page B-20) of Appendix B (Statement of Work) of the RFP has been revised to read as follows:

e. Oracle 11g Release 2, or Oracle 12c, or **SQL Server 2012 (64 bit)**, or latest supported version as the IBM Maximo supported database.

14. Section 2.9.3 (page B-43) of Appendix B (Statement of Work) of the RFP has been revised to read as follows:

As further defined in Attachment 1 (Glossary of Terms) to this Appendix B, a Defect includes any undesired result that conflicts with the Department's reasonable expectations for system behavior or performance, including all add-ons, reports, interfaces and all other aspects of the system as a whole; as well as a failure of some part of the system to conform to specified requirements. Contractor will characterize all Defects by Severity Level with concurrence of the Department, based on the definition applicable to each Severity Level, as set forth in such Attachment 1 (Glossary of Terms) to this Appendix B.

15. Section 2.10.4.b (page B-52) of Appendix B (Statement of Work) of the RFP has been revised to read as follows:

b. This line item (2.10.4(b)) is provided for information only and no Contractor involvement is anticipated. The Department plans to move the archived IBM Maximo 6 data to an Oracle data warehouse and to develop reports to access the old data in the data warehouse.

16. New Section 1.16 (page B.1-3), of Attachment 1 (Glossary of Terms), to Appendix B (Statement of Work), of the RFP has been added to read as follows:

1.16 CONTRACTOR'S PROJECT EXECUTIVE

As used herein, the term "Contractor's Project Executive" shall provide oversight and guidance throughout the term of the Contract.

The provisions of renumbered Section 1.17 (Contractor's Project Manager), of such Attachment 1 (Glossary of Terms), to Appendix B (Statement of Work)

(page B.1-3), of the RFP will follow the provisions of newly added Section 1.16 (Contractor's Project Executive).

17. Section 1.40 (Field Certification Form), of Attachment 1 (Glossary of Terms), to Appendix B (Statement of Work) (page B.1-5), of the RFP has been revised to read as follows:

As used herein, the term "Field Certification Form" shall mean a document prepared by an installation technician completing a successful Maximo system install and configuration in a system environment. At a minimum, such a form must identify the technician, the version of IBM Maximo, and all add-ons and other software installed, the environment into which the install took place, and must also document the type of install (new, upgrade, etc.), the complete software environment (Websphere version, Oracle **or SQL Server** version, AIX version **or Windows Server version**, etc.), the database size, user accounts and permissions, reporting tools, interfaces, integrations, configurations, Maximo components, initial administrator account names and passwords, environment names and URLs and JVMs, tuning performed, system settings, and any relevant comments or notes.

18. Section 1.75 (Pre-Production Environment), of Attachment 1 (Glossary of Terms), to Appendix B (Statement of Work) (page B-1.10), of the RFP has been revised to read as follows:

As used herein, the term "Pre-Production Environment" shall refer to the computer application environment in which the MAXDEV7 and MAXTEST7 systems (separately or together) will be initially established. In addition to instances of IBM Maximo, it can include all supporting applications required for Maximo such as appropriate versions of IBM AIX, Oracle **or SQL Server**, Java Runtime Environment, Java Virtual Machines and Microsoft Windows.

19. The first grammatical paragraph in Column 3 for Category "Administration" and Workshop "System Administration" of the table (page B.1-37), in Attachment 4 (List of Workshops), to Appendix B (Statement of Work), of the RFP has been revised to read as follows:

Identify the hardware and software requirements and system configuration needed to develop the required Maximo infrastructure at the Department and to ensure acceptable system performance. This will address at least all of the following: clustering, load balancing, Single Sign-On, HTTPS, LDAP and LDAPS, user load, load balancing, server and JVM configuration, Oracle **or SQL Server**,

AIX, Windows Server 2012, Maximo Integration Framework (MIF), Cognos Reports and Crystal Report Integration, ESRI ArcGIS and Maximo Spatial, interfacing with one or more mobile solutions, attached/linked documents, and the four environments (MAXPROD7, MAXTEST7, MAXDEV7, and MAXTRAIN7). Also ensure all system and data security issues are identified and addressed. The DPW Security Information Officer or a designated representative shall be a participant in this Workshop.

20. The first grammatical sentence in Column 3 for Category "Configuration" and Workshop "Conditional Expressions, Escalations, Automation Scripting, Other Native Maximo Configuration Functionality, and Triggers" of table (page B.1-42), in Attachment 4 (Listing of Workshops), of Appendix B (Statement of Work Attachments), of the RFP has been revised to read as follows:

Maximo's Conditional Expressions, Escalations, Automation Scripting features, and possibly other native configuration functionality, will be needed to implement various DPW business rules and requirements and to replace current Application Extensions, Java Class File Extensions, and triggers, which are listed in Attachment 5 "~~Listing Of Application~~ **Existing Application** Extensions And Triggers" of this SOW.

21. The current title of Attachment 5 (Listing of Application Extensions and Triggers), to Appendix B (Statement of Work Attachments) of the RFP, as it appears (i) in the Table of Contents for Appendices (page v); (ii) in the Table of Contents for Attachments to Appendix B (page B.1-50); and (iii) as may be listed or referenced anywhere else in the RFP, has been revised to read as follows:

LISTING OF APPLICATION ~~EXISTING~~ APPLICATION EXTENSIONS AND TRIGGERS

22. Step 9 (Accepting the Deliverable), of Attachment 6 (Deliverable Acceptance), to Appendix B (Statement of Work Attachments) (page B.1-57), of the RFP has been revised to read as follows:

When the Deliverable Response indicates that the Deliverable is accepted, County's Project Manager and **the Director or his/her designee** ~~County's Project Director~~ will sign the Task/Deliverable Acceptance Certificate and the Process ends.

B. Questions and Answers

The following answers are in response to the request for information and clarification and other questions submitted by attendees of the Mandatory Proposers' Conference for the Next Generation Maintenance Management System (NextGen MMS) Maximo Upgrade and Services (2015-IT011). Questions presented in this Addendum represent the questions asked by the Proposers in the form and context submitted.

1. **Question:** A Response: to Section 1.4 Minimum Requirements is asked for in Sections B.1 and B.2. Please validate that the County would like vendor's Response: in both sections.

Response: Yes. B.1 is requesting how the Proposer meets Minimum Requirements and B.2 is requesting detailed information on your firm's background and experience.

2. **Question:** Please validate that there is no Item 2 in this Section B.3.

Response: Item 3 has been renumbered to 2. Please see Section A of the Addendum above.

3. **Question:** In an effort to be environmentally friendly, we request the ability to include URL(s) in the document to provide financial statements and electronic copies of the financial statements on the CDs.

Response: If your firm is publicly traded and has financials published on a website, we can accept a URL that is listed on the proposal. Financial statements may be submitted on CDs. Proposers may also submit one hard copy of the financials instead of the multiple sets.

4. **Question:** We request that the County provide Word versions of the Required Forms in order to allow Proposers to complete them without recreating them and risking disqualification.

Response: The County cannot provide Word versions. Proposer should use the pdf versions and complete it electronically or with a pen.

5. **Question:** Please clarify if the Cost Proposal should be a separate hard copy and file from the Business Proposal or if the Proposer should include both the Business and Cost proposals as one response.

Response: The Business Proposal and the Cost Proposal should be submitted separately; although they can be submitted at the same time.

6. **Question:** Please clarify if the County is requesting a total of 24 hard copies and 6 electronic copies which each electronic copy containing one original and one redacted copy plus the Project Plan file.

Response: No. The County is not requesting 24 hard copies and 6 electronic copies. There should be a total of four hard copies of each Business Proposal and each Cost Proposal (one original and three copies) and two electronic copies of each such Proposal (one original and one redacted).

7. **Question:** In order to insert the forms into our Response: without risking disqualification, would the County prefer we 1) insert them without our header and footer and no page numbers or 2) that we shrink the forms to fit within the headers and footers?

Response: The County will accept either method.

8. **Question:** Does every person the Contractor may have working on the Contract need to have Maximo certification?

Response: The Contractor's planned staff such as Project Manager and other key staff identified by the Contractor who will have responsibility for advising, planning, or working on the new Maximo system should have appropriate IBM Maximo certification. Other Contractor staff, such as Cognos or Crystal report writers, training video producers, and others not directly influencing the development or implementation of the new Maximo system are not expected to need Maximo certification. Please see the Addendum above.

9. **Question:** Does this [certification requirements] apply to contract option years that were awarded but not executed for the full term of the option?

Response: Yes. Depending on the nature of the work that the County and the Contractor agree to have the Contractor perform during one or both of the option periods.

10. **Question:** Do we need to list terminated contracts for our subcontractors?

Response: No.

11. **Question:** Please clarify or confirm that costs for items 1-11 should be all inclusive of any physical material deliverable (Ex: Training Material) and/or travel costs.

Response: Yes. Per Form PW-2, the Proposer rate(s) (hourly, monthly, etc.) shall include all administrative costs, labor, supervision, overtime, materials, transportation, taxes, equipment, and supplies unless stated otherwise in the RFP.

12. **Question:** Appendix D - Performance Requirements, Section C.1, Background Check - "...Contractor shall certify all employees who are in a designated sensitive position has passed a fingerprints..."

Please define "designated sensitive position" and what is the county's expectation as to which contractor employees will need to pass the background check?

Response: At this time, the Department does not expect any of the duties to be performed by Contractor's staff to require that they be identified as holding "designated sensitive positions." Please see Appendix A (Required Contract), Section 6.4 (Background And Security Investigations).

13. **Question:** Appendix D - Performance Requirements, Section C.2, Employee Orientation - "Maintain knowledge of thorough knowledge of facilities orientation; possible system requirements and system and their needs."

Please elaborate what this requirement means.

Response: Contractor shall only assign employees who are knowledgeable with the system and the County's needs.

14. **Question:** Appendix D - Performance Requirements, Section C.5 and C.6, Employee Training. What, if any, training is being provided by the Department?

Response: The Department will not provide any training.

15. **Question:** Section 3.5 - Proposal Price Evaluation - "In no case shall any Preference be combined to exceed eight percent (8%) in response to any County solicitation."

8% of what? Is it possible for a single vendor to qualify for and receive all 3 (Local SBE, TJO, DVBE) pricing credits for a maximum of \$150,000? Will a price preference be granted if a proposer's subcontractor qualifies for one of the 3 preferences?

Response: Proposers will only receive one of the three preferences. These preferences cannot be combined and is only given to the prime. Subcontractors are not eligible.

Proposers who qualify for the Local Small Business or Disabled Veteran Business preference will be entitled to have their price reduced for purposes of evaluation only by 8 percent of **the lowest proposed price**, or up to \$50,000, whichever is less. The Transitional Job Opportunity Preference Program does not have any maximum dollar amount.

16. **Question:** Section 3.5.1 - Transitional Job Opportunities Preference - "...8 percent of the lowest price proposed will be calculated, and that amount will be deducted..."

Is the parenthetical, "(which shall not exceed \$50,000)", intentionally omitted from this sentence or is this a mistake?

Response: Please see response to Question 15.

17. **Question:** We request that LADPW remove or relax the requirement or externally audited financial statements. Would it be acceptable for LADPW if we were to provide these statements as well as the contact information for our CPA and information of our banking contact as a reference? In addition we can provide another large Los Angeles department as a current reference for the implementation of Maximo 7.5.

Response: There will not be a change to this requirement. Proposers will be required to submit financial statements. Financial statements or annual reports that are incomplete or unaudited may be given a low or zero score. Providing a CPA, bank, and/or other agency contact cannot be used as an addition or substitute for financials. The evaluation of financials will be scored solely on the provided financial statements.

18. **Question:** It is stated that "Subcontracting is not allowed to meet several requirements of this section". Is it correct understanding that Subcontracting is NOT the preference of DPW for this opportunity?

Response: Only certain sections of the Minimum Mandatory Requirement can be met through the use of a subcontractors. The Department does not have a preference whether or not a subcontractor is used as long as the categories of the Minimum Mandatory Requirement, that are prohibited to be met by subcontractors, are met by the proposing entity.

19. **Question:** Can DPW utilize GSA terms and conditions to allow use of advantageous GSA pricing?

Response: No. Department of Public Works cannot utilize GSA terms and conditions.

20. **Question:** What is the size (GB) of the current Maximo 6.2.3 database?

Response: The size of the Maximo 6.2.3 database (MAXPROD.world) as of August 6, 2015, is 170GB with a MAXPROD schema of 117GB. The WORKORDER table is 7.1GB. Note that the Maximo production database contains over 3.5 million work orders (active and history), only a few thousand of which the Contractor will be responsible for converting and bringing into the new system.

21. **Question:** What is the current Spatial version installed?

Response: Maximo Spatial is not currently installed.

22. **Question:** What is the current Mobile version installed?

Response: DataSplice v3 and DataSplice v5 are in limited use as of August 6, 2015.

23. **Question:** On page B-3 to B-4, what is the active Work Order record count to include tasks (*istask=0* or *istask=1*)?

Response: As of August 6, 2015:

Active Work Orders (History=0, Task=0) = 456,530

Active Work Orders (History=0, Task=1) = 591,900

24. **Question:** What is the total number of expected Maximo, Spatial and Mobile users and what is the expected number of concurrent Maximo, Spatial and Mobile users?

Response: Los Angeles County Department of Public Works has a site license for the Maximo base product. It has Spatial licenses for 1,000 users and four servers. Typical daily maximum number of concurrent users of current Maximo 6.2.3 system is 150. The expected number of concurrent Maximo, Spatial, and Mobile users for the new system can only be speculated, but will likely meet or exceed the number of concurrent users of the current system.

25. **Question:** What is the current Maximo Middleware? (WebSphere, WebLogic)

Response: Websphere 6.0.2.43.

26. **Question:** What is the current Maximo Database Platform? (DB2, Oracle, SQL Server)

Response: Oracle 10g (exact version 10.2.0.4).

27. **Question:** We understand our Response: exclude software. However, should the proposal include: Hardware procurement, Hardware Setup, Operating System installation?

Response: Hardware procurement, hardware setup, and operating system installation are County responsibilities and should not be included in the Proposal. However, note that Task 2 of the Statement of Work requires the Contractor to provide the County "in consultation with the Department's IT staff and for approval by the County's Project Manager, an Initial Environment Technical Specification Document ...[containing a] full description, specification, and diagram describing in detail the technical environments and configurations" for the initial system environments.

28. **Question:** Is it acceptable for some Contractor personnel to access appropriate County IT systems using VPN rather than being physically present?

Response: Yes. Depending on the business needs of the County.

29. **Question:** In 2.9.7, section d, it states that a licensed copy of one of the commercial software packages will provided '...at no cost for the Testing and Implementation phases...'

Since these are commercial software companies that require either purchase or rental of the software in order to be licensed is the desire to have this cost built into the overall Testing deliverable, or is a line item for purchase/rental of the software (to the vendor for licensed use at a client site) acceptable with an optional purchase by the Department after Go-Live?

Response: This cost (for the limited time use of the testing tool) should be built into the Contractor's overall Testing deliverable.

30. **Question:** Can the county provide their estimated value of \$3,650,000 broken down by each of the 11 tasks in the SOW (Appendix B)?

Response: The amount of \$3.65 million is an estimate that the Department is using for budget planning purposes to implement and maintain the project; it is not a target, a lower bound, or an upper bound. Proposer's Total Proposed Price as shown on Form PW-2 is not constrained to the budget planning amount. However, Proposers should keep in mind that 30 percent of the Proposal Evaluation score is based on price. The Department will not breakdown the estimated cost by task. Per Form PW-2, this is for each Proposer to fill in their Proposed Prices. Also note that the 15 percent holdback/retention discussed on Form PW-2 is payable upon the successful completion of Item 11 (Post Go Live Support and System Acceptance). The holdback/retention will not be retained by the County during the 180 day Warranty Period.

31. **Question:** How much of the \$3,650,000 does the County expect to keep in reserve for the two option years?

Response: This is unknown at this time. The two option years (or a portion thereof) could be used as an extension of the initial two-year project time period if delays in the project schedule are experienced or if the County opts to engage contractor for optional services.

32. **Question:** Did the county receive assistance from an outside vendor(s) to determine the estimated contract value?

Response: No.

33. **Question:** RFP Section 1.1 Background and Objectives, Principal Objective 1c - "Migrate a limited number of active MMS work orders..." This would seem to imply that not all active MMS work orders will be migrated to NEXTGEN.

What criteria will be used to determine which active MMS work orders will be migrated and which ones will not be migrated?

Response: The criteria is to be determined, likely in the "Data: Data Move to Maximo 7" Workshop detailed on (page B.1-43).

34. **Question:** RFP Section 1.1 Background and Objectives, Principal Objective 1d - "...using native IBM Maximo functionality...automation scripting and... No custom code or code extensions will be accepted unless absolutely required for mission-critical functionality..." Automation scripting provides for virtually unlimited ability to customize Maximo behavior, which would seem to contradict the statement; "No custom code... will be accepted..."

Please clarify the Departments position as to the extent that automation scripts would be implemented and not be considered "custom code" and please provide specific criteria that the Department uses to determine "mission-critical functionality"

Response: Maximo's Automation Scripting is part of native IBM Maximo functionality. It is anticipated that Automation Scripting would be used to configure the application to achieve DPW goals. It is not considered "custom code".

The Department's mission is, "We provide public infrastructure and municipal services to protect and enrich the daily lives of over ten million people in the Los Angeles County." "Mission-critical functionality" would be any part of the process in the NextGen MMS (i.e., application, process, procedure) whose failure would result in the failure of business operations, i.e. the Department not meeting its mission. Many specifics can only be determined once the Use Cases are finalized and Workshops completed.

35. **Question:** Appendix A (Contract), Section 4.3 - Invoices and Payments. Will county make incremental or milestone payments based on percentage completion of tasks or will they pay only upon 100% completion of a given task.

Response: Several of the Tasks could not be subject to "percentage complete" payments.— These Tasks include: Tasks 1 (Project Start Up), 2 (Install and Configure Initial Development and Testing Environments), 5 (Install and Configure Training and Production Environments), and 10 (Implementation: Dress Rehearsal and Go Live). For those that may be broken down into clear percentages (perhaps Task 4), and where useful work could be realized before the completion of the Task in its entirety, County may agree to percentage payments. Terms for this would need to be specified and agreed upon during contract negotiation or implemented via a change order.

36. **Question:** Appendix B, Attachment 3 - "results of a series of workshops conducted in 2013"

Did the county enlist the assistance of any outside vendor/consultant to facilitate the workshops and/or document the results? If yes, who was that vendor/consultant?

Response: Yes. The owner of the Maximo product, IBM.

37. **Question:** Work Plan and Schedule. We were told at the Proposer's conference that for purposes of our proposal, we should consider this a 2 year project. It seems clear that Tasks 1-10 would be included but what if any, of Task 3 (3.1, 3.2, etc.) should be included within that 2 year timeframe?

Response: In order to more effectively compare and evaluate Proposals, Proposers should set their Project Schedule for Tasks 1-10 to not exceed 24 months. However, the County and the Contractor may negotiate for an actual initial Implementation Plan that has a longer timeline, if it is in the interest of the County in order to meet the County's requirements.

Task 3 "Mobile MMS Solution Selection" should be planned to be completed within the first two-year period. However, if your question refers to Appendix B (Statement of Work), Section 3 "Post Go Live Support and System Acceptance," if necessary, this may extend past the two year mark, at no additional cost to the County.

38. **Question:** Appendix B, Attachment 1, Paragraph 1.5 -"... "Business Day" shall mean Monday through Thursday,..."

Does this imply that for scheduling purposes we should assume that LADPW resources will not be available on Fridays?

Response: Yes. In preparing the Project Schedule (part of the Work Plan required of the proposers in their response to the RFP) proposers should plan for Department staff resources Monday through Thursday, 7 a.m. to 5 p.m. only.

39. **Question:** SOW, Page B-16, section 2.1.1(p). Organizational Change Management. Can an example of a DPW Organizational Change Management Plan be provided to provide a baseline understanding of DPW's definition of an OCM plan?

Response: The Organizational Change Management Plan is being produced by Department staff and is not available for review at this time. It will list potential ideas, tools, and actions aimed at gaining and maintaining organizational and user buy-in and sense of ownership for the new system. As noted in the Statement of Work, Section 1.4.4, "Contractor's review of, and recommendations for the Organizational Change Management Plan is not a paid deliverable; it is a plan developed by the Department for encouraging acceptance and optimum usage of the new system by users. Since the ultimate success of the NextGen MMS Project will be dependent, in part, upon user acceptance of the new system, the Contractor's experience in successfully motivating other clients' users to adopt new Maximo installations is of interest."

40. **Question:** Appendix B, Section 2.4, [Task 4 Deliverable], paragraph d.xii) - In lieu of a Maximo Workflow, will LA DPW accept a simplified workflow leveraging start center data portlets and other methods for appropriate processes?

Response: It is anticipated that a number of Workflows will be necessary to meet business needs. The Department is also open to considering other options as long as they are clearly at least as effective as well-designed workflows could be in meeting the Department's needs.

41. **Question:** Will remote access be provided to Department systems for purposes of this project so that technical tasks can be performed from contractor offices?

Response: Please see response to Question 28.

42. **Question:** ATTACHMENT 3: INITIAL PARTIAL LIST OF DPW USER REQUIREMENTS from 2013 Workshops - "eCAPS Interface / General Ledger. This external system may require several distinct interfaces with the new Maximo System, including but not limited to (timesheets, materials, and other costs)." Pg B.1-45.

To quantify our response, is there any additional definition on planned eCAPS/Maximo interfaces beyond this attachment? What functions will be managed in eCAPS - MRO Inventory, Purchase Orders, Receipts, Invoices?

Response: Timesheet integration is a requirement - as described on pages B.1-45 and B.1-22 (REF NO. PW-019). As stated in PW-019, the extent of the interface needed and the functions to be managed are to be determined in one or more workshops.

43. **Question:** Is current GIS data contained in a single ESRI Geodatabase or is there separate databases, e.g. by division and/or system? If separate, is the intent to integrate and normalize this data across the Department? If so, how many data sources and layers are estimated

Response: Current GIS data is contained in a single ESRI geodatabase. We currently have approximately 60 GIS feature classes relating to County assets, but this number may grow slightly as more divisions integrate their data.

44. **Question:** Appendix B - System Administration Workshop Pg. B.1-37 Maximo 6 archive.

Does DPW have an archive tool? If so, please specify which one is in use.

Response: No. The Department does not have a Maximo archive application tool.

45. **Question:** Appendix B – Workshops B-27 “conduct a system of workshops”

Are the workshops intended to be Division Specific, other than system administration and interfaces?

Response: Some workshops may be specific to a single division or a limited number of divisions. For example, only Road Maintenance and Operational Services Divisions are expected to have a significant interest in the Road Code workshop.

46. **Question:** Overview and Background Pg. 1.2.4 “DPW maintains an enterprise GIS based in part on ESRI's product, ArcGIS”

Is the database implemented for ESRI the "Linearly referenced method GeoDatabase"?

Response: No.

47. **Question:** Is your Maximo currently integrated with SCADA? Do you have any enterprise standard/infrastructure for integrating data from systems like SCADA?

Response: The Department's SCADA is not currently integrated with Maximo.

48. **Question:** Instead of integrating with the existing "custom" City Services Request Tracking System (pg b-7, paragraph b-3)

Are you open to a solution which includes a replacement of such systems with a solution that provides the same functionality and more closely works directly with Maximo? More generically, are you open to similar solution propositions for any of the integrations listed?

Response: Replacing the City Services Request Tracking System with Maximo features is a possibility the Department has seriously considered. Without having access to a contractor with sufficient knowledge and expertise, the Department determined for now that the CSRTS with all its custom programming requirements was too complex to replace with Maximo using only standard Maximo features. However, we are open to this option if it can be proven feasible without losing current functionality or requiring custom code.

49. **Question:** Appendix A, 32.1 "Approval or rejection of deliverable(s) will not be unreasonably withheld by County".

What is definition of unreasonable? What are objective criteria for County to accept or reject?

Response: The County will endeavor to provide approvals or rejections within a reasonable time frame as indicated per Task in the table on page B.1-55. As outlined in Appendix B, Attachment 6 Deliverable Acceptance, "Contractor may include or attach a list of recommended criteria for County to use in reviewing the Deliverable". Criteria for acceptance for individual Tasks are defined throughout Appendix B. The Department reserves the right to return a deliverable for revision due to clarity, spelling, or grammatical errors in an effort to preserve or ensure the quality of the work.

50. **Question:** Appendix A, 49.2 If, after County has given notice of termination suspension under the provisions of this Paragraph 49, it is determined by County that Contractor was not in default under the provisions of this Paragraph 49, or that the default was excusable under the provisions of Paragraph Error! Reference source not found. What is missing reference?

Response: Please see Section A, Addendum above.

51. **Question:** Appendix B, 1.2.3 b) 5) Document Management System "DMS"), currently using FileNET with plans to move to Microsoft SharePoint.

When is move to SharePoint planned? Before, during or after this project?

Response: Best projection as of now (August 17, 2015, and subject to change) is during the first few months of this NextGen MMS Project, if not before.

52. **Question:** Appendix B, 1.2.3 b) 7) Electronic Development and Permit Tracking System ("eDAPTS"), a client-server-based, customized version of a COTS application, fully supported by its vendor (Accela). eDAPTS issues permits and tracks plan review and permit activities. DPW is investigating replacing this system.

What is the expected nature of this integration? What Maximo functionality will be used/enhanced by this integration? What eDAPTS functionality will be used/enhanced by this integration?

Response: Details of this integration to be determined at Workshop - Integrations and Interfaces: eDAPTS Interface described on page B.1-45.

53. **Question:** Appendix B, 1.2.3 B) 13) SCADA (Supervisory Control And Data Acquisition), Some of the other such systems will also require an interface with MMS.

What are other remote data gathering systems?

Response: Flood Maintenance Division has one SCADA system. Waterworks Division has two SCADA systems. Sewer Maintenance Division has one SCADA system. Water Resources Division has five SCADA systems, some of which may be maintained by one or more of the five maintenance divisions. At the time of the preparation of this Statement of Work, only one to three SCADA systems

are projected to need a Maximo interface. By the time the Contract is underway, other SCADA systems may also be identified as needing Maximo interfaces. Also see description on table page B.1-46.

54. **Question:** Appendix B, 1.2.3 b) 16) InfraMap by iWater is currently part of a pilot project in the Waterworks Division. Depending on the results of that pilot, an InfraMap-Maximo Interface may be required.

When will this decision be made? What is expected function of this interface?

Response: The iWater pilot is ongoing. Whether an interface is required and, if it is, its expected function is to be determined at the InfraMap workshop. See page B.1-44 for details.

55. **Question:** Appendix B, 1.2.6 d) Document and implement a significant number of work process...

Contractor can document recommended work processes. How does County expect Contractor to IMPLEMENT work processes? What is Contractors recourse if County fails to adopt recommended processes that take full advantage of available features?

Response: "Document and implement a significant number of work process..." in the RFP at this reference is a statement of the overall Project objectives. Contractor will assist County in meeting objectives as provided under the Contract terms.

56. **Question:** Appendix B, 2.2.2 c) Install and configure Maximo Everyplace and any other applicable Maximo tool or feature appropriate for this Project. Appendix B, 2.3 states that part of this engagement is to assist in determining Mobile solution, further states that no preference is to be assumed for any Maximo Mobile products, meaning Maximo Everywhere should not be in scope.

Why is it included here and in Appendix B, 2.2.3 c)?

Response: Please refer to response to Question 101.

57. **Question:** Appendix B, 2.3.1 Note: DPW has already drafted some Use Cases that include mobile elements prior to the start of the Project. All of the Use Cases currently available (mobile and otherwise) will be available for inspection at the Proposers' Conference.

Use cases were NOT available at Proposers Conference, will County provide prior to response deadline?

Response: Hard copies of the Use Cases were in fact available for viewing at the Proposers Conference at the front table. The presenter lifted them up to show them and several attendees heard. However, as some other conference attendees did not hear the announcement, an electronic copy of all the Use Cases will be made available for download and will be posted at <http://dpw.lacounty.gov/asd/contracts>.

58. **Question:** Appendix B, 2.4.1 INITIAL PARTIAL DPW USER REQUIREMENTS
The Department has previously surveyed its maintenance divisions and developed an initial partial list of user requirements for the NextGen MMS Solution...

Attachment 3 (Initial Partial List of DPW User Requirements] is primarily intended for use by the Contractor as a planning tool for scoping the extent of this Project...

As stated above, the County intends for the Initial Partial DPW User Requirements to be used to scope the extent of this project. Since this is only a partial list as noted in the text above, what additional guidance does the County offer to determine extent of scope?

Response: This list, and more generally, the entirety of the Statement of Work, is all the guidance regarding requirements available at this time. "Additional requirements to be met by the Solution are expected to be identified in the Workshops." The "Initial Partial DPW User Requirements" list is merely offered to illustrate the depth and breadth of already-known requirements upon which the proposer can plan its scope in its proposal. If, based on proposer's professional experience, there are obvious omissions in the requirements in this list and in the requirements listed elsewhere throughout the Statement of Work, then proposers are encouraged to identify and include them in their proposals, both to help ensure the scope of the work is adequately documented and also to demonstrate during the Proposal Evaluation phase the expertise of the Proposer.

59. **Question:** Appendix B, 2.4.3 Workshops - The Contractor shall use these Workshops and resulting operational requirements...

Detailed descriptions of how to use Maximo to achieve the specified requirements are work instructions, what mechanism does the County propose to ensure Contractors detailed instructions are followed? Especially given the language in Appendix B 2.9.6 c) below, which states the detailed instructions to achieve success will NOT be followed in testing?

Response: The Contractor shall document all requirement solutions in the Specifications Documents (which will also be used for the Solution Build Phase), and these solutions shall also be incorporated into the user training and included in the As-Builts. The language of Appendix B, 2.9.6 (c) states that the Department as part of its user acceptance testing may conduct, in addition to the system tests using the test scripts provided by the Contractor, additional ad-hoc tests that relate to functions supporting the Department's business needs. This ad-hoc testing will not be performed instead of, but as a supplement to, the Contractor's scripted testing instructions.

60. **Question:** Designated DPW staff may also, at their option, perform ad-hoc tests of their own design.... Appendix B, 2.9.4 b) The Contractor shall not consider Unit Testing to be complete if there are any Severity 1 or Severity 2 Defects noted.

What about potential Severity 1 or 2 defects that are software related? Will Contractor be held responsible for Software vendor code issues?

Response: The Contractor is not held responsible for Software vendor code issues within the scope of IBM's Maximo Maintenance Agreement with the Department. Any defects of that nature would be addressed between the Department and IBM via its existing Maximo Maintenance Agreement.

61. **Question:** Appendix B, 2.9.7 b) The Department requires each IBM Maximo environment to conform to the following IBM Maximo user interface...

As Maximo is a web based solution, response times are affected by network traffic and other network issues outside Contractors control. What assurance does the County provide that Contractor recommendations in the Infrastructure Recommendations report will be complied with?

Response: The Contractor will perform technical system tuning and configuration such that the system's performance meets or exceeds the standards noted in Appendix B (Statement of Work), Section 2.9.7 (Performance Testing and Tuning by Contractor), subparagraph (b). If the Contractor is unable to "tune" the system to meet these standards due to factors outside its control

(such as network performance to field locations), the Contractor is expected to make recommendations to the Department on how to address such deficiency.

62. **Question:** Does the budget indicated in the RFP include any additional software licenses required?

Response: The Contractor shall include software license costs in its Proposed Prices only for appropriate Tasks as discussed in the Statement of Work Section 1.4.5 (Document Sharing and Issues Tracking Application) and Section 2.9.7(d) relating to a performance testing tool. In regards to other software licensing costs, please see the response to Question 24.

63. **Question:** Does the published budget amount of \$3,650,000 include mobile s/w and implementation services?

Response: Yes. However, please refer to the response to Question 30 for additional related information.

64. **Question:** Outside of IBM GBS, which IBM Maximo business partner companies has DPW received consulting services from in the past five years?

Response: Other than IBM itself, the only IBM Maximo business partners known to the business unit that prepared this RFP to have provided the Department with Maximo-related consulting services in the past five years have been DataSplice and iWater. The Department is a large organization and other business units may have engaged IBM Maximo business partners for other services unrelated to the RFP.

65. **Question:** Have any IBM Maximo business partners directly or indirectly contributed to the development of this RFP?

Response: No.

66. **Question:** How many Full-Time-Equivalent (FTE) resources does LADPW currently plan to allocate to this project and over what period of time? What job roles does LADPW currently have planned to support this project?

Response: Please refer to the Statement of Work, Section 2.1.2(e) (page B-17).

67. **Question:** Given the existing investment in DataSplice, why does DPW want to re-evaluation mobile solutions? What specific requirements does DPW feel DataSplice cannot support?

Response: Refer to the Statement of Work, Section 2.3.4 (page B-24), and also the last paragraph of Section 2.3.5 (page B-25). It is incorrect to conclude at this time that DataSplice fails to meet requirements that are not yet documented.

68. **Question:** Does LADPW have a preference as to which technical approach is taken for your upgrade – i.e. use of IBM upgrade scripts or direct data migration/conversion or is that a decision you will leave up to your chosen consulting partner?

Response: Due to the extensive and significant number of work process and data structure improvements, and industry-specific IBM Maximo best practices applicable to DPW's maintenance divisions, use of standard IBM conversion/upgrade scripts does not appear to the Department to be compatible with the approach described in the Statement of Work. The Department is open to a persuasive rebuttal. See also the response to Question 73.

69. **Question:** SOW, Page B-7, section 1.2.3 (b). Integrations. Can DPW provide a subject matter expert to contribute to the project for each external system listed in the RFP?

Response: Yes.

70. **Question:** SOW, page B-11, section 1.2.5. "These Java Class File Extensions are customizations..." Existing Java Class Files and database triggers.

Is DPW open to possible recommendations to keep existing customizations after the contractor's analysis (e.g. in order to complete project within defined budget)?

Response: Our existing customizations are not satisfactory for a variety of reasons and the Department is taking this opportunity to replace them.

71. **Question:** Appendix B, 1.4.4, Status Meetings and Status Reports, paragraph g) - "...suggestions for enhancing DPW's Organizational Change Management Plan..."

Will the Department provide a copy of the OCM Plan as an addendum to the RFP?

Response: Please see response to Question 39.

72. **Question:** SOW, page B-21, Section 2.2.2 (d). There is a mention of SSO in the Dev, Test and Training setup. We need to clarify what is required here due to varying level of efforts. Integrating with the LDAP directory so that users can login using the same password for Windows and Maximo represents one level of effort. However, configuring SSO where the client is automatically logged into Maximo based on the stored Windows credentials represents a greater level of effort.

Can LADPW clarify which of these two options is required?

Response: The Department desires configuring SSO (Single Sign-On) such that the client is automatically logged into Maximo based on the stored Windows credentials. See also Section 2.5.5(c) of the Statement of Work for additional details.

73. **Question:** SOW, page B-21, section 2.2.2/2.2.3. Install and Configure MAXDEV7/MAXTEST7.

When creating the two environments for development and testing, it was not clearly stated if you desire to update the current production database from 7.1 to 7.5/7.6 with the vendor provided database update scripts for use in these environments. This is an important activity we recommend to all clients to perform this activity very early in the project, to determine if major data issues exist.

Response: This is beyond the scope of the RFP Question and Answer phase. It discusses details of the implementation that have not been decided yet. This will be determined in the process described in Appendix B (Statement of Work), Section 2.2.1 (Initial Environment Technical Specification Document), which states that the Contractor shall prepare and submit in consultation with the Department's IT staff and for approval by the County's Project Manager, an Initial Environment Technical Specification Document, which shall in part include a full description, specification, and diagram describing in detail the technical environments and configurations for the initial MAXDEV7 and MAXTEST7 environments. This should include a determination of whether these two initial environments should be created via updating a copy of the Department's existing production system using a scripting process from Maximo 6.2.3 to Maximo version 7.1 and then again to version 7.6, or if they should be created as

new "vanilla" version 7.6 environments into which the Department's Maximo version 6.2.3 data tables are individually processed and imported, or if they should be created via some other process. See also the response to Question 68.

74. **Question:** SOW, page B-37, section 2.6.2 Task 6 - Build deliverable regarding invoicing and payment.

It is mentioned in the note for payment, no invoicing can be done until Task 6 (Build) is 100% complete. More than likely, this will be the largest cost and longest timeframe of all phases to complete for the consultant chosen. Will LADPW consider payment for deliverables as they are completed/accepted for this lengthy task to reduce time from actual work performed to payment?

Response: Refer to the response to Question 35. However, the Department is concerned that it not pay for a partially completed system that does not meet essential requirements and cannot be used. Tasks have been carefully defined to be appropriate stand-alone deliverables worthy of payment. The contractor would need to make a persuasive case that completion of parts of Task 6 (MMS Solution Build Phase) represent payments for worthy and truly complete stand-alone products and not merely partially completed work.

75. **Question:** SOW, page B-39 - section 2.7.1.(b)v. Approximately how many Maximo users currently exist within each of the five Divisions using Maximo?

Response: As of August 17, 2015:

Flood Maintenance = 163
Operational Services = 155
Road Maintenance = 228
Sewer Maintenance = 32
Waterworks = 60

76. **Question:** SOW, Page B-54 - section 4. Optional Services. What is the approximate amount of available Pool Dollars allocated for Optional Services?

Response: Please see response to Question 31.

77. **Question:** Section 1.4.5. DOCUMENT SHARING AND ISSUES TRACKING APPLICATION

In the past we have simply used a file share on the client's network as a repository for project documents. What is the Department's expectation for the issues application? Do they have a particular product in mind?

Response: Any file share network proposed by the Contractor must meet all criteria on Section 1.4.5 to the satisfaction of the County's Project Manager. In a recent past major IT product development and rollout project in our Waterworks Division, we used a combination of SharePoint (already at the Department) and a product called ServiceWise. However, the Department has no particular product in mind and wishes to leverage the expertise of the contractor for this item.

78. **Question:** Would a vendor's proposal be disqualified or otherwise rejected if the pricing exceeded \$3,650,000?

Response: No. This amount is only a planning budget estimate. Please also see response to Question 30.

79. **Question:** What is the protest process for liquidated damages? What is the protest process for performance penalties?

Response: A Dispute Resolution Procedure is being added to the Required Contract by an Addendum to address any dispute arising from the contract.

80. **Question:** Appx B, 1.2.3, b. - Please provide a more detailed definition of the integration requirements, including functional overview of the external system, integration process overview, and data flows. This information is required to estimate the integration effort for those interfaces that will be retained in the new environment, and to understand the Maximo configuration required for those interfaces that will be replaced.

Response: No further information is available on this other than what is presented in several locations in the RFP and in responses herein to questions about the interface requirements. Proposers should plan their proposals and pricing accordingly.

81. **Question:** Appendix B, section 1.2.3, sub-section b, Page 121, Paragraph 3 – Existing Integration between Maximo and various external systems are mentioned here. Can you please provide details on:

- a. Total number of interfaces between Existing Maximo and external systems?

- b. Any 3rd part EAI tool is used for integration or it is point to point interfaces?
- c. Are there any intentions to go for a Enterprise Application Integration platform as part of the current RFP?

Response: Please see responses below:

- a. For the new Maximo 7.6 (or later) system, there will be a minimum of 16 interfaces as noted in Section 1.2.3(b), but there may be more as the Department continues developing new and enhanced systems to meet its business needs.
- b. In the current Maximo setup the Department does not use a third-party EAI tool and the interfaces are P2P. As stated in Section 1.2.3(b) of the Statement of Work, the Contractor is expected to use the Maximo Interface Framework (MIF) for external system integrations.
- c. No.

82. **Question:** Appx B, 2.9.7.b. - Are performance requirements applicable to mobile devices? Is this a measurement of transaction response time at the server or at the client device?

Response: This is something to be determined as part of Task 3, "Mobile MMS Solution Selection".

83. **Question:** Appx B, 2.1.1.g. - What are DPW's criteria for the "most current, proven version of IBM Maximo"? If the most current, proven version changes during the term of the project does DPW intend to move to that version, or deploy on the version identified at project initiation?

Response: Refer to the bold face italics paragraph at the start of the Statement of Work, Task 2 (page B-18), Initial Development and Testing Environments. Maximo version changes that occur after the conclusion and acceptance of Task 2 deliverables will not constitute a "moving target" for compliance, unless both the County and the Contractor concur.

84. **Question:** Appx B, 2.4.2 - Please provide a copy of the draft use cases identified in Section 2.4.2, and any other use cases (draft or final) that may be applicable to this project.

Response: Please see the response to Question 57.

85. **Question:** Appx B, 2.4.3 - Will DPW allow requirements workshops to be recorded?

Response: We will allow audio recording, subject to the agreement of all workshop attendees, consistent with all applicable laws, and not for use or distribution by the contractor outside of this contract.

86. **Question:** Appx B, 2.10.4 - Seems to imply that historical data will be retained only in the archive system. Please confirm what transactional data (in-process only?) needs to be migrated to the new version of Maximo.

Response: This is expected to be the subject of one or more workshops and cannot be completely defined at this time. The nonbinding intention at this time is for the divisions to examine all of their work orders for work in some stage of WAPPR, WSCH, WMATL, APPR, INPRG, and similar open statuses and to identify perhaps as many as a few thousand work order records for conversion and migration. It is NOT intended that the several hundreds of thousands of existing open work orders, some dating back years, will be sent to the new system.

87. **Question:** Appx B, Defects - In considering criteria for entering a project activity (e.g. testing phases, dress rehearsal, go-live, etc.) are base Maximo product issues considered defects that could delay or prevent initiation of that activity? Are base Maximo product issues considered defects that could prevent system acceptance?

Response: Please see response to Question 60.

88. **Question:** Appx B, 2.10.1.h - Will all unscripted or ad-hoc tests be based on the requirements as accepted during system design?

Response: Until the requirements and the tests are fully identified, this cannot be answered. However, it is the intention that unscripted/ad-hoc tests identify legitimate problems that may exist that have not yet been identified and that need to be addressed.

89. **Question:** Appx B, Schedule - Are there any "block out" dates for go-live that need to be considered, such as end-of-year financial close-out, holidays,

department-wide events, etc? What such dates and events need to be considered in terms of activities and interim deliverables?

Response: The list of County holidays is provided in section 1.9 of the RFP. It is not prescriptive for the project timeline (either the Project Schedule or the Project Implementation Plan), but having the system go live a few weeks to a few months before the beginning of a County fiscal year (July 1) or, secondarily, the beginning of a fiscal half-year (January 1), would be helpful. However, the project should not be artificially delayed or unduly rushed to try to meet this preference.

90. **Question:** The RFP states under multiple references the scope is not definitive in relationship to documented requirements; scope of integrations, data sets and sources, and the potential for extensions and enhancements to meet business processes not included within the RFP.

Does the county anticipate working with the Contractor to baseline the scope per the RFP and then adjust for cost and schedule increases as the scope increases due to new discoveries or previously undocumented scope?

Response: Yes. But all requirements referenced in the RFP, Statement of Work, and all associated attachments, will be "baseline" to the scope, as well as any requirements that a reasonable and experienced contractor would be expected to foresee for a project of the scope and complexity of this one. The significant expertise of the contractor in performing work of this nature for lines of business such as exist in the Department is an element of the contractor selection process. Notwithstanding this, the unexpected expense of incorporating new requirements that are found after the signing of the contract by both parties may be grounds for a change order or may be included later as "Optional Services" (refer to Statement of Work section 4). Please also see to the response to Question 58.

91. **Question:** Several of the named interfaces are based on upgrades and enhancements that will impact the scope of the interface. More than one interface is under some form of a pilot.

How does the county plan to reconcile the RFP scope with decisions made by the county related to these integrations?

Response: We are unable to provide a response as it is not clear from the question what reconciliation is suggested or what is being asked about.

92. **Question:** There are over 40 workshops named as required and the county states that more may be required. The contractor is responsible for coordination of DPW staff, having availability of no more than 16 hours/week.

How does the county anticipate enforcing attendance for planned and scheduled workshops (understanding emergency events impacting the availability of DPW Core Team members)?

Response: Once the actual Implementation Plan (which will be based on the Project Schedule due as part of the proposal) is developed and approved near the beginning of the contract, the Department will commit that its personnel will attend as planned, barring unexpected events. Divisions will be asked to send qualified substitutes when needed.

93. **Question:** The RFP lists 100+ existing reports that will have to be migrated from Crystal Reports or other developer tools as part of the re-implementation.

Has the county identified new reports the contractor will be responsible to develop and if so, from which division and what are the totals? To insure the report scope is reasonably defined provide a list to the contractors for inclusion within a single scope document.

Response: All of the information currently available regarding the reports is listed in the Statement of Work and its attachments. Please refer to the Statement of Work, Attachment 7, Summary of Existing Reports.

94. **Question:** The County makes reference in many places within the RFP the statement "at the counties discretion" in terms of performance and acceptance.

Please identify the arbitration process available to the contractor if the contractor does not agree with the discretionary decision by the County?

Response: A Dispute Resolution Procedure is being added to the Required Contract by an Addendum to resolve any dispute arising from the contract.

95. **Question:** If the bids were to come in over the stated budget, what is the process for securing additional funding?

Response: The Department's budget process is beyond the scope of this contract. The Department will not enter into a contract for which it does not

reasonably expect to have funding available. Notwithstanding this, refer to the Required Contract (Appendix A of the RFP) sections 10.1 and 10.2.

96. **Question:** Page 12, paragraph 3 - There is a reference to implementation of a Mobile Solution for accessing Maximo functionality on Mobile. Can you please provide details on:

- a. Total Number of Mobile Users?
- b. Concurrent Mobile User Loads?
- c. No and Type of Mobile Devices?
- d. Any evaluation that DPW has carried out on target Mobile solutions?
- e. Any licenses that DPW currently hold on specific Mobile products?
- f. Is there any decision to replace the existing Data Splice mobile solution by DPW?

Response: Please see response below:

- a. Please see response to Question 25.
- b. Please see response to Question 25.
- c. This information is not available. All mobile devices currently known to be in use are either using DataSplice or directly accessing Maximo.
- d. This is part of Task 3 of the Statement of Work.
- e. As noted in the RFP, we have licenses for DataSplice. See the final paragraph of the Statement of Work section 2.3.5.
- f. Please see responses to Question 67.

97. **Question:** Page 12, paragraph 5 - There is a requirement stated here to provide Training to DPW users. Can you please provide details on:

- a. No of users to be trained?
- b. Whether WBT is acceptable to DPW?
- c. Number of location where training needs to be conducted?

Response: Please see responses below:

- a. This information is included in Task 7, Section 2.7, of the Statement of Work.
- b. The Department will interpret "WBT" as Web-based Training. Depending on the nature, extent, and quality of the WBT, it may be acceptable. As noted in Section 2.7.1 of the Statement of Work, "The outline below provides a suggested framework and parameters for the intended User

Training Plan and should be used by the Contractor as a guide. The actual User Training Plan developed by the Contractor may not conform identically to what is presented below, but all the components and requirements should be fully addressed."

c. Refer to section 2.7.1(b) (Training Methodologies and Locations).

98. **Question:** Page 15, paragraph 2 – It is mentioned that Contractor is required to provide services Onsite. Is DPW open for a Offshore Centric model of delivery OR is it that it expects 100% of services in a Onshore centric model at its offices?

Response: Many activities, by their nature, must be conducted onsite, such as establishing the development and testing system environments, workshops, training, meetings, etc. Some activities may be able to be effectively conducted offsite via remote access, such as parts of the solution build phase (refer to Task 6) and some parts of system testing.

99. **Question:** Page 32, paragraph 3 – There is a mention about development of Cognos Reports. Can you please provide details on:

- a. DPW's existing Operational reporting platform.
- b. DPW's MI reporting platform.
- c. Target Operational / MIS reporting platforms.
- d. No of custom reports that needs to be developed.

Response: Please see responses below:

- a. The Department's Cognos reporting is currently on version 8.4; the bulk of content is Report Studio developed reports. Note that, as discussed extensively in Section 2.4.5(t)-i, of the Statement of Work, the "Department intends to operate in a mixed reporting environment that will use BIRT, Crystal Reports, and Cognos Reports, all of which must be configured to run from within IBM Maximo."
- b. Unable to respond to question using an unclear acronym "MI".
- c. Please see response above, Question 99(a).
- d. Please refer to Section 2.4.5(t)-iv, of the Statement of Work.

100. **Question:** Page 34, last paragraph – There is a requirement to provide detailed Project Schedule. Can you please provide details on:

- a. Any Target Start Date for the programme that DPW has in mind

- b. Any expected duration for the programme
- c. Any external constraints on completion of the programme before certain timelines

Response: Please see responses below:

- a. The Department plans to issue a Notice to Proceed the first workday after the County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors has approved the contract.
- b. Two years or less, not including any Optional Services (refer to Section 4, Optional Services of the Statement of Work).
- c. No. However, please see responses to Question 89.

101. **Question:** Appendix B, section 1.2.3, sub-section a.3, Page 121, Paragraph 1 – It is our understanding from reading the Maximo Everyplace note that DPW has evaluated this solution and discarded it because it does not meet the criteria of 'disconnected' working. Can you please confirm?

Response: As noted in Section 1.2.3(a)-3, of the Statement of Work, "[Maximo] Everyplace is not a mobile MMS solution in that it does not provide for disconnected or "store and forward" use, like DataSplice or Maximo Anywhere or various other applications." The Department and the Contractor may nevertheless make use of the screen design capability and/or other capabilities of Maximo Everyplace that is bundled with the core Maximo version 7.6 product during the course of the Project.

102. **Question:** Appendix B, section 1.2.3, sub-section b, Page 121, Paragraph b –

- a. Do you have any ESB platform or intended to have one?
- b. What is the preferred approach for the integration? e.g. Web services, HTTP, P2P

Response: Please see responses below:

- a. Please see response to Question 81. The preferred approach and integration options will be explored as part of the workshops listed in Attachment 4 (List of Workshops) to the Statement of Work.
- b. Please see response to Question 81.

103. **Question:** Appx B, 1.2.3.b. - From the RFP, "The upgraded NextGen MMS Solution will require an interface/integration, at a minimum, with each of the

existing key external systems listed below. This is not an exhaustive list of such external systems.”

Please identify any additional external systems that may require an interface, and provide a functional overview, integration process overview, and data flows.

Response: Please see response to Question 81.

104. **Question:** Appendix B, section 1.2.4, sub-section a, Page 123, Paragraph a – Is there any data migration requirement of GIS data to Maximo?

Response: Requirement is to link Maximo assets with ArcGIS assets and use Maximo Spatial, not to import GIS data into Maximo.

105. **Question:** Appendix B, section 2.1.1, sub-section a, Page 130, Paragraph 1 - It is assumed that all the required Infrastructure required will be procured directly by DPW and the contractor does not have to account for any hardware costs in its proposal. Can you please confirm?

Response: See the response to Question 27 above.

106. **Question:** Appendix B, section 2.4.5, sub-section t.i, Page 145, Paragraph 2 - It is mentioned that Cognos Reports is planned to be used mainly for reporting from a combination of Maximo and other databases, primarily the County's eCAPS database. However, Cognos Business Intelligence Analytics Module included by IBM as part of Maximo v7.6 should be used only with Maximo database and not with other databases like County's eCAPS database.

This can be achieved only by getting the enterprise wide Cognos reports licenses. Does the DPW has procured similar licenses or planning to buy?

Response: The Department currently holds site licenses for Cognos.

107. **Question:** Appendix B, section 2.4.5, sub-section v.d.xi, Page 147, Paragraph d.xi - Who is responsible for Data cleansing and converting the data into the structured format?

Response: The Department expects the Contractor to be responsible for this activity to be described during Task 4, with guidance as needed by the Department. It may be that certain data may need to be "cleansed" by the Department; if so, the Department may require the Contractor's guidance.

108. **Question:** Appendix B, section 2.9.7, sub-section a, Page 160, Paragraph a - Does DPW has any existing Performance Testing tool licenses for carrying out Performance Testing? Does the contractor supposed to carry out Disaster Recovery Testing?

Response: No. The Department does not have performance testing tool licenses. No. The Department will carry out Disaster Recovery Testing.

109. **Question:** Appendix B, section 3.4, sub-section a, Page 167 - Post the 30-days of Post Implementation support, is there a requirement for the contractor to provide any Application Support Services ? If yes, for how many years?

Response: Contractor shall provide services required under terms of the Warranty. Also, please refer to the section called Optional Services on page B-54.

110. **Question:** Appendix B, Attachment 3 - Are there any tools, adaptors used for integrating Maximo with eCaps external system?

Response: The Department currently interfaces Maximo and eCAPS via staging tables with scheduled cron jobs (P2P). The preferred approach and integration options will be explored as part of the workshops in Attachment 4 (List of Workshops).

111. **Question:** Are there any other ongoing projects which may have dependencies with the Maximo 7.x Upgrade program??

Response: Please see response to Question 81.

September 15, 2015
Page 40

If you have questions concerning the above information, please contact Mr. Eric Fong at (626) 458-4077, Monday through Thursday, 7 a.m. to 5 p.m.

Very truly yours,

GAIL FARBER
Director of Public Work



JOSE M. QUEVEDO
Assistant Deputy Director
Architectural Engineering Division

EF

P:\aepub\Service Contracts\CONTRACT\Eric\MMS\01 RFP\ADDENDA\Addendum 1 vm cz ef rb 9 Sep 2015.docx

bc: Information Technology Systems & Applications (Tawfik w/o enc., Barker, Smith, Trinh)

SO
EF
EN

**SCHEDULE OF PRICES FOR
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
NEXTGEN MMS PROJECT**

The undersigned Proposer offers to perform the work described in the Request for Proposals (RFP) for the following price(s). The Proposer rate(s) (hourly, monthly, etc.) shall include all administrative costs, labor, supervision, overtime, materials, transportation, taxes, equipment, and supplies unless stated otherwise in the RFP. It is understood and agreed that where quantities, if any, are set forth in the Schedule of Prices, they are only estimates, and the unit prices quoted, if any, will apply to the actual quantities, whatever they may be.

It is understood and agreed that the County, at its sole discretion, has the option to expand any approved subtask to better achieve the County's objectives of this Project and/or to reduce or discontinue any approved subtasks due to time constraints or lack of effectiveness in achieving the County's objectives for this Project. The County reserves the right to reallocate funds, any unspent task funds, or surplus funds to better achieve the County's objectives for this Project.

Please note the following:

- **The cost of software licenses, if any, shall not be included in the Contractor's pricing for this contract.**
- **Items 1 through 11 are subject to 15% holdback/retention.** (County will hold 15% of each payment and release these holdback/retention funds as the final project payment upon acceptance of all deliverables and issuance by the County of the Work Acceptance Certificate)
- **Item 10 (Implementation: Dress Rehearsal and Go Live) should equal no less than fifteen percent of the Total Proposed Price.**
- **Items 12 (Project Management) and 13 (Start of Warranty Period) should have no price associated with them.**

Item No.	Summary Description and Deliverable(s)	Unit	Proposed Price	Estimated # of Weeks from "Notice to Proceed" to Item Completion
1	Task 1: Project Start Up: Project Management Kick Off and Core Team Kick Off Meetings Deliverables: a) Project Implementation Plan b) Minutes of both Kick Off Meetings	lump sum		
2	Task 2: Install and Configure Initial Development and Testing Environments Deliverables: a) Initial Environment Technical Specification Document b) Actual working systems configured as required in the MAXDEV7 and MAXTEST7 environments c) Field Certifications Forms	lump sum		
3	Task 3: Mobile MMS Solution Selection (Workshops, Identify Solution Candidates, Assist with Vendor and Product Selection, Participate in Negotiations, Etc.) Deliverables: a) Comprehensive set of disconnected and connected mobile MMS Use Cases for DPW b) Mobile MMS Solution Requirements Document c) Product Evaluation/ Demonstration Checklist d) Memorandum and Report from the Contractor to the County's Project Manager summarizing the results of the Mobile MMS Solution Selection process	lump sum		

Item No.	Summary Description and Deliverable(s)	Unit	Proposed Price	Estimated # of Weeks from "Notice to Proceed" to Item Completion
4	Task 4: Design Phase: Best Practice Experts, Use Case Updates, Workshops, Requirements Traceability Matrix, Specifications Documents, Etc. Deliverables: a) Updated, revised, and/or additional Use Cases b) Workshop notes c) Requirements Traceability Matrix d) All 22 Specifications Documents identified in this task, including the "Additional Items" Specifications Document and the "Gap Analysis" Report and Recommendations Document	lump sum		
4-SME	Task 4-SME (OPTIONAL): Subject Matter Expert Consultants Deliverable: a) Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) to provide industry-specific Maximo Best Practices during the Use Cases and Workshops phases of Task 4	lump sum	N/A	N/A
5	Task 5: Install and Configure Training and Production Environments Deliverable: a) Actual working systems configured as required in the MAXTRAIN7 and MAXPROD7 environments b) Field Certifications Forms	lump sum		
6	Task 6: MMS Solution Build Phase Deliverable: a) Develop and implement the solutions specified in the Requirements Traceability Matrix and the various Specification Documents developed in the Design Phase b) Updated Requirements Traceability Matrix and Updated Specification Documents	lump sum		
7	Task 7: Develop an MMS User Training Plan Deliverable: a) MMS User Training Plan (including user and administrator training for the Mobile MMS Solution)	lump sum		
8	Task 8: Develop Training Materials and Conduct User Training Deliverables: a) Training Materials b) User Training Completed, with signed releases if appropriate	lump sum		
9	Task 9: Testing Deliverables: a) Comprehensive Testing Plan b) Unit Testing Completion Report c) System Testing Completion Report d) User Acceptance Testing Completion Report e) Performance Testing and Tuning Configuration Report	lump sum		

Item No.	Summary Description and Deliverable(s)	Unit	Proposed Price	Estimated # of Weeks from "Notice to Proceed" to Item Completion
10	Task 10: Implementation: Dress Rehearsal and Go Live Deliverables: a) Conduct the successful Dress Rehearsal b) Conduct the successful Go Live c) Final copies of the Dress Rehearsal Task List, the Dress Rehearsal Checklist, the Go Live Task List, and the Go Live Checklist d) Updated Design Phase Requirements Traceability Matrix to record the final Maximo 7 "as-built" state e) Updated Specification Documents to record the final Maximo 7 "as-built" state f) Updated final Field Certifications documenting the final installation, system environments, and configurations for all four environments	lump sum		
11	Post Go Live Support and System Acceptance Deliverables: a) Post Go Live memorandum from the Contractor to the County's Project Manager summarizing the work performed during the thirty (or more) days of Post Go Live Support b) Final Project Implementation Plan c) Copy of all Project-related data in the Document Sharing and Issues Tracking Application	lump sum		
12	Project Management (Contractor shall include in its prices for Items 1 through 11 a proportional share of all costs related to the Contractor's project management, including the preparation, revision, and delivery of various status reports and meeting/workshop notes. No separate "Project Management" price shall be shown and no separate "Project Management" item will be invoiced or paid.)	N/A	N/A	
13	180 day Warranty Period commencing upon the end of the Post Go Live support period and issuance of the Work Acceptance Certificate	N/A	N/A	
TOTAL PROPOSED PRICE:		\$		

Change Orders and Optional Services Fixed Hourly Rate

Proposer's fixed hourly rate for the purpose of calculating the cost for any Project Change Order or in response to a request by the County for Optional Services (Statement of Work, Section 4), if any:

\$ _____ / hour

The County, at its sole discretion, will determine the necessity of any such Optional Services.

The Change Orders and Optional Services Fixed Hourly Rate will not be calculated as part of the Total Proposed Price

**SCHEDULE OF PRICES FOR
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
NEXTGEN MMS PROJECT**

LEGAL NAME OF PROPOSER		
SIGNATURE OF PERSON AUTHORIZED TO SUBMIT PROPOSAL		
TITLE OF AUTHORIZED PERSON		
DATE	STATE CONTRACTOR'S LICENSE NUMBER	LICENSE TYPE
PROPOSER'S ADDRESS:		
E-MAIL		
PHONE	MOBILE	FACSIMILE

p:\aepub\service contracts\contract\eric\mms\01 rfp\addenda\enclosure a 5.1 pw2 schedule of prices.docx

**NEXTGEN MAINTENANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (NEXTGEN MMS)
MAXIMO UPGRADE AND SERVICES (2015-IT011)
PROPOSER'S COMPLIANCE WITH THE MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS OF THE RFP**

PROPOSER MUST CHECK A BOX IN EVERY SECTION

Important Note: The information on this form is subject to verification and will not be used for scoring purposes.

Completing this form by itself without including detailed narrative in your proposal to support the minimum mandatory requirement of this RFP, any inconsistencies or inaccuracies in the information provided in this form, or this form and your proposal, may subject your proposal to disqualification or other actions, at the sole discretion of the County.

At the time of proposal submission, Proposer must meet the following Minimum Mandatory Requirements:

1. The Proposer must have at least three years of continuous experience implementing client Maximo systems at version 6.0 or higher. **Subcontracting is not allowed to meet this requirement.**

☐ Yes. Proposer meets the experience requirement stated above. Please complete the chart below. (In addition to responding on this form, as specified in Section 2.9.6.2, Experience, please provide a detailed narrative in your proposal to validate this minimum mandatory requirement for scoring of your proposal in this category.)

Proposer's Name	Dates of Experience (Mth/Yr to Mths/Yr)	Maximo Version Implemented	Detailed Description of Experience	Page Number*

*List the page number in the proposal containing the proposer's experience.

☐ No. Proposer does not meet the experience requirements stated above.

2. The Proposer must have managed or led some combination of at least three successful client upgrades to Maximo v 7.x or three successful new Maximo v 7.x implementations or re-implementations. **Subcontracting is not allowed to meet this requirement.**

☐ Yes. Proposer meets the experience requirement stated above. Please complete the chart below. (In addition to responding on this form, as specified in Section 2.9.6.2, Experience, please provide a detailed narrative in your proposal to validate this minimum mandatory requirement for scoring of your proposal in this category.)

Upgrades to Maximo v 7.x:

No.	Client's Name	Previous Maximo Version	Upgraded Maximo Version	Description of Service Performed	Page Number*
1					
2					
3					

* List the page number in the proposal containing this detailed experience.

AND/OR

New Maximo v 7.x implementations or re-implementations:

No.	Client's Name	Previous Maximo Version	Upgraded Maximo Version	Description of Service Performed	Page Number*
1					
2					
3					

* List the page number in the proposal containing this detailed experience.

☐ No. Proposer does not meet the experience requirements stated above.

3. The proposer and/or its subcontractor(s) must have managed or led at least one successful integration of Maximo (with Maximo Spatial) with a client's ESRI ArcGIS system.

☐ Yes. Proposer meets the experience requirement stated above. Please complete the chart below. (In addition to responding on this form, as specified in Section 2.9.6.2, Experience, please provide a detailed narrative in your proposal to validate this minimum mandatory requirement for scoring of your proposal in this category.)

Maximo with Maximo Spatial, integrated with a client's existing ESRI ArcGIS system:

No.	Client's Name	Maximo Version	ESRI ArcGIS Version	Description of Service Performed	Page Number*	Subcontractor (Yes or No)
1						
2						
3						

* List the page number in the proposal containing this detailed experience.

☐ No. Proposer and/or its subcontractor(s) does not meet the experience requirements stated above.

4. The proposer's planned Project Manager for this Project must be a full-time employee of the Contractor. This person must have a minimum of two (2) years' experience in successfully implementing IBM Maximo v 7.x. **Subcontracting is not allowed to meet this requirement.**

☐ Yes. Proposer's planned Project Manager meets the experience requirement stated above. Please complete the chart below. (In addition to responding on this form, as specified in Section 2.9.6.2, Experience, please provide a detailed narrative in your proposal to validate this minimum mandatory requirement for scoring of your proposal in this category.)

Project Manager's Name	Dates of Experience (Mth/Yr to Mth/Yr)	Maximo Version Implemented	Detailed Description of Staff Experience	Page Number*

* List the page number in the proposal containing this detailed experience.

☐ No. Proposer does not meet the experience requirements stated above.

5. The proposer's planned staff, including the Contractor's Project Manager, who will have responsibility for advising, planning or working on the new Maximo system must submit a copy of a valid and active certification to perform Maximo system implementations as evidenced by holding one or more of the following IBM certifications applicable to Maximo v 7.1 or greater:

- IBM Certified Advanced Deployment Professional
- IBM Certified Infrastructure Deployment Professional
- IBM Certified Deployment Professional
- IBM Certified Solution Advisor
- IBM Certified Solution Designer

Subcontracting is not allowed to meet this requirement.

☐ Yes. Proposer's planned staff, including the Contractor's Project Manager, who will have responsibility for advising, planning or working on the new Maximo system meets the experience requirement stated above. Please complete the chart below. (In addition to responding on this form, as specified in Section 2.9.6.2, Experience, please provide a detailed narrative in your proposal to validate this minimum mandatory requirement for scoring of your proposal in this category.)

Staff's Name and Planned Role	Type of Certifications	Valid/Active Dates	Page Number*

* List the page number in the proposal containing this certification and their detailed experience.

☐ No. Proposer does not meet the experience requirements stated above.

**NEXTGEN MAINTENANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (NEXTGEN MMS)
MAXIMO UPGRADE AND SERVICES (2015-IT011)
PROPOSER'S COMPLIANCE WITH THE MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS OF THE RFP**

I declare under penalty of perjury that the above information is true and accurate. Proposer further acknowledges that if any false, misleading, incomplete, or deceptively unresponsive statements in connection with this proposal are made, the proposal may be rejected at the sole discretion of the County.

Proposer's Name:	
Address:	
Authorized representative:	
Signature:	Date: