



January 21, 2020

**Re: #19RFP121719K-DB; Data Migration and Permit, License and Land (PLL)
Implementation**

Dear Proposers:

Attached is one (1) copy of Addendum 2, hereby made a part of the above referenced Request for Proposal (RFP).

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions in the RFP referenced above remain unchanged and in full force and effect.

Sincerely,

Darlene A. Banks

Darlene A. Banks,
Chief Assistant Purchasing Agent

**#19RFP121719K-DB; Data Migration and Permit, License and Land (PLL)
Implementation
Addendum No. 2
Page Two**

This Addendum forms a part of the contract documents and **modifies** the original RFP documents as noted below:

NOTE: The County will not be accepting any more questions/clarifications for this Solicitation. Vendors, if you did not receive a response to your submitted/written question as requested in Section 2.4 CLARIFICATION & ADDENDA, please provide e-mail with time and date of submittal no later than January 23rd, 2020 by 1:00 P.M.

QUESTION:

Which technology platform your current application is built on?

RESPONSE:

You may need to be more specific, but I believe you are referring to the operating system platform. That would be Microsoft Windows Server and Microsoft SQL Server platforms.

QUESTION:

As per our understanding, the application is a commercial off the shelf solution. What customization you have done to the off the shelf solution?

RESPONSE:

This application has existed in several different formats over the past 13 years. We are expecting the winning vendor to be intimately familiar with the Azteca Cityworks platform therefore having the ability to ascertain and work within all customizations.

QUESTION:

Do you have documentation for changes and enhancements made in the application in the past?

RESPONSE:

No.

QUESTION:

Is the application hosted on-premise?

RESPONSE:

Yes.

**#19RFP121719K-DB; Data Migration and Permit, License and Land (PLL)
Implementation
Addendum No. 2
Page Three**

QUESTION:

Do you follow DevOps methodology currently for any release and enhancements?

RESPONSE:

Not currently. As a bidding entity for this RFP, you are welcome to pursue any methodology you wish as long as the end result adheres to the scope of work beginning on page 14 section 3.3.

QUESTION:

On page 18 section c. Licensing, Do vendors have to purchase and provide the licenses to Fulton County?

RESPONSE:

This information is located on page 16 in section 3.3 B and states the following:

“The County currently owns all Cityworks licensing modules for this project and through its current annual maintenance licensing support access to all upgraded versions of the software for use in the project.”

QUESTION:

In section 3.6, under “Section 2 – Technical Approach” there is a line item “Project Plan for interfacing to county systems –AUS-CIS Infinity Water Billing System, Arc-GIS”. This is the first reference to an interface with CIS in the RFP. Is development of that interface part of the scope of this RFP, or would it be sufficient to provide a high level architecture for this interface which includes a description of the required components, such as CIS Infinity APIs and Cityworks APIs?

RESPONSE:

No, the development of this interface is not within the scope of this RFP. Finance’s CIS Infinity system is not sufficiently upgraded to communicate with the Azteca Cityworks PLL, but it has been approved to be upgraded. A description of the high level architecture and the required components will be sufficient.

**#19RFP121719K-DB; Data Migration and Permit, License and Land (PLL)
Implementation
Addendum No. 2
Page Four**

QUESTION:

Section 3.4 IT Requirements, C Licensing – This section requests provision of all applicable licenses for the solution. We are proposing to provide services to implement Cityworks and that all licensing requirements will be handled by the County directly with Azteca, the Cityworks vendor. Is that appropriate for this proposal?

RESPONSE:

This information is located on page 16 in section 3.3 B and states the following:
“The County currently owns all Cityworks licensing modules for this project and through its current annual maintenance licensing support access to all upgraded versions of the software for use in the project.”

QUESTION:

UI design – as the project calls for out of the box Cityworks AMS and PLL functionality, there should be no UI development. Can this deliverable be dropped?

RESPONSE:

The provided UI (User Interface) from Azteca out-of-the-box will be sufficient

QUESTION:

Full Functionality Design – we are proposing to conduct requirements workshops and deliver documented requirements for the PLL workflows. Would this satisfy this deliverable? If not, what would be required for this deliverable? Similarly can the requirements workshops satisfy the “Preliminary Design Review Meeting”?

RESPONSE:

Several interactions with several Public Works staff members from several different areas of the Public Works Permit process will be required by the winning bidder to successfully document workflows so as to implement the Azteca Cityworks PLL successfully. If the ‘requirement workshops’ and ‘documented requirements for the PLL workflows’ are within the scope of these actions as perceived by Power Engineering, then they will satisfy the Full Functionality Design requirement.

QUESTION:

Interface testing – as no integration is part of this project, can this deliverable be dropped?

RESPONSE:

Interface testing pertaining to this Request for Proposal (RFP) is the Azteca Cityworks PLL UI (user interface). No cross-platform application integration is requested in the scope of work of this RFP.

**#19RFP121719K-DB; Data Migration and Permit, License and Land (PLL)
Implementation
Addendum No. 2
Page Five**

QUESTION:

Instructional Design Plan – can the County provide more details on this deliverable? Would the Training Plan suffice?

RESPONSE:

Yes.

QUESTION:

System and application administrator manuals – as the solution is out of the box Cityworks, we are proposing that the standard Cityworks administration documentation suffice for this deliverable. Is that acceptable?

RESPONSE:

Yes.

QUESTION:

Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Plan – as the solution is out of the box Cityworks, we are proposing that the standard Cityworks administration documentation suffice for this deliverable. Is that acceptable?

RESPONSE:

Yes.

QUESTION:

Service Level Agreements – as the solution is out of the box Cityworks, we are proposing that the SLA the County has in place with Cityworks suffice for this deliverable and there is no SLA for the services portion of this project. Is that acceptable?

RESPONSE:

Yes.

**#19RFP121719K-DB; Data Migration and Permit, License and Land (PLL)
Implementation
Addendum No. 2
Page Six**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF ADDENDUM NO. 2

The undersigned proposer acknowledges receipt of this addendum by returning one (1) copy of this form with the proposal package to the Department of Purchasing & Contract Compliance, Fulton County Public Safety Building, 130 Peachtree Street, Suite 1168, Atlanta, Georgia 30303 by the RFP due date and time **Tuesday, January 28th, 2020, @ 11:00 A.M.**

This is to acknowledge receipt of Addendum No. 2, _____ day of _____, 20__.

Legal Name of Proposer

Signature of Authorized Representative

Title