ADAM PAUL LAXALT
Attorney General

NICHOLAS A. TRUTANICH
Chief of Staff

KETAN D. BHIRUD
General Counsel

STATE OF NEVADA
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

100 North Carson Street
Carson City, Nevada 89701

November 22, 2017

Via Electronic Mail and Internet Posting

Responses to Vendor Questions regarding NV Office of the Attorney General Request for Information for an Investigations Division Evidence Room, dated November 2, 2017

The Office of the Attorney General received the following questions by the November 15, 2017 2:00 pm PST deadline. Questions are in bold; answers are in italics directly following the question:

We are confused about how we respond to the Scope of Work in Section 3. Section 9.2.3.6 prescribes formatting responses for Tab IV, but Section 3 is a mixture of background on AGO and requirements, which are often duplicated two and three times, e.g. the interface with ProLaw, installation, etc.

Can the AGO pinpoint what subsections of Section 3 need responses in order for our proposal response to the Scope of work to be complete?

NV AGO Response: The following subsections of Section 3 need responses in order for a proposal response to the Scope of work to be complete:

- *Software Requirements*
- *Legacy Data and Evidence*
- *Proposed Hardware, Software and Services*
- *Product Overviews*
- *Vendor Experience*
- *Project Approach*
- *Cost Information*
- *Technical Requirements*

If a vendor finds a particular requirement to be duplicative, vendors can refer to prior response sections if the information has previously been provided in their proposal.

Does the AGO have a preference for hosting on the cloud vs running the application with on-premises servers?

NV AGO Response: The AGO does not have a preference for system hosting. If a system is hosted in the cloud, it must comply with State Cloud security standards as referenced in the RFP. The link to the current version of the standard is: http://it.nv.gov/uploadedFiles/ITnvgov/Content/Governance/dtls/Standards/134CloudHosting.pdf. Also ensure the referenced information in the RFP is included as part of the Confidential information provided with any proposal (completed spreadsheet, any compliance reports such as SOC-2, and any other relevant information regarding the security of the cloud-hosted solution.

If on-premises solution, do we supply server and storage or just application required auxiliary hardware including barcode printers, scanners, signature pads?

NV AGO Response: If an on-premise solution is proposed, the vendor should provide required auxiliary hardware including barcode printers, scanners, signature pads, etc. that are part of the proposed solution. The NV AGO will procure needed server and storage based on specifications provided by the vendor in the proposal.

Detailed specifications for any and all hardware (and software) required for operation of the system, and clear delineation of what is proposed to be provided by the vendor as part of their proposal and costs and what is proposed to be procured by the NV AGO must be included in the vendor response.

Scope of work pg 11

Is the "item serial number assignment" the unique number for an evidence item that will be printed as a barcode?

NV AGO Response: Yes

Does AGO know and can it share the database, in which Total Solutions stores data from its Evidence Trac application?

NV AGO Response: The current Evidence Trac system stores its database on the local workstation; there are separate databases for each of our Evidence Room locations – Carson City, Las Vegas, and Reno. The database is in a .GDB format; according to our research, this type of Database is associated with Borland InterBase.

The middle part the form Proposed Staff Resumes asks for Relevant Professional Experience. At the bottom it asks for References. What is the difference between the two?

NV AGO Response: Relevant Professional Experience refers to a description of each contract, project or job assignment the individual proposed to staff the project has worked on that demonstrates that the proposed project staff have the right skills and background to staff the project.

References are individuals that can validate or confirm that the proposed staff member has the appropriate skills and background to staff the project. It is possible that the individual References will be a subset of the contacts listed in the Relevant Professional Experience section, but it is not required.

Can the AGO describe the weight given to evaluation factors in particular the means for comparing two prices. Does the lowest cost vendor get all of the points/weight given to cost or will the weighting be proportional, such as with the following formula?

In the former case the weight of cost is such that by itself it's determinative and overwhelms other quality factors.

$$\underline{\text{Lowest Vendor's Cost}} \quad \text{x} \quad \text{Number of points for cost} = \text{Vendor score}$$
$$\text{Other Vendor's Cost}$$

Lowest vendor says at $100,000 gets full points for cost. A vendor whose cost is $120,000, receives a smaller percentage of points, in this case 83.3 % of the points

NV AGO Response: We will not provide the weights we plan to give to each evaluation factor. The lowest cost vendor does not get all the points/weight. The weighting is also not proportional in the way described in the example above. The cost is one factor assigned a number of points between 1 and 10 by each member of the evaluation committee, as is each of the other evaluation factors. The scores for each evaluation factor are then multiplied by the weight for that evaluation factor to determine the overall score given by each member of the evaluation committee.

We understand that ProLaw may not have an export function but that AGO has a DBA, who can assist to understand the data base structure of ProLaw. Most systems do not like data being inserted into their database.

Does ProLaw have an import function for two-way integration

NV AGO Response: There is no import function from within the ProLaw GUI. An import can be done via SQL Server, depending on the format of the incoming data. The NV AGO would need to contract with ProLaw for consulting services to setup the import and an automated SQL Server Agent job.

If an import function is proposed, please price it separately so the NV AGO can determine if we would like to automate this.

The Office of the Attorney General received the following questions *after* the November 15, 2017 2:00 pm PST deadline. We felt it beneficial to this critical project to include these additional questions in our formal answers. Questions are in bold; answers are in italics directly following the question:

With your current system, Evidence Trac, is it safe to assume that the data in this system is being exported in an standard file format or at least in a database which we can read from, and not proprietary?

NV AGO Response: The current Evidence Trac system stores its database on the local workstation; there are separate databases for each of our Evidence Room locations – Carson City, Las Vegas, and Reno. The database is in a .GDB format; according to our research, this type of Database is associated with Borland InterBase.

After researching the cost of integration with Thomas Reuters ProLaw using their documentation, I discovered that they charge $3,500.00 annually for integration. This requirement alone would increase Maintenance and Support costs for your RFP from approximately $1,500.00 to over $5,000.00 annually. Is the integration cost something your agency is anticipating to be part of the RFP, or are you expecting potential vendors to absorb this cost?

NV AGO Response: Any costs for Thomsen Reuters ProLaw services associated with this project will be paid by the NV AGO and are not expected to be absorbed by potential vendors. Proposals should separately price any services or related costs for integration with ProLaw so the NV AGO can determine if we want to automate this.