DATE: March 8, 2017
TO: Prospective IT Service Management & IT Asset Management (ITSM & ITAM) Proposers
FROM: Roxane L. Goss, Business Process Analyst
SUBJECT: Proposer Clarifying Questions and Skagit County Answers

Below are questions submitted as part of the Skagit County IT Service Management & IT Asset Management System (ITSM & ITAM) RFP. Skagit County's answers are provided following each question.

General Questions:

1. Would it be possible to supply an 'Unlocked' version of the "S6 - Functional Requirements" spread sheet? I would like to include screen shots to supplement any written response in order to provide the county with visual detail to support the response for each question.

   Answer: Answer: Proposers are to type in their answers into the space provided in 'Proposer Response to Requirement' Column (F)'. Please create a master pdf file containing all requested screen shots, numbered to correspond to the RFP worksheet section and requirement number and attach it to the RFP response. Proposers are to attach PDF documents for sample reports that are requested in any of the requirement sections (i.e., 6.1 #5) and number the reports using the worksheet section and requirement number.

2. Could you confirm that the total number of IT professionals (Engineers/Analysts) that would need access to the tool is 23?

   Answer: As discussed in Section 2.Project Scope, the total number of IT Positions w/contractors is 23.

3. Does the county have a preference as to a license model? The tool supports both concurrent and named licenses therefore should it be assumed that all 23 IT positions would need dedicated access to the application with named licenses or would the county prefer concurrent licenses e.g. floating licenses that are not specifically assigned to an IT User.

   Answer: We have no preference in the license model. We would appreciate a proposal that would show both licensing options as price will vary dependent on the model. We would probably need at least 15 concurrent licenses.

4. Please could you also advise as to whether the tentatively proposed call on Monday 13th March at 10am PST is going ahead so that we could schedule time accordingly to attend?

   Answer: As stated in section 3.2 Proposer Conference, College Way, Mount Vernon, WA 98273. The Proposer conference is at the Proposer's expense, is not mandatory and will **not include** a teleconference.

If you're **unable** to attend, please be sure to send any question you have to the RFP contact person at the email address listed in section 2.3 Communications. All questions asked and answered during the conference will be sent to all prospers that have submitted a letter of intent.

5. Under section 2.3 I saw 2/24 listed as the deadline for questions so I just want to clarify.

    Answer: The date in section 2.3 Communications is incorrect. The correct deadline for **Proposer questions** is the one listed in section 3.1 Schedule, which is **March, 27, 2017**. We will correct this.