

April 21, 2021

ADDENDUM #2
RP023-21, Provision of an Operational Performance Assessment

This addendum is being issued to provide answers and clarification.

- C1.** In Addendum #1, A1, change \$250,000 to \$200,000 to read:
\$200,000 was allocated for this project in the 2021 budget. However, the County anticipates that the full project will exceed this amount. Additional funds may be allocated as necessary.
- C2.** The sign-in sheet for the Pre-Proposal Conference held on April 14, 2021 is attached.
- C3.** **The proposal deadline has been extended to 2:50PM on Friday, May 7, 2021.**
- Q1. What level of access will the consultant have to data/documents/papers across the 12 departments being considered in the assessment?
- A1.** **The awarded consultant will be provided access to all necessary non-confidential data/documents/papers.**
- Q2. Can you provide a list of the 12 departments that have already undergone a department-specific assessment, review, or evaluation and when these were conducted?
- A2.** **The County's Internal Audit Division has conducted targeted audits focused on limited processes and operations. No large-scale reviews, similar to the scope of work of this project, have been conducted. Audits completed by Internal Audit will be made available to the awarded firm.**
- Q3. Per page 3 of the RFP, might you be able to provide a list of "other agencies, departments and divisions as applicable" for inclusion in this review and what criteria is being used for applicability?
- A3.** **For the purposes of this RFP, proposers should only consider the 13 departments/agencies specifically listed on Page 3. Disregard the reference to "other agencies, departments and divisions". If another agency is added to the scope of work of this assessment at a later date, a change order will be executed.**
- Q4. Regarding the timeline for key deliverables, are there any specific goals that this assessment must align with (ex: prior to budget adoption, before fiscal year end, etc.)?
- A4.** **No. There are no time constraints associated with this project. See also, Addendum 1, A2.**
- Q5. Has the County seen or reviewed any examples of this type of assessment for other County's that is similar to the type of assessment that you are requesting?
- A5.** **The assessment completed for Harris County, TX has many of the same components we are looking for.**

- Q6. The RFP mentions the growth of the County. Does this assessment need to include projections as it relates to the potential of growth in services to be provided by the County?
- A6. The County would like to see best practices based upon the knowledge that there will be new growth.**
- Q7. Regarding the scope of this contract, is the County looking for a high-level review of the departments or a deeper dive? Can you provide clarification in terms of depth of review?
- A7. For some departments, a high-level review may be sufficient. However, there are some departments that have many different functions that may require a deeper dive. The County will discuss which departments may require a more in-depth approach with the awarded vendor.**
- Q8. In terms of submittals, would you like for proposers to propose a more in-depth review or focus on high level tasks?
- A8. See A7. The County is interested in the proposer’s ability to provide an in-depth review.**
- Q9. In terms of References, would you like them to be more aligned with size or scope of the proposed project?
- A9. Per the RFP, “proposers should provide three (3) satisfactory references where an operational performance assessment has been completed with a scope and size similar as the proposed project within the past five (5) years.” Proposers should provide references as close as possible to the size and scope of the proposed projects. References will be scored accordingly.**
- Q10. Will County staff be assigned to support this project?
- A10. Yes. There will be a County staff member assigned to work with the awarded vendor to coordinate department activities.**
- Q11. Is there a provision in the RFP that will allow DBE and small business participation?
- A11. Gwinnett County currently does not have a preference program for DBE or small business participation. All qualified vendors are encouraged to submit a proposal for this project.**
- Q12. Please elaborate on the Notice to Proceed being specified as a Key Deliverable.
- A12. Delete the reference to the Notice to Proceed under the Key Deliverables section. The Notice to Proceed will be provided to the awarded vendor by the County.**
- Q13. The RFP references various reports. Does the County want a consolidated report or reporting by individual departments?
- A13. The County is interested in reporting by individual departments.**
- Q14. Can you clarify the budget for this project? What is the County’s budget for this engagement?
- A14. See C1.**
- Q15. How many County Departments/Agencies do you anticipate will be included in the assessment in addition to the ones identified?
- A15. See A3.**
- Q16. Will the County Internal Audit Department have any involvement with the assessment? If so, please elaborate on their role.
- A16. No, the County’s Internal Audit Division will not be involved in this assessment.**

- Q17. Have there been other assessments, consulting reviews, etc. performed for any of the departments/agencies that are in scope for this proposal? If so, are those audit reports available for review to bidders and/or awarded firms?
A17. See A2.
- Q18. Is there a set of published best practices for each department that you are looking for to compare to as a part of the assessment? If so, please specify.
A18. No.
- Q19. Has the County Internal Audit Department reviewed any of the departments/agencies that are in scope for this proposal? If so, are those audit reports available for review to bidders and/ or awarded firms?
A19. See A2.
- Q20. Should COVID-19 restrictions continue or worsen, would the County be open to conducting some portions of the assessment through virtual means, if not all portions?
A20. See Addendum 1, A7.
- Q21. Does the County have a preference for in-state (Georgia-based) vendors?
A21. Gwinnett County currently does not have a preference program for local or Georgia businesses. All qualified vendors are encouraged to submit a proposal for this project.
- Q22. On insurance, might the requirement of coverage for workers' compensation for employees discriminate against those single-member firms who do not have employees?
A22. Workers compensation is only required for firms with three (3) or more employees. Firms with less than three (3) employees must sign our workers compensation waiver. The waiver must be signed by any employee coming onsite and the owner of the firm.
- Q23. On the submission process, responses are to be as follows per page 1: "One unbound single-sided original, four (4) exact copies, and one electronic pdf copy on disc or flash drive should be submitted" Are electronic (email submissions) not permissible? If so, what is the procedure to do so?
A23. See Addendum 1, A8. Electronic submissions are not permitted.
- Q24. Is there an onsite requirement to the Scope of Work, or will the County consider qualified consultants with a record of successfully conducting similar reviews remotely?
A24. See Addendum 1, A7.
- Q25. Will being awarded this assessment work prohibit the approved firm(s) from bidding on and selection to provide implementation work with Gwinnett County on future solicitations or statements of need for follow-on work associated with this assessment or future solicitations or statements of need involving the departments covered in this assessment?
A25. No.
- Q26. Will the County please define "Other agencies, departments, and divisions as applicable" found on Page 3, in the "III. Scope of Services, Statement of Work" section.
A26. See A3.
- Q27. For forms that require notarization, would the County accept electronically notarized forms through the SIGNiX platform where the notary witnesses the signature via videoconference and the document includes an electronic stamp?
A27. Yes, electronically notarized forms are acceptable.

- Q28. Have any of the departments included in the Operational Performance Assessment been subject to other performance reviews and/or audits in the past five years? If so, can proposers obtain access to or a copy of those reviews during the proposal period (i.e., prior to response submittal)?
- A28. See A2.**
- Q29. Can a firm submit more than three references?
- A29. Only three (3) references are required and only three (3) references will be scored. If desired, vendors may submit additional references that may be used if one of the three initial references cannot be reached.**
- Q30. The RFP's key deliverables include "Written Summary of Findings per Department per phase" and "Comprehensive Written Summary of Findings per phase." Could you define "phase" in this context?
- A30. Per Page 3 of the RFP, the result shall be multiple reports over the course of the contract, each of which describes the current organization(s), documents current practices that are working well, detailed actions to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the specified entity's services, identify specific areas that would benefit from a more in-depth analysis, and provide an Implementation Plan to execute recommendations. The Final Report shall provide a summary of the highest-impact recommendations as well as any cross-cutting themes and opportunities identified throughout the effort.**
- Q31. Will the focus and priority areas and corresponding strategies now in development inform this assessment?
- A31. The focus and priority areas are high level Board of Commissioner priorities. These priorities will provide general direction for this assessment.**
- Q32. Is there an expectation that the assessment will include development of performance metrics for each department? Do you have any performance data available for review?
- A32. Performance metrics are not a deliverable of this RFP.**
- Q33. This was mentioned in the meeting, but for clarification: do you expect the proposal scope and pricing to include a high-level analysis of each department, with the awarded firm and the County deciding after the high-level analysis which departments warrant a deeper dive, which will then be scoped and priced separately? Or should some deeper dives be included in the proposed plan of work and pricing? If so, how many deep dives should we include?
- A33. See A7.**
- Q34. Should pricing be expressed only as a lump sum for the entire project? Is it acceptable to provide per-department pricing and add it up to a lump sum?
- A34. It is acceptable to provide per-department pricing and add it up to a lump sum. Cost will be scored based on the lump sum for the entire project.**
- Q35. Is there a priority order for the departments? How will the County decide in which order to conduct the assessments?
- A35. There is no priority order for the departments. The priority will be developed in conjunction with the awarded vendor.**
- Q36. Do you have any existing surveys of internal or external customers available for review during the assessment?
- A36. See A2.**

Q37. Can the word version of the RFP and Forms be provided to all Bidders?

A37. No. It is not our practice to provide the RFP and forms in Word.

Q38. We note that our proposal response must be signed in ink in order to be considered. Please confirm if an electronic or scanned signature would be considered acceptable given COVID restrictions mean many organizations are working remotely.

A38. An electronic or scanned signature is acceptable.

Q39. Talent: does this refer to the assessment of job architecture, or skillset? At the individual or role level?

A39. Yes, at role level.

Q40. Are there any legislative deadlines or milestones that need to be considered in the project timeline?

A40. No.

Q41. Other agencies, departments, and divisions as applicable are included in the scope. How many organizations are included in the other category?

A41. See A3.

Q42. To develop a proposed schedule for the submission of deliverables and to properly price the execution of services, a period of performance is required. Does the County have a notional timeframe/period of performance for this engagement?

A42. We anticipate this will be a 1 to 1 ½ year project.

Q43. Would the County consider extending the proposal due date?

A43. See C3.

Q44. Could the County specify their expectations for timing of the project?

A44. See A42.

Q45. Can the County clarify the level of review required for the “other agencies, departments, and divisions” included in the Scope of Services; also, could the County specify which these are?

A45. See A3.

This addendum should be signed in the space provided below and returned with your proposal. Failure to do so may result in your bid being deemed non-responsive.

Company Name_____

Authorized Representative_____

date 4/14/21

RP023-21 PRE-BID CONFERENCE
Provision of an Operational Performance Assessment

Representative Name

Company Name

Phone #

E-Mail Address

(DEPARTMENT REPRESENTATIVES SIGN-IN AT BOTTOM)

- 1. Shawn Ryan Deloitte 404 360 0028 shawnyan@deloitte.com
- 2. David Eichenenthal PFM 504-930-7684 eichenmald@pfm.com
- 3. Ryan McNeely PFM 504-930-7684 mcneelyr@pfm.com
- 4. Bianca Sarrach Brown Smith Wallac 314-983-1365 bsarrach@bswillc.com
- 5. Shannon Madden Crowe LLP 312-964-3027 shannon.madden@crowe.com
- 6. Stephen Lathrop UHY consulting 678-602-4485 slathrop@uhy-us.com
- 7. Brendan Davis KPMG 786-374-3579 brendan.davis@kpmg.com
- 8. Paul King Orion Development 800-510-2177 pking@odgroup.com
- 9. Lawrence Spinetta KPMG 737-999-1918 lspinetta@kpmg.com
- 10. Keith Scott Gartner, Inc. 470-380-8168 keith.scott@gartner.com
- 11. Robert Friess Accenture 404-964-1518 robert.j.friess@accenture.com
- 12. Bryan Cainion TACG, LLC 404-229-3067 bryan.cainion@tacg.com
- 13. Richard Oden Alexander Atta 770-860-8442 raoden@alexander-atta.com

Department Representative Name Department

- Holly Cafferata DOFS
- Maria Woods CA
- Rick Reagan DWR
- Dustin Williams DOFS

date

RP023-21 PRE-BID CONFERENCE

Representative Name

Company Name

Phone #

E-Mail Address

(DEPARTMENT REPRESENTATIVES SIGN-IN AT BOTTOM)

- 1. Will Johnson Alexander At'ta 404-641-2265 wjohnson@alexander-at'ta.com
- 2. Tim Evans Mauldin & Jenkins 770-955-8600 tevans@mjcpa.com
- 3. Mary Wong EvaluCraft Global 703-635-2086 mwong@evalucraftgloballlc.com
- 4. Julie Zimmerman Management Partners 513-543-1501 jzimmerman@managementpartners.com
- 5. Kay Hiott Lumenor Consulting 770-265-1966 khiott@lumenorconsulting.com
- 6. Larry Labedz Lumenor Consulting 636-222-3511 llabedz@lumenorconsulting.com
- 7. Scott Patton Plante Moran 248-223-3503 scott.patton@plante Moran.com

- 8. _____
- 9. _____
- 10. _____
- 11. _____
- 12. _____

| <u>Department Representative Name</u> | <u>Department</u> | <u>Department Representative Name</u> | <u>Department</u> |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------|
| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |