



Office for People With Developmental Disabilities

KATHY HOCHUL Governor

KERRI E. NEIFELD Acting Commissioner

ROGER BEARDEN, J.D. Executive Deputy Commissioner

PROCESS IMPROVEMENT FOR ASSISTIVE TECHNOLOGY, ENVIRONMENTAL MODIFICATIONS AND VEHICLE MODIFICATION SERVICE REQUESTS

Questions and Answers (Q&A) - February 17, 2022

Below are responses to questions received. Please note Proposals remain due on Thursday, March 3, 2022.

Question 1: May Offerers who submitted offers in the previous round submit an application in response to the current round?

OPWDD RESPONSE: Yes.

Question 2: Please confirm that Offerers must modify or revise any previous submission to conform to the requirements stated in the current round's RFP?

OPWDD RESPONSE: Yes

Question 3: Section 3.1.1.1. states "Offerers must provide a list, clearly and specifically identifying any portion of the proposal that the Offerer believes constitutes proprietary information entitled to confidential handling as an exception to the Freedom of Information Law. See Section 4.2, (Freedom of Information Law)."

- a. Question: If the proposal does not include proprietary information entitled to confidential handling, is the Offerer required to provide a list or letter or note confirming the proposal does not contain proprietary information entitled to confidential handling?

OPWDD RESPONSE: No. The Offerer shall indicate on Attachment 2, Administrative Proposal Requirements and Offerer Attestation Form, "N/A" in the "included column" for the highlighted question as pasted below.

Table with 3 columns: DOCUMENT, RFP §, INCLUDED. Row 1: 4.4.1.2. Electronic (non-redacted): One USB Memory Stick containing a PDF file... 4.4.1.2 [] Row 2: Proposal Redactions and memory stick redacting proprietary information 3.1.1 []

Question 4: Section 3.1.1.2. states “Offerer is also required to submit a memory stick redacting proprietary information and clearly labeled as such per Section 4.4.1.3 of this RFP.”

- b. If an Offerer does not need to redact proprietary information in their proposal, may the Offerer skip the step of submitting a memory stick specific for redacted information?
- c. Or is an Offerer required to submit a memory stick containing a list or letter or note confirming the proposal does not contain proprietary information entitled to confidential handling?

OPWDD RESPONSE:

b. Yes

c. The Offer is not required to submit an additional memory stick but shall indicate on Attachment 2, Administrative Proposal Requirements and Offerer Attestation Form, “N/A” in the “included column” for the highlighted question as pasted below.

DOCUMENT	RFP §	INCLUDED
4.4.1.2. Electronic (non-redacted): One USB Memory Stick containing a PDF file for each one of the proposal sections – the Administrative, Technical and Cost Proposal (three total USB Sticks).	4.4.1.2	<input type="checkbox"/>
Proposal Redactions and memory stick redacting proprietary information	3.1.1	<input type="checkbox"/>

Question 5: Less a question and more suggestion – please consider removing the memory stick requirements from future solicitations and consider alternate means of application delivery, such as NYS Grants Gateway or Bidsnet or similar. Memory sticks present a security risk for agencies whose IT infrastructure contain sensitive personal information or rely on their IT infrastructure to deliver services. Memory sticks may contain malware that can take control of computers or install unwanted software that hijack systems. They can imperil operations. Memory sticks represent an opportunity for employees to take home confidential files, whether intentionally or not, and increase the risk of the data being misplaced, accessed by someone else or misused. Agencies are increasingly prohibiting the use of memory sticks within their businesses; even locking out computers from accessing them. OPWDD may inadvertently be forcing agencies to circumvent security protocols. Encrypted memory sticks can mitigate some of these dangers, but the cost can range from \$50 - \$100 for one stick. Internet-based platforms for bid/application submissions do exist such as NYS Grants Gateway or Bidsnet. These systems can, but not always, allow the solicitor to set requirements for which questions are answered or what forms need be uploaded before allowing submission. Thank you for any consideration of this suggestion for future changes.

OPWDD RESPONSE: Thank you for the suggestion.

Question 6: Section 2.3.1.3. states an Offerer will need to “Evaluate three years of historical costs for items and modifications and develop a review protocol that allows a more streamlined/rapid approval and contracting process for items/modifications where requested funding fall within already approved cost parameters.”

Could OPWDD describe the existing format of the three years of historical costs and project information? Does the data exist in electronic format? Is it a mix of electronic and paper-based? The number of documents or size of the tranche, etc. Further details regarding the documents would be helpful.

OPWDD RESPONSE: Yes, OPWDD will provide the historical data. The data will be provided electronically, in the Excel format and will note costs by category as well as the individually billed services.