

RFP ADDENDUM  
RFP-18 Rev. 10/17/13  
Prev. Rev. 5/17/12

Aimee Cunningham  
Contract Specialist

860-713-5250  
Telephone Number

**STATE OF CONNECTICUT**  
*DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES*

PROCUREMENT DIVISION  
165 Capitol Avenue, Room 5<sup>th</sup> Floor South  
HARTFORD, CT 06106-1659

RFP NO.:
13PSX0296

Proposal Due Date:
11 December 2013
Date Addendum Issued:
27 November 2013

**PLEASE NOTE:**

**This document has been marked as "Returnable". Electronic submittal of this document indicates that your company has read and accepted any modifications to the RFP that are contained in this Addendum.**

RFP ADDENDUM #3

DESCRIPTION: Statewide Library System

FOR:  
Connecticut State Library

PROPOSERS NOTE:

The purpose of this Addendum is to answer the questions asked (listed below).

**Question #1:**

Because the final response will be uploaded, will a scanned copy of our officer's signature be considered an original or a true signature? Or will there be a type of e-signature necessary?

**Answer #1:**

We utilize an electronic signature method.

**Question #2:**

Where specifically do we upload the actual RFP response to Product and/or Service Specifications and Addendum 1 as there is not a folder for them in the Required Company Documents or Solicitation Documents?

**Answer #2**

In addition to the documents that are marked "returnable", multiple documents can be uploaded. Documents that are marked "returnable", must be filled out, scanned, and then uploaded with your response. Additional documents should be titled according to what they contain for ease of review.

**Question #3:**

(Page 8, Section 2 Vision) In regards to the program being available via mobile tablet devices, is this for only patrons, patrons and staff? If staff; what parts of the software will need to be accessible via mobile tablet?

**Answer #3:**

As stated in RFP section 3.4.6 on page 9, this requirement pertains only to services intended for use by Patrons.

**Question #4**

(Page 8, Section 3.1.1.a. Usability) Based on a review of section 3.1, A-G has utilized its resource sharing community as a means to conduct usability testing of the proposed system. Patron types were not used as this was a staff usability study. Section 3.1.1.a. uses patron types as a sample but does not say it is required, can you please clarify?

**Answer #4:**

We require that you have done usability testing but do not specify particular patron types. You should describe what usability testing you have done and with whom

**Question #5:**

(Page 12, Section 3.8.1 Special Access) *Universal Web Site Accessibility Policy for State Web Sites - Version 4.0* appears to be last updated in 2006 but is listed as setup design guidelines. Will the state balance modern web design and/or requirements in your RFP with a seven year old policy?

**Answer #5:**

We want the system to be accessible but if technology advances since these standards were last updated have rendered any elements of our accessibility standards obsolete, we may allow the successful proposer to achieve the same end result (accessibility) by a different means than what the standards assumed was possible at the time.