



Commonwealth of Massachusetts

CANNABIS CONTROL COMMISSION

101 FEDERAL STREET, 13TH FLOOR
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02110
TELEPHONE (617) 701-8400

STEVEN J. HOFFMAN
CHAIRMAN

DECEMBER 8, 2017: Questions and Answers #1 - 13

DECEMBER 12, 2017: Questions and Answers #14 - 15

- Q1: I'm unable to locate several of the required forms. Can you please provide or point me to these forms, or provide examples of what is required? Proof of Diversified Certification (if appropriate) ...
- A1: Proof of Diversified Certification. If you are on the list of certified businesses, please inform the Commission so we can search for you in the business directory and/or provide a copy of the third-party certification. Learn more here: <https://www.mass.gov/supplier-diversity-office>
- Q2: I'm unable to locate several of the required forms. Can you please provide or point me to these forms, or provide examples of what is required? ... Ethics in Public Contracting
- A2: More information will be provided about this form by Monday, December 11.
- Q3: Is it required that bidder's submit a Certificate of Tax Compliance in Good Standing at the time of the bid submission? Or, is this something that is required if selected?
- A3: Submission may occur at the time of selection. Given the tight timelines, the Commission would expect the form to be provided that same day.
- Q4: We are responding to the Licensing and Tracking RFP. We are unable to locate the Tax Compliance Certification form. Can someone send us the PDF version or send a working link to download?
- A4: This link has been tested and confirmed as active and working:
<http://www.mass.gov/ig/publications/guides-advisories-other-publications/model-invitation-for-bids-section-7.html>
- Q5: Under the Response Pages section, there is a mention of identifying requirements (by number). Can you please advise where to find the requirements?
- A5: The requirements were approved by the Commission on 11/28 and posted on the Cannabis public documents web page. That same file is now posted under this procurement announcement. The link

is labeled “specifications for Seed-to-Sale and Licensing Tracking Systems” (shown below) and the requirements are numbered, e.g., L-280 and T-840.

Q6: (Paraphrased) Where can I find the appendices mentioned on these pages:

Page 8: Requirements – use appendix A

Page 11: Project Team – use appendix B

Page 12: Subcontractor Relationship – use appendix C

Page 16: Contract – use Appendix D

Appendix E

A6: All of the appendices are pages you create (no forms provided) and are as long as you need them to be to accomplish the purpose of the appendix. For example if there is only one requirement you cannot meet, list it on a page labeled “Appendix A” and it should be page 17 in your document. If Appendix A was only one page, then Appendix B starts on page 18. The length of the appendices will vary for each respondent so we did not dictate page numbers for this section. However, please don’t skip the page numbers or restart at page 1 for each appendix because having consecutive page numbers helps us make sure we keep them in order and can reference them easily during our review. As a reminder, please include company name and project as a footer on every page (including the appendix).

Q7: If the awarded vendor plans to charge for tags, would licensees purchase these tags directly from the awarded vendor or would the State prefer to purchase tags from the awarded vendor and then resell to licensees? The rationale behind this question is to determine whether or not the State would like to control the distribution of tags to enhance oversight.

A7: If the Commission’s answer changes the price, please describe each option using the pricing template. For example, on pricing form A provide pricing information if licensees purchase tags directly and on pricing form B provide pricing if the State purchased tags and resold them to licensees. If you feel like one option is better than another, that information could be presented in the section called “The Solution” (pages 5-7) or “Differentiating Factors” (page 9)

Q8: The Commission’s procurement memo indicates that vendors can propose to provide either or both of two solutions—licensing and seed to sale tracking. The specifications published on 11/28, however, referenced and contained requirements for three “key technology systems”—Licensing, Tracking, and Revenue Collection of Fees and Fines. Is the Commission expecting the licensing system and/or the seed-to-sale tracking system to also support Revenue Collection of Fees and Fines, or will these requirements be handled by a separate system?

- A8: We anticipate that the collection of fees and fines will be accomplished with an ePay process managed by the Comptroller's office. If that assumption proves false, we will conduct a separate procurement process unless one of the bidders selected in this process can meet the requirements with no additional project costs and acceptable fees. That decision will be made separately from this procurement effort.
- Q9: The General Rules on page 1 state, "A single vendor may submit up to three responses: One for licensing, one for seed-to-sale tracking, and one for both. Each response must stand-alone so that if it is selected for the next phase, the Commission need not to refer to another document." In the case of a response for both systems, in order that the response may stand alone and fully describe both systems without reference to external documents, do the page allocations increase commensurate with the inclusion of both scopes of work (e.g., 6 pages for solution description, 4 pages for engagement approach, 2 pages for references, etc.)?
- A9: Expanding the page counts will impair our effort to conduct our analysis of the responses quickly. If you need extra pages to describe your solution for both seed-to-sale tracking and licensing, please submit two separate responses, but make it clear that the two are connected and do not stand alone. That is, you're not proposing a licensing solution that we could match up with some other seed-to-sale solution – it only works with your seed-to-sale solution. Many of the pages in the two proposals will be identical which is fine. In particular, if for some reason the pricing sheets are not identical, be sure to explain the difference.
- Q10: For Appendix A, is the Commission only looking for explanation of any requirements that vendors consider out of scope of their proposed solution, or can vendors describe additional functionality supported by their solution that is outside the scope of the Commission's requirements but which may deliver additional value to the Commonwealth?
- A10: Additional functionality is better described in the main sections such as "The Solution" and "Differentiating Factors". Appendix A is meant to help us understand what we would need to forego.
- Q11: In reviewing the Pricing Table, why does the second to last column request the 4-year total cost when the previous four columns are in three month increments spread across one and a half years? What is the reason for discrepancy between columns C-F and G?
- A11: Breaking out the pricing in that way is the best breakdown for the Commission's budgeting purposes and best facilitates a comparison across all bidders. If it causes a problem for you, please explain why in your response, but the Commission strongly urges you to complete the pricing estimate since that is a determining factor.

Q12: Please provide clarification related to when the required forms in Appendix E must be submitted. There were two different dates referenced in the RFP: Page 5 indicates the forms are due on 12/13, while page 2 states 12/14 at 4:00 PM

A12: 12/14 at 4:00 PM is the deadline

Q13: The RFP mentions a budget posted on the Commission's web page(s) which we were unable to locate. Is there a URL or document outlining the budget limitations?

A13: The estimated budget for Seed-to-Sale Tracking in FY18 (through June 30, 2018) is \$750,000. The estimated budget for Licensing in FY18 (through June 30, 2018) is \$700,000.

Q14: Vendors on state contracts such as ITS53 have already executed many of the forms requested in appendix E (see list below). Will these vendors still be required to submit signed copies of these?

A14: All forms are required. Copies of previously executed forms are acceptable as long as they are still valid. The Commission may require that they be executed again if the vendor is selected.

Q15: General questions about the Ethics form

A15: The Ethics form is no longer required for the first phase since the basic content is covered in another form. The Commission may add form(s) at the time of selection.