

Click the arrow ► next to the RFP title to expand.

RFP 2615 Restorative, Decontamination, and Cleanup Services for Government

There have been no questions received to date.

RFP 2620 Event and Performance Lighting, Rigging, and Production Systems and Services

There have been no questions received to date.

RFP 2625 Legal Case, Document, and Contract Management Solutions

Q:	Regarding the preference for goods and services fabricated or performed within the state per ORS 279A.128: Does this preference apply exclusively to the state of Oregon, or is a reciprocal preference extended to other states where participating NPPGov, Public Safety GPO, First Responders GPO, or Law Enforcement GPO members are located?
A:	The preferences identified in Section 5.1.1 (including ORS 279A.128) apply to the state of Oregon. They are not extended on a reciprocal basis to other states.

Q:	Please clarify the definition of 'goods fabricated or processed' as it pertains to this RFP. Does the Lead Contracting Agency classify Software-as-a-Service (SaaS), software products and development, and associated professional services under this definition for the purposes of evaluating local preference? ORS 279A.010 implies that Software products and services would be included in the definition
A:	LOC declines to issue an advisory interpretation in advance of evaluation. Proposers are welcome to describe in their response how they believe their offering should be characterized under ORS 279A.010 and 279A.128, including the location of development, hosting, support, and related services.

Q:	May respondents propose multiple products within one category that cover different aspects of the category type? For example, offering different Legal CMS products for different security situations, such as a FedRAMP authorized product offering and a non-FedRAMP product.
A:	Yes. Per Section 2.2.1, LOC encourages Proposers to submit their entire catalog of responsive products and services.

Q:	Can respondents include provisions for services or individual products that may have more variable pricing in the future (such as AI tokens in relation to Category 5 products) as an alternative to Option B Price Modification requests?
A:	Attachment D permits pricing based on (1) fixed discount(s) off published price list(s) or catalog(s), (2) firm fixed price with economic adjustment, or (3) a combination of the two. Proposers may clearly describe a variable or consumption-based pricing component (such as token- or usage-based pricing) within their response. LOC will evaluate the proposed pricing methodology as submitted.

Q:	The RFP asks for "anticipated future models," What is the formal process for adding entirely new technology modules or product lines to the contract once they are officially launched?
-----------	---

A:	A successful Proposer may replace or add product lines provided the addition reasonably falls within the intent of the original RFP specifications, is equal to or superior to the original products offered, is discounted in a similar or greater degree, and otherwise meets the requirements of the solicitation. The process begins with a written request to the Proposer's assigned Business Development Manager.
-----------	--

Q:	How will "anticipated future models" be evaluated for Attachment E "Product Line?"
A:	Anticipated future models will be considered as part of the overall Product Line evaluation. See Attachment E for how LOC will evaluate all proposals.

Q:	If a respondent partners with a different firm for marketing or national presence, how should respondents describe their national presence? Such as when completing Exhibit 1.
A:	Exhibit 1 should reflect the Proposer's own retail, distribution, and service/support locations. A partnership with a separate firm for marketing or national reach should be described narratively within Section 4.0 of Attachment B or the body of the proposal (for example, in the executive summary, qualifications, marketing, or coverage sections).

Q:	Would you be open to pricing for the Contract Management to be hosted by vendor (SaaS/cloud) or deployed on your organization's server (on-premise)?
A:	The LOC does not have a preference or restriction on the type of Contract Management service proposed. LOC welcomes any proposal that satisfies the requirements of the solicitation.

Q:	Can LOC provide the names of the legal document software for integrations?
A:	This is an interstate cooperative procurement solicitation for LOC members and NPPGov members to utilize. There is no singular user, software, or integration.

RFP 2630 Janitorial, Custodial, and Facility Sanitation Supplies, Equipment, and Related Services

Q:	Reporting Requirements — Is the proposed monthly consolidation, validation, and payment timeline acceptable, and are there specific reporting formats or data requirements?
A:	Specific reporting cadence, format, and remittance timing are governed by the NPPGov Vendor Administration Agreement (VAA) and its Addendum A, referenced in Section 2.1.1 of the RFP and Section 2.5 of the Proposer Profile Workbook. Reporting is typically electronic and includes sales data correlated with NPPGov Member ID numbers. NPPGov will work with successful Proposers to operationalize reporting consistent with the VAA, and reasonable accommodations for distributor consolidation models can be discussed during VAA execution. Proposers should describe their proposed reporting approach in their response (PPW Section 2.5) so that capabilities and any constraints are documented up front.

Q:	Pricing Structure — Would a cost-plus markup proposal be considered acceptable, and may it be submitted as a supplemental schedule to Attachment D?
A:	Per Section 2.3.1 and Attachment D, contract pricing is to be based on (1) fixed discount(s) off published price list(s) or catalog(s), (2) firm fixed price with economic adjustment, or (3) a combination of the above, with Option (1) preferred. Proposers may present pricing in the format that best represents their product line and business model, and may include supplemental tabs or schedules as needed, provided the proposal clearly delineates the relative discount and value to LOC and NPPGov Participating Agencies as required by Attachment D. Proposers electing an alternative methodology should include written justification, and LOC reserves the right to evaluate alternative pricing structures on their merits.

RFP 2635 Consulting Services for Public Organizations

Q:	How and when might cities decide to utilize this contract, compared to issuing their own RFP process? Or perhaps again, this would be more for fairly discrete and/or tangible services, compared to more tailored services like planning and public engagement?
A:	Use of any resulting Master Price Agreement is entirely at the discretion of each Participating Agency. As noted in Sections 1.5 and 3.2 of the RFP, agencies "may purchase directly from the successful Proposer(s) without the need for further solicitation," provided they have satisfied their own local, state, or provincial cooperative procurement requirements. Participating Agencies are encouraged to consult their own legal counsel and procurement staff to determine whether utilizing the cooperative contract is appropriate for a given engagement.

Q:	Is there an upper budget limit to contracts that could go through this?
A:	The RFP does not establish an upper budget limit. Each Participating Agency is responsible for complying with its own jurisdiction's procurement thresholds, approval requirements, and applicable laws when accessing the Master Price Agreement.

Q:	Is this better suited to discrete/tangible services rather than tailored services like planning and public engagement?
A:	The RFP is intentionally broad and contemplates the Proposer's full catalog of consulting services (Section 2.2.1). Both standardized and more tailored engagements may be appropriate for the Master Price Agreement. The scope, deliverables, and terms of any specific engagement are negotiated between the Participating Agency and the awarded Proposer at the task or project level, subject to the Agency's own procurement rules.

Q:	Is a scope of work proposal required for each unique service in each category, or can a general scope be provided?
A:	Per Attachment C, the RFP requests a detailed scope of work and description of the typical approach for each type of consulting service the Proposer wishes to be considered for. Proposers may organize and combine that information in the format that best represents their business; a categorical or service-line description of methodology and approach is acceptable, provided it sufficiently describes the work offered. Engagement-specific scopes of work are negotiated between the awarded Proposer and the Participating Agency at the project level.

Q:	Does Category 1: Public Safety include Police/Sheriff/Corrections consulting services, or only Fire, 9-1-1, and Emergency Management?
-----------	---

A:	Category 1 is intentionally non-exhaustive — the listed services are "including but not limited to" — and the standards referenced in the category include CALEA (Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies). Operational consulting services for police, sheriff, and corrections agencies may be proposed under Category 1. To the extent a particular service does not align with Category 1 or 2, Proposers may include it under Category 10 (Other Consulting Services for Public Organizations).
-----------	---

Q:	Do we need to include three references for each category, or three total?
A:	Per Proposer Profile Workbook Section 1.2, a minimum of three (3) references is required. References should reasonably reflect the services proposed. Additional references demonstrating experience across the categories proposed may strengthen the response but are not required.

Q:	For pricing, is a submittal of our proposed hourly rates sufficient? Is it acceptable to provide a master listing of staff classifications with their hourly rates?
A:	Yes. A master schedule of staff classifications and corresponding hourly rates is acceptable and is consistent with Option B (fixed pricing with economic adjustment, where applicable) under Section 2.3 of the RFP. Proposers are encouraged to identify any discount off published rates that will be made available to LOC and NPPGov Participating Agencies (a hybrid of Options A and B is acceptable), as well as any standard policies for reimbursable expenses. Project-specific pricing for individual engagements will be negotiated between the Proposer and the Participating Agency.

RFP 2640 EMS Billing and Revenue Cycle Management Services

Q:	The RFP states that to be considered fully responsive, we must provide at least three references from government agencies within the United States or Canada that have purchased similar products or services within the last year. Is the requirement to provide three references non-negotiable, or is there any flexibility regarding this criteria?
A:	Per Section 1.2 of Attachment B in the solicitation, and Step 1 of Attachment F, the addition of references is required.

Q:	Please share the category wise FTE numbers in scope.
A:	RFP 2640 is an Interstate Cooperative Procurement Solicitation, for which LOC serves as the Lead Contracting Agency on behalf of its members; it is not procuring services for itself. Individual Participating Agencies determine specific FTE requirements.

Q:	The RFP references an estimated annual value of approximately \$10 million across similar contracts. Are there any additional historical utilization details available by agency type, geography, number of participating agencies, or expected EMS billing volume?
A:	The estimate referenced in Section 1.2 reflects an industry-level analysis of potential spend for similar products and services and should not be relied upon as a prediction of actual contract spend. LOC does not maintain or have additional segmented utilization data to share, and as noted in Section 1.2, volume is anticipated but not guaranteed.

Q:	Kindly share the expected hours of operation for the in-scope services.
A:	RFP 2640 is an Interstate Cooperative Procurement Solicitation, for which LOC serves as the Lead Contracting Agency on behalf of its members; it is not procuring services for itself. Individual Participating Agencies determine hours of operation.

Q:	Please confirm the languages included in scope. If multiple languages are required, kindly provide the corresponding bifurcation of FTEs and/or transaction volumes by language.
A:	LOC does not prescribe specific language requirements. Proposers should identify the languages in which they are able to provide services and any limitations.

Q:	Please share the in-scope transaction volumes, segmented by category, language, and channel.
-----------	--

A:	Transaction volumes are not defined at the RFP level and will vary by Participating Agency.
-----------	---

Q:	Please share the channel-wise and category-wise Average Handle Time (AHT) targets and applicable Service Level Agreements (SLAs).
A:	LOC does not establish AHT targets or SLAs at the Master Price Agreement level. Proposers should describe their standard service level commitments. Specific SLAs may be established between Proposer and individual Participating Agencies.

Q:	We understand Patient call center support is required, Please confirm whether proposer is expected to provide the complete voice telephony solution, including inbound and outbound calling, ACD, IVR, reporting, and call recording, or if client will extend its existing telephony environment.
A:	Telephony arrangements are not prescribed at the RFP level and will vary by Participating Agency. Proposers should describe their standard telephony capabilities (inbound/outbound, ACD, IVR, reporting, recording) and their ability to operate within a customer-provided environment if required.

Q:	If Client will provide the telephony, kindly share the telephony platform details and confirm the approach for extending access to the proposer's delivery location.
A:	Telephony arrangements are not prescribed at the RFP level and will vary by Participating Agency. Proposers should describe their standard telephony capabilities (inbound/outbound, ACD, IVR, reporting, recording) and their ability to operate within a customer-provided environment if required.

Q:	Please confirm how Proposer agents will access Client applications and systems. Specifically, kindly clarify whether the Client will extend the required VDI and/or VPN access to enable Proposer agents to securely connect to and operate within the Client environment.
A:	Access methods will vary by Participating Agency. Proposers should describe their standard secure-access model, including VDI, VPN, and any other supported approaches, along with relevant security and HIPAA controls.

Q:	Please share the targeted member population for the scope of services covered under this engagement.
-----------	--

A:	LOC does not maintain a defined target population for the resulting Master Price Agreement. Eligible users are the LOC and NPPGov membership described in Section 1.0, and actual utilization will vary by Participating Agency.
-----------	--

Q:	Please provide sample or indicative service level metrics that proposers are expected to meet or comply with.
A:	LOC does not impose service level metrics at the Master Price Agreement level. Proposers should propose their standard service level commitments and KPIs, which may be adopted or modified by individual Participating Agencies under their own engagements.

Q:	What would be the geographic scope across the US which the selected service provider will provide coverage for?
A:	The intended geographic scope is nationwide, including all 50 states and, where applicable, Canada (see Sections 1.0 and 1.4). Local and regional Proposers may also respond and may receive awards consistent with the multiple-award provisions in Section 1.4.

Q:	Does the RFP or LOC/NPPGov impose any restrictions on offshore or hybrid delivery for non-patient-facing back-office activities, provided all services comply with HIPAA, data security, privacy, and applicable federal, state, provincial, and local requirements?
A:	LOC does not impose offshore or hybrid delivery restrictions at the Master Price Agreement level beyond compliance with all applicable federal, state, provincial, local, and contractual requirements (including HIPAA, data security, and privacy laws). Individual Participating Agencies may impose additional restrictions under their own engagements.

Q:	Are there any restrictions on performing the in-scope services remotely within the United States?
A:	LOC does not impose restrictions on remote performance within the United States at the Master Price Agreement level. Compliance with all applicable laws and any Participating Agency requirements remains the Proposer's responsibility.

Q:	For patient customer service and communications, is there an expectation that all patient-facing call center support be performed from the United States, or may proposers offer multiple delivery options for Participating Agencies to select from?
A:	Proposers may offer multiple delivery options and should clearly describe each, including location of performance. Selection among available options will rest with individual Participating Agencies.

Q:	Is it mandatory for the proposer to maintain a physical office presence in the state of Oregon to deliver the services?
A:	No. Section 1.4 expressly contemplates both national and local Proposers. A physical office in Oregon is not required to be eligible for award.

Q:	Do you allow proposers to subcontract some part of the scope (if necessary) as part of the proposal?
A:	Yes. Subcontracting is permitted as described in PPW Section 3.3 and Section 2.3.2, provided the Proposer clearly identifies the subcontracted scope, ordering, shipment, invoicing, and billing arrangements in its response.

Q:	Are any existing reports available that detail the number of emergency medical services utilized by members on a state-wise basis? If so, would LOC be willing to share these reports with proposers?
A:	LOC does not maintain or have access to such reports and is not in a position to share utilization data of this kind.

Q:	Please confirm whether the current scope of services is being delivered by an incumbent vendor, managed in-house, or represents a new service implementation.
A:	This RFP establishes a new cooperative Master Price Agreement available to LOC members and other Participating Agencies. The current state of services within any specific Participating Agency is determined by that agency.

Q:	Are there any mandatory qualifications, certifications, or credentials that the proposer must possess to be eligible to deliver the required scope of services?
A:	Proposers must comply with all applicable federal, state, provincial, and local laws, rules, and regulations governing the in-scope services (including, where applicable, HIPAA, payer enrollment requirements, and any state-specific licensure). Proposers should identify in their response any certifications, accreditations, or credentials they hold that are relevant to the scope.

Q:	Can LOC confirm the expected training timelines by role/category, including process training, on-the-job training (OJT), and ramp-up to steady-state productivity?
A:	LOC does not establish training timelines at the Master Price Agreement level. Proposers should describe their standard onboarding and ramp methodology; specific timelines will be determined with individual Participating Agencies.

Q:	We assume that any transportation and CAD related services will be managed by LOC or the respective state departments and the proposers will be responsible only for the business processes related to claim creation and submission, denial management, appeals management, A/R follow-up with payer and patient collections(if applicable). Please confirm
A:	The scope of this RFP is set forth in Attachment C and is generally limited to EMS billing, revenue cycle management, and the related categories listed therein. Transportation operations and computer-aided dispatch (CAD) are functions of the EMS agencies and are not within the scope of this Solicitation. Proposers should describe how their solutions integrate with EMS ePCR, CAD, and other source systems where relevant (see Category 5).

Q:	The RFP provides multiple service categories- please confirm if LOC is expecting a Fixed price managed service FTE rate or service line/category wise annual fixed cost..?
A:	Per Attachment D, pricing may be based on (1) fixed discount(s) off published price list(s) or catalog(s) — Option A, which is preferred, (2) firm fixed price with economic adjustments — Option B, or (3) a combination of the two. Proposers may present FTE-based, transaction-based, percentage-of-collections, or other pricing models in the format that best represents their service offering, consistent with the methodologies described in Attachment D.

Q:	Does LOC anticipate awarding multiple vendors by category, region, or service capability, or is the intent to select a primary vendor for the full EMS billing and RCM scope?
A:	Per Section 1.4, multiple awards are contemplated and may be granted based on differentiation in service, geographic coverage, capability, or category. LOC reserves the right to make multiple awards or a single award based on the evaluation outcome.

Q:	Should proposers include pricing and approach for legacy accounts receivable cleanup, backlog billing, denial recovery, or historical underpayment review as optional services?
A:	Yes. Proposers are encouraged to include these and other related services within their response, either under the applicable category in Attachment C (including Category 7 — Other Related Services) or as additional services consistent with Section 2.3.2.

RFP 2645 Total Energy Solutions: Backup, Prime Power Generation and Distribution Systems

Q:	If I understand correctly there are no prices just a range. For instance, we manufacturer battery storage systems. They can range from a few kW to MW. There could be 20 sizes in between. We also Manufacturer UPS solutions, again these can be a range from small to large in 100's of sizes or combinations. In these cases you just need the min to max?
A:	LOC is not able to provide guidance or provide what could be deemed as guidance. There are no restrictions or limitations on how a Proposer desires to structure their pricing schedule, including whether a price range is part of it. Conformance is one of the scoring criteria, so in general, following the directive in the proposal as much as possible.