



UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

AMENDMENT NO. 2 TO SOLICITATION

TO: ALL VENDORS

FROM: Charles Johnson, Procurement Manager

SUBJECT: SOLICITATION NUMBER: USC-RFP-2939-CJ

DESCRIPTION: Brokerage Services and Purchase of Automotive Insurance for The University of South Carolina Department of Athletics

DATE: March 28, 2016

This Amendment No.2 modifies the Requests for Proposals only in the manner and to the extent as stated herein.

Vendor Questions and Answers

BIDDER SHALL ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF AMENDMENT NO. 2 IN THE SPACE PROVIDED BELOW AND RETURN IT WITH THEIR BID RESPONSE. FAILURE TO DO SO MAY SUBJECT BID TO REJECTION.

Authorized Signature

Name of Offeror

Date

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS WERE RECEIVED FROM VENDOR A:

QUESTION 1.: Section VI. Award Criteria - Will a percentage breakdown of the three Evaluation Factors be given?

ANSWER: No. For RFPs, like most State agencies, the University doesn't generally release the percentage breakdown of the evaluation factors. Instead, the University lists the evaluation criteria in relative order of importance, with the first evaluation factor being the most important. After award is made from the solicitation, if you will send me a Freedom of Information Act request for the percentage breakdown of the three evaluation factors, then I will be happy to supply you with the percentage breakdown of the three evaluation factors.

QUESTION 2.: Minority Participation is listed as a section of the RFP on page 19. In Section VI Award Criteria, no consideration is listed for Minority Participation/Status. Will there not be consideration for Minority Status? If there is, what section and what percentage of an evaluation factor would this impact?

ANSWER: While the University asks offerors to complete the Minority Participation clause in Section IV of the solicitation and include it with their bids, no consideration is given to offerors' minority status during either the evaluation of the proposals, negotiations with the highest ranked offeror (if conducted), nor determination of responsibility of an offeror prior to making award from the solicitation. The information offerors supply on the Minority Participation clause (for those offerors who choose to complete it and include it with their proposals) is used by the USC Purchasing Department to track the number of minority vendors who respond to its solicitations and are awarded contracts from the solicitations.

QUESTION 3.: Who will be the professionals whom will be evaluating the proposals? Will the decision be reached by a vote of a committee or will one individual have final say?

ANSWER: Prior to evaluation of the responsive proposals, the department chooses the 3, 5, or 7 persons it wishes to serve on the evaluation committee as evaluation committee members who are responsible for evaluating and scoring the responsive proposals. At this time, the department hasn't decided on the 3, 5, or 7 persons it wishes to serve on the evaluation committee as evaluation committee members who are responsible for evaluating and scoring the responsive proposals. After the evaluation committee members have completed their review of the responsive proposals, finalized their scores and turned them into the evaluation committee chair person (the procurement officer responsible for the solicitation), the evaluation committee chair person tabulates the scores and announces the highest ranked offeror (the offeror whose proposal received the highest number of total points from the evaluation committee members' scoring of the responsive proposals). Pending successful negotiations with the highest ranked offeror (if negotiations are conducted), award of contract from the solicitation is normally made to the highest ranked offeror from the evaluation process.

QUESTION 4.: On page 8 of the RFP, under Ethics Certificate and under state procurement codes, are individuals, owners of businesses or businesses who's ownership is comprised of a person who is:

- a. Employed by the University in any capacity
- b. A Super Donor
- c. Members of boards of the University or University Foundations

disqualified from participating in this RFP process due to potential conflicts?

ANSWER: These individuals are not necessarily disqualified from participating in the RFP process. Any relationship of the nature outlined in this question, and as set forth in Title 8, Chapter 13 of the South Carolina Code of Laws, must be disclosed as a conflict of interest before the evaluation process begins. All evaluators are required to read and sign the certification (as listed below) prior to reviewing any responses to the RFP. In the event of a conflict of interest, the procurement officer will review the conflict and act accordingly.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST CERTIFICATION

I will avoid conflicts of interest by withdrawing from the Evaluation Panel if there is any proposal involving organizations:

- 1. where to the best of my knowledge and belief, I or my spouse, minor child, or partner have a financial interest;**
- 2. where I am an officer, director, trustee, partner, consultant, or employee or otherwise similarly associated;**
- 3. where there exists any arrangement concerning my prospective employment, financial interest, or other similar association;**
- 4. where I have provided technical assistance to the offeror in the preparation of their proposal;**
- 5. where, to the best of my knowledge, I am a supervisor of, or supervised by, anyone who is subject to one of the above-mentioned items.**