

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI'I	AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION	PAGE 1 of 3
1. AMENDMENT NO. 2	3. REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) NO. <u>24-1759</u> Dated <u>JULY 2024</u> Provide Building Research Competitiveness Across the University of Hawaii System, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii	
2. EFFECTIVE DATE August 19, 2024		
4. ISSUED BY Director, Office of Procurement Management 1400 Lower Campus Road, Room 15 Honolulu Hawaii'i 96822 BUYER: <u>M. Elmore</u>		5. CONTRACTOR (NAME AND ADDRESS) N/A

6. The RFP referenced above is amended as set forth in block 7. The hour and date for receipt of offers is extended is not extended. This amendment is attached to HlePRO solicitation P24003399 for distribution and acknowledgement purposes.

7. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT

- A. The University's response to questions is attached hereto and made a part hereof (2 pages).
- B. Section 1.4 SCHEDULE OF KEY DATES, shall be revised as follows:

RFP Advertised and Issued	July 1, 2024
Closing Date for Submission of Questions	July 15, 2024
University Response to Offeror's Questions	August 19, 2024
Closing Date for Receipt of Proposals	September 6, 2024
Proposal Review Period	September 20, 2024
Discussion with Priority Listed Offerors (if necessary)	September 27, 2024
Best and Final Offer (if necessary)	October 4, 2024
Contractor Selection and Award (Tentative)	October 11, 2024
Contract Start Date (Tentative)	January 14, 2025

NOTE: Changes are denoted in **BOLD**.

EXCEPT AS PROVIDED HEREIN, ALL TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE DOCUMENT REFERENCED IN BLOCK 3 UNLESS HERETOFORE AMENDED, REMAIN UNCHANGED.

THE REMAINDER OF THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**Questions for solicitation: P24003399 RFP No. 24-1759 Provide Building
Research Competitiveness
07/15/2024**

1. We plan to partner with other firms to provide the optimum results for UH. Are there any special concerns? The concern with a partnership model lies with the ability of the firms to work together to serve UH. UH's research enterprise is diverse and having boutique partners address each specific area of expertise may seem like a way to provide optimal responsiveness, but in practice, a single, coordinated partner makes collaboration across disciplines and strategic planning much more achievable.

2. Can you provide more details about proposal volumes? (e.g. seasonality, turnaround timelines). The volumes stated in the RFP are fairly representative of what UHM sees. Proposal submission for NIH awards follow the standard due date schedule. Submissions to other agencies (federal and non-federal) are consistent through-out the year with peaks for some of the key programs for UH, such as NSF-CAREER and NSF-EPSCoR programs. Turnaround times will vary, but a week is typical based on submission deadlines and the request dates for proposal review support.

3. What activities are expected in the annual site visits? We would expect that there would be significant one-to-one engagement with faculty. We would also expect that a firm would work with UH leadership to identify a proposal development workshop topic that the firm would host on-site to provide specific guidance. Past workshops have been focused on NSF-CAREER and NSF Mid-Career Advancement programs. Additional meetings should be scheduled to address institutional leadership concerns related to strategies and insights that the partner firm would have into non-federal and federal agency funding trends and future directions in order to assist leadership with strategic planning for their campuses.

4. How will you evaluate the performance of this contract in improving UH's research competitiveness? What conditions need to be met for annual renewals?

Successful proposal funding would serve as the primary metric for success, with data separated based on submission (e.g. initial versus resubmission). Another measure of success would be the level of faculty satisfaction with the support they receive for proposal development and/or consultation. An additional measure of success would be the level of engagement during the campus visit (workshops and one-to-one meetings).

5. Are there specific research areas (e.g., Climate Resilience) that will be prioritized in the proposals we will assist with? I would hope that there would be no prioritization, as faculty in all areas need assistance. UH has a diverse research enterprise and any firm that could advance the research mission would need to be comfortable reviewing and providing assistance in all areas of investigation by UH faculty. If there was any prioritization, it would be in alignment with the strategic priorities of the System and/or individual campuses.

6. Can you provide any guidance on the budget constraints or allocations for this contract? Do you have a preferred pricing model (e.g. fixed fee vs hourly, etc.)? What costs will be reimbursed? I would prefer a fixed price model. From experience, a contract based on an hourly fee places burden on administration to oversee, as well as limits the interactions faculty can have on a specific proposal due to the pressure of increasing costs. Reimbursements would be for: proposal development support, consultation (leadership and faculty), and the annual visit. Additional services, such as internal limited submission opportunity down-selection support can be negotiated on an ad hoc basis.