

Question & Answer Log 1				Date: 02/23/2026
Project Name/Number:		Laboratory Information Management System Replacement (LIMSR)- 2025-002		
Item #	Document ID # (Solicitation Section, Exhibit, or Attachment number)	Page #	Bidder Submitted Question/Request For Change	State's Final Response
1	2.3 KEY ACTION DATES / CDT-OSTP_RFP_LIMS_2.0	16 and 17	Given the large number of reference forms that are required for this RFP, would the State please consider granting a minimum two-week extension to the current March 11 submission deadline?	Please refer to Addendum 1 to see the updated Key Action Dates
2	N/A	N/A	Please provide your test compendium or, if the complete compendium is not available, the number and types of testing the laboratory performs.	Please see Addendum 1, Section Attachment 22
3	SECTION 1.2 BACKGROUND / CDT-OSTP_RFP_LIMS_2.0	11	Please list all current subcontract /reference laboratories engaged for testing, including toxicology testing. For each test at each subcontract lab, indicate whether results must be returned as: • Discrete/structured • Rendered PDF document only, or • Both (discrete plus an attached PDF).	Reference Lab security is confidential, including returned results, and will be shared with the contracted Vendor during project execution.

4	ATTACHMENT 15: KEY STAFF QUALIFICATIONS FORM – INSTRUCTIONS	2	For the sake of clarity and proportionality, would the State permit vendors to submit a comprehensive list of projects demonstrating that a key staff resource meets the applicable experience requirements, while limiting the completed reference forms to the five most recent qualifying projects for that individual?	Please refer to the instruction provided in Attachment 15, that states "It is the Bidder's responsibility to ensure that each mandatory experience requirement is met in full and is addressed in the Key Staff qualification forms in order for the State to determine compliance to the requirements." For References, please Refer to Addendum 1, Section 3.3.4. KEY STAFF REFERENCES.
5	EXHIBIT_A_FUNCTIONAL_NON-FUNCTIONAL_WORKBOOK_RFP / FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS TAB	Requirement #23	Requirement 23 references "dual entry verification". Our system enables a two-step process for rapid initial data entry (optional scanning/storage of requisition forms) and follow-up tasks for verification. Does this meet the requirements here?	If you believe your system meets the requirement as written please select the appropriate response code.
6	3.2.14 STATEMENT OF WORK / CDT-OSTP_RFP_LIMS_2.0	30	Does the State intend to allow vendors to submit proposed contract or SLA exceptions as part of their RFP responses? If so, where in the response format does the State prefer vendors to document those exceptions (e.g., Narrative Response or another section)?	Please refer to the Section 2.2.2 that states, "If the Bidder believes that one or more of the solicitation requirements is onerous, unfair, or imposes unnecessary constraints on the Bidder proposing a less costly or an alternate solution, the Bidder may

				request a change to the solicitation by submitting, in writing, the recommended change(s) and the facts substantiating this belief and reasons for making the recommended change using ATTACHMENT 1: TEMPLATE FOR QUESTION SUBMITTAL/REQUEST FOR CHANGES. Such request must be submitted to the Procurement Officers". For any such request, please reach out to Procurement Officer with a written request. State will evaluate the request and provide a response.
7	ATTACHMENT 5-RESPONSE TO ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS FORM	1	With respect to ATTACHMENT 5 – Response to Administrative Requirements, specifically Section 3.2.14 Statement of Work, how should vendors respond if they are requesting clarification or proposing limited exceptions? Would identifying exceptions require vendors to select "No" for this item? If "No" is selected for the purpose of identifying exceptions, would that response preclude the vendor from further evaluation or consideration?	Please refer to the response provided for Question #6

8	LIMS_2.0 – 26. Compatibility and Interface	182	Instruments: Please provide your instrument inventory (make/model/control software/version). For each instrument type, please describe supported output formats and, if possible, plus one example data output file.	Detailed instrument information is confidential will be shared with the contracted vendor during project execution.
9	LIMS_2.0 – 8. Solution	158; 183	METRC: SLIMS has some existing tooling that could be leveraged for METRC integration. In order to best scope this requirement, please summarize the desired state for a LIMS integration with METRC. 1. In the desired state, does the LIMS pull orders, push results/COAs, or any additional bidirectional synchronizations? 2. Are there any required events/schemas? 3. Are functional specifications actively synced between METRC and LIMS?	Desired state is pulling general METRC information into LIMS. Effort is to reduce a lot of manual writing and inscribing. All the other specifics asked in this question will be shared with the contracted vendor during project execution as the information requested is confidential.
10	LIMS_2.0 – 3.5 Demonstrations	40	Will you provide a demo script? Are you willing to share the demo scoring framework with the vendors?	As per Section 6.5.1, the demo will focus on functional requirements where the Bidder indicated in their response that the system can be met with "out of the box" in EXHIBIT A: FUNCTIONAL AND NON-FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS.

11	LIMS_2.0 – 26. Compatibility and Interface	182	Should final math(calibration/regression, acceptance, rounding) run in the LIMS or be handled using instrument software and imported into LIMS?	Instrument software.
12	LIMS_2.0 – 8. Solution	153	If possible, could you please describe your desired process for handling samples (sub-samples / splits), data, and COC for samples sent to 3rd party labs? Additionally, please describe any required touchpoints with METRC for these handoffs.	Process includes sample intake, testing for X, Y, Z. Send Z to 3rd party lab, results provided to DCC and summarized in the DCC LIMS. Creates chain of custody across labs for entire lifecycle and shows what we sent and received.
13	LIMS_2.0 – 8 Solution Requirements	157	in “2.0 Sample Receiving”. The customer mentions a requirement to “upload eLAR or upload sample information through online portal by clients”. Does the customer want a quote on a Customer Portal included with a LIMS or does the state already have a sample submission portal that they wish to integrate with their new LIMS? If the later, please provide details about this portal if this integration needs to be scoped as part of this RFP.	Attachment 24, Section 8 refers to a secure online portal for customers. Exhibit A - Functional Requirements 68 & 69 also references the mandatory need for a customer portal.
14	LIMS_2.0 – 3.1 Documentation & Development	165	Would you need your legacy data migrated?	Attachment 24 - Appendix A - SOW -Deliverables 2 & 3 identify the requirements for mapping and loading legacy data to the new LIMS.

15	LIMS_2.0		There are some references to cloud-based options but can you please clarify the desired option for hosting the SLIMS solution? Customer Cloud/on premises hosted or Vendor-Cloud hosted?	Vendor - Cloud hosted system. RFP Section 1.1 and Attachment 24, SOW Section 9 mentions the detailed ask.
16	LIMS_2.0 – 4. Term of Contract	154	Can you elaborate on the factors that would dictate extension of the base contract from the 2-year agreement to any of those 1-year extensions up to 5 years? When would this extension be realized/disclosed by DCC?	Developing and deploying the system to the functional and non-functional requirements would provide system acceptance and ongoing usage considerations for the 1-year optional extensions.
17	LIMS_2.0 – 4. Term of Contract	154	To understand the unanticipated task budget limitations better, what does the state consider to be part of the base contract? Does this include all costs associated with the initial 2-year agreement, including SaaS Licenses and associated services for implementation, training, consulting, integrations, etc.?	Base contract is identified in the Exhibit D: Cost workbook and labeled as 'Base Contract Grand Total' on the Summary worksheet. This includes all design, development, and implementation (DD&I), the first two years of system licensing, deliverables in the SOW and unanticipated task funds.
18	Attachment 24 Appendix A	N/A	Does attachment 24 - Appendix A - SOW necessitate that the attachment itself needs to be completed or can the vendors SOW template be used instead if it satisfies all requirements?	Attachment 24 - Appendix A - SOW will become the executed agreement between the State and the Vendor. No other template will be used.

19	Exhibit A: Functional & Non Functional Requirement		There are several features that are marked as "Mandatory Scored" that we currently do not offer and would require "Customization (More than 40 Hours)" to deliver. Given this, I would like to know if these missing items are truly "deal breakers" for the State or not.	Please Enter an "1" under customization if the requirement can be met with code changes that create functionality that is not available through configuration. However, the customization must be completed before system acceptance is approved.
----	--	--	--	---