

The purpose of this Addendum 2 to RFP 10700053-03 (State of Oregon Computing and Networking Infrastructure Consolidation) is to: (A) reflect a MODIFICATION TO THE "TASK 4 NOTE" AT PAGE 29 OF THE SAMPLE CONTRACT, (B) identify the Mandatory Pre-Proposal Conference ("MPC") Attendees, (C) respond to all questions raised by MPC Attendees at the conference conducted on October 24, 2003, and (D) announce the availability of electronic copies of the Contact list for MPC Attendees, the MPC Microsoft PowerPoint slides and two matrices from the RFP in Microsoft Excel formats.

A. The Agency has determined to MODIFY the "Task 4 Note" at page 29 of the Sample Contract (Exhibit A, Statement of Work) as follows:

1. Delete the words, "they firm plan . . .," substituting therefor the words, "their firms plan . . .".

2. The modified provision now reflects the following:

"TASK 4 NOTE: Enterprise-wide auto discovery capabilities and/or an enterprise asset repository do not exist at this time. Prospective Proposers are expected to identify and describe the tools and techniques their firms plan to utilize in completing the Inventory. If the State's purchase of recommended Inventory tool(s) (i.e., licenses) is required in order for a Proposer to complete the Inventory-related tasks, then the Proposer should define/describe what is required and build in the cost of the Inventory tool licenses into the required not-to-exceed pricing portion of its Cost Proposal."

B. The following 27 firms attended the MPC on October 24, 2003:

1. ACCENTURE
2. ACS
3. ALTIRIS (with Denali Advanced Integration)
4. AURIGA CORPORATION
5. CDI CORPORATION (CDI Professional Services and CDI Innovantage)
6. CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.
7. DELL, INC.
8. DELOITTE CONSULTING
9. DENALI ADVANCED INTEGRATION (with Altiris)
10. EDS
11. EMC CORPORATION
12. GARTNER
13. HEWLETT-PACKARD
14. IBM
15. LOCKHEED MARTIN
16. MICROSOFT CORPORATION
17. NOANET (Northwest Open Access Network)

18. PACIFIC TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
19. PRO DX
20. QWEST
21. SCRUGGS & ASSOCIATES, INC.
22. SUN MICROSYSTEMS
23. TRIAD TECHNOLOGY GROUP
24. UNISYS CORPORATION
25. VERIZON
26. W & H PACIFIC
27. WILLAMETTE CONSULTING

C. The Agency responds to questions raised by MPC Attendees at the conference conducted on October 24, 2003, as follows (The questions are written in lower case text and numbered 1 to 59. Their answers follow in UPPER CASE text):

1. Who will serve on the RFP review committee?

THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE FOR RFP 10700053-03 ("RFP") IS COMPRISED OF THE FOLLOWING PERSONS: DON FLEMING, STATE CIO, AND MIKE FREESE, DEPUTY CIO - DAS INFORMATION RESOURCES MANAGEMENT DIVISION; DAN ADELMAN, ADMINISTRATOR OF INFORMATION MANAGEMENT DIVISION - DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AND BUSINESS SERVICES; KRISTEN DUUS, DEPUTY CIO - DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES; PETER BYRNE, TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT MANAGER - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION.

2. Will ongoing projects continue despite possible consolidation efforts? (asked of ODOT Data Center Manager: Marc Williams)

YES; NO CHANGE TO EXISTING PROJECTS IS PLANNED.

3. The Burns Archive Center was mentioned in the previous RFP; is Burns part of the scope of the current procurement?

NO. IT WAS MENTIONED AT THE MANDATORY PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE ("MPC") FOR INFORMATION PURPOSES ONLY. PROPOSERS MAY OFFER SUGGESTIONS RELATED TO THE BURNS ARCHIVE CENTER, BUT NO SUCH DISCUSSION IS MANDATORY.

4. Different funding sources amongst agencies lead to the "color of money" argument. This could be a stumbling block to the consolidation initiative; does ENS have a billing system that supports and satisfies "color of money" issues?

THIS IS AN ISSUE FOR THE STATE'S RESOLUTION. IT IS AN ISSUE OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF THE RFP.

5. Eleven of 14 state data networks are potential targets for consolidation; what three networks are not included in the eleven?

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT; DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, AND THE OREGON MILITARY DEPARTMENT. ADDITIONALLY, THE OREGON UNIVERSITY SYSTEM NETWORK IS EXCLUDED. THESE NETWORKS ARE NOT UNDER THE DIRECT CONTROL OF THE GOVERNOR (SIMILAR TO SECRETARY OF STATE AND OREGON STATE TREASURY). THEY MAY OPT IN, BUT ARE NOT REQUIRED TO DO SO.

6. Is "voice" considered outside the scope of this RFP?

YES.

7. Is it possible that "voice" will be considered for future consolidation initiatives?

YES.

8. Regarding funding phase II; will the state take the business case to the legislature to get funding?

PHASE I IS FUNDED; FUNDING FOR PHASE II WILL BE BASED IN LARGE PART ON THE QUALITY AND COMPLETENESS OF A VALIDATED BUSINESS CASE DEVELOPED BY THE CONTRACTOR IN PHASE I. THE EXACT MECHANISM FOR FUNDING PHASE II HAS NOT BEEN DETERMINED AT THIS TIME. NOTE THAT THE DAS DIRECTOR HAS PERSONALLY ARTICULATED THE STATE'S DEEP COMMITMENT TO THE UNDERLYING CONSOLIDATION PROJECT; IT IS NOT WHETHER THE STATE WILL CONSOLIDATE, BUT HOW, AND IN WHAT MANNER THE STATE CAN CAPTURE A RETURN AS QUICKLY AS POSSIBLE.

9. What dollar amount is the state expecting to pay?

THE STATE DOES NOT BELIEVE IT IS APPROPRIATE TO DISCLOSE THAT INFORMATION AT THIS TIME. THE STATE HAS TRIED TO ATTRACT THE BEST IN THIS FIELD THROUGH THE CURRENT RFP, AND IS EXPECTING PROPOSERS TO SUBMIT A COST PROPOSAL FOR SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETING THE WORK ENVISIONED IN THE RFP.

10. Regarding the scope of "consolidation"; is the state looking to reduce the number of technologies being used, or just reduce the number of a particular technology being used?

APPLICATION SETS ARE OUTSIDE THE SCOPE, WHICH IMPLIES THAT CONSOLIDATION OF IN-SCOPE INFRASTRUCTURE MAY NOT REDUCE THE NUMBER OF TECHNOLOGIES IN USE. THE SELECTED PROPOSER MAY CHOOSE TO ADDRESS THIS ISSUE AS IT COMPLETES THE PHASE I ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDS THE BEST APPROACH TO CONSOLIDATION.

11. Is application retirement (or reduction) in the scope of this RFP?

NOT NECESSARILY. THE INVENTORY IS REQUESTED SO THAT THE OPPORTUNITY FOR REDUCTION / CONSOLIDATION OF APPLICATIONS CAN BE IDENTIFIED.

12. Regarding timelines; the RFP is set up for 18 months for phase 1, but aren't there key deliverables due in June or August?

YES, AND THE STATE EXPECTS PROPOSERS TO SUBMIT A PROJECTED TIMEFRAME FOR COMPLETION. HOWEVER, ESTABLISHING A CONTRACT IS A LONG-TERM PROPOSITION. THE STATE IS COMMITTED TO FAIR AND OPEN PROCUREMENTS. NOTWITHSTANDING THE DESIRED COMPLETION DATES REFLECTED IN THE RFP AND STATEMENT OF WORK, THE FULL CONTRACT TERM OF 18 MONTHS ALLOWS TIME/FLEXIBILITY FOR BOTH THE CONTRACTOR AND THE STATE TO DEAL WITH UNFORESEEN CIRCUMSTANCES.

13. When does the state expect phase I will wrap up?

THE STATE WANTS TO MOVE AS BRISKLY AS POSSIBLE. HOWEVER, THE STATE'S ABILITY TO MOVE FORWARD QUICKLY DEPENDS ON THE COMPELLING NATURE AND CLARITY OF THE BUSINESS CASE. THE STATE HAS OUTLINED A DESIRED SCHEDULE FOR COMPLETION OF THE MAJOR COMPONENTS OF PHASE I WORK ON PAGE 12 OF THE RFP: 2.2. CONTRACT TERM/TIME FOR PERFORMANCE. FURTHER, ON PAGE 14 OF THE RFP: 3.1.1.3.: RESPONSE TO TECHNICAL QUESTIONS, SUBSECTION D) THE STATE REQUESTS THE INCLUSION OF A PROPOSED PROJECT SCHEDULE AS PART OF THE VENDOR TECHNICAL PROPOSAL TO THE RFP. ALSO, SEE ANSWER 12 ABOVE.

14. Does the state expect a delay / gap between phase I completion and phase II beginning?

THE STATE IS NOT ABLE TO GIVE A TIMELINE OR DATE, BUT CAN ASSURE PROPOSERS THAT NO SUBSTANTIAL DELAY BETWEEN PHASES IS DESIRED OR EXPECTED. THE SPEED AT WHICH PHASE II WORK COMMENCES WILL BE BASED ON A VARIETY OF FACTORS, INCLUDING THE SELECTED PROPOSER'S COMPLETION OF A QUALITY AND COMPELLING BUSINESS CASE TO PROCEED WITH PHASE II WORK. ALSO, SEE ANSWERS 12 AND 13 ABOVE.

15. Please explain the vendor neutral environment stated in the RFP. (This question was posed in the context of the potential for the selected vendor proposing the purchase of its own hardware, software and/or services).

THE STATE INTENDS THAT PROCUREMENT OF ANY NEEDED HARDWARE OR SOFTWARE TO ACCOMPLISH THIS INITIATIVE WILL BE ACCOMPLISHED THROUGH ESTABLISHED PROCUREMENT MECHANISMS.

16. What other state resources (beyond the inventory) are dedicated to this project?

A PROJECT TEAM HAS BEEN FORMED ALONG WITH A PROJECT MANAGER. MOREOVER, THE STATE EXPECTS PROPOSERS TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS ALONG THIS LINE AS NEEDED. IF THERE ARE AREAS WHERE STATE RESOURCES ARE NEEDED TO SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETE THE WORK, PROPOSERS ARE EXPECTED TO NOTE THAT IN THEIR RESPONSES TO THE RFP. TASK 1 OF THE STATEMENT OF WORK RELATED TO PROJECT PLANNING. PART OF PROJECT PLANNING IS DEFINING THE RESOURCES NEEDED TO COMPLETE A PROJECT.

17. Regarding nodes and the state's current contract with Qwest; should responders be concerned about this?

NO. IMPACT ON THE NUMBER OF NODES WILL NOT BE AFFECTED. THERE ARE NO OTHER VENDORS FROM WHICH THE STATE CAN PURCHASE THESE SERVICES, AND THERE ARE FOUR YEARS LEFT ON THE QWEST CONTRACT. USE THE CURRENT NUMBERS AS A BASELINE.

IF, AS A RESULT OF THE SELECTED PROPOSER'S ASSESSMENT OF THE CONSOLIDATION ALTERNATIVES, IT IS DETERMINED THAT A DIFFERENT ARCHITECTURE IS NEEDED USING SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT NETWORK ELEMENTS, THE SELECTED PROPOSER WOULD BE EXPECTED TO INCLUDE THAT RECOMMENDATION AS PART OF THE IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY IT DEVELOPS FOR EACH CONSOLIDATION OPTION.. THE STATE WOULD THEN USE THESE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE PROCUREMENTS AS IT MOVES FORWARD OVER TIME.

18. Are storage and data (retirement and/or migration) in scope, at least as to making recommendations?

IF A PROPOSER BELIEVES, BASED ON ITS EXPERIENCE, THAT RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING STORAGE AND DATA (RETIREMENT AND/OR MIGRATION) SHOULD BE IN SCOPE FOR THE PROCUREMENT, THE PROPOSER IS ENCOURAGED TO NOTE THAT RECOMMENDATION IN ITS PROPOSAL. FROM THE STATE'S CURRENT PERSPECTIVE, IF A RECOMMENDATION VERGES ON CHANGING AN APPLICATION, THEN IT IS LIKELY NOT IN SCOPE.

19. Does the state have preferences on network vendors?

THE CURRENT NETWORK IS LARGELY CISCO; THE VOICE NETWORK IS LARGELY NORTEL. THE SELECTED PROPOSER, AS IT COMPLETES ITS ASSESSMENT OF THE COLLECTED INVENTORY AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE CONSOLIDATION ALTERNATIVES, WOULD BE ENCOURAGED TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS IF THEY BELIEVE THE PROPOSED BUSINESS CASE EXISTS TO MAKE A CHANGE(S).

20. Will questions that were submitted before the bidders' conference be answered today?

QUESTIONS MUST BE ASKED FROM THE FLOOR TO RECEIVE A VERBAL ANSWER TODAY. THERE IS A FORMAL PROCESS OUTLINED IN THE RFP FOR RESOLUTION OF ALL SOLICITATION QUESTIONS SUBMITTED. QUESTIONS RECEIVED BEFORE AND AFTER THE MPC WILL BE ANSWERED IN ALIGNMENT WITH THIS PROCESS.

THIS INCLUDES DISTRIBUTING ANSWERS TO ALL MPC ATTENDEES. QUESTIONS WILL NOT BE IDENTIFIED BY THE SUBMITTING FIRM.

21. Why are oral presentations omitted from the evaluation process?

THE STATE HAS RESERVED THE RIGHT TO USE INTERVIEWS/ORAL PRESENTATIONS IF THERE IS A COMPELLING REASON TO DO SO. CURRENTLY, THERE ARE NO EVALUATION POINTS ASSOCIATED WITH INTERVIEWS/ORAL PRESENTATIONS. IF THE STATE DECIDES TO REQUIRE AND EVALUATE INTERVIEWS/ORAL PRESENTATIONS, SUCH DECISION WILL BE ANNOUNCED WITHIN THE NEXT TWO WEEKS VIA AN ADDENDUM RELEASED TO THE VENDOR INFORMATION PROGRAM (VIP) SYSTEM AND DISTRIBUTED TO ALL MPC ATTENDEES.

22. Can the state explain the previous RFP and the availability of the proposal that was received under that process?

THREE RFPS HAVE BEEN RELEASED FOR THE UNDERLYING PROJECT: 10700032-03, 10700046-03 AND 10700053-03. THE STATE CANCELLED THE FIRST TWO RFPS. THE FIRST CANCELLATION WAS EFFECTED PRIOR TO CLOSING TO DELETE A PROVISION THAT PRECLUDED THE SELECTED PROPOSER FROM COMPETITION FOR ANY SUBSEQUENT IMPLEMENTATION WORK AND TO MODIFY THE DEFINITION FOR "IT CONSOLIDATION/CENTRALIZATION" TO EXCLUDE AN EXPLICIT REFERENCE TO "OUTSOURCING". THE SECOND RFP WAS CANCELLED AFTER CLOSING BECAUSE ONLY ONE PROPOSAL WAS SUBMITTED. IN THE STATE'S VIEW, ONE PROPOSAL, REGARDLESS OF ITS MERIT, WOULD NOT HAVE SUFFICIENTLY SATISFIED THE PUBLIC INTEREST FOR A FAIR, COMPETITIVE PROCESS INHERENT IN THE UNDERLYING PROJECT. THE LONE PROPOSAL SUBMITTED WAS NOT EVALUATED. IT WAS RETURNED TO THE PROPOSER AFTER SOLICITATION CANCELLATION AND IS NOT AVAILABLE FOR DISTRIBUTION.

23. What is the name of the one responder for the second RFP?

THE SOLICITATION FOR RFP 10700046-03 WAS CANCELLED AND IS A NULLITY. THE LONE PROPOSAL SUBMITTED WAS NOT EVALUATED, BUT RETURNED TO THE SOLE PROPOSER. THE PROPOSER RESPONDED TO A SOLICITATION FOR A PROJECT OF SMALLER SCOPE AND SIZE THAN THAT REFLECTED IN RFP 10700053-03. FOR EXAMPLE, THERE WAS NO EXPLICIT REQUIREMENT FOR A "NETWORKING" CONSOLIDATION, NO REQUIREMENT FOR DEVELOPMENT OF A BUSINESS CASE REFLECTING A SPECIFIC SAVINGS FOR THE STATE'S RECAPTURE IN A 24 TO 36 MONTH PERIOD FROM IMPLEMENTATION, AND NO OPTIONAL IMPLEMENTATION PHASE. NEITHER THE IDENTITY OF THE PROPOSER, NOR ITS PROPOSAL IS RELEVANT TO THE CURRENT SOLICITATION.

24. Explain the state's expectations for the response to Exhibit A.

THE SECTION THAT OUTLINES THE RESPONSE TO THE STATEMENT OF WORK IS LOCATED IN ITEM C, PAGE 20 OF THE RFP. THE STATE DEFERS TO THE EXPERTISE OF EACH PROSPECTIVE PROPOSER TO DETERMINE THE LEVEL OF DETAIL NEEDED IN ITS PROPOSAL.

25. Should the response to Exhibit A be included in the body of the response or should it be presented in narrative style (the team, qualifications, and credentials) and address the items in Exhibit A?

COST PROPOSALS SHOULD BE BROKEN OUT BY DELIVERABLE. IN THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL, EACH PHASE OF THE STATEMENT OF WORK MUST BE ADDRESSED. IF PROPOSERS FEEL A NARRATIVE RATHER THAN POINT-BY-POINT APPROACH BETTER EXPLAINS THEIR POSITION, THAT IS ACCEPTABLE. THE POINT IS TO SHOW A CLEAR RESPONSE TO EACH COMPONENT OF THE STATEMENT OF WORK. HOW WELL A PROPOSER ACCOMPLISHES THIS IS A MATTER FOR SCORED EVALUATION ACCORDING TO THE EVALUATION CRITERIA REFLECTED IN THE RFP.

26. Should the majority of responder's 75 pages be spent on the above (referring to question 25)?

THERE IS NO PAGE LIMIT, RATHER A DESIRE OR PREFERENCE THAT THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL NOT EXCEED 75 PAGES. THIS PREFERENCE EXCLUDES APPENDICES, EXHIBITS, ETC., THAT PROPOSERS MAY CHOOSE TO INCLUDE IN THEIR PROPOSALS. PROPOSERS SHALL USE THEIR DISCRETION IN DETERMINING HOW BEST TO CRAFT THEIR TECHNICAL PROPOSALS. THE "WEIGHT" THAT THE STATE PLACES ON PARTICULAR COMPONENTS OF THE TECHNICAL AND COST PROPOSALS IS EVIDENCED BY THE MAXIMUM POINTS AVAILABLE FOR PARTICULAR COMPONENTS AS REFLECTED IN THE RFP.

27. Will the list of bidders' conference attendees be published?

YES; IT WILL BE INCLUDED IN AN ADDENDUM AND DISTRIBUTED TO ALL MPC ATTENDEES.

28. Explain more about the disaster recovery and backup strategy service that now exists (page 7, second paragraph of the RFP).

THE STATE HAS ENTERED INTO A CONTRACT FOR DISASTER RECOVERY / BUSINESS CONTINUITY PLANNING WITH SUNGARD. IT IS A FLEXIBLE, "BUY WHAT YOU NEED" CONTRACT.

29. Explain the methodology and expand on the word "validation" (Exhibit A, page 28); what is sufficient for this—a checklist?

AS PART OF THE INVENTORY PROCESS (TASK 4.C.) THE STATE ASKS FOR AN INVENTORY VALIDATION PROCESS TO BE PROPOSED. THE STATE BELIEVES THE RESULTS OF AN INVENTORY MUST BE CERTIFIED BY THE RESPECTIVE PARTICIPATING AGENCIES. BOTH THE STATE AND THE CONTRACTOR MUST RELY ON THE COLLECTED INFORMATION.

THE STATE CURRENTLY ENVISIONS A COMMON SENSE APPROACH TO VALIDATION: ONCE THE INVENTORY IS TABULATED, THE PROJECT TEAM WILL REVIEW AND APPROVE THE RESULTS. AGENCY STAFF WILL BE ASKED TO FILL IN ANY HOLES.

WHEN THE TEAM DETERMINES THE INVENTORY IS COMPLETE, IT WILL BE PRESENTED TO THE RESPECTIVE PARTICIPATING AGENCIES FOR THEIR FORMAL VALIDATION (SIGNATURE BY THE AUTHORIZED PARTICIPATING AGENCY OFFICIAL) ATTESTING TO THE ACCURACY OF THE COMPILED INFORMATION. ANY REASONABLE PROCESS TO ACCOMPLISH THIS GOAL WILL BE ACCEPTABLE.

30. Does the state have minimum requirements for the inventory?

THE STATE DEFERS TO A PROPOSER'S EXPERTISE TO DECIDE THE LEVEL OF DETAIL NEEDED. REFER TO TASK 3.A. ON PAGE 27.

EXAMPLE: IF DURING THE INVENTORY 15 BOXES ARE FOUND TO BE SIMILAR, WHAT INFORMATION WOULD THE CONTRACTOR NEED TO GATHER ABOUT THOSE BOXES TO DECIDE IF THEY SHOULD BE CONSOLIDATED? THE KIND OF ITEM BEING INVENTORIED WILL AFFECT HOW MUCH INFORMATION IS NEEDED.

31. Is the state expecting to rely on the recommendations of the selected vendor related to inventory?

YES.

32. Are there any other automated discovery tools deployed?

NO. THERE IS CURRENTLY NOT AN ENTERPRISE SOLUTION. PARTICIPATING AGENCIES USE DIFFERENT TOOLS AND COLLECT DIFFERENT INFORMATION. SMALL AGENCIES, BOARDS, AND COMMISSIONS MAY NOT NEED AN AUTOMATED PROCESS AS THEY CAN PHYSICALLY SEE EVERYTHING THEY OWN. ADDITIONALLY, THERE IS NO ONE REPOSITORY. AS NOTED IN THE SAMPLE CONTRACT - APPENDIX A: STATEMENT OF WORK PAGE: 29 AND 30:

TASK 4 NOTE: ENTERPRISE-WIDE AUTO DISCOVERY CAPABILITIES AND/OR AN ENTERPRISE ASSET REPOSITORY DO NOT EXIST AT THIS TIME. PROSPECTIVE PROPOSERS ARE EXPECTED TO IDENTIFY AND DESCRIBE THE TOOLS AND TECHNIQUES THEIR FIRMS PLAN TO UTILIZE IN COMPLETING THE INVENTORY. IF THE STATE'S PURCHASE OF RECOMMENDED INVENTORY TOOL(S) (I.E., LICENSES) IS REQUIRED IN ORDER FOR A PROPOSER TO COMPLETE THE INVENTORY-RELATED TASKS, THEN THE PROPOSER SHOULD DEFINE/DESCRIBE WHAT IS REQUIRED AND BUILD IN THE COST OF THE INVENTORY TOOL LICENSES INTO THE REQUIRED NOT-TO-EXCEED PRICING PORTION OF ITS COST PROPOSAL.

33. Is the state expecting the selected vendor to walk in with their own tools?

YES, THE SELECTED PROPOSER MUST DEFINE WHAT IS NEEDED, NOT JUST KNOW WHAT THE STATE IS USING. AS NOTED IN THE SAMPLE CONTRACT - APPENDIX A: STATEMENT OF WORK PAGE: 29 AND 30:

TASK 4 NOTE: ENTERPRISE-WIDE AUTO DISCOVERY CAPABILITIES AND/OR AN ENTERPRISE ASSET REPOSITORY DO NOT EXIST AT THIS TIME. PROSPECTIVE PROPOSERS ARE EXPECTED TO IDENTIFY AND DESCRIBE THE TOOLS AND TECHNIQUES THEIR FIRMS PLAN TO UTILIZE IN COMPLETING THE INVENTORY. IF THE STATE'S PURCHASE OF RECOMMENDED INVENTORY TOOL(S) (I.E., LICENSES) IS REQUIRED IN ORDER FOR A PROPOSER TO COMPLETE THE INVENTORY-RELATED TASKS, THEN THE PROPOSER SHOULD DEFINE/DESCRIBE WHAT IS REQUIRED AND BUILD IN THE COST OF THE INVENTORY TOOL LICENSES INTO THE REQUIRED NOT-TO-EXCEED PRICING PORTION OF ITS COST PROPOSAL.

34. What systems does the state have for circuit inventories across the state?

THE STATE HAS CIRCUIT INVENTORIES, BUT THERE IS NOT A SPECIFIC TOOL TO COUNT "LOGICAL CONNECTIONS."

35. Have there been any data center consolidation efforts in the past?

THERE HAVE BEEN GOOD FAITH EFFORTS TO SHARE RESOURCES AMONG AGENCIES AND SEVERAL STUDIES HAVE BEEN DONE OVER THE YEARS, BUT NO CROSS-AGENCY CONSOLIDATION HAS BEEN ATTEMPTED.

36. Can earlier state studies of consolidation be made available?

THE TECHNOLOGY HAS CHANGED DRAMATICALLY SINCE THE LAST STUDY, BUT THE STATE WILL MAKE AVAILABLE WHATEVER IS ACCESSIBLE AND SUBSTANTIVE.

37. What assurance do responders have that this RFP will not be cancelled?

THE PRIOR CANCELLATIONS AND PROMPT RESOLICITATIONS, WITH THEIR THOUGHTFUL MODIFICATIONS, ACTUALLY EVIDENCE THE DEEP COMMITMENT THE STATE HAS TO THE UNDERLYING PROJECT. MOREOVER, AS DAS DIRECTOR WEEKS INDICATED IN HIS OPENING REMARKS AT THE MPC, HE AND THE GOVERNOR ARE INTERESTED IN FINDING WAYS TO REDUCE THE COST OF GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS. THE GOVERNOR IS AWARE OF THIS INITIATIVE AND IS INTERESTED IN ITS SUCCESSFUL CONCLUSION. IF A COMPELLING IMPLEMENTATION PLAN AND BUSINESS CASE (24 TO 36 MONTHS ROI) ARE PRESENTED, THE STATE WILL ACT UPON THEM.

38. Does every agency use the shared services available through ENS?

ENS PROVIDES SHARED SERVICES PRIMARILY TO SMALL AGENCIES. THE DATA NETWORK CORE IS ALSO CONSIDERED SHARED SERVICES. FROM AN ENTERPRISE-WIDE VIEW, THE LARGER AGENCIES OPERATING THEIR OWN NETWORKS ARE CONSIDERED DISTINCT. THEY MAY PURCHASE SERVICES FROM ENS, BUT THEY DESIGN AND OPERATE THEIR OWN NETWORK.

39. Is the state looking to collapse these networks to reduce redundancies?

THIS IS ONE OF THE OPPORTUNITIES THAT EXIST.

40. Does ENS have rates for every service?

YES. RATES FOR THE NEXT BIENNIUM (05-07) ARE BEING DEVELOPED NOW. THE RATE STRUCTURE FOR THE COMING BIENNIUM WILL BE SIMILAR TO THE CURRENT STRUCTURE.

41. What level of detail does the state expect in Task 1.b. of Exhibit A?

PROPOSERS ARE EXPECTED TO ADDRESS ALL TASKS AND DELIVERABLES IN THE STATEMENT OF WORK. THE STATE BELIEVES THE DETAIL PROVIDED IN TASK 1B AND RELATED SUBTASKS PROVIDES PROSPECTIVE PROPOSERS WITH A SUFFICIENT LEVEL OF DETAIL TO FORMULATE THIS PORTION OF THEIR PROPOSALS.

42. Regarding the work breakdown structure, how much detail should responders include—individual tasks, by the hour, by the staff?

AS IT RELATES TO A PROPOSER'S TECHNICAL PROPOSAL, THE STATE IS RELYING ON THE PROPOSER'S EXPERTISE AND EXPECTS THE PROPOSER TO PROVIDE ENOUGH DETAIL TO CLEARLY INDICATE ITS ABILITY TO SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETE THE WORK.

43. Regarding applications and the opportunity to retire some or make changes; is it the state's intention for agencies to keep their databases, email systems, etc?

THE STATE EXPECTS A HIGH-LEVEL APPLICATION INVENTORY FOR THE PURPOSE OF IDENTIFYING POTENTIAL OPPORTUNITIES TO CONSOLIDATE BY SERVICE OR PLATFORM. THE ACTUAL IMPLEMENTATION OF CONSOLIDATION AT THE APPLICATION LEVEL IS NOT IN SCOPE.

44. Is consolidation of version levels in scope?

POSSIBLY. OTHER QUESTIONS MUST BE ASKED AND ANSWERED FIRST—IS THE APPLICATION DEPENDENT ON SOME VERSION? DO WE HAVE TO KNOW IF THERE ARE APPLICATIONS THAT ARE DATABASE LEVEL DEPENDENT? A DEFINITIVE RESPONSE TO THIS QUESTION WILL BE INCLUDED IN A SUBSEQUENT ADDENDUM RELEASED TO THE VIP SYSTEM AND DISTRIBUTED TO ALL MPC ATTENDEES.

45. Are there opportunities to make changes from Novel to other file-server technologies?

A DEFINITIVE RESPONSE TO THIS QUESTION WILL BE INCLUDED IN A SUBSEQUENT ADDENDUM RELEASED TO THE VIP SYSTEM AND DISTRIBUTED TO ALL MPC ATTENDEES.

46. Are space and capacity limitation numbers available?

YES. THE STATE WILL PROVIDE WHATEVER INFORMATION IS AVAILABLE RELATING TO THIS SUBJECT AREA TO THE SELECTED PROPOSER. NOTE THAT THE RFP REFLECTS THE FACT THAT A ONE DATA CENTER SCENARIO WILL REQUIRE ADDITIONAL DISASTER RECOVERY TO PROTECT FROM ONE POINT OF FAILURE.

47. Is there limitation on sites being located in Oregon?

YES. THE PHYSICAL LOCATION(S) MUST BE IN OREGON.

48. How will answers to questions received over the next few days be handled?

THE STATE WILL RELEASE ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS AS QUICKLY AS POSSIBLE THROUGH SUBSEQUENT ADDENDA.

49. When will the questions be answered that were verbalized today?

THE STATE WILL RELEASE ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS WHEN A THOROUGH RESPONSE IS PREPARED. AN INITIAL ADDENDUM (ADDENDUM #2) IDENTIFYING MPC ATTENDEES AND REFLECTING RESPONSES TO ALL QUESTIONS POSED AT THE MPC WILL BE RELEASED TO THE VIP SYSTEM, AND DISTRIBUTED TO MPC ATTENDEES, BY FRIDAY, OCTOBER 31, 2003. ADDITIONAL ADDENDA WILL BE RELEASED THEREAFTER AS NECESSARY AND APPROPRIATE.

50. Given that responders may propose different scopes, how will cost play into the evaluation criteria, and how will costs be compared?

SEE ANSWER 51, BELOW.

51. Discussion has included applications, etc. One responder may pursue these discussions and another may not. How will they be evaluated differently?

PRICING IS ONLY ONE COMPONENT OF THE EVALUATION CRITERIA. THE WEIGHT THE STATE PLACES ON THE PRICING PROPOSAL IS EVIDENCED BY THE MAXIMUM POINTS AVAILABLE FOR DIVERSE PRICING COMPONENTS AS REFLECTED IN THE RFP (ALL PRICING COMPONENTS COMPRISE APPROXIMATELY 25 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL PROPOSAL SCORING). THE BALANCE OF PROPOSAL SCORING IS FOCUSED ON THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL (APPROXIMATELY 75 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL PROPOSAL SCORING). TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORING WILL PROPERLY REFLECT THE VALUE OF WHAT IS BEING PROPOSED. THIS ASSESSMENT WILL TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE RELATIVE MERIT OF DIVERSE SCOPE SIZE, ETC., EXAMINED AGAINST THE BACKDROP OF THE RFP REQUIREMENTS AND DESIRABLES.

PROPOSERS SHOULD PITCH THEIR PROPOSALS TO THE STRENGTHS OF WHAT THEY CAN DELIVER, AND THE STATE WILL MEASURE THE PROPOSALS ACCORDING TO THE RFP REQUIREMENTS AND DESIRABLES. THE STATE DOES NOT EXPECT PRICING TO HAVE AN IMPACT ON WATERING DOWN THE VALUE OF TECHNICAL PROPOSALS. THIS IS NOT AN INVITATION TO BID IN WHICH LOWEST PRICE DETERMINES THE OUTCOME OF THE SOLICITATION. MOREOVER, THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE WILL REVIEW AND SCORE TECHNICAL PROPOSALS WITHOUT REFERENCE TO PRICING. PROPOSERS SHALL SUBMIT PRICING SEPARATELY FROM THEIR TECHNICAL PROPOSALS. PRICING WILL BE EVALUATED BY THE SINGLE POINT OF CONTACT FOR THE PROCUREMENT ACCORDING TO THE CRITERIA IN THE RFP. THE LOWEST PRICING FOR A PARTICULAR COMPONENT WILL RECEIVE THE FULL QUANTUM OF DESIGNATED MAXIMUM POINTS AVAILABLE FOR THE COMPONENT. ALL HIGHER PRICING WILL RECEIVE A PORTION OF THE MAXIMUM POINTS AVAILABLE FOR THE COMPONENT ACCORDING TO THE FORMULA REFLECTED IN THE RFP.

REMEMBER THAT THE REQUIRED PRICING PROPOSAL IS ONLY FOR THE PLANNING PHASE. THE COST FOR IMPLEMENTATION IS NOT ADDRESSED UNTIL TASK 7.

52. What is the mechanism to approve subcontractors?

THE SAMPLE CONTRACT INCLUDES SUBCONTRACTOR PROVISIONS. SUBCONTRACTING IS SUBJECT TO STATE'S PRIOR APPROVAL. IF PROPOSERS KNOW OF THEIR POTENTIAL SUBCONTRACTORS PRIOR TO CLOSING, THEY MUST BE APPROPRIATELY IDENTIFIED IN THEIR PROPOSALS.

53. The state has not mentioned anything about people. Is there an expectation for information on people?

THE STATE EXPECTS A SKILLS INVENTORY AS PART OF THE INVENTORY AND CURRENT IT MODEL ASSESSMENT PROCESS (TASK 4 AND 5). STATE ACTION WILL DEPEND ON RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE VENDOR, BUT ISSUES RELATED TO STAFFING WILL BE MANAGED BY THE STATE AND NOT THE VENDOR.

54. Will the state provide information on the cost of staff by position?

YES. AS THE INVENTORY PROCESS PROCEEDS, ALL THE PEOPLE PERFORMING IT RELATED TASKS NEED TO BE IDENTIFIED (AND SUBSEQUENTLY VALIDATED THROUGH THE INVENTORY VALIDATION PROCESS); THIS WILL INCLUDE BOTH IT PROFESSIONALS AND OTHERS WHO ARE NOT CLASSIFIED AS IT BUT WHO PERFORM IT RELATED FUNCTIONS. THE STATE WILL PROVIDE THE SELECTED PROPOSER WITH ALL AVAILABLE INFORMATION RELATED TO IT STAFFING ACROSS THE PARTICIPATING AGENCY LOCATIONS.

55. Does the answer to question 54 include help desk staff?

YES. REFER TO TASK 5.

56. Will the bidders' conference slides be made available electronically?

YES.

57. Regarding contacting references, clarify "three attempts"; will this be three attempts total or per reference?

THREE ATTEMPTS PER REFERENCE.

58. Will responders be provided feedback on how and/or when contacts are attempted?

THE STATE IS COMMITTED TO A SUCCESSFUL CLIENT REFERENCE CHECK PROCESS. THE STATE WILL NOT MAKE MORE THAN THREE ATTEMPTS TO CONTACT A LISTED CLIENT REFERENCE. AFTER THREE UNSUCCESSFUL ATTEMPTS FOR PARTICULAR CLIENT REFERENCE INPUT, THE PROPOSER WILL NOT RECEIVE ANY POINTS FOR THAT REFERENCE. HOWEVER, THE STATE WILL CONTACT PROPOSERS FOR ASSISTANCE WITH A PARTICULAR CLIENT REFERENCE INTERFACE FOLLOWING ONE OR TWO UNSUCCESSFUL CONTACT ATTEMPTS FOR THE SUBJECT CLIENT REFERENCE(S).

59. What are the names of the evaluation committee?

SEE ANSWER TO QUESTION 1. IT IS NOTED THAT THE SINGLE POINT OF CONTACT FOR THIS RFP IS NICHOLAS BETSACON.

D. The Single Point of Contact for this procurement has transmitted electronic copies of the following documents to all MPC Attendees:

1. Contact List of MPC Attendees (Microsoft Word Tables Format)
2. MPC Slides (Microsoft PowerPoint format)
3. Matrix of (Microsoft Excel format)
4. Matrix of (Microsoft Excel format)

E. Nicholas Betsacon remains as the Single Point of Contact for this procurement.

Salem Phone: 503.373.1189 and Email: nicholas.betsacon@state.or.us

THIS ADDENDUM 2 DOES NOT CHANGE THE DEADLINE FOR SOLICITATION PROTESTS (11-05-2003); OR THE DATE FOR THE CLOSING (11-19-2003).

-End-