

Addenda 6246

The purpose of this Addendum 3 to RFP 10700053-03 (State of Oregon Computing and Networking Infrastructure Consolidation) is to: (A) respond to additional questions submitted by prospective Proposers and (B) announce the availability of Agency's preferred format for submission of the Cost Proposal (a Microsoft Excel format).

A. The Agency responds to additional questions submitted by prospective Proposers as follows (The questions are written in lower case and sentence case text and numbered 1 to 26. Each question's answer follows in UPPER CASE text):

1. Page 24, Schedule. The November 5th due date for protests - are we to assume we need to protest unacceptable T&C's at this time or will contract provisions be subject to negotiation?

ANSWER: NOVEMBER 5, 2003, IS THE DEADLINE TO SUBMIT CLARIFICATION QUESTIONS, REQUESTS FOR MODIFICATION OF REQUIREMENTS, CONTRACT TERMS AND CONDITIONS OR PROTESTS OF THE SAME. AGENCY WILL RESPOND IN WRITING BY OR BEFORE NOVEMBER 10, 2003 TO ALL TIMELY REQUESTS FOR CLARIFICATION, MODIFICATIONS AND PROTESTS. THE AGENCY'S RESPONSE(S) MAY GRANT FULL, PARTIAL OR NO RELIEF TO REQUESTS FOR MODIFICATION AND PROTESTS REGARDING TERMS AND CONDITIONS. THE AGENCY WILL EXPLAIN ANY FULL OR PARTIAL REJECTIONS IN ITS RESPONSE(S). UNLESS OTHERWISE CHANGED BY THE AGENCY THEREAFTER, AND EXCEPT FOR THOSE SELECTED CONTRACT PROVISIONS THAT AGENCY HAS ALREADY IDENTIFIED FOR POST-SOLICITATION NEGOTIATION, THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS STANDING AFTER NOVEMBER 10, 2003, ARE THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS BY WHICH AGENCY WILL EXPECT PROPOSERS TO ABIDE.

2. Page 33, 4th bullet, "Perform a High-level analysis of potential application interactions between participating agency systems."

Please expand on the meaning of High level, as to what you expect this to contain.

ANSWER: AGENCY APPLICATIONS/SYSTEMS EXCHANGE INFORMATION OR INTERACTION TO REQUEST SERVICE. AN EXAMPLE IS ODOT INTERACTS WITH DAS TO REQUEST PRINT SERVICES.

3. Page 28 of Exhibit A - SOW Required Level 1. States that we must inventory PBX, hubs, routers, etc. Can you tell us why you need an inventory of the PBX environment? Can you give us a rough order of magnitude the number, type, etc of currently installed PBX equipment?

ANSWER: AS "VOICE" IS OUT OF THE SCOPE OF THE NETWORKING INFRASTRUCTURE CONSOLIDATION PORTION OF THE RFP, THE STATE APPRECIATES THE QUESTION AND HAS DECIDED TO MOVE THE INVENTORY OF PBX EQUIPMENT FROM THE REQUIRED LEVEL 1 TO THE OPTIONAL LEVEL 2 INVENTORY SECTION OF THE STATEMENT OF WORK. IF A PROSPECTIVE PROPOSER BELIEVES THAT IT IS ESSENTIAL TO HAVE THIS INFORMATION AVAILABLE AS PART OF THE REQUIRED LEVEL 1 INVENTORY IN ORDER TO SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETE PROJECT WORK, THE STATE EXPECTS THE PROSPECTIVE PROPOSER TO NOTE THAT IN ITS TECHNICAL RESPONSE TO THE RFP.

4. Page 17, 3.1.1.6. Would an acceptable reference project be one that the vendor has done for their own corporation? We would list and provide contacts for the CIO and staff for our own firm and the benefits we realized from data center consolidation. (Our internal project consolidated 54 data centers worldwide to one in the U.S.)

ANSWER: YES, BUT WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT THE STATE MAY CHOOSE NOT TO SCORE SUCH REFERENCE. THIS DECISION BY THE STATE COULD LEAVE THE SUBMITTING PROPOSER WITH ONLY FOUR (4) REFERENCES FROM WHICH THE STATE WOULD SEEK INFORMATION FOR SCORED EVALUATION (THE STATE WILL SELECT THREE (3) REFERENCES FROM THOSE SUBMITTED FOR SCORED EVALUATION).

THE STATE HAS TWO PRINCIPAL OBJECTIVES RELATED TO REQUIRING THE SUBMISSION OF REFERENCES. ONE CENTERS ON THE ISSUE OF "RESPONSIBILITY." TO THIS END, THE STATE SEEKS A CLEAR DEMONSTRATION OF A PROSPECTIVE PROPOSER'S EXPERIENCE IN SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETING COMPUTING AND NETWORKING INFRASTRUCTURE CONSOLIDATIONS OF A SIMILAR SCOPE. THE SECOND OBJECTIVE CONCERNS THE ABILITY OF THE STATE TO REVIEW, CONTACT, AND SCORE THE REFERENCES PROVIDED. IN THE STATE'S VIEW, THE INCLUSION OF A REFERENCE RELATING TO AN INTERNAL PROJECT CONDUCTED WITHIN THE PROSPECTIVE PROPOSER'S ORGANIZATION (OF SIMILAR OR LARGER SCOPE TO THE PROJECT ENVISIONED IN THIS RFP) WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE AS A DEMONSTRATION OF THE PROPOSER'S EXPERIENCE (RESPONSIBILITY) BUT MAY NOT, IN THE STATE'S SOLE DISCRETION, BE ACCEPTABLE FOR THE PURPOSES OF REFERENCE SCORING.

5. Page 5, bottom of the page, item #1 and page 38, Optional Task 10, item #4 Progress Payments. It looks to us like the State is tying the realization of savings to the payment of deliverables in Phase 2. It also appears that we are responsible to measure the savings as they are realized (a Q/A function) in addition to being the project manager. Please confirm for us that these are

your expectations. Are you willing to consider an alternative "sharing of risk" strategy with the vendor?

ANSWER: THE REFERENCED PROVISIONS ARE PHASE II: IMPLEMENTATION SPECIFIC ISSUES THAT THE STATE WILL ADDRESS WITH THE SELECTED PROPOSER AT THE APPROPRIATE TIME DURING THE COMPLETION OF PHASE I WORK. WITH THAT SAID, IT IS THE STATE'S EXPECTATION THAT THE CONTRACTOR AND THE STATE CREATE A PROCESS FOR MEASURING AND VALIDATING THE SAVINGS REALIZED THROUGHOUT THE COMPLETION OF PHASE II WORK.

IN REGARD TO THE STATE'S WILLINGNESS TO "SHARE RISK" VIA SOME ALTERNATIVE METHOD, THE STATE REQUESTS CLARIFICATION FROM THE PROSPECTIVE PROPOSER(S) SUBMITTING THIS QUESTION REGARDING THE ALTERNATIVE "SHARING OF RISK" STRATEGIES IT HAS IN MIND. UPON RECEIPT OF THAT INFORMATION THE STATE WILL APPROPRIATELY RESPOND TO THE QUESTION VIA AN ADDENDUM TO THE RFP.

6. Considering the magnitude of the response to this RFP, and the large amount of research and thought required to respond to it, are you willing to consider a two week extension to the proposal due date?

ANSWER: THE STATE DOES NOT BELIEVE IT CAN APPROPRIATELY RESPOND TO THE QUESTION WITHOUT THE PROVISION OF ADDITIONAL DETAILED RATIONALE REGARDING THE NEED FOR THIS REQUESTED EXTENSION. UPON RECEIPT OF THIS ADDITIONAL MORE DETAILED REQUEST, THE STATE WILL CONSIDER THE INFORMATION PROVIDED AND RESPOND VIA AN ADDENDUM TO THE RFP.

7. Section 1, 1.1 Phase II Question 1. "Prior to Phase II, the parties must negotiate a fee with a hard dollar savings/return on investment target derived from Phase I Optional Deliverable 7A..." Does this point infer that the fee for implementation will be based on anticipated savings? Could you please explain further how the fee for Phase II will be calculated?

ANSWER: THE FEE WOULD BE CALCULATED FROM THE DETAILED STATEMENT OF WORK (BASED ON PHASE I OPTIONAL DELIVERABLE 7B). THE HARD DOLLAR SAVINGS TARGET DERIVED FROM PHASE I OPTIONAL DELIVERABLE 7A WOULD BE USED TO DERIVE THE RETURN ON INVESTMENT. THE IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY, BUSINESS CASE AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR THE STATE-SELECTED CONSOLIDATION ALTERNATIVE MUST BE DEVELOPED ON THE BASIS OF A 24 TO 36 MONTH PAYBACK PERIOD.

8. Outsourcing was briefly mentioned in the pre-bidder's conference, but not discussed in detail. Is Phase II for

management services only, or would it be possible to fully outsource Phase II implementation?

ANSWER: PHASE II IS FOR MANAGEMENT SERVICES ONLY.

9. Sample Contract, Section III, 3.1 Project Manager. "...The Project Manager shall be familiar with Agency's business operations and objectives,..." Does this point infer that a qualification for the project manager is that the project manager has worked for or provided services to the agency previously?

ANSWER: NO. AS THIS PROVISION IS CONTAINED WITHIN THE SAMPLE CONTRACT, IT IS THE STATE'S EXPECTATION THAT AFTER CONTRACT EXECUTION, THE PROJECT MANAGER MUST BECOME FAMILIAR WITH THE AGENCY'S BUSINESS OPERATIONS AND OBJECTIVES.

10. In the SOW page 25-26, task 1A refers to reviewing and understanding several State developed artifacts. Several of these artifacts are not hyperlinked to access. Can the State provide copies of the following documents for vendors to review as part of this RFP process?

- 1 - Goals and Objectives for IT Operations in Oregon State Government
- 2 - Physical Network Architecture and Standards
- 3 - Draft Asset Management Architecture and Standards
- 4 - Draft IT Security Architecture and Standards

ANSWER: APPENDICES A, B AND C SUMMARIZE THE REFERENCED DOCUMENTS, HOWEVER THE STATE DOES NOT BELIEVE THAT REVIEW OF THE DOCUMENTS REFERENCED IN APPENDIX A IS ESSENTIAL TO A PROSPECTIVE PROPOSER'S ABILITY TO DEVELOP AND SUBMIT A RESPONSIVE PROPOSAL. THE STATE WILL PROVIDE TO CONTRACTOR THE REFERENCED DOCUMENTS AT THE APPROPRIATE TIME DURING THE COMPLETION OF PHASE I WORK.

11. In the SOW, page 28, Task 4, the Contractor is required to perform an inventory of IT assets. Will the State please provide details on current inventory processes and tools used for the collection of data? What process/tool is used to collect information on desktop equipment? What process/tool is used to collect information on network equipment? What process/tool is used to collect information on server equipment? Are the same processes/tools used by all agencies? If not, can you please elaborate on the processes used by each individual agency that will potentially be a part of this project?

ANSWER: REFERENCE STATE'S ANSWER TO QUESTION 32 IN ADDENDUM 1.

12. Will the State please provide details on how IT costs are currently captured and tracked at the State level as well as agency and department levels? Please provide details on the unique methods used by each potential agency.

ANSWER: THE STATE UTILIZES A BUDGET SYSTEM CALLED THE OREGON BUDGET INFORMATION TRACKING SYSTEM (ORBITS) TO PREPARE IT BUDGETS AND THE STATE FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT APPLICATION (SFMA) TO PROCESS PURCHASE ORDERS AND RECORD EXPENDITURES THAT HAVE BEEN MADE. THE OREGON DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION UTILIZES A SYSTEM CALLED TEAMS AND THE OREGON DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS UTILIZES A JD EDWARDS SYSTEM TO ACCOMPLISH THESE BUDGETING AND EXPENDITURE REPORTING PROCESSES.

THE STATE ALSO UTILIZES A SYSTEM CALLED THE PERSONNEL AND POSITION DATABASE (PPDB) TO MANAGE EMPLOYEE INFORMATION (POSITION, CLASSIFICATION, CONTACT, ETC.). MUCH OF THE STATE UTILIZES THE OREGON STATE PAYROLL SYSTEM TO ENTER TIME AND DETERMINE PAYROLL. A NUMBER OF STATE AGENCIES ALSO UTILIZE A VARIETY OF TIME TRACKING APPLICATIONS.

SUBSEQUENT TO THE COMPLETION OF TASK 2 RELATED WORK, THE STATE WILL PROVIDE THE SELECTED PROPOSER WITH THE INFORMATION IT IS ABLE TO OBTAIN FROM THESE SYSTEMS FOR USE IN COMPLETING THE REMAINING WORK AS ENVISIONED IN THE STATEMENT OF WORK.

13. Does the State have an enterprise-wide IT refresh strategy? If not, what are the refresh strategies of the individual agencies?

ANSWER: THE STATE REQUESTS CLARIFICATION OF THIS QUESTION. PLEASE PROVIDE MORE DETAIL TO ALLOW THE STATE TO APPROPRIATELY ANSWER THE POSED QUESTION.

14. On Page 13 of the RFP it lists 5 sections that must be in the vendor's proposal (Introduction and Executive Summary, Response to Commercial Questions, Response to Technical Questions, Alternative Proposals and Relevant Experience of Proposer/ Sample Work Products). These headings match sections 3.1.1.1-3.1.1.5, but there is an additional section 3.1.1.6, Corporate Reference Checks. Do the vendors also need to respond to section 3.1.1.6?

ANSWER: YES, PROPOSERS SHALL RESPOND TO SECTION 3.1.1.6. THE ENTIRETY OF SECTION 3 OF THE RFP ESTABLISHES THE REQUIREMENTS FOR TECHNICAL AND COST PROPOSALS. THE STATE INTERPRETS EACH INCLUDED SUBSECTION AND PROVISION IN SECTION 3 IN THE CONTEXT OF THE ENTIRE

SECTION, AND WITH THE EVALUATION PROCESS THAT IS SET OUT IN SECTION 4 OF THE RFP. SECTION 3.3 "MINIMUM PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS" CLEARLY DELINEATES "REFERENCE CHECKS" AS A NECESSARY COMPONENT IN ANY SUBMITTED TECHNICAL PROPOSAL. MOREOVER, PROSPECTIVE PROPOSERS SHOULD NOTE THAT SECTION 4.1 OF THE RFP CLEARLY INDICATES THAT 150 POINTS OF THE EVALUATION FOR EACH RESPONSIVE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SUBMITTED IS RESERVED FOR AGENCY'S ASSESSMENT OF THE SUBMITTED CORPORATE REFERENCE CHECKS.

15. In the SOW, page 30, Sub-Task 5B-2 speaks to a Performance Goals and Objectives Section that addresses the performance goals and objectives of the Participating Agencies' Computing and Networking Infrastructure operations. Will the State please clarify your definition of performance goals?

ANSWER: FOR THE PURPOSES OF TASK 5B-2 THE WORDS "ADDRESS" OR "ADDRESSES" MEAN (I) DOCUMENTING THE EXISTENCE OF PARTICIPATING AGENCIES' FORMAL MODELS, POLICIES, PLANS, PROJECTS, AGREEMENTS, REQUIREMENTS, ETC., AS APPROPRIATE TO THE SUB-TASK; (II) SUMMARIZING THEM AND (III) IDENTIFYING THEIR LOCATION. SUCCINCTLY STATED, THE STATE SEEKS ANSWERS TO THE FOLLOWING: (I) HAS THE PARTICIPATING AGENCY DEVELOPED PERFORMANCE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR ITS COMPUTING AND NETWORKING INFRASTRUCTURE, (II) WHAT ARE THEY AND (III) WHERE CAN THESE PERFORMANCE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES BE LOCATED AT THE PARTICIPATING AGENCY SITE.

16. RFP, page 18, 3.1.2 Cost Proposal. Is it correct that vendors do not include pricing for optional Task 10 and Task 11?

ANSWER: CORRECT REGARDING DEVELOPMENT AND SUBMISSION OF RESPONSIVE PROPOSALS. THE PRICING FOR TASK 10 AND TASK 11 IS TO BE SUBSEQUENTLY DEVELOPED BY THE CONTRACTOR AS PART OF ITS COMPLETION OF TASK 7B.

17. Is it correct to assume that if one agency is supplying services, hardware, or software to another agency, both agencies will be in scope?

ANSWER: YES.

18. RFP section 3.1.2, Cost Proposal, page 18. It is difficult to determine if pricing should be provided at the task level, deliverable level or both. Will the State please provide a detailed format for the cost proposal to ensure all vendors provide information in an identical manner?

ANSWER: PRICING SHOULD BE PROPOSED AT THE DELIVERABLE(S) LEVEL. THIS PRICING INFORMATION SHALL REFLECT ALL COSTS FOR TASKS RELATED TO THE SUBJECT DELIVERABLE(S). THE STATE WILL PROVIDE A DESIRED FORMAT FOR SUBMISSION OF COST PROPOSALS.

19. Does the State of Oregon currently have a standard build template for platforms (Unix, WinTel, mainframe), database, storage, network (hw manufacturer, operating system/version level, application/version level)? If not, does the State envision the contractor developing one as part of this SOW either alone or in conjunction with State of Oregon personnel?

ANSWER: THE STATE DOES NOT CURRENTLY HAVE A STANDARD BUILD TEMPLATE FOR PLATFORMS. EACH AGENCY MAINTAINS ITS OWN BUILD TEMPLATE. IT IS ENVISIONED THAT THE INVENTORY PROCESS WILL IDENTIFY THE VARIOUS TEMPLATE ATTRIBUTES. THE STATE DOES NOT ENVISION THE CONTRACTOR DEVELOPING A STATE TEMPLATE AS PART OF THE SOW.

AS STATED ON PAGE 16 OF THE STATE'S ENTERPRISE INFORMATION RESOURCES MANAGEMENT STRATEGY:

[http://irmd.das.state.or.us/prog\\_proj/itec/eirms/Enterprise%20IRM%20Strategy%20v1.pdf](http://irmd.das.state.or.us/prog_proj/itec/eirms/Enterprise%20IRM%20Strategy%20v1.pdf)

"ALTHOUGH THE STATE HAS BEEN WORKING TOWARDS STANDARDIZATION IN TECHNOLOGIES AND THE USE OF COMMON METHODOLOGIES, PRACTICES, AND PROCEDURES, A COMMON ENTERPRISE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ARCHITECTURE DOES NOT YET EXIST. SOME PROGRESS WAS MADE IN RESPONSE TO THE YEAR 2000 PROBLEM BUT SIGNIFICANT DIVERSITY AND OPERATIONAL COMPLEXITY WITHIN AGENCIES AND ACROSS THE ENTERPRISE EXISTS TODAY."

FURTHER, AS STATED ON PAGE 35 OF THE STATE'S ENTERPRISE INFORMATION RESOURCES MANAGEMENT STRATEGY AND PARAPHRASED ON PAGE 7 OF THE RFP:

THE STATE WILL HAVE A STANDARD DESKTOP ENVIRONMENT BY JULY 2007. WHERE FEASIBLE, THE DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT, NETWORK HARDWARE AND SOFTWARE, AND CENTRALIZED COMPUTING HARDWARE, SOFTWARE AND PROCESSES WILL ALSO BE STANDARDIZED.

20. Page 32 (Appendix B) of the RFP references work currently underway or complete on a Network Consolidation effort. Is it possible to gain access to any documentation surrounding:

1) Establish network architecture and standards

- 2) Form multi-agency Engineering Team
- 3) Revise the Enterprise Network Services strategy
- 4) Telephone system consolidation and integration

ANSWER: THE STATE DOES NOT REGARD THE REFERENCED DOCUMENTS AS RELEVANT TO A PROSPECTIVE PROPOSER'S DEVELOPMENT AND SUBMISSION OF A RESPONSIVE PROPOSAL. DOCUMENTATION FOR ITEM 1), NETWORK STANDARDS AND ARCHITECTURE WILL BE PROVIDED TO THE SELECTED PROPOSER. ITEMS 2), 3) AND 4) ARE OUT OF SCOPE AND DOCUMENTATION ON THESE ITEMS WILL NOT BE PROVIDED.

21. What tools are currently in place for discovering and maintaining an inventory of network assets, including devices (e.g. routers, switches, etc.) and connections (e.g. physical circuits, frame-relay PVCs, etc.)? In what organizations do these tools currently reside (e.g. ENS, individual agencies, etc.)? Approximately what percent of the total network assets are inventoried and tracked in the above tools? What parts of the network are not tracked with the above tools?

ANSWER: DAS IRMD ENS USES HP "OPENVIEW" FOR THE PURPOSE OF LIMITED NETWORK DISCOVERY, MONITORING AND MANAGEMENT. THE USE OF HP OPENVIEW IS LIMITED TO THE ENS NETWORK WAN CIRCUITS, AND ONLY AS FAR AS THE DEMARK (ROUTER) ON THE CUSTOMER PREMISE. ENS HAS NO TOOLS THAT ALLOW DISCOVERY OF THE OTHER PARTICIPATING AGENCY NETWORKS. ENS MAINTAINS AN INVENTORY OF ENS NETWORK ASSETS IN "REMEDY." AN INVENTORY OF ALL DATA NETWORK CIRCUITS FOR ALL PARTICIPATING AGENCIES IS KEPT IN A SPREADSHEET AND IN "SMARTRACK" (A QWEST DATABASE). ENS DOES NOT HAVE ACCESS TO INVENTORIES OF PARTICIPATING AGENCY ASSETS OTHER THAN CIRCUITS ORDERED THROUGH ENS ON THE TSO PROCESS. ALL CIRCUITS ARE REQUIRED TO BE ORDERED THROUGH ENS, BUT LIMITED EXCEPTIONS HAVE BEEN ALLOWED.

ODOT CURRENTLY HAS IN PLACE TWO DISCOVERY TOOLS: "SMS" AND "VISIO," BUT THE AGENCY IS NOT USING THEM FOR INVENTORY PURPOSES. MOST INVENTORY DATA IS COMPILED THROUGH PHYSICAL INVENTORY, AND THE COMPILED INVENTORY DATA IS MAINTAINED BY ODOT ASSET MANAGEMENT PERSONNEL.

DHS CURRENTLY HAS IN PLACE "CISCO WORKS" FOR DISCOVERING AND MAINTAINING INVENTORY OF CISCO ROUTERS AND SWITCHES. NEARLY ALL OF DHS ROUTERS AND SWITCHES ARE MAINTAINED WITH CISCO WORKS. DHS USES "nGENIUS PERFORMANCE MONITOR" FOR MONITORING ALL FRAME RELAY PHYSICAL CIRCUITS. THESE TOOLS COVER THE ENTIRE AGENCY, INCLUDING COMMUNITY PARTNERS THAT HOUSE THEIR EQUIPMENT. ALL FRAME RELAY CIRCUITS ARE BEING MONITORED BY nGENIUS PERFORMANCE MONITOR, BUT DHS DOES NOT MONITOR THE POINT TO POINT CIRCUITS WITH THIS TOOL.

THE INFORMATION PROVIDED ABOVE SERVES AS A SAMPLE OF THE TOOLS IN PLACE. SPECIFIC TOOLS USED IN PARTICIPATING AGENCIES OTHER THAN DAS, ODOT AND DHS FOR DISCOVERING AND MAINTAINING AN INVENTORY OF NETWORK ASSETS ARE NOT KNOWN AT THIS TIME.

22. No page #. Would an additional possible ROI driver be better service to end users/agencies? Would this be considered in Phase 1 to justify consolidation?

ANSWER: YES, PROVIDED THE CURRENT SERVICE LEVEL TO END USERS/AGENCIES CAN BE IDENTIFIED, BASELINED AND COMPARED WITH THE "FUTURE IT MODEL" ENVISIONED IN THE SELECTED PROPOSER'S BUSINESS CASE.

23. Also no page #. Would the state consider, as an alternative during Phase 1, a proposal from the vendor for Outsourcing all or portions of the Data Center, Operations, Help Desk, etc? We have found in other states that it is possible to realize additional savings of 30% or more by taking the next step to Outsourcing after doing consolidation. Please comment on your thoughts of this option.

ANSWER: AS THE STATE ANSWERED IN ITS RESPONSE AT THE MANDATORY PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE (OCTOBER 24, 2003), THE STATE HAS EXCLUDED OUTSOURCING FROM THE RFP DEFINITION OF COMPUTING AND NETWORKING INFRASTRUCTURE CONSOLIDATION. STATE TOOK THIS ACTION BECAUSE IT BELIEVES THAT OUTSOURCING IS AN OPTION THAT SHOULD NOT BE CONSIDERED UNTIL AFTER THE STATE FULLY ASSESSES ITS OPPORTUNITIES TO CONSOLIDATE AND STANDARDIZE ITS COMPUTING AND NETWORKING INFRASTRUCTURE INTERNALLY.

24. Also no page #. Did the state have assistance from a consultant in preparation of the RFP? If so, who? Is that consultant allowed to submit a proposal on this RFP? If so, is that consultant's work public information? How can we obtain it?

ANSWER: STATE STAFF PREPARED THE RFP AND DID NOT HAVE THE ASSISTANCE OF AN OUTSIDE CONSULTANT.

25. Page 13, top of page. After doing considerable research during this RFP process, we have determined that it is not practical to try and achieve the scope of work and all deliverables required in Phase 1 in a 6 month timeframe. We believe the minimum amount of time for an engagement of this magnitude is 9 months, and more realistically, 12 months. Would the state consider proposals that dictate a longer Phase 1 time?

If so, would we score less than someone who says they can do it in less time? [Please note: we are not making this statement lightly; it is based on real world experience of doing similar projects in at least two other state governments - Michigan and Pennsylvania]

ANSWER: YES, THE STATE WILL CONSIDER AND EVALUATE SUBMITTED, RESPONSIVE PROPOSALS THAT RECOMMEND AND JUSTIFY A LONGER PHASE I DURATION. THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE WILL NOT AUTOMATICALLY DOWNGRADE SCORING OF PROPOSALS MERELY BECAUSE THEY INCLUDE SUCH A RECOMMENDATION. RESPONSIVE PROPOSALS THAT REFLECT AND JUSTIFY SUCH A RECOMMENDATION AS PART OF THE PROPOSING FIRM'S PRESCRIBED PROJECT APPROACH WILL BE SCORED BASED UPON THE MERITS OF THE JUSTIFICATION AND OVERALL APPROACH.

26. Exhibit A, Statement of Work, Task 6 pgs 31-34. The order of the subtasks under task 6 is confusing. Will you please clarify your intent by answering the following questions?

1) It appears that much of the information coming out of the Gap Analysis (task 6H) is needed to populate the Decision Matrix (task 6D) and Business Case (task 6I). Will you please verify which of these tasks should come first?

2) Task 6G is the CNCA decision making process. How can a decision be made before either the Gap Analysis (task 6H) or the Business Case (task 6I) is completed? Can you explain what decision is being made at this point? It is clearly stated that the recommendation of a CNCA occurs in 6I (last sentence of last paragraph before Deliverable 6I-1, page 33).

We suggest that the order be changed to move the Gap Analysis and Business Case tasks prior to the current task 6D. This will allow the information gathered in those activities to be used to populate the decision matrix. Then the current task 6G, can truly be used as the decision-making point for which CNCA should be recommended for implementation.

ANSWER: THE STATE APPRECIATES THE PROSPECTIVE PROPOSER'S THOUGHTFUL REVIEW OF THE SAMPLE CONTRACT, APPENDIX A: STATEMENT OF WORK.

IT IS NOT THE STATE'S INTENTION TO REQUIRE A LINEAR COMPLETION OF ALL SUBTASKS IN EACH MAJOR TASK AREA. THE STATE EXPECTS TO WORK WITH THE SELECTED PROPOSER DURING THE COMPLETION OF TASK 1 WORK TO IDENTIFY AND AGREE ON A FINAL SEQUENCING (LINEAR AND CONCURRENT) OF TASKS AND RELATED SUBTASKS. AS PART OF THEIR RECOMMENDED

PROJECT APPROACH, PROPOSERS ARE FREE TO INCLUDE IN THEIR SUBMITTED PROPOSALS SUGGESTED CHANGES TO SEQUENCING (LINEAR AND CONCURRENT) OF TASKS AND RELATED SUBTASKS. THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE WILL EVALUATE AND SCORE SUCH SUBMISSIONS PURSUANT TO THE RFP EVALUATION CRITERIA.

B. Agency will provide to the prospective Proposers via email attachment a preferred format for use in submitting the Cost Proposal. The document is in Microsoft Excel format.

C. Agency plans to release an Addendum 4 on or about November 10, 2003, which will reflect its responses to remaining questions submitted by prospective Proposers.

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

Salem Phone: 503.373.1189 and Email: [nicholas.betsacon@state.or.us](mailto:nicholas.betsacon@state.or.us)

**THIS ADDENDUM 3 DOES NOT CHANGE THE DATE FOR THE CLOSING (11-19-2003).**

**-End-**