

| Question ID | RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph) | Specific RFP Language | Question | Answer |
|-------------|--|--|--|---|
| Example | Page 5, Paragraph 1, Section 1.1 | <i>This Request for Proposals (RFP) is issued by the State of Arkansas (State) Department of Finance and Administration (DFA)</i> | <i>Please confirm the issuing entity of this RFP is the Department of Finance and Administration.</i> | |
| 1 | Page 3, Paragraph 1, Section 1.1 | The Office of State Procurement (OSP) issues this Request for Proposal (RFP) on behalf of the Arkansas Development Finance Authority (ADFA) in conjunction with the Department of Information Systems (DIS) to obtain proposals and a contract for the System Integrator (SI) for Data Center Optimization (DCO). The scope of services for this RFP is restricted to the State Data Center located in the multi-agency complex (MAC), the State Data Center West (SDCW) and the new colocation data center. | Will the State of Arkansas be looking for help from the chosen vendor finding and validating co-location data centers, if not, has the co-location provider been identified? | No. That is a separate element of the Data Center Optimization Initiative and is outside the scope of work for this RFP. See Final RFP Section 2.3.B. |
| 2 | Page 3, Section 1.1. item C | Designing and building the target state (refer to Section 3.1) NOTE: The future state architecture developed by the contractor shall not be proprietary such that colocation requirements of the architecture are specific to the services and technology capabilities, and offerings, of a single colocation vendor. | In section 1.1 sub-bullet C, the RFP states that the selected service provider will be responsible for Designing and building the target state. Can they be more specific about what they mean with designing and building. Below are a variety of things that could mean design and build: a. By design, is the client requesting that we develop complete CAD drawings of what we propose their Colo data center architecture should look like (i.e. rack location and rack buildout design) b. By building is the client requesting that we i. Install, level, label and ground customer provided cabinets ii. Install and label customer provided cabinet power strips iii. Install overhead strut grid iv. Install cable tray and waterfalls v. Install POP room cabling connectivity vi. Install structured cabling vii. Install, barcode label Cat6 and fiber patch cords viii. Install power cords c. If not, can the client please define what is meant/required by Designing and building the target state. On page 26 bullet number 3 under the “General and Shared Services Deployment” section, it stipulates that DIS will Prepare the new colocation data center and SDCW for deployment of the new physical infrastructure. Does this mean DIS will handle the tasks I’ve outlined above? Or would the client rely on the Colocation facility for any structured cabling design or build out services as I’ve outlined above? | The Prospective Contractor should not assume that the paragraph applies to the colocation facility. The Prospective Contractor may assume the presence of two fully-functional data center facilities (SDCW and the new colocation facility) to include both hot aisle/cold aisle rack layout, installed racks with appropriate labeling and grounding, overhead network cable and underfloor power cable trays. The Prospective Contractor may also assume that any required power cabling, as well as any required network cabling between their proposed configuration and POP room will be provided by DIS. Conversely, any cabling required, within the Prospective Contractor's proposed configuration should be included within their provided Bill of Materials. The design and build of the target state (SDCW, new colocation facility and cloud services) involves the <u>architecture</u> of the shared service environment including network, security, storage, and high virtualized server platforms. |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|--|--|
| 3 | Page 3, Section 1.2. C) Type of Contract Cost Workbook Draft.xlsx | The initial term of a resulting contract will be for two (2) years. Upon mutual agreement by the Contractor and agency, the contract may be renewed by OSP for up to five (5) additional one-year terms or portions thereof, not to exceed a total aggregate contract term of seven (7) consecutive years. | The RFP states this effort has a potential 7 year period of performance. The Pricing Workbook requires the bidder to price Years 1 and 2 for phases 1-3. Please clarify the number of years each bidder is to price. | Years 3 through 7 refer to potential enhancements that may be needed as described in the pricing workbook. |
| 4 | Page 3, Section 1.5 | Questions Due | Will there be an opportunity to ask questions following the release of the Final RFP? | No. |
| 5 | Page 4, Section 1.7 | Definition of Terms | Can you provide DIS' definition of SI? | An enterprise that specializes in implementing, planning, coordinating, scheduling, testing, improving and sometimes maintaining a computing operation. SIs try to bring order to disparate suppliers. |
| 6 | Page 5, 1.8 Response Documents | | Is there a page count limit to the formal response? | No. Prospective Contractor's should endeavor to provide a thorough yet precise proposal. |
| 7 | Page 5, Section 1.8.A.3 | "DO NOT include any other documents or ancillary information, such as a cover letter or promotional/marketing information." | Section 1.8.A.3 state not to include a cover letter yet the template includes a cover letter. Please clarify. | See Final RFP Section 1.8.A.3. |
| 8 | Page 6, Sec 1.9 – T3 – Identification of Key Staff | | Will resumes representing the capabilities / experience of the Key personnel (Prior to award) be acceptable to meet this requirement vs named personnel? | ADFA and DIS prefer for Prospective Contractors to provide named personnel. See final RFP Section 3.5.C.2.a. |
| 9 | Page 8, Section 1.12 | Subcontractors | If a manufacturer is able to use a sub-contractor, will the manufacture be financially responsible for the sub-contractors? | Refer to Section 1.14 of the Final RFP. |
| 10 | Page 8, Sec 1.12 – Subcontractors | | Will subcontractor be allowed to team with multiple SI's ? | That decision would be determined by the subcontractor and any potential System Integrators. |
| 11 | Page 11, item C, Section 1.25, Technology Access | State agencies cannot claim a product as a whole is not reasonably available because no product in the marketplace meets all the standards. Agencies must evaluate products to determine which product best meets the standards. If an agency purchases a product that does not best meet the standards, the agency must provide written documentation supporting the selection of a different product, including any required reasonable accommodations. | For tools the Supplier provides for the transformation efforts, will DIS perform the accessibility analysis and product selection documentation? | A VPAT should be provided by the Prospective Contractor for any products purchased by ADFA and DIS with the proposal response but shall be provided prior to contract award. A VPAT is not required for any tools or products that are only used by the Systems Integrator and any subcontractors during the engagement. |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|--|
| 12 | Page 12, item D, Section 1.25, Technology Access | For purposes of this section, the phrase “equivalent access” means a substantially similar ability to communicate with, or make use of, the technology, either directly, by features incorporated within the technology, or by other reasonable means such as assistive devices or services which would constitute reasonable accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act or similar state and federal laws. Examples of methods by which equivalent access may be provided include, but are not limited to, keyboard alternatives to mouse commands or other means of navigating graphical displays, and customizable display appearance. As provided in Arkansas Code Annotated § 25-26-201 et seq., as amended by Act 308 of 2013, if equivalent access is not reasonably available, then individuals who are blind or visually impaired shall be provided a reasonable accommodation as defined in 42 U.S.C. § 12111(9), as it existed on January 1, 2013. | <i>Are the assistive devices or services required per technology in the provided the solutions a capability or functional request in the solution? Or is the full detail of the device(s); model, configuration, etc. or service(s) per technology required to be presented?</i> | See answer to Question 11. |
| 13 | page 12, 1.27 Visa Application | Awarded Contractor should have the capability of accepting the State’s authorized VISA Procurement Card (p-card) as a method of payment. Price changes or additional fee(s) must not be levied against the State when accepting the p-card as a form of payment. VISA is not the exclusive method of payment. | Will the state consider alternate forms of payment other than the P-Card such as electronic funds transfer? | Yes |
| 14 | Page 14, Bullet A, Paragraph 1, Section 2.2 | In mid-2017 DIS launched an important multi-phase initiative. This initiative includes optimizing and consolidating the State's data center assets, unifying the IT infrastructure to streamline State government operations, reduce costs and energy consumption, and improve service delivery and efficiency across executive branch agencies. | Section 2.2 Current State Architecture mentions a long term strategic mission to “Strengthen the security of State IT operations” and “Create a more robust Statewide cybersecurity program.” Is it the State’s intent the respondent will create the cybersecurity program and strengthen its security operations within the scope of this RFP? | The intent is to provide best in class security features and functionality. The creation of a cybersecurity program is not within the scope of the RFP. |
| 15 | Page 14, Bullet A, Paragraph 1 | In mid-2017 DIS launched an important multi-phase initiative. This initiative includes optimizing and consolidating the State's data center assets, unifying the IT infrastructure to streamline State government operations, reduce costs and energy consumption, and improve service delivery and efficiency across executive branch agencies. | Section 2.2 Current State Architecture mentions in bullet A that a multi - phase initiative that was launched in mid-2017, Are these initiatives still in progress or are they complete. Will the information on the initiative work be available to the chosen vendor if required for the migration work? | Initiatives are still in progress. DIS will work with the chosen Contractor to make information available throughout the engagement in order to achieve a target state environment which aligns with statewide goals. This RFP represents only one of the initial phases of that effort. For a more detailed listing, see Attachment H - Strategic Priorities and Initiatives. |
| 16 | Page 14, item A, Section 2.2, Current State Architecture | 1.Help ensure that sensitive citizen and government data, managed and maintained by the State, is housed in a highly secure location. 2.Strengthen the security of State IT operations. 3.Create a more robust State wide cybersecurity program. 4.Enhance the State’s continuity of operations and disaster recovery capabilities. | Will the physical location security, IT Operations Security, Cybersecurity programs and Disaster Recovery/Business Continuity capabilities be detailed in the "Future State" Architecture? Will the Security and DR/BC programs be integrated within the outlined "Target State Design" objectives or will there be a defined Security and DR/BC requirements for the "Target State"? | The future state and target state architectures will advance all of the stated objectives. |

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|---|
| 17 | Page 14, Section 2.2 B | Diagram | Currently, how may small low resilience DC's (small agency DC's) connect to the SDCW and MAC DC ? Are they dual homed ? What technologies / protocols are used presently for those DC connections ? | "Small Low Resilience DC's" are comprised of server rooms, or closets. These connections are primarily Ethernet. Many agencies within the greater Little Rock metro area (i.e. Dept. of Finance & Administration - DFA, Dept. of Human Services - DHS, Dept. of Health - DoH, AR State Police - ASP, and state government entities housed in the Mann on Main building) are connected via ring topology (DWDM & Ethernet) for dual connections. Others are point to point connections. See Attachment C - Network and Security Details, pages 2-3, section 2 table 3 and section 3 diagram. |
| 18 | Page 14, Bullet D, Paragraph 1, Section 7.7 | DIS has developed a five-year roadmap outlining various tasks and timelines to implement the Data Center Optimization strategy. The figure below depicts a high-level view of the major milestones that have been envisioned. DIS will finalize sourcing of the colocation facility by Q1 2019. MAC migration planning will be a parallel activity, which will continue through Q4 2019, thereafter MAC migration execution will kick-off. | Section 2.3 Future State, Bullet D Agencies Migration to Shared Services Environment - There is a statement that says "the planning and migration of a subset of the Agencies shall be performed by the contractor. Does this mean that you want the respondent to provide a price for this effort and if so, can you tell us which agencies you want us to focus on or is this a situation that would require a PCR once the agency and the scope is identified? | Yes, this will be a separate price. See C-1 Cost Workbook for Phase 3: Agency Migration Planning and Execution (Optional). At this time, we do not have a specific list of agencies that will be included in that phase. Currently we are conducting "Push / Pull" meetings with each agency, board, and commission to discuss the data center optimization initiative, learn more about their needs, and gather information regarding their current applications and IT systems, in order to start planning for how best to migrate their systems to the new shared services infrastructure. This information will be available to the successful Contractor. |
| 19 | Page 15, Section 2.2.C | Data Center Space By Agency as of Q4 2017 | How many servers, by type and age,that currently reside in agency spaces are expected to migrate to the new data center? | Information that was collected by Gartner during the 2017 assessment is included in the Attachment A - Server Details Excel workbook on the third tab (worksheet) for a listing of servers by agency. Currently we are conducting "Push / Pull" meetings with each agency, board, and commission to discuss the data center optimization initiative, learn more about their needs, and gather information regarding their current applications and IT systems, in order to start planning for how best to migrate their systems to the new shared services infrastructure. This information will be available to the SI via the AIMS application developed and hosted by DIS. |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|---|
| 20 | Page 17, Section E | Overview of Application Environment | There are 60 applications currently listed on page 17 section E that are currently distributed only between the primary (MAC) and Secondary (SDCW) data centers. However, there are or are roughly 3600 servers distributed among both data centers as well as several of the other smaller lower resiliency agency data centers? That said, I would imagine that there will be several other applications or at a minimum application instances (outside of the two data centers) that will also be in scope of this Data Center Optimization effort. If so, can they provide us with the total application count in scope? The count should also include instances as separate applications. (So in other words, if an application has a production, a test, a dev, a pre-prod environment) all of which will need to be moved, the application count for that application would be 4. | At this time the total number of “Applications” is unknown. The “60” represent unique applications and would likely have multiple instances, possible instances include but is not limited to dev, test, QA, training, prod, etc. |
| 21 | Page 17, Paragraph E, Section 2.2 | The table below summarizes the total number of applications distributed across both data centers. | Please breakdown the application criticality categories to include the distribution of mainframe vs server based applications. | There is an ongoing effort to identify business critical applications. At this point there is no centralized listing of application criticality. |
| 22 | page 17, RFP 2.2. f Current Architecture | Overview of Servers | What portion of the server environment is currently configured for High Availability? | That is unknown and is part of the overall project discovery. However, we do know that VMWare High Availability is in use on many. Platforms are generally designed for high availability to include varying virtualization and clustering technologies |
| 23 | page 17, RFP 2.2. f Current Architecture | Overview of Servers | Is the state looking to implement a tiered server environment to align to industry best practice as it appears by the table in Section F that there are little to no current Dev, Stage or test servers? | Many “Applications” do currently employ Dev, Test, QA, Training, and Prod environments based on customer requirements. Where applicable, yes the State will utilize this architecture. |
| 24 | Page 19, Section 2.2 G | Table | Further, can we have make and model of the customer owned (presently deployed)network devices presently in place ? Does the scope cover migrations of these devices ? | This table only covers network devices housed in the SDCW and MAC data centers. Customer owned network equipment inventory is being collected via the current "Push / Pull" meetings and AIMS system. The SI's scope of work includes discovery of and determination of devices to be migrated. In addition, see Attachment C for more information about the network devices. |
| 25 | page 20, RFP 2.2. H Current Architecture-Storage | Overview of Storage Environment | Has the state completely phased out the NetApp storage platform? Is the only current storage platform the 3par? | No - the NetApp is an appliance in support of our VoIP solution. 3Par is our current primary storage platform since 2017. |
| 26 | Page 21, Section 2.3 | DIS intends to migrate customers positioned to do so, along with existing DIS systems, from the current MAC data center into the State's new Shared Services Environment as part of the Data Center Optimization (DCO) initiative. | Please give the target percentage of reuse of exsiting technologies or is it all net new? | The SI's scope of work includes discovery of and determination of devices to be reused or replaced. Total cost of ownership and available funding will be a factor in the decision of reuse or new equipment. |
| 27 | Page 21, Section 2.3 | DIS intends to migrate customers positioned to do so, along with existing DIS systems, from the current MAC data center into the State's new Shared Services Environment as part of the Data Center Optimization (DCO) initiative. | Will there be any lift and shift (physical move) legacy HW moves required? | Yes and the quantity is to be determined based on the SI's assessment. DIS will retain responsibility for any physical relocation of data center assets. DIS reserves the right to request Contractor support (such as recommending, or assisting with a solicitation of professional data center equipment relocation services or OEM resources where required by the manufacturer) for any such moves.See final RFP Section 2.3.C. and Section 3.1.B.2. |

| | | | | |
|----|---------------------------------|---|---|--|
| 28 | Page 21, Section 2.3 | Future State | In the course of this Data Center Optimization scope, does a migration pathway need to be created to migrate apps directly to the public cloud, or rather, only a capability to broker IaaS. | Yes the SI should recommend a migration pathway in addition to assisting DIS with determining network connectivity and bandwidth requirements. The Contractor shall provide appropriate depth of expertise in the areas of virtualization and cloud technology platforms, to support DIS cloud initiatives. |
| 29 | Page 21, Sec 2.3 – Target State | | Will the state consider the secondary site as private cloud vs colocation target? | PLEASE NOTE - the colocation facility is NOT referred to as a "secondary" site in the RFP document --- it is a "second" data center that we plan to operate in an active-active mode with SDCW to render much-needed resiliency for the State's data center environment. Private cloud for the State's IT systems will run at both of these facilities. |
| 30 | Page 22, paragraph 1 | "The new colocation facility must act as a second data center and must be more than 100 miles from the primary data center. The SDCW data center and the new colocation facility must operate in an active-active mode to render much-needed resiliency in the current data center environment. " | Active - Active clarification -- Same application servicing requests from both Datacenters or -- Application at a single DC with capability to move to secondary Datacenter and service requests there Reason for question -- 5ms RTT is required for synchronous storage replication which most Hardware Vendors calculate at maximum distance of 100km (~62 miles). Applicable only if desired behavior is to have same application service requests from both DCs | DIS defines that active-active mode be for an application at a single DC with capability to move to second datacenter and service requests there in the event of failure of the hosting site. |
| 31 | Page 22, Section 2.3.A | Key Characteristics of the Target State Architecture | Are the are public cloud components currently designed and provisioned or does the State need assistance in Cloud design, Automation, and 3rd party tool evaluation and selection? | At the enterprise level, there are no public cloud deployments at this time. Yes, the State does need assistance in Cloud design, Automation, and 3rd party tool evaluation and selection. See final RFP Section 3. |
| 32 | Page 22, Section 2.3.A | DIS will also negotiate with a public cloud provider to reduce its on-premises IT infrastructure footprint. DIS will evaluate the public cloud providers to ensure security and enhanced performance and will enable direct cloud connectivity from the SDCW data center and the new colocation facility to the public cloud. The Contractor shall assist DIS in determining network connectivity and bandwidth requirements. | Which public cloud providers (including government clouds) are under consideration by Arkansas DIS? Which applications and with what latency sensitivities are being considered for migration to a public cloud? Indications in this regard, especially preferences, assist the vendor in their selection of a datacenter location and its logical/physical proximity to both Arkansas and cloud resources as well as addressing the quality of those latency sensitivities. | The Systems Integrator shall not be selecting the location of a datacenter see final RFP page 22 - Section 2.3 Future State, B. Migration Roadmap.... "DIS will finalize sourcing of the colocation facility by Q1 2019." In other words, by the end of March 2019 just prior to the SI's engagement starting. Public cloud providers are currently under consideration. DIS has entered into a statewide enterprise agreement with Microsoft, consolidating all licenses procured by the State into a single agreement. A result of this is the migration to cloud-based Office 365. This migration is scheduled to be completed by December 2018. |

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|--|---|
| 33 | Page 22, Bullet C, Paragraph 3, Section 2.3, First Sentence | The overall migration can be divided into migration waves, which may include parallel activities in multiple tracks. | Section 2.3 Future State, Bullet B, Migration Roadmap - Does the state already have an idea of the number of migration waves and order in which the agencies will migrate and if so, will that information be shared with respondents? | At this time we anticipate three waves, but which agencies in each wave has not been determined. Currently we are conducting "Push / Pull" meetings with each agency, board, and commission to discuss the data center optimization initiative, learn more about their needs, and gather information regarding their current applications and IT systems, in order to start planning for how best to migrate their systems to the new shared services infrastructure. This information will be available to the contracted SI via the AIMS application developed and hosted by DIS. |
| 34 | Page 22 Bullet C, Paragraph 3, Section 2.3 | DIS shall have the discretionary right to postpone waves, as necessary | Section 2.3.C – The State mentions they can postpone migrations; are there provisions providing the respondent remediation or relief if the postponements go beyond the stated milestones and targets? | Refer to Question 3. The initial contract period will be for two (2) years. The initial contact may be renewed for up to five (5) additional years. The State may be open to negotiations of Service Level Requirements prior to contract award, prior to the commencement of services, or at times throughout the contract duration. (page 60, 3.6 A.) |
| 35 | Page 22, Bullet c, Paragraph 3, Section 2.3 | The Contractor shall adhere to the above stated timelines for migrating the IT infrastructure environment from the MAC data center to SDCW and the new colocation facility. DIS PMO will handle coordination and communication with all the stakeholders. Once the Contractor is finalized, DIS PMO will jointly work towards creating a detailed migration plan and execute the plan starting Q1 2020, for migrating from the MAC data center to the new Shared Services Environment. This will also include collaborating with customers to assess and communicate potential impacts of the migration to their operations. Any forklift migration of assets and data must be accomplished by the end of Q1 2021. DIS PMO will provide on-going support to the migration team. Once migration from the MAC data center is complete, the Contractor must hand-off the new Shared Services Environment to steady state operations. | Section 2.3.C – The State mentions they will provide PMO support, but does the State expect the respondent to provide transitional operations support for the migration or will the State provide? | Refer to section 3.5.C of the final RFP. |

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|--|---|
| 36 | Page 22, Paragraph 2, Section 2.3 | The State’s data center operations must run as a Shared Services infrastructure across two active data centers, augmented with hybrid cloud capabilities (public and private). The current SDCW data center must continue in the target state and must be the primary production data center. The new colocation facility must act as a second data center and must be more than 100 miles from the primary data center. The SDCW data center and the new colocation facility must operate in an active-active mode to render much-needed resiliency in the current data center environment. DIS will also negotiate with a public cloud provider to reduce its on-premises IT infrastructure footprint. DIS will evaluate the public cloud providers to ensure security and enhanced performance and will enable direct cloud connectivity from the SDCW data center and the new colocation facility to the public cloud. The Contractor shall assist DIS in determining network connectivity and bandwidth requirements. After steady state operations are established, the MAC data center will be decommissioned. | Section 2.3.A – The State requests an “active active” architecture, but requests the SDCW data center as primary and the colocation facility as the secondary. Please define active active and primary secondary as it relates to this request. Do you want primary with active failover to secondary or do you want the applications to be able to run with local and geographically resiliency with software defined workload movement without regard to which data center it sits? | See Question 29 and 30. |
| 37 | Page 22, Bullet B, Paragraph 1, Section 2.3 | Migration Roadmap to Implement Data Center Optimization Strategy | Section 2.3 Future State, Bullet B Migration Roadmap - Does the timeline for migrations have specific reasons why migrations will occur out into 2021 and 2022 other than for contingency purposes. Can the vendor if the state approves finish the migrations sooner? | Yes, due to the complexity of multi-agency migrations and critical services provided to the citizens of the State, extensive planning and coordination will be required to minimize downtime and impact to Arkansas citizens. It is our goal to finish the migrations sooner, but the States project timeline must factor sufficient time in order to have minimal disruption of the State's services to its citizens. |
| 38 | Page 23, Section 2.3 A | Diagram | Will the new Co-location DC be an exact replica of SDCW (proposed primary) DC? | No |
| 39 | Page 23, Section 2.3 A | Diagram | <i>Further, since it is a Disaster recovery site and would be in active-active mode with SDCW DC, will the traffic volume be equally shared between the SDCW DC (primary) and the new Co-Lo DC ?</i> | No |
| 40 | Page 23, Section C | "The existing production services at MAC must be migrated to SDCW and/or the new colocation data center as part of MAC migration initiative. The migration plan must be executed to ensure minimal disruption to day-to-day operations." | Is the goal to create a Greenfield (Net-New) solution in new data center and migrate existing production/workloads to SDCW? OR is the goal to re-use existing hardware in MAC at new Data Center? If it is the later then is there enough Compute and Storage capacity to support migrating production to SDCW? Also is all subnets accessible/provisioned in both data centers to be able to migrate to new colocation or SDCW at any time (Stretched VLANs)? | It is unlikely that we will re-use existing hardware in MAC at the new colocation data center. At present there is not sufficient compute and storage capacity to support migrating production to SDCW. Regarding subnets, DIS prefers to not utilize stretched VLANs on a permanent basis. When possible and necessary we may be able to temporarily stretch VLANs to support migration. |
| 41 | Page 23, Bullet C, gParagraph 10, Section 2.3 | | Is the respondent providing application and infrastructure dispositions for possible decommission or evaluation to move workload to cloud or is respondent excepted to only review physical to virtual and/or virtual to virtual migrations? | See final RFP Section 2.3.A. |

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|--|--|
| 42 | Page 23-24, Section 2.3.C | The overall migration can be divided into migration waves, which may include parallel activities in multiple tracks. The Contractor shall structure the migration waves in conjunction with DIS. Each wave must constitute a specific set of servers, storage, backup, network, and security volumes. DIS shall have the discretionary right to postpone waves, as necessary. DIS will initiate each migration wave by presenting a list of assets that need to be migrated in the agreed format with the agreed notice. The Contractor shall process the migration request upon reception of DIS' wave initiation request. DIS shall have final approval of the migration wave request. Each migration wave must consist of the following activities at a broad level: | Does the State envision that migration waves will encompass whole application or agency environs including all related servers and storage? Does the State expect that the vendor will map and accommodate dependencies within the agencies? | Yes and Yes. See Section 2.3.C of the Final RFP. |
| 43 | Page 24, section 2.3D | Task F: Consolidation planning and migration of agencies' IT environments into the new Shared Services Environment | How many agencies and applications would be in Scope for Task F? | As of this writing, there are eighty-four (84) Agencies, Boards and Commissions within scope of Task F. |
| 44 | Page 24, Paragraph1, Section 2.4 | DIS has various strategic business and IT priorities and initiatives, which can directly or indirectly impact the optimization. Prospective Contractors should review Attachment H for progress progress that Prospective Contactors shall consider when developing their response | Section 2.4- the State articulates there are other strategic projects in flight that will impact the efforts within this RFP. Will the State provide those prior to response submission in order to understand the potential impacts to the effort within? | See final RFP Attachment H Strategic Priorities and Initiatives. |
| 45 | Page 24, Section D, Paragraph 4 | Testing and handover: System integration, testing, user acceptance testing and sign-off. | To what level of detail does DIS expect application validation testing to occur for pre/post migration activities? | See final RFP Section 2.3.C.4. |
| 46 | Page 25, Section 3 | Statement of Work | Who owns the relationship to the agencies for SOW execution - Contractor or DIS? | DIS |
| 47 | Page 25, Section 3 | Do you require separate SOWs for each specific section | The RFP mentions section 3 as the "Statement of Work" Do you want each sub section 3.1 through 3.5 as individual statements of work or can the vendor provide one statement of work that combines all those sections into the one document? If separate, do you want a pricing worksheet for each section? | Prospective Contractor's should provide a comprehensive proposal encompassing all work requested in the RFP. Only one pricing sheet shall be provided by a Prospective Contractor per proposal. |
| 48 | Page 25, Section 3.1, Bullet A, Sub Bullet 2. | Self-service provisioning for the new shared services platforms, via infrastructure as a Services (IaaS) | Section 3.1.A.2 – Self-service provisioning is identified. Does the state expect the respondent to create the service catalogue? Do the tools exist to support a modern service catalogue with automation and self-provisioning capabilities? | See Section3.1.C.1.18 and Section 3.1.C.4.a.i of the final RFP. |
| 49 | Page 25, Section 3.1, Bullet A, Sub Bullet 2. | Self-service provisioning for the new shared services platforms, via infrastructure as a Services (IaaS) | Section 3.1.A.2 – Does the State currently have a governance model in place for self-service replete with policies, decision rights, spend limits, security controls, and monitoring? | No |
| 50 | Page 25, Section 3.1, Bullet A, Sub Bullet 2. | Self-service provisioning for the new shared services platforms, via infrastructure as a Services (IaaS) | Section 3.1.A.2 – As noted above, if the answer is yes – how many templates or service blueprints is expected? Does the State already have an enterprise architecture, standard, or strategy for any of them? | Not applicable based on response to Question 49. |
| 51 | Page 25, Section 3.A.1.2 | Self-service provisioning for the new shared services platforms, via Infrastructure as a Service (IaaS) | Are all self-service provisioning options to be based on standard catalog-based options? Is the Service Management tool to provide this service and will this tool and service be available during the final RFP submission? | See Section 3.1.C.13 of the RFP. |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|--|--|
| 52 | Page 25, Section 3.1.A (3) and (7) | <p>A. Overview and Objectives</p> <p>The Shared Services Environment is a vital enhancement to enable DIS to fulfill its mission in achieving efficiencies through IT infrastructure consolidation across State agencies. The Arkansas State Government Executive Leadership aims to transition all agencies to a new environment comprised of:</p> <p>3. The new environment will operate in active-active mode across both data centers with the capability to host production and non-production environments at both sites and to support failover from one site to another with minimum impact to production workloads</p> <p>7. Disaster recovery and high availability services across both data centers as well as Disaster Recovery as a Service (DRaaS) solutions where appropriate</p> | How often does the State require Disaster Recovery testing to occur? | DR testing is not in scope for this engagement. Currently, annual testing is conducted, but not for all applications. See final RFP Sections 3.1.D.10, 3.2.D.6, and 3.3.D.6. This is necessary to confirm that the architecture of the SSE will work properly in the event of a failure of one of either facility. This does not include the normal annual or semi-annual DR testing that is currently done or will be preformed post handover. |
| 53 | Page 25, Section 3.A.1.5 | Single cloud management interface (single pane of glass) to access/manage hybrid cloud landscape | Is the cloud management interface to be integrated with the Service Management tool? | If an off the shelf cloud management interface exists, yes. However we do not require implementation of custom cloud management interfaces to the ITSM tool. |
| 54 | Page 25. Section 3.1, Bullet A, Sub Bullet 7 | Disaster recovery and high availability services across both data centers as well as Disaster Recovery as a Service (DRaaS) | Section 3.1.A.7 – Disaster recover as a service is noted as an objective. Does the State intend for the respondent to create a disaster recovery plan, design, and architecture based on the tiered application strategy outlined later in the RFP and provide guidance on implementation, tooling, testing, and recovery? | It is an objective of the overall DCO initiative but is out of scope for the SI. Dr as a Service (DRaaS) is addressed within the context of the overall DCO project, and that fact should be considered in the contractor's Shared Services Environment design. However, specifically in response to the question, the State does not intend for the respondent to create a disaster recovery plan based on the tiered application strategy outlined later in the RFP. Nor does the State expect the Contractor to provide guidance on implementation, tooling, testing, and recovery. |
| 55 | Page 25, Section 3.1 Bullet A, number 7 | Disaster recovery and high availability services across both data centers as well as Disaster Recovery as a Service (DRaaS) solutions where appropriate | Section 3.1 Target State Design, #7 High Availability - Does the state have a DR solution and or a HA environment and can details be shared? | No, the details cannot shared at this time. |
| 56 | Page 26, Section 3.1, Paragraph C. | Key Characteristics and Roles and Responsibilities | Is it DIS' expectation that the SI will provide the labor required for the physical move of hardware from the MAC DC? | DIS will retain responsibility for any physical relocation of data center assets. DIS reserves the right to require Contractor support (such as recommending, or assisting with a solicitation of professional data center equipment relocation services or OEM resources where required by the manufacturer) for any such moves. See final RFP Section 2.3.C. and Section 3.1.B.2. |
| 57 | Page 26, Section 3.C.1 | | As part of the end state shared service model is there any consideration for consumption based hardware platforms? | Yes |
| 58 | Page 26, Section C.1. | General and Shared Services Deployment | At what point in the process will hardware recommendations be considered? | During the first third of the nine month design phase. |
| 59 | Page 26, Section C.1. | General and Shared Services Deployment | Has “any” of this hardware for this “Integration” already been purchased? | Yes |
| 60 | Page 26, Section C.1. | General and Shared Services Deployment | Is the winner of the DC Systems Integrator RFP precluded from bidding on the procurement of the requisite target state hardware? | No |

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|---|
| 61 | Page 26, Section C.1. | General and Shared Services Deployment | When or at what stage or benchmark will the hardware recommendation come into play? | During the first third of the nine month design phase. |
| 62 | Page 26, Section 3.1, Item C.1, General and Shared Services Deployment (4) | Deploy, and configure tools or solutions required for the shared services implementation on the X86 platform. | Will Contractor be expected to deploy the ITSM tool that DIS selects for this program as implied by this RFP statement? | Refer to Section 3.1.C.13 of the RFP. |
| 63 | Page 26, Section 3.1, Bullet C, Sub Bullet 1.3 | Prepare the new colocation data center and SDCW for deployment of the new physical infrastructure | Section 3.1.C.1.3 – The State is responsible for preparing the new colocation facility. Are there any provisions or remedies for the respondent if the State is unable to perform the duties sufficiently for on time migration? | No |
| 64 | Page 26, Section 3.1, Bullet C, Sub Bullet 1.6 | Provide or procure tools and software licenses for on-going monitoring, management and administration of servers, tiered storage and back-up, network and security elements including IT Service Management (ITSM) | Section 3.1.C.1.6 – Who is responsible for configuring and executing delivery of the ITSM tools in the target state? Are current ITSM processes going to be repurposed and implemented in the tools for the future state? Are the current processes valid? Who is responsible for the Service Management processes for the migration waves (not steady state)? | See answer to Question 62. |
| 65 | Page 26, Section 3.1, Item C.1, General and Shared Services Deployment (4) | Deploy, and configure tools or solutions required for the shared services implementation on the X86 platform. | Will Contractor be expected to deploy the ITSM tool that DIS selects for this program as implied by this RFP statement? | See answer to Question 62. |
| 66 | Page 27, Section 3.1.C.1 | General and Shared Services Deployment 18. Alignment of the Shared Services Environment with the service catalog, as defined by DIS | Is the service catalog available for review? | No |
| 67 | Page 27, Section 3.1, Item C.1, General and Shared Services Deployment (18) | Alignment of the Shared Services Environment with the service catalog, as defined by DIS | Can DIS provide details of their current Service Catalog so that contractor can understand what is to be transferred over in addition to the new services outlined in this RFP? | Not at this time. |
| 68 | Page 27, Table 2.6 | Perform Proofs of Concept (PoC) demos and finalize technical components in consultation and approval with DIS PMO | Details on the POC. When would DIS prefer to have the POC delivered? At what stage of the RFP, prior to or after award? | During the first third of the nine month design phase. |
| 69 | Page 27, Section 3.1.C.2 (| Design and Architecture | What Data Center Infrastructure Management (DCIM) tools are employed now and targeted for the future state? Does the State expect to incorporate the new facility in the current or new DCIM environment? To what degree will the DCIM environment be integrated with the new Information Technology Service Management (ITSM) tools? Who is responsible for that integration? | The current State DCIM will continue and incorporate the new colocation for space management and likely environmental monitoring. DCIM / ITSM integrations are out of scope for this RFP. |
| 70 | Page 27, Section C.2, Design & Architecture | Design & Architecture | Are there specific preferred vendors that should be used in the design for network, compute, and storage? | No, the State expects Prospective Contractors to provide best of breed solutions. |
| 71 | Page 27, Section C.2, Design & Architecture | Design & Architecture | Is the design required to implement state specific preferred vendors/solutions in regards to network, compute, and storage design or would the state consider a design including a best-of-breed solution that uses vendors outside of the preferred vendor list? | See answer to Question 70. |
| 72 | Page 27, Section C.2, Design & Architecture | Design & Architecture | Would the design need to incorporate connectivity between the data center and state services/remote locations? | The State will provide connectivity between the data centers and State services/remote locations. |
| 73 | Page 27, Section C.2, Design & Architecture | Design & Architecture | Is the expectation that DR capabilities be effective throughout the migration or would those capabilities only be required once the full migration to the new DCs is completed? | Where DR functionality currently exists, it is required to be effective throughout the migration. |
| 74 | Page 27- Design & Architecture | Design & Architecture | Is the design of the new colo meant to be Greenfield or will there be equipment that must be reused? If reused, which equipment? | DIS is moving into existing, fully functional, data center space. It is possible that there may be equipment reuse, as part of the colocation effort. |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|---|
| 75 | Page 27, Section 3.1.C.2(1) | Assess requirements of workloads that can be migrated from the DIS and State Agency data centers to the Shared Services Environment | To what degree and for which environments (applications) is server consolidation anticipated to fall within the scope of this migration? | Extensive server consolidation is anticipated, within the scope of the migration across all environments. |
| 76 | Page 27, Section 3.1 Bullet C, sub bullet 12 | Service desk self service capabilities must enable the users to resolve issues without the need to call the service desk support number. The service desk self-service must have the following capabilities tailor to DIS requirements | Section 3.1.C.12 – Do these processes exist or need to be created for the new hybrid environment? Will they be executed in conjunction with the steady state or separate and only for the migration/transformed environments? | Configuring and executing delivery of the ITSM tool is outside the scope of work for the SI. |
| 77 | Page 28, Section 3.1, Bullet 4, Sub Bullet B | The contractor shall include a central repository of all configuration parameters to enable automation of services (e.e., Configuration Management Database - DMDB) | Section 3.1 Target State Design, #4 Automation sub bullet b, does the state have a CMDB solution currently, if so, what is it? | No |
| 78 | Page 28, Section 3.1, Bullet 4, Sub Bullet B | The contractor shall include a central repository of all configuration parameters to enable automation of services (e.e., Configuration Management Database - DMDB) | Section 3.1.C.4.B – At what level of detail is the respondent expected to populate the CMDB? | See final RFP Section 3.1.C.4.b. |
| 79 | Page 28, Section 3.1 | "Design and implementation of the virtualization stack based on VMWare and Microsoft HyperV platforms and associated technologies " | Is the both virtualization stacks a hard requirement or is there an opportunity to migrate and cosolidate on one platform (either all to Hyper-V or Vmware or another solution)? | See final RFP Section 3.1.C.3. |
| 80 | RFP, Page 28, Section 3.1.C.4 | a. The Contractor shall assess current DIS business workflows and underlying technology, required for DIS-defined service catalog, and design automated future-state approval processes and underlying automated workflow framework. | Are the current workflows available for review? | No |
| 81 | Page 28, Section 3.1, Item C.4, Automation (a) | The Contractor shall assess current DIS business workflows and underlying technology, required for DIS-defined service catalog, and design automated future-state approval processes and underlying automated workflow framework | Please provide details of the existing business workflows that the contractor will be required to assess. Minimally, names of workflows and volume will assist in our definition of effort | See answer to Question 80. |
| 82 | Page 28, Section 3.1, Item C.4, Automation (a.i) | i. The service catalog will be developed during a foundational element for ITSM. | Please confirm your expectation as to which party will design and implement the Service Catalog within the ITSM tool? | The State. |
| 83 | Page 28, Section 3.1, Item C.4, Automation (d) | The Contractor's solution must support implementation and population of an overall CMDB solution and other related repositories | Can DIS confirm the scope of the CMDB solution they are looking to employ. For example, which Asset Types are to be included (e.g. Server, Storage, Facilities equipment, Apps and Network equipment as outlined in the RFP), what level of relationships between Assets are required, will all of the information in the CMDB be from electronic sources or will some manually entered information be required? | See answer to Question 78. |
| 84 | Page 28, Section 3.1, Item C.4, Automation (d) | The Contractor's solution must support implementation and population of an overall CMDB solution and other related repositories | Please outline what other related repositories DIS are looking for the Contractor to populate? | At this time, DIS does not have any other related repositories to populate. |
| 85 | Page 29, Section 3.1, Item C.4, Automation (d5) | Implement the proposed automation solution along with the required integration with other solutions in alignment with DIS V&C CoE team | Please outline the 'other solutions' that are referenced in this clause in the RFP | None implemented at this time |
| 86 | Page 28, Section 4 | Automation | What DevOps / automation tools such as Ansible, Chef, Puppet,... does the State currently use? | None |
| 87 | Page 28, Section 4 | Automation | Does the State currently follow DevOps practices? | No |
| 88 | Page 28, Section 4 | Automation | What IP management system does the State currently use? | PHP/IPAM (open source) |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|---|
| 89 | Page 28, Section 4.d | "The Contractor's solution must support implementation and population of an overall CMDB solution and other related repositories, as necessary" | Please confirm if this is a new CMDB (ITSM Solution) or integrating into the CA Service Desk and Spectrum? | This is a new ITSM solution |
| 90 | Page 29, Section 3.1, Bullet 5, Table line 4 | Provide a self-service ability to create infrastructure templates and blueprints for IaaS | Section 3.1.C.5.4 – Please define templates and blueprints with respect to this line item. Commonly service catalogues house templates to automate blueprints which are defined by enterprise architecture. | No templates in use today |
| 91 | Page 29, Section 3.1.C.5 | The Contractor shall compare the capabilities of the native provisioning tools provided by the various cloud services providers vis-a-vis a multi-platform provisioning tool and recommend the option that best meets DIS objectives | Will a cloud provisioning tool that interacts with all target cloud providers but is not native to any of them be considered? | Yes |
| 92 | Page 29, Section 3.1.C.5(c) | 8. Identify a mechanism for automated metering and chargeback to agencies and business units based on usage | Please describe the level of metering required (e.g. system, component, application, service). Please describe the level of performance monitoring required (e.g. system, component, application, service). | As much detail as possible for metering and performance monitoring (e.g. system, component, application, service). |
| 93 | Page 29, Section 3.1.C.5(c) | 8. Identify a mechanism for automated metering and chargeback to agencies and business units based on usage | Please describe the nature of the billing to be provided including billing units, allocation to 'payers' (agencies and business units), where this payer data is held and how it is identified, provided and matched to the billing unit. | DIS provides usage based billing to AR State Government entities. |
| 94 | Page 29, Section 3.1.C.5(c) | 8. Identify a mechanism for automated metering and chargeback to agencies and business units based on usage | Please provide the requirements for the inclusion of cloud services into the metering, chargeback, and performance monitoring capability. What is the State's preferred chargeback system that will utilize metering data for that chargeback activity? | The State's current chargeback system is Calero MySoft, however that is subject to change during the duration of this engagement. The SI's architecture should be sufficiently flexible to enable that change. |
| 95 | Page 30, Section 3.1 Number 6, Bullet B | Leverage Public cloud offerings (AWS, Azure, Google Cloud etc.) as part of the strategy and provide management capabilities across multiple cloud environments. The proposed cloud orchestration solution must include the following capabilities: | Section 3.1.C.6.B.i-vi – Do these policies or strategies exist currently? Who is responsible for transitioning those current processes and policies from your traditional IT operational methods to the future state (hybrid)? | See Section 3.1.C.6.c. of the final RFP. |
| 96 | Page 30, Section 3.1.C.6(b) | b. Leverage public cloud offerings (AWS, Azure, Google Cloud etc.) as part of the strategy and provide management capabilities across multiple cloud environments. The proposed cloud orchestration solution must include the following capabilities: | Please describe the State's timeline for the adoption of the various public cloud services or those that may already be in use and would require immediate incorporation into an orchestration capability. | As of this writing, there is no definite timeline for the adoption of various public cloud services. |
| 97 | Page 30, Section 3.1.C.7(a.ii) | ii. Redundancy standards that are equal to or better than those implemented in the current operational solution. | What are the State's current standards and experience for redundancy and infrastructure resiliency? What are those for the newer State agencies that might become part of the Shared Services environment? | The State / DIS is aware and utilizes many different high availability strategies based on customer (Agencies) needs. DIS is open to guidance from the SI for other options and standards. |
| 98 | Page 30, Section 3.1.C.8 | The system must provide direct connectivity to public cloud service providers as that ensures reliability, faster speed, lower latencies, and most importantly higher security as compared to traditional Internet connections. The Contractor may consider other alternatives that meet DIS objectives and have similar or lower pricing structure. | What public cloud services is the State currently using and considering for use including locations/regions? | Various public cloud providers are currently being used for point solutions throughout State government by various agencies. DIS has entered into a statewide enterprise agreement with Microsoft, consolidating all licenses procured by the State into a single agreement. A result of this is the migration to cloud-based Office 365. This migration is scheduled to be completed by December 2018. |
| 99 | Page 30, Section 3.1.C.8(4) | 4. Provision connectivity of the data centers to the public cloud environments | What network vendors does the State currently use and are these arrangements available for use by the service provider during the migration program? If so, please describe the nature of the available services? | The reference to final RFP Page 30, Section 3.1.C.8(4) is a DIS role and responsibility. Identification of network Contractors will be provided during the design phase. |

| | | | | |
|-----|--|---|--|---|
| 100 | Page 31, Section C, Paragraph 8.3 | Deploy, and configure the recommended data center network design including, SDN, DC switch topology, equipment e.g. router, switches, and load balancers. | Will DIS obtain new IP addressing for the new data center or will the existing IP address space from the MAC data center be reused? | It will be preferable to use current IP addresses where possible. DIS will provide new IP networks as required. DIS holds five Class B subnets, plus an IPv6 allocation. |
| 101 | Page 31, Section 3.1.C.9(7) | 7. Structure a technical service offering based on performance and availability tiers (e.g. Gold, Silver, and Bronze) for primary and remote storage instances. The Contractor shall leverage commonly-understood availability and performance metrics (e.g. Recovery Time Objective, Recovery Point Objective, Input\Output Operations per second (IOPS), etc.). | What are the State's current definitions for availability tiers vis-à-vis Recovery Time Objective (RTO), Recovery Point Objective (RPO), Input Output Operations per secondR (IOPS) etc.? | At the time of this writing, there are no standard RTO and RPO across the enterprise-class storage offerings. DIS seeks a multi-tiered storage model to support customer workloads. |
| 102 | Page 32, 11. C. | Data Protection and Backup | What data and/or applications would be going to the public Cloud? | To be determined |
| 103 | Page 33, Sec 3.1 – item 12 – ITSM | | Will the SI be expected to provide integration services if needed for the connection of native tools to the selected ITSM solution? | DIS has selected an ITSM solution and is in the process of issuing a contract. Some integration services may be required of the SI for tools incorporated into the design of the new Shared Services Environment. |
| 104 | Page 33, Section 3.1.C.12 | (Note: as of August 22, 2018, DIS is in the process of evaluating various ITSM solutions and should have one selected and purchased before the Systems Integrator Contractor starts work on this project). | What various ITSM solutions are under consideration? Are the requirements of this procurement being considered in the context of that selection? Will that selection be complete and the decision available to bidders before the proposal due date for this Optimization procurement? | See answer to Question 103. |
| 105 | Page 33, Section 3.1, Item C.12, Service Desk Self-Service (a) | Self-service provisioning must be provided through the IT Service Management portal as a part of the request fulfillment process and will be designed to meet the requirements of DIS business users | Please provide details about the IT Service Management portal. For example, what tool is utilized for this portal, what version of the tool is in place today, what other items are on this Portal in addition to the intended Self-Service provisioning | See answer to Question 103. |
| 106 | Page 33, Section 3.1, Item C.12, Service Desk Self-Service (a) | Self-service provisioning must be provided through the IT Service Management portal as a part of the request fulfillment process and will be designed to meet the requirements of DIS business users | Are there any requirements for the Contractor to amend or change the IT Service Management portal above and beyond linking the Self Service Provisioning service to it? | This will be determined after contract award. |
| 107 | Page 33, Section 3.1, Item C.12, Service Desk Self-Service (b) | A detailed knowledge portal must be provided to enable end users to reference frequently occurring issues and enable self-service | Please confirm that DIS will select and provide the licenses for the Knowledge Portal | Confirmed |
| 108 | Page 33, Section 3.1, Item C.12, Service Desk Self-Service (b) | A detailed knowledge portal must be provided to enable end users to reference frequently occurring issues and enable self-service | Please confirm if there is an existing knowledge portal or equivalent knowledge base in place or will the contractor be required to source and collect the required knowledge objects / articles to meet this clause. | No such knowledge portal/knowledge base currently exists. |
| 109 | Page 33, Section 3.1, Item C.12, Service Desk Self-Service (d) | The Contractor must assist DIS in user training for both functional and project related changes to minimize delay in rollout | What type of assistance is required from the contractor. For example: Training development, Training execution, Training Management? | See answer to Question 103. |
| 110 | Page 33, Section 3.1, Item C.12, Service Desk Self-Service (d) | The Contractor must assist DIS in user training for both functional and project related changes to minimize delay in rollout | Approximately, how many users does DIS anticipate will require training? | Delivery of training will be conducted by the contracted ITSM solution provider, not the SI. |
| 111 | Page 34, Section 3.1, Item C.12, Service Desk Self-Service (6) | Contractor needs to identify the areas of improvement with respect to self-service and strive to convert most of the service request management as self-service | How much self service is in place today? i.e. approximately what percentage of self-service options are there versus manual. Please provide any examples. This would assist in the determination of level of effort required | None |
| 112 | Page 34, Section 3.1, Item C.13, IT Service Management (2) | Implement the proposed ITSM solution with the DIS defined processes | Please confirm what is meant by the proposed ITSM solution in this clause. i.e. is this just the implementation of the process, or is this the implementation of the selected ITSM tool, Process and support organization? | See answer to Question 103. |
| 113 | Page 34, Section 3.1, Item C.13, IT Service Management (2) | Implement the proposed ITSM solution with the DIS defined processes | When does DIS intend to implement the proposed ITSM solution? | The ITSM solution is expected to be fully implemented by mid-April 2019 |
| 114 | Page 34, Section 3.1, Item C.13, IT Service Management (4) | Provide the required knowledge transfer of the in-scope ITSM processes to the Contractor | When does DIS intend to perform this knowledge transfer? | Upon approval of Contractor resources for the design phase of this engagement. |

| | | | | |
|-----|---|--|--|--|
| 115 | Page 35 of 70, 3.2 A point 5 | Identify infrastructure assets with residual useful lives and in agreement with DCO PMO migrate them from source data center to the target data center | The subsequent roles and responsibilities table beginning on page 37 of 70 does not include information on who is responsible for the actual relocation of equipment, and the Cost Workbook does not appear to allow for entry of costs related to physically relocating equipment (shipping, insurance, etc.). Is it the State of Arkansas' intention to be responsible for physical relocation of equipment per the agreed to plan or is the intent for the selected vendor to perform those activities? | DIS will retain responsibility for any physical relocation of data center assets. DIS reserves the right to require Contractor support (such as recommending, or assisting with a solicitation of professional data center equipment relocation services or OEM resources where required by the manufacturer) for any such moves. See final RFP Section 2.3.C. and Section 3.1.B.2. |
| 116 | Page 35, Section 3.2, Item A.6, | Propose an efficient migration approach for forklifting assets and migrating data, while proposing tools for migration planning and discovery such as ADM tool (Application Dependency Mapping). | What requirements does DIS have for relationship mapping for the CMDB. For example: Is it Apps->Server, Apps->Apps, Business Services->Apps or combination of these? | Prior to platform migration DIS will insure that all applications inter-dependencies are identified in order to ensure that disruption is minimized. |
| 117 | Page 35, Section 3.2.A(6) | Propose an efficient migration approach for forklifting assets and migrating data, while proposing tools for migration planning and discovery such as ADM tool (Application Dependency Mapping). | To what degree is Application Dependency Mapping incorporated in the State's schedule? Does it include mapping for those agencies that will migrate from their own facilities? | Application Dependency Mapping will be in the schedule and must include all executive branch agencies. |
| 118 | Page 35, Section 3.2.A(7) | A. Service Objectives The Contractor shall meet the following high-level service objectives related to Data Center Migration Planning and Execution Services: 7. Assist DIS in importing all discovered infrastructure assets into an asset management repository such as CMDB. | Please describe the scope of the State's new Configuration Management Database (CMDB) and the level of detail it is expected to reflect within the environment (e.g. compute, storage, network device, network service, facility, facility plant, etc.)? What level of CMDB is currently available and expected to be migrated to any new ITSM environment? Who is responsible for that migration? When will that migration occur relative to any migration to the new datacenter? | The contractor's solution must provide data (e.g. Server, Storage, Facilities equipment, Apps and Network equipment as outlined in the RFP) to populate the CMDB. There is no current CMDB. As such, no migration will be required. The new ITSM system is currently in procurement and is expected to be in production in mid-April 2019. |
| 119 | Pag 35, Section 3.2, Section A Bullet 6 | Propose an efficient migration approach for forklifting assets and migrating data, while proposing tools for migration planning and discovery such as ADM tool (Application Depedency Mapping). | Section 3.2 Data Center Migration Planning and Execution - Section A - The term fork lifting is used, does that mean the physical relocation assets or the logical migration of images? | A fork lift migration is a physical, as opposed to logical, migration. Hence the requirement for the forklift. DIS will retain responsibility for any physical relocation of data center assets. DIS reserves the right to request Contractor support (such as recommending, or assisting with a solicitation of professional data center equipment relocation services or OEM resources where required by the manufacturer) for any such moves. See final RFP Section 2.3.C. and Section 3.1.B.2. |
| 120 | Page 35, Section 3.2, Section A, Bullet 1 | Liase with the Data Center Optimization Project Management Office (DCO PMO) and meet DIS business needs for discovery and documentation of data center infrastructure assets, and identifying the dependencies and risks for performing the Data Center Migration from MAC to the new Shared Services Environment. | Section 3.2 Data Center Migration Planning and Execution - Section A - Is the vendor supplying all resources for the PMO or just a management team reporting into the State's PMO? | Both the State and Contractor shall provide PMO teams. The RFP describes the relationship and duties of each party. |
| 121 | Page 35, Section 3.2, Section A, Bullet 1 | Liase with the Data Center Optimization Project Management Office (DCO PMO) and meet DIS business needs for discovery and documentation of data center infrastructure assets, and identifying the dependencies and risks for performing the Data Center Migration from MAC to the new Shared Services Environment. | Section 3.2 Data Center Migration Planning and Execution - Section A - Is the vendor supplying all resources for the PMO or just a management team reporting into the State's PMO? | See answer for Question 119. |

| | | | | |
|-----|--|--|--|---|
| 122 | Page 35, Section 3.2 Section A, Bullet 6 | Propose an efficient migration approach for forklifting assests and migrating data, while proposing tools for migration planning and discovery such as ADM tool (Application Depedency Mapping). | Section 3.2 Data Center Migration Planning and Execution - Section A - Does the state have any logical application dependencies identified? | Not at this time |
| 123 | Page 35, Section 3.2 Paragraph 1 | DC Migration Planning and Execution Services are the services and activities pertaining to migration from the MAC Data Center located in One Capital Mall, Little Rock, AR to the new Shared Services Environment. See Section 2.3 of the RFP for more detail regarding the target state architecture. The scope includes migration planning and execution for the applications, compute, storage and back-up, and network environments. | Section 3.2 Data Center Migration Planning and Execution - Section A - Is decommissioning involved in this process and if so who owns it and how does the state define decommissioning? | Decommissioning is not in the required scope of work in this RFP. |
| 124 | Page 36, Section 3.2.A(7) | Assist DIS in importing all discovered infrastructure assets into an asset management repository such as CMDB. | What level of information from asset discovery and application mapping is to be kept in the CMDB? Are the requirements for this information being considered in the acquisition of an ITSM tool? | See answer to Question 78. Yes, this data was considered for the ITSM tool that is currently being procured by DIS. |
| 125 | Page 36, Section 3.2, Section B, | The following sub-sections and attached appendices further describe and scope the data center environment to be supported and /or with which Contractor shall comply | Section 3.2 Data Center Migration Planning and Execution - Section A - Who will have the responsibility for doing the floor layouts and rack elevations for the data centers? | DIS Enterprise Operations will retain this responsibility. |
| 126 | Page 36, Paragraph 3.2.B.1 | Target Data Center (colo facility) | Is DIS performing the Colocation Facility internal design and buildout (cabinets, ladder rack, cabling, power, etc.), or is that a Contractor responsibility? | Design of the Colocation Facility, with the exception of the Shared Services Environment to be housed therein, is the State's responsibility. |
| 127 | Page 37, Section 3.2, Item C. Data Collection and Discovery Roles and Accountabilities (5) | Provide tools and software licenses that are required to be leveraged for data collection, discovery and migration e.g. Asset Discovery tool, Application Dependency Mapping | Please confirm that there is an expectation that the contractor is to include the cost of discovery tools in their pricing. | Yes, refer to Section 1.13 of the RFP. |
| 128 | Page 37, Section 3.2, Item C. Data Collection and Discovery Roles and Accountabilities (7) | Use all available DIS resources including records and access to SMEs in addition to DIS' own tools and methodologies to capture an accurate inventory of current data center hardware assets (including compute, network, storage, appliances etc.) both physical and virtual | What methods are DIS utilizing today to measure the accuracy of their inventory? | Non-centralized inventory audits, visual inspection, and Contractor audits (software licensing) |
| 129 | Page 37, Section 3.2, Item C. Data Collection and Discovery Roles and Accountabilities (7) | Use all available DIS resources including records and access to SMEs in addition to DIS' own tools and methodologies to capture an accurate inventory of current data center hardware assets (including compute, network, storage, appliances etc.) both physical and virtual | Please provide any statistics on the current level of accuracy of the Asset information currently stored by DIS | No statistics are available |
| 130 | Page 37, Section 3.2, Item C. Data Collection and Discovery Roles and Accountabilities (5) | Provide tools and software licenses that are required to be leveraged for data collection, discovery and migration e.g. Asset Discovery tool, Application Dependency Mapping | What electronic discovery tools does DIS currently have in place? | Several point solutions are in use which may include: InTune, CA Spectrum, and SolarWinds. |
| 131 | Page 37-38, Section 3.2.C (Data Collection...) | Data Collection and Discovery Roles and Accountabilities | Where is the current and where does the State want the new command center? | Little Rock metropolitan area |

| | | | | |
|-----|---|--|---|--|
| 132 | Page 38, Section 3.2.C (Data Collection..., 11) Page 41, Section 3.3.A (6) | Document internal and external interdependencies between hardware and software systems that may impact the data center migration. This documentation may include dependencies such as data feeds, electronic data interchange, batch jobs, real-time Application Programming Interface (APIs), referenced routines and libraries, software licenses, Software as a Service (SaaS) systems including inactive systems, etc. Propose an efficient migration approach for migrating systems, applications and data, while proposing tools for migration planning and discovery such as ADM tool (Application Dependency Mapping). | What application discovery services are expected and to what level will the vendor be expected to provide them? How will these services be incorporated into the State's continuing model of operations, and how is the vendor expected to support their transition, if any, into those operations? | See final RFP Sections 3.2.C and 3.3.A.6 |
| 133 | Page 39, Section 3.2.C (Migration Approach...) | Migration Approach, Planning and Execution Accountabilities | What is the State's plan for tier changes and upgrades for SDCW? Will the SDCW be upgraded above Uptime Tier Level 2 equivalence? | There is no plan to upgrade SDCW, to Tier 3. |
| 134 | Page 39, Section 3.2.C (Migration Approach...) | Migration Approach, Planning and Execution Accountabilities | Who is and will be managing the SDCW? What level of support will they be expected to provide during physical migration activities (in or out)? | The State currently manages SDCW. That is not expected to change. DIS' Enterprise Operations Division Director and Facilities Management team will provide lead oversight and on-site assistance during the physical migration activities (in or out). |
| 135 | Page 39, Section 3.2.C (Migration Approach...) | Migration Approach, Planning and Execution Accountabilities | Who is responsible for the internal and external aspects of physical security at the SDCW? | The State is responsible for all aspects of security at the SDCW. |
| 136 | Page 41, Section 3.3.A (4) | Deliver services with guarantees backed by Service-Level Requirements. | What structure for measurement and guarantee does the State expect for these Service Level Requirements (SLRs)? Are penalties, claw-backs, performance improvement and innovation characteristics expected for these SLRs? Will these SLRs persist in the environment for any operations team beyond the term of this contract? | Measurement will be based on the mutually agreed to SLRs. See Template T-4 Section 3.1. Damages should be proposed by the Prospective Contractors and will be negotiated with the State prior to contract award. |
| 137 | Page 42, Section 3.3.C (1.3) | Approve the comprehensive standards, processes and procedures that will be used in the delivery of services across all services. | To what degree is the vendor expected to provide new or updated process, procedure and run book documentation for Operations that incorporate the migrated environment? | Refer to Section 3.3.C.1. |
| 138 | Page 42, Section 3.3.C (1.5) | Report performance against Service Level Requirements ("SLRs"). | Please describe the nature of SLR reporting and any required dashboarding including tool integration (e.g. ITSM, mobile dashboarding). | Satisfaction of SLRs will be measured relative to the agreed project delivery schedule / milestones. |
| 139 | Page 42, Section B.1.a,b,c | "800 physical servers" and "4TB of data" | Please confirm that the size of data is more than 4TB? Also the 800 servers is not just physical but both physical and virtual? | These numbers are based on an assessment done by Gartner in 2017 and serve as a baseline for this RFP. The storage amounts are listed in TB and the server counts were both physical and virtual. A role of the Systems Integrator will be to use all available DIS resources including records and access to SMEs in addition to DIS' own tools and methodologies to capture an accurate inventory of current data center and Agencies' hardware assets (including compute, network, storage, appliances etc.) both physical and virtual. |
| 140 | Page 42, Section B.4.c | "c. While VMware SRM and Storage VMotion may be licensed, they may not be implemented/in use. " | Please confirm if SRM with 3PAR SRA is setup or if this statement indicates that the solution is licensed but not configured/setup? | VMware SRM and Storage VMotion may be licensed, they may not be implemented or in use. This can be addressed in the design phase. |

| | | | | |
|-----|---|--|---|---|
| 141 | Page 43, Section C | "Provide tools and software licenses that are required to be leveraged for data collection, discovery and migration e.g. Asset Discovery tool, Application Dependency Mapping " | Please confirm if any Application Dependency Mapping(ADM) has been performed to date that can be utilized? | As of this writing, no application dependency mapping has been performed. |
| 142 | Page 44, Migration Approach, Planning, and Execution Accountabilities; Line 3 and Line 17 | Contractor should identify and document the appropriate method of migration for each application or system | Is the contractor responsible for providing manpower to do forklift (lift and shift) moves? | No. The SI Contractor's role is to: identify and document the appropriate method of migration for each application or system and propose an efficient migration approach for forklifting assets and migrating data. DIS will retain responsibility for any physical relocation of data center assets. DIS reserves the right to request Contractor support (such as recommending, or assisting with a solicitation of professional data center equipment relocation services or OEM resources where required by the manufacturer) for any such moves. See final RFP Section 2.3.C. and Section 3.1.B.2. |
| 143 | page 46, Section 3.4(B) | Dun & Bradstreet (D&B) Financial Stress Risk Class-The prospective contractor must have a current D&B Financial Stress Risk Class not greater than 2. | If the Financial Stress Risk Class is slightly higher than 2, would the State consider raising the requirement to 3 or allow alternate D&B ratings such as the Overall Business Risk score or D&B Viability Score that shows the company has an overall low risk profile? For large companies with many subsidiaries, a score of 2 is extremely difficult to achieve and this could restrict competition. | This requirement has been removed from the final RFP. |
| 144 | Page 48, Section C. Key Roles | Support DIS strategic and tactical planning processes for in scope services, including DIS team alignment to industry leading technology standards and architectures. | Is there an Approved Technology Standards list for the State of Arkansas? | No |
| 145 | Page 56, Section 3.4.E | DIS and the Contractor must collaborate and jointly manage the processes in support of the relationship as outlined below: | Does the State expect the described vendor relationship management activities to range beyond the data center migration/optimization objectives of this contract? (e.g. development of strategic business plans, develop and maintain the Standards and Procedures Manual) | The scope is limited to that included in the RFP. |
| 146 | Page 65, item B, Section 5.1, Payment and Invoice Provisions | Payment will be made in accordance with applicable State of Arkansas accounting procedures upon acceptance goods and services by the agency. | After acceptance by the State of Arkansas agencies, how many days does the State generally pay the invoice? | The State attempts to pay within 30 days, but a specific answer cannot be given. |
| 147 | Page 68, Sec 6 - standard terms and conditions – item 12 | | Invoicing – will the state please clarify – or notify the SI to define within its response - which items are Itemized and can be billed as milestones during the process of the work to be done. | See Section 5.1.B of the final RFP. |
| 148 | Attachment T3 - Section 2.1 | Provide a Staffing Plan and associated organization chart detailing the number of personnel, level, roles and responsibilities, and team reporting relationships, and identify the approach to providing “shoulder-to-shoulder” links for key staff roles between Prospective Contractor staff and DIS staff | Can the state provide a breakdown of DIS staff with roles? | This information may be provided after award of the contract. |
| 149 | Template T-3, 2.5 Work Locations | non-key phases of the project | The prospective contractor key project personnel will be allowed to work off-site during non-key phases of the project that do not require in-person meetings. Can DIS identify the non-key phases of the project where staff can work remotely and the duration of those phases? | Please see final T-5 Section 2.1 |

| | | | | |
|-----|--|--|---|--|
| 150 | Template T-3, 2.5 Work Locations | DIS provided facility | What is the capacity and expectation for the contractor to be at the DIS provided facility? Will there be capacity provided for the entire time of the project and for all of the contractor's staff? | Space allocations will be made upon confirmation of the number / capacity of the contractor's staff and provided for the duration of the engagement. |
| 151 | T-4, Section 3.1 Table 2 | Description | Has DIS created any measurement to determine timeliness? | The project schedule will be mutually agreed upon by the State and Contractor. |
| 152 | T-4, Section 3.1 | Service Level Requirements | We will not be able to propose damages prior to discovery and the deliverables have been identified by DIS. Will this be acceptable to DIS? | The Prospective Contractor should provide damages in T-4 Section 3.1. Proposed damages may be negotiated per Section 3.6 of the final RFP. |
| 153 | C-1 Cost workbook Template Tab 3. Enhancements | <p>The Enhancement costs must include all tasks and deliverables required for enhancements required while performing the requirements of this RFP. All costs will be calculated based on appropriate composite rate for that year. Contractors must assume a level of effort representing 15,000 hours each year.</p> <p>It is the responsibility of the Contractor to ensure spreadsheet calculations are correct. All costs must be fully inclusive.</p> | Please elaborate on what constitutes application enhancements along with necessary skills expectations for the State. | An Enhancement is defined as a request and/or need to modify the project beyond what is defined in the RFP. This need could be a result of, for example, new requirements from business users, court rulings, or new State/Federal mandates. Such requests are documented and then processed through the defined change control process. |
| 154 | Cost Workbook Draft.xlsx | Tab 1 calculations | Entering totals hours on project does not appear to provide the expected total project cost. Only a total composite rate appears to transfer from sheet "2. Labor Rates" to "1. Total Cost Summary" with the consequence that total cost to the State is not visible. Will the state consider revising the formula in Cell C22 of the Tab "1. Total Cost Summary". It appears that it should be linked to Cell E8 of the tab "2. Labor Rates". | See the final Price Workbook. |
| 155 | Cost Workbook Draft.xlsx | Tab 2 entries | Since this contract is for a completed effort as described in the SOW, why is the State requesting labor rates as opposed to deliverable or outcome based pricing per phase (e.g. environment discovery completion, MAC Data Center (DC) migration plan, MAC DC migration execution, large agency migration)? | The State is requiring a fixed price contract, which is based on usage of resources. |
| 156 | Cost Workbook Draft.xlsx | Enhancement Tabs | The Base plus option years on the Enhancements tab of the workbook do not appear to be consistent with the RFP. Will the State consider revising? | See the final Cost Workbook. |
| 157 | Cost Workbook Draft.xlsx | General Question | The cost sheets include hourly rates, which typically indicates a Time and Materials approach. However, the state is asking for a firm fixed price in the cost sheets. There is a significant amount of items that could impact the effort required by the contractor. Some examples are how quickly hardware and software gets procured by the state, how quickly the new facility is identified and secured, which tools end up being chosen by the state, and how many agency systems and applications migrate. Can the state please provide clarification as to how contractors should provide firm fixed pricing if there could be significant deviation in the effort based on the above items. | The cost sheets require hourly rates and quantities to calculate a fixed price. |
| 158 | C-1 Cost Workbook | | Will the pricing be considered Binding for the proposal? | Yes |

| | | | | |
|-----|--|---|--|--|
| 159 | Attachment A | | Are OS versions to be updated, by Vendor, to be compliant with OEM warranty and support requirements during transformation period? | If required, per DIS discretion, the Contractor shall update OS versions to be compliant with OEM warranty and support requirements during transformation period, please note some legacy applications require back level out of support OS. Should operating system version upgrades be required (and possible), in order to migrate systems to the Contractor's new Shared Services Environment, those upgrades would fall within the scope of the Contractor's migration efforts. As stated on RFP page 25, 3.1.B.2 Personnel: "the Contractor shall be responsible for supplying appropriately-skilled staffing for the design and build activities, roles and responsibilities; DIS resources will be responsible for operating and maintenance once the environment has achieved steady-state." |
| 160 | Attachment A | | Are any Unix system replatforming initiatives in scope? | No |
| 161 | Attachment A | | Are any Linux OS to be migrated to a different OEM Linux version during transformation period? | It is possible that some Linux OS implementations might be migrated to other OEM Linux versions, or at least updated to current revisions, during this effort |
| 162 | Attachment A | Dell as manufacturer of VxRail | Please note that EMC Corporation ("Dell EMC") is the OEM for the VxRail product line, not Dell Marketing LP ("Dell"). | See final Attachment A. |
| 163 | Attachment B | Storage Summary - Sum of Tier 0-4 | How do you classify the different tiers of storage (e.g., media type, bandwidth, latency)? | Currently, there is no differentiation between tiers of storage. |
| 164 | Attachment C, Page 1 | | What WAN technologies are presently deployed to connect the present MAC DC and SDCW DC ? | See final Attachment C. |
| 165 | Attachment C Section 1 Overview | The existing network equipment from MAC will be migrated to SDCW and/or the new colocation facility as part of the MAC migration initiative. | Is it required to utilize all of the existing network equipment from MAC in the SDCW and/or new co-location facility? | No, the network equipment at MAC is not expected to meet all of the requirements of a highly-virtualized and automated shared services infrastructure environment with self-provisioning, orchestration, metering and billing, high availability, Disaster Recovery and public cloud connectivity capabilities. |
| 166 | Attachment C Section 2 Network Equipment | The LAN and WLAN environment of State of Arkansas is comprised of 203 network and security devices hosted in the MAC and SDCW data centers. The detailed breakdown for the equipment by location and by OEM is shown below. | Is any of the existing network equipment End of Life and if so, is the state planning on replacing any EOL equipment as part of the migration? | No. |
| 167 | Attachment C Section 2 Network Equipment | The LAN and WLAN environment of State of Arkansas is comprised of 203 network and security devices hosted in the MAC and SDCW data centers. The detailed breakdown for the equipment by location and by OEM is shown below. | Who are the manufacturers\vendors of the switches? | See final Attachment C. |
| 168 | Attachment C Section 2 Network Equipment | The LAN and WLAN environment of State of Arkansas is comprised of 203 network and security devices hosted in the MAC and SDCW data centers. The detailed breakdown for the equipment by location and by OEM is shown below. | Is any of the existing network infrastructure currently configured as High Availability (HA)? | Yes |

| | | | | |
|-----|--|--|--|--|
| 169 | Attachment C Network and Security, page 4, Table 3 | "Little Rock Metro 40 Gbps L3 Ring" | Please confirm there is a requirement around 40Gbps Dark Fiber or if this is current state and future state this is not required? | See final Attachment C. |
| 170 | Attachment C, Page 4 | | What LAN Layer 2 (and/or Layer 3) technologies are presently deployed within each of the Data centers? | DWDM and Metro Ethernet |
| 171 | Attachment D, Service Assurance | Table 1-Monitoring and management tools | Has Quest Foglight already been purchased? If not, when does DIS anticipate completing the acquisition? | Yes |
| 172 | Attachment D, Service Assurance | Table 1-Monitoring and management tools | IS the state expecting the contractor to identify, procure and implement an Application Performance Monitoring tool? | No, the State will procure an Application Monitoring tool but the Contractor may recommend a product. |
| 173 | page 4, Attachment D- Service Desk and ITSM | DIS currently utilizes CA Service Desk as an IT Service Management (ITSM) solution. The details regarding the ownership of the ITSM solution along with infrastructure discovery solution have been provided in the table below. Note: as of August 22, 2018, DIS is in the process of evaluating various ITSM solutions and should have one selected and purchased before the Systems Integrator Contractor starts work on this project. | What tools are currently being evaluated as potential replacements for the existing CA Service Desk? | The ITSM tool is being acquired as a separate initiative, from the DCO projects such, it is outside the scope of this RFP. |
| 174 | Attachment D- Service Desk and ITSM | DIS currently utilizes CA Service Desk as an IT Service Management (ITSM) solution. The details regarding the ownership of the ITSM solution along with infrastructure discovery solution have been provided in the table below. Note: as of August 22, 2018, DIS is in the process of evaluating various ITSM solutions and should have one selected and purchased before the Systems Integrator Contractor starts work on this project. | What ITSM components is the state looking to acquire and implement as part of their perspective ITSM tool? | The ITSM tool is being acquired as a separate initiative, from the DCO projects such, it is outside the scope of this RFP. |
| 175 | Attachment F, Policies 7.h | Physical Security Policy | Please indicate those policies that are to be applied to any colocation or 3rd party data center provider. Please provide copies or the means of public access for review. | Current policies in place with the State (DIS) will be followed at the new colocation data center. The policies listed in Attachment F will be shared with the selected contractor after selection and background checks are completed. (See RFP page 9, 1.17.I) |
| 176 | Attachment H, Security Initiatives | Security Initiatives | What if any of the security or application initiatives does the state anticipate initiating during the Data Center migration period? | Given the anticipated duration of the data center migration period, improvements to the security posture and application rationalization efforts are ongoing. |
| 177 | Attachment H, Application Initiatives, DIS AIMS | Internal system designed to manage agency data for data center optimization | Please describe AIMS and its purpose and use within the context of the duties of this RFP. | AIMS is a data gathering application, for use in accumulating information systems/application information, across the various state agencies/boards/commissions. AIMS provides a repository and maintenance tool, in order to eliminate the need to ask for the same information, in the future. |
| 178 | Attachment H, B - Foundational Elements: Enhancements to the Shared Services Environment | Three cloud resources were approved by OPM and the legislature. Advertising will start by end of FY19 Q1. | Can you please provide the functional title and\or role the 3 Cloud resources are expected to fill? | Cloud Architect, Cloud Strategist, and Cloud Engineer. |

| | | | | |
|-----|--|--|---|--|
| 179 | Attachment H, B-(i) | System Integrator | What is the status of the System Integrator RFP? Who was selected as the Shared Services Environment's system integrator? What is their role regarding the datacenter migration/optimization? | This is the Systems Integrator RFP. |
| 180 | Attachment H, B-(ii) | Cloud Center of Excellence Formation | What is the status of the State's formation of their Cloud Center of Excellence? What is their role regarding within the scope of this RFP? | Pending |
| 181 | Attachment H, B-(vi) Implement a tiered storage model to offer lower cost storage alternatives | Deploy storage offerings | Has the state completed an assessment to identify respective data types as it relates to desire for a Tiered Storage model? Is the state seeking to have this Tiered model cloud based? | See answer to Question 162. It is acceptable for some portion to be cloud based. |
| 182 | Attachment H, C-(vii) Restructure DIS support organization to remove siloed support and delivery | Organizational Assessment | Can the state provide additional detail regarding the outcome of the Organizational assessment and its impact on DIS support organization? | As of this writing, plans are in development. |
| 183 | Attachment H, D&E | Items for "Sourcing support" and "Ready for occupancy" | Do the dates showing for these two strategic priority/initiatives indicate that the expected period between procuring sourcing support and readiness for occupancy is expected to be approximately 6 weeks? | See the final Attachment H - Strategic Priorities and Initiatives for corrected target dates that match the timeline in the final SP-19-0025 RFP document. |
| 184 | Attachment H, C - Foundational Elements: Other DIS Service improvements | Additional network capabilities | Please clarify what is included in the additional network capabilities strategic initiative? | Assess and deploy additional network, security, and infrastructure capabilities for SDCW to be a primary production data center. |
| 185 | Attachment H, C-(vi) Improve IT Financial Management Practices | Research has begun on a financial management solution to replace the current billing system and other external processes handled through various methods. A solution has not been determined at this time. | Is DIS looking to have the contractor support the implementation of the new Financial Management Tool? | No |
| 186 | General T-1 through T-6 | Table of Contents | Do the Tables of Content requested require the listing of accurate pagination for each Template? | The State would prefer that Prospective Contractors provide accurate pagination for each template in the Table of Contents. |
| 187 | General | General | Will the awarded Contractor for this RFP be precluded from future contract awards or from selling the recommended products / services for this data center project? | There are no such restrictions. |
| 188 | General T-1 through T-6 | Table of Contents | Do the Tables of Content requested require the listing of accurate pagination for each Template? | See answer to Question 185. |
| 189 | General | Absence of Attachment G | Please confirm that Attachment G was intentionally omitted. | In order to view Attachment G a Prospective Contractor must sign and submit a Non-Disclosure Agreement (Attachment E). See Final RFP Section 3.2.B.3.b. |
| 190 | General | | Are there any restriction in the RFP that would preclude the selected SI from also being the service provider for Cloud or colo or services requested within this RFP ? | There are no such restrictions. |
| 191 | General | | Will the state accept question after the DD or allow for a second round after release of the final RFP ? | No. |
| 192 | General Question | | Is DIS envisioning a multi-vendor environment or a single vendor environment? - Would DIS prefer a SI or a reseller for this project instead of one vendor? (For example Dell, Cisco or HPE) | DIS is looking for an optimized, cost-effective solution. We have no preference relative to single Prime Contractor vs. Prime Contractor with sub-Contractors environment. |
| 193 | General Question | | Can a vendor respond to the RFP with several different solutions? | If a Prospective Contractor wishes to provide multiple solutions a separate proposal must be submitted for each solution. |
| 194 | General Question | | When the will this project be divided up? (Servers, Storage, Networking) | Any contract awarded as a result of this RFP will be awarded to a single Contractor. |

| | | | | |
|-----|------------------|------------------|--|---|
| 195 | No reference | No reference | We assume that any resources provided the services will need to be based in the United States. Can you elaborate on any restrictions on the use of resources not residing in the United States? | The assumption is correct. See final Template 3, item 2.5 Work Location(s) |
| 196 | General Question | General Question | Is the client planning to perform any transformational activities (i.e. P2V's, replatforming of applications, application rationalization) or will this be a like-for-like optimization effort? | Yes, extensive transformational activities are expected. |
| 197 | General Question | General Question | Will the lower resiliency agency DC's be decommissioned? If so, will physical lift and shifts be required of certain critical infrastructure minus typical core infrastructure (i.e. DNS, AD, SCCM services)? | Decommissioning of non-DIS data centers will happen to the extent practical/feasible. |
| 198 | General Question | General Question | Can you provide more detail around any upgrades or remediation activities that would be required at the new primary site (SDCW) location prior to the 'role swap' and can you confirm which activities should be included in the scope of work for this project? | Ongoing activities, in support of SDCW as the primary data center include but not limited to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Server Capacity Upgrade• Firewall Upgrade• Networking Upgrade• SAN Switch Capacity Upgrade• Expanding Splunk security monitoring Most of the above are expected to be completed, prior to contract award. However, the new contractor-designed Shared Services Environment is expected to drive requirements for further upgrades/ installations. Also see Attachment H for further details regarding strategic priorities and initiatives. |
| 199 | General Question | General Question | Does the client have a breakout of the number of standalone databases vs. shared environment databases? | Currently no such breakdown exists. |
| 200 | Time Table | General Question | What is the time table for when a Public Cloud provider is slated to be selected? | As of this writing, there is no definite time table for that selection. |