To all bidders of the CATS+ TORFP – J01B3400044  
TBU – Dedicated Network Resources

This Addendum is being issued to answer questions submitted by Master Contractors. All information contained herein is binding on all offerors who respond to this TORFP.

1. REVISED BID DUE DATE FOR THE ABOVE REFERENCED TORFP #J01B3400044, change to the Key Information Summary Sheet:

   DELETE old Due Date: Wednesday, August 6, 2014 at 2:00PM. Local Time

   ADD new Due Date: Wednesday, August 13, 2014 at 2:00PM. Local Time

2. QUESTION & ANSWERS

   1. Are all resources (initial 4 and the rest) required to be on MDOT facilities or can they work off-site (our location)?

      RESPONSE #1 – all nine will be on site at MDOT locations as stated in the TORFP

   2. When (time frame) MDOT is expecting to hire the additional five resources?

      RESPONSE #2 – As per the solicitation email states and in section 2 of the TORFP – upon award of this task order. The additional resources are needed as soon as the award is made.

   3. Is any vendor providing these services under CATS-2 or under other contracts? If so, who is the vendor company(s) and what is the TORFP/Contract# under which these contracts were awarded?

      RESPONSE #3 - The current services are provided via a CATS I task order J01P8200158, Skyline Network Engineering

   4. Are there any Incumbents for this requirement? If yes, then please list the name?

Quality Transportation Services through Information Technology Excellence
5. I logged onto the -DoIT website (https://www.doit.state.md.us/ITMC/login.aspx) to submit a Master Contractor Feedback form (per Section 3) and noticed the procurement is not there?

RESPONSE #5 – please contact DoIT at ITPO.doit@maryland.gov

6. Does that mean it was withdrawn or do we need to email the MC Feedback form to you?

RESPONSE #6 – see response to #5

7. Please confirm the budget of the requirement?

RESPONSE #7 – MDOT does not disclose budget information.

8. If any incumbent already working please let us know?

RESPONSE #8 – yes, see question #3

9. Start date of the project?

RESPONSE #9 – current contract expires December 31, 2014, start date of this TORFP will be no later than Jan. 1, 2015

10. Please provide me URL/ Link from where I can find VSBE companies to fulfill the goal for this TORFP?

RESPONSE #10 – https://www.vip.vetbiz.gov

11. Please answer the following: Is there an incumbent for this task? If so, who?

RESPONSE #11 – See response #3
12. (Name removed) company is a MBE certified company by MDOT, so do we have to still partner with another MBE company to fulfill the 30% MBE goal?

RESPONSE #12 – Yes

13. Is this a new task order or a reissue/renewal of any previous task order?

RESPONSE #13 – see response #3

14. Is there any current/previous incumbent? If yes, can you provide the name?

RESPONSE #14 – see response #3

15. The required minimum experience appears to cover a broad base of technology from all TBUs combined. Must each candidate meet every minimum requirement to be considered?

RESPONSE #15 – The minimum requirements for each TBU must be met by the proposed resource for that TBU.

16. The TORFP requires candidates to have ITIL Foundation certification. Would MDOT accept candidates if the Master Contractor commits to getting the candidates trained prior to the start or immediately upon the start of the Task Order?

RESPONSE #16 – No, Section 2.12 of TORFP states, “Resources submitted shall be certified with foundation ITIL

17. Would MDOT consider awarding by position / TBU to ensure you get the best qualified person and price without compromise?

RESPONSE #17 – Award shall be made to one Master Contractor that proposes a team of 4 resources that meet the min. qualifications and shall have the ability to produce the additional 5 required resources upon notice of award – review section 2 and the information in the solicitation email.
18. MDOT has requested a very short turnaround for the response to this TORFP, with the need to respond with four (4) well qualified technical resources. Will MDOT consider extending the deadline to ensure enough time to provide those candidates?

RESPONSE #18 – Yes, and any change will be provided in Addendum.

19. Will the experience of our supporting subcontractor meet the qualifications as stated in Section 2.13.1?

RESPONSE #19 – Master Contractors shall meet the requirements of Section 2.13.

20. Do all current incumbent staff possess the required individual minimum qualifications listed in TORFP Section 2.12?

RESPONSE #20 – Not relevant to this TORFP.

21. Please reconcile the requirements for TORFP Section 2.5.3 (TBU Specific Requirements) and Section 2.12 (Offeror’s Personnel Minimum Qualifications). The checked items in the Specific Requirements table do not sync up with the Minimum Qualifications requirement(s) in respect to the individual TBUs.

Examples:

2.5.3 - LANDesk is checked as a required skill for MAA, MVA, and TSO.
2.12 - LANDesk Management Suite experience (4 years) is required for each proposed TBU resource. SHA, MDTA, and OTTS, do not have LANDesk checked as a required skill in 2.5.3.

2.5.3 - SyncSort is checked as a required skillset for MAA, MPA, MVA, and SHA.
2.12 - SyncSort experience (2 years) is required for each proposed TBU resource. MDTA, MTA (2), TSO, and OTTS do not have SyncSort checked as a required skill in 2.5.3.

2.5.3 - Quest software does not show up at all in the Specific Requirements table.
2.12 - Quest software experience (3 years) is required for each proposed TBU resource. We request that the Offeror’s Personnel Minimum Qualifications be modified to align to the specific needs of each TBU.
RESPONSE #21 – The minimum qualifications chart in Section 2.12 identifies years of experience for a specific skill set. The chart in Section 2.5.3 lists the specific skill set per TBU.

22. Section 2.12 of the TORFP (Offeror’s Personnel Minimum Qualifications) has an item that was not present in the prior solicitation; “Installation and support of all facets of Microsoft IIS, and Linux for web server support”. The Recent Years of Experience Required is “7”. This seems excessively high when compared to the Recent Years of Experience Required for other line items. We request the Recent Years of Experience Required for Microsoft IIS/Linux web server support be more in line with the Recent Years of Experience Required for the other Minimum Qualification line items.

RESPONSE #22 – The requirements will remain as stated.

23. Is it permissible to use the same subcontractor to meet the MBE (30%) and VSBE (7%) goals?

RESPONSE #23 – No

24. Who is the incumbent contractor?

RESPONSE #24 – see response #3

25. Do the qualifications as stated in Section 2.13.1 relate to the Master Contractor past performance or past performance of proposed resources?

RESPONSE #25 – Section 2.13 pertains to the Master Contractor experience.

End of Addendum #1