



Maryland Department of Transportation
Office of Procurement
CATS+ TORFP J02B3400050
SHA – Database Portfolio Business Services
Addendum #1

November 21, 2013

**To all bidders of the CATS+ TORFP – J02B3400050
SHA – Database Portfolio Business Services**

This Addendum is being issued to amend, clarify, add and delete certain information contained in the above referenced TORFP. All information contained herein is binding on all offerors who respond to this TORFP.

1. SECTION 3.2.1 – TECHNICAL PROPOSALS, SECTION 3.2.1 A 2 IS REMOVED

DELETE

3.2.1 TO TECHNICAL PROPOSAL

A. Proposed Services

1. Executive Summary: A high level overview of the Master Contractor's understanding of the background, purpose, and objectives of the TORFP. The Executive Summary shall summarize the Master Contractor's resources capabilities and experience to address the requirements outlined in Section 2.
2. *Proposed Solution: A detailed narrative of the Master Contractor's proposed methodology and solution for completing the requirements and deliverables in Section 2 - Scope of Work. This section should include a comprehensive schedule of tasks and estimated times frames for completing all requirements and deliverables, including any tasks to be performed by State or third party personnel*
3. Assumptions: A description of any assumptions formed by the Master Contractor in developing the Technical Proposal. Master Contractors should avoid assumptions that counter or constitute exceptions to TORFP terms and conditions.

REPLACE WITH

3.2.1 TO TECHNICAL PROPOSAL

A. Proposed Services

1. Executive Summary: A high level overview of the Master Contractor's understanding of the background, purpose, and objectives of the TORFP. The Executive Summary shall summarize the Master Contractor's resources capabilities and experience to address the requirements outlined in Section 2.



Maryland Department of Transportation
Office of Procurement
CATS+ TORFP J02B3400050
SHA – Database Portfolio Business Services
Addendum #1

November 21, 2013

2. Assumptions: A description of any assumptions formed by the Master Contractor in developing the Technical Proposal. Master Contractors should avoid assumptions that counter or constitute exceptions to TORFP terms and conditions.

2. SECTION 3, ON PAGE 32: THIS SECTION SHOULD BE LISTED AS SECTION 4 AND EACH SUB-SECTION LISTED AS 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, AND 4.4

DELETE

3 – TASK ORDER AWARD PROCESS

3.1 OVERVIEW

The TO Contractor will be selected from among all eligible Master Contractors within the appropriate functional area responding to the CATS+ TORFP. In making the TO Agreement award determination, the SHA will consider all information submitted in accordance with Section 3.

3.2 TECHNICAL PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

The following are technical criteria for evaluating a TO Proposal in descending order of importance.

- Personnel experience as listed in Section 3.2.1.B.1, 3.2.1.B.2, 3.2.1.B.4, and 3.2.1.B.5.
- The Master Contractor and Subcontractor Resources Experience and Capabilities as specified in Section 3.2.E.
- The Master Contractor's understanding of the TORFP Scope of Work based on the required response in Section 3.2.1.A.
- Professional Development Plan as specified in Section 3.2.1.F.

3.3 SELECTION PROCEDURES

- A) TO Proposals will be assessed throughout the evaluation process for compliance with the minimum personnel qualifications in Section 2.19 and Section 2.18 and quality of responses to Section 3.2 of the TORFP. Master Contractor proposed resources that fail to meet minimum qualifications will be deemed not reasonably selectable for award, i.e., disqualified from further consideration. Master Contractors whose resources are deemed technically qualified will be ranked against each other. This ranking will be broken down into three (3) categories, "Best Qualified", "Well Qualified", and "Minimally Qualified". All others will be deemed not reasonably susceptible to award and will receive e-mail notice from the TO Procurement Officer of not being selected to perform the work.
- B) Qualified TO Proposals whose resource(s) were deemed technically qualified will have their TO financial proposal considered and their financial responses will be reviewed and ranked from lowest to highest price proposed.
- C) The most advantageous TO Proposal offer considering both technical and financial submission shall be selected for the work assignment. In making this selection, technical merit has greater weight than price.



**Maryland Department of Transportation
Office of Procurement
CATS+ TORFP J02B3400050
SHA – Database Portfolio Business Services
Addendum #1**

November 21, 2013

- 3.4 COMMENCEMENT OF WORK UNDER A TO Agreement
Commencement of work in response to a TO Agreement shall be initiated only upon issuance of a fully executed TO Agreement, a Non-Disclosure Agreement (To Contractor), a Purchase Order, and by a Notice to Proceed authorized by the TO Manager.

REPLACE WITH

4 – TASK ORDER AWARD PROCESS

4.1 OVERVIEW

The TO Contractor will be selected from among all eligible Master Contractors within the appropriate functional area responding to the CATS+ TORFP. In making the TO Agreement award determination, the SHA will consider all information submitted in accordance with Section 3.

4.2 TECHNICAL PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

The following are technical criteria for evaluating a TO Proposal in descending order of importance.

- Personnel experience as listed in Section 3.2.1.B.1, 3.2.1.B.2, 3.2.1.B.4, and 3.2.1.B.5.
- The Master Contractor and Subcontractor Resources Experience and Capabilities as specified in Section 3.2.E.
- The Master Contractor's understanding of the TORFP Scope of Work based on the required response in Section 3.2.1.A.
- Professional Development Plan as specified in Section 3.2.1.F.

4.3 SELECTION PROCEDURES

- A) TO Proposals will be assessed throughout the evaluation process for compliance with the minimum personnel qualifications in Section 2.19 and Section 2.18 and quality of responses to Section 3.2 of the TORFP. Master Contractor proposed resources that fail to meet minimum qualifications will be deemed not reasonably selectable for award, i.e., disqualified from further consideration. Master Contractors whose resources are deemed technically qualified will be ranked against each other. This ranking will be broken down into three (3) categories, "Best Qualified", "Well Qualified", and "Minimally Qualified". All others will be deemed not reasonably susceptible to award and will receive e-mail notice from the TO Procurement Officer of not being selected to perform the work.
- B) Qualified TO Proposals whose resource(s) were deemed technically qualified will have their TO financial proposal considered and their financial responses will be reviewed and ranked from lowest to highest price proposed.
- C) The most advantageous TO Proposal offer considering both technical and financial submission shall be selected for the work assignment. In making this selection, technical merit has greater weight than price.

4.4 COMMENCEMENT OF WORK UNDER A TO Agreement

Commencement of work in response to a TO Agreement shall be initiated only upon issuance of a fully executed TO Agreement, a Non-Disclosure Agreement (To Contractor), a Purchase Order, and by a Notice to Proceed authorized by the TO Manager.

End of Addendum #1



Maryland Department of Transportation
Office of Procurement
CATS+ TORFP J02B3400050
SHA – Database Portfolio Business Services
Addendum #2

November 22, 2013

**To all bidders of the CATS+ TORFP – J02B3400050
SHA – Database Portfolio Business Services**

This Addendum is being issued to amend, clarify, add and delete certain information contained in the above referenced TORFP. All information contained herein is binding on all offerors who respond to this TORFP.

**1. SECTION 2, SUB-SECTION 2.18 – OFFEROR’S MIMIMUM QUALIFICATIONS,
FIRST BULLET POINT (last four (4) words)**

DELETE

2.18 OFFEROR’S MIMIMUM QUALIFICATIONS

The awarded TO Contractor shall be capable of furnishing all necessary services required to successfully complete all tasks and work requirements and produce high quality deliverables described herein. The Master Contractor shall demonstrate, in its proposal, that it possesses such expertise in-house or has fostered strategic alliances with other firms for providing such services. TO Contractor Minimum Qualifications are as follows:

- 5 years of demonstrated experience providing Oracle and Microsoft SQL Server support services *to Maryland State Agencies.*
- 3 years of demonstrated experience providing Staffing Plans.

REPLACE WITH

2.18 OFFEROR’S MIMIMUM QUALIFICATIONS

The awarded TO Contractor shall be capable of furnishing all necessary services required to successfully complete all tasks and work requirements and produce high quality deliverables described herein. The Master Contractor shall demonstrate, in its proposal, that it possesses such expertise in-house or has fostered strategic alliances with other firms for providing such services. TO Contractor Minimum Qualifications are as follows:

- **5 years of demonstrated experience providing Oracle and Microsoft SQL Server support service.**
- 3 years of demonstrated experience providing Staffing Plans.

End of Addendum #2



Maryland Department of Transportation
Office of Procurement
CATS+ TORFP J02B3400050
SHA – Database Portfolio Business Services
Addendum #3

December 5, 2013

**To all bidders of the CATS+ TORFP – J02B3400050
SHA – Database Portfolio Business Services**

This Addendum is being issued to amend, clarify, add and delete certain information contained in the above referenced TORFP and answer questions. All information contained herein is binding on all offerors who respond to this TORFP.

1. SECTION 2, SUB-SECTION 2.7.6 – TALEND Administration - TO Contractor personnel shall; BULLET POINT SEVEN

DELETE

- Set up SVN (Server Virtual Name) Repository Configuration

REPLACE WITH

- Set up SVN (**Subversion**) Repository Configuration

2. SECTION 2, SUB-SECTION 2.7.1.5 – Microsoft SQL Server Administration - TO Contractor personnel shall:

DELETE

2.7.1.5

REPLACE WITH

2.7.1

3. QUESTION & ANSWERS

Q1. Is this a new opportunity or is there a current incumbent?

A1. This is not a new opportunity, there are currently four incumbents.

Q2. On page 24, section 2.18, **Offeror's Minimum Qualifications:** Our agency does not have 5 years of experience providing Oracle and Microsoft SQL Server support services to Maryland State Agencies BUT we have provided such services to other state client agencies; does this make us an unqualified bidder?



Maryland Department of Transportation
Office of Procurement
CATS+ TORFP J02B3400050
SHA – Database Portfolio Business Services
Addendum #3

December 5, 2013

A2. Please See Addendum #2, "to Maryland State Agencies" was removed from Section 2.18, first bullet.

Q3. Our firm is a non-certified MBE/DBE; would this make us ineligible for award considering that there is a 25% DBE goal?

A3. To be clear, this TORFP has a 25% Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) goal, not an MBE goal. The Prime Contractor does not have to be an MDOT certified DBE firm. However, the Prime Contractor would need to use a subcontractor to satisfy the goal. The subcontractor must be an MDOT certified DBE at the time of proposal submittal and be certified in the area in which they will be providing services. Pending certifications will not be accepted. See the MDOT DBE/MBE directory at <http://mbe.mdot.state.md.us/directory/>

Q4. In section 2.18 Offeror's Minimum Qualifications, it states the following: "The Master Contractor shall demonstrate, in its proposal, that it possesses such expertise in-house or has fostered strategic alliances with other firms for providing such services. TO Contractor Minimum Qualifications are as follows:

- 5 years of demonstrated experience providing Oracle and Microsoft SQL Server support services.
- 3 years of demonstrated experience providing Staffing Plans."

If our company has been operating for 4 years, but our personnel and teaming partners have over 5 years of demonstrated experience providing Oracle and Microsoft SQL Server support, will we be qualified to bid as a Master Contractor for this TO? The statement "or has fostered strategic alliances with other firms for providing such services" seems to imply that the entire team is evaluated for the minimum qualifications. Please clarify.

A4. That is correct. If your proposal partner(s) or sub-contractor(s) meet the minimum qualifications, you would be qualified to submit a proposal even though your company has been in operation for only four years.

Q5. Exactly how many candidates are required to be submitted at the time of submission of the proposal?

A5. Exactly four (4) named resources are to be submitted at the time of submission of the proposal. Four (4) resources are to be available upon award and SHA will initiate a work order to obtain an additional five (5) resources upon NTP. Please see Section 2.1 of the TORFP for a detailed explanation.

Q6. In the section 2.18 TO Contractor's minimum qualification there is mentioned that - "5 years of demonstrated experience providing Oracle and Microsoft SQL Server support services to Maryland State Agencies" is required. Is this a mandatory qualification?

A6. See Answer to Question 2.

Q7. How many awards SHA is planning to make for this TORFP? One or more than one?

A7. MDOT will award to one (1) Master Contractor only.

Q8. The TORFP has a 25% MBE goal. If the Master contractor itself is an MBE, do they still have give 25% of the work to another MBE?

A8. To be clear, this TORFP has a 25% Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) goal, not an MBE goal. If the Master Contractor is an MDOT certified DBE at the time of proposal submittal and is an MDOT certified DBE in the area in which the Master Contractor will be working, the Master Contractor can satisfy the entire 25% DBE goal. Pending certifications will not be accepted. See the MDOT DBE/MBE directory at <http://mbe.mdot.state.md.us/directory/>

Q9. Is the MBE goal only for the 4 resources award that are initially expected with the NTP or does it apply to the additional 5 resources too?

A9. To be clear, this TORFP has a 25% Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) goal. Not an MBE goal. The 25% DBE goal will be based on the total amount of the contract award, and can be fulfilled through all nine (9) of the resources,



Maryland Department of Transportation
Office of Procurement
CATS+ TORFP J02B3400050
SHA – Database Portfolio Business Services
Addendum #3

December 5, 2013

that include the initial four (4) and the additional five (5) resources. See the MDOT DBE/MBE directory at <http://mbe.mdot.state.md.us/directory/>

Q10. If it is applicable to the additional 5 resources, would SHA explain how you expect the master contractors to meet 25% of 5 resources?

A10. See Answer to Question 9

Q11. Is this a new requirement or is there an incumbent already doing this work under CATS-2?

A11. See Answer to Question 1.

Q12. If there is an incumbent, who is the master contractor and under what CATS-2 Solicitation# is the work being performed?

A12. There are currently four Master Contractors providing these services (CATS II Solicitation J02B0400009 – G. R. Patel & Associates, Inc., DK Consulting, LLC and CNSI) and (CATS II Solicitation J02B2400007 – Synergy Systems and Services, Inc.).

Q13. Do the subcontractors have to be Certified DBE/MBE in the State of MD to apply towards the 25% goal or can they be certified in any state in the US?

A13. To be clear, this TORFP has a 25% Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) goal, not an MBE goal. Yes, subcontractors used to fulfill the DBE goal must be MDOT certified DBE firms, and must be certified in the area they will be used to fulfill the goal at the time of proposal submittal. Pending certifications will not be accepted. See the MDOT DBE/MBE directory at <http://mbe.mdot.state.md.us/directory/>

Q14. The RFP states a DBE goal of 25%. Please confirm that the 25% goal can be met through the total resource pool of nine resources (the four required resources and five additional resources), rather than the “four named resources.”?

A14. See Answer to Question 9.

Q15. Question: The RFP defines SVN as “Server Virtual Name”. Based on the context of the RFP, is it possible that SVN is actually intended to be a reference to Subversion (developed by Apache), which is a versioning and configuration software. Please confirm that the definition as stated in the RFP is correct.

A15. Correct, SVN should have been identified as Subversion and not Server Virtual Name.

Q16. Please confirm that this requirement section should be numbered 2.7.5.

A16. Correct, Requirement 2.7.1.5 should be numbered 2.7.5.

End of Addendum #3