1. Section 2.9.1.A states: At least three (3) years of demonstrated experience providing application hosting, helpdesk, and software development services to U.S. based commercial or government entities with at least 3,000 end-users. This full requirement in its current state heavily favors large firm(s) and immediately excludes smaller MBEs and SBR firms.

   Can it be modified to the following:

   At least two (2) years of demonstrated experience providing application hosting, helpdesk, and software development services to U.S. based commercial or government entities with at least 1,000 end-users.

DNR Response:

We will modify the TO Contractor minimum requirements to reflect the recommendation, amended to ensure that the above referenced minimum of two years’ experience be in the past five years. Please expect an amendment to the TORFP forthcoming in the next few days to formally address this change.

2. If Section 2.9.1.A can’t be modified to reflect two (2) years and end-users down to 1,000, can Section 2.9.1, which states: Only those Master Contractors that fully meet all minimum qualification criteria shall be eligible for TORFP proposal evaluation.

   The Master Contractor’s proposal and references will be used to verify minimum qualifications, be modified to reflect the following:

   The TO Contractor shall be able to furnish all necessary services required to successfully complete all tasks and work requirements and furnish high quality deliverables as described herein. The TO Contractor shall demonstrate in its proposal that it possess such expertise in-house or has fostered strategic alliances with other firms providing such services.

DNR Response:

We require that the TO Contractor have experience and competency in the area of our need and therefore cannot approve this request.

3. On page 4, Key Information Summary Sheet, there are no defined MBE sub-goals. However, on page 7, Section 1.12, it makes reference to “MBE goals and sub-goals.” Please confirm that there are no sub-goals for this TORFP.

DNR Response:

There are no MBE sub-goals for this TORFP.

4. On page 4, Key Information Summary Sheet, there are no defined VSBE sub-goals. However on page 7, Section 1.13, it makes reference to “VSBE goals.” Please confirm that there are no VSBE goals for this TORFP.
DNR Response:

There are no VSBE goals for this TORFP.

5. Regarding section 1.19 whose responsibility it is to provide the “proper disposition” of equipment, media and confidential information.

DNR Response:

Should recycling or other proper disposition of State equipment, media and/or confidential information be required; this action will take place at the State’s expense under the TORFP’s work order process, with the guidance of the State’s Information Technology (IT) Security Policy as referenced in Section 1.19 of this TORFP.

6. Page 12’s definition of system contains the following statement. “All Upgrades and regulatory updates shall be provided at no additional cost to the State.” Should this be removed per page 14’s description of the work order process?

DNR Response:

The definition of system on page 12 shall be so amended to allow all upgrades and regulatory updates to be handled through the monthly O&M or time and materials work order process contained in the TORFP. Please expect an amendment to the TORFP forthcoming in the next few days to formally address this change.

7. For 2.6.1.14 what is the required deliverable?

DNR Response:

Regarding requirement 2.6.1.14, the TO Contractor shall provide DNR a scan proving the OS and any other system and environment components are in compliance with the DISA STIGs. This deliverable shall be called “Deliverable 2.8.4.15 - System Compliance Scan” and included in the table of fixed price deliverables beginning on page 30. Please expect an amendment to the TORFP forthcoming in the next few days to formally address this change.

**Pre-Bid (2) Questions & Answers**

May 14, 2015

1. With whom did DNR partner to develop the Compass system?

DNR Response:

DNR previously contracted with JMT Technology Group out of Sparks, MD to develop and maintain the Compass system.

2. How will telephone sales services be handled in this TORFP?

DNR Response:

Telephone sales are not part of the scope of this TORFP.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Contact Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CD Dynamics</td>
<td>Patti Ramirez</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pianose@cdynamics.com">pianose@cdynamics.com</a></td>
<td>403-475-5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>DK Consulting</td>
<td>Heath Goisovich</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hgoisovich@dkconsult.net">hgoisovich@dkconsult.net</a></td>
<td>443-552-3257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>JMT</td>
<td>Jeanne Ruthloff</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jruthloff@jmtg.com">jruthloff@jmtg.com</a></td>
<td>410-316-2298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>JMT</td>
<td>JEFF ROBERTS</td>
<td>via phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>JMT</td>
<td>KELSEY HENSEY</td>
<td>via phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Section 2.6.3 of the TORFP indicates that “Work Orders shall be issued to perform operations and maintenance work as necessary and at the discretion of the TO Manager or designee when support activities require more than eight (8) hours in a particular week.” However in Attachment 1, Price Proposal Form, there is no specific line item within which to account for this base 8 hours per week of operations and maintenance labor. Should this be included in the fixed price Monthly Hosting fee?

   **DNR Response:**  
The department agrees that due to the nature of this consistent and predictable cost, it is appropriate to be included in the fixed price Monthly Hosting cost.

2. Regarding Attachment 1 Price Proposal Form; is the intent that the contractor will provide individual costs for the 2.8.4.1 through 2.8.4.12 (where applicable) or does the dark gray cell background indicate that these line items should be left blank? If the former, should the total in the first line of each table be the sum of all subsequent deliverables costs? Also, if the former is the expectation that deliverables that are not monthly activities (such as 2.8.4.9), the pricing still be provided in the form of monthly price X number of months?

   **DNR Response:**  
It is not the intent of the department that dark gray cells in the Attachment 1 Price Proposal Form be populated with specific costs. Only cells containing dollar signs ($) require values.

3. Regarding Attachment 1 Price Proposal Form; there does not appear to be a means to itemize costs for Transition-Out Activities. Is the assumption correct that, should these activities require more than the base 8 hours / week of support, these tasks will be subject to the work order process?

   **DNR Response:**  
As the specific circumstances and timing of Transition-Out Activities are currently unknown, the department considers it appropriate that delivery of these requirements beyond the base 8 hours/week be tied to the work order process.

End Questions & Answers #2

Issued by Jonathan Manley  
Department of Natural Resources