

STATE OF ALASKA RFP NUMBER 2016-0200-3405
AMENDMENT NUMBER TWO



Department of Administration
Division of General Services
333 Willoughby Avenue, 7th Floor
PO Box 110210
Juneau, Alaska 99811-0210

THIS IS NOT AN ORDER

DATE AMENDMENT ISSUED: April 26, 2016

RFP TITLE: ALMR SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT SERVICES

IMPORTANT NOTE TO OFFERORS: This amendment is being issued to answer question(s) received and/or to modify a section of the Request for Proposals (RFP). Only the following items/sections referenced in this amendment are to be changed. All other terms and conditions of the original RFP remain the same.

The following section has being modified on the RFP to read as follow:

Page 8, Section 4.4 – PROPOSAL FORM (ATTACHMENT B)

- System Manager– will be the daily single point of contact for the State for this service (the State can contact at any time to resolve any issues and answer any questions) and will be the lead for the execution of this service for the entire duration of the service.
- Systems Technologist – will be on the jobsite every day for the entire duration of the service.

Page 10, Section 4.8 – PAST PERFORMANCE INFORMATION (ATTACHMENTS F, G, H)

- The System Manager (Individual that is listed in Attachment B)
- The Systems Technologist (Individual that is listed in Attachment B)

Reference List Requirements (Attachment F)

- The System Manager and the Systems Technologist can use the same past references as the Firm, provided that they were used on those particular projects.

Page 12, Section 5.2– EVALUATION SUMMARY

Proposals will be prioritized based on the categories described below.

Evaluation Category	Points
Risk Assessment Plan	100
Value Assessment Plan	100
Past Performance Information (Firm, Primary Subcontractor, System Manager & Systems Technologist)	50
Interviews (System Manager & Systems Technologist)	250
Alaska Offeror Preference	100
Cost	400
Total	1,000

Page 14, Section 5.6– INTERVIEWS

“The State will conduct interviews with the System Manager and the Systems Technologist from each of the Shortlisted Offerors.”

Page 38, Section 3.1.4.6–PERSONNEL

The Offeror shall handle all classified matter in accordance with Exhibit H “Contract Security Classification Specification – DD Form 254.”

Page 47, Attachment B– PROPOSAL COVER SHEET

CRITICAL TEAM MEMBERS

Name of System Manager ¹:

Name of System’s Technologist:

¹The System Manager is the individual who will be the daily point of contact throughout this project.

²The Systems Technologist is the individual who will be on the jobsite every day throughout this project.

Page 63, Attachment F–REFERENCE LIST

PAST PROJECT LIST – SYSTEM MANAGER

PAST PROJECT LIST – SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGIST

Page 64, Attachment G– PAST PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

To: _____
Name of person completing survey

Pho _____ **Email:** _____

Past Performance Survey of: _____
Name of Company (and/or) Name of System Manager (and/or) Name of Systems Technologist

Page 66, Attachment H– PAST PERFORMANCE RATING

PAST PERFORMANCE RATING – SYSTEM MANAGER

PAST PERFORMANCE RATING – SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGIST

Attachment I– COST PROPOSAL FORM

Table C	System Management Services Description	Monthly Costs	x 12	Yearly Cost	x 10	=	Extended Cost
	Master Site System Technologist	\$ -	x12	\$ -	x 10	=	\$ -
	OEM Technical Support Services	\$ -	x12	\$ -	x 10	=	\$ -
	Cybersecurity Services	\$ -	x12	\$ -	x 10	=	\$ -
	SUB-TOTAL	\$ -		\$ -		=	\$ -

Table D	Miscellaneous Support Staff Titles	Hourly Rates	x	Estimated Hours	=	Extended Cost
	System Manager	\$ -	x	100 hrs	=	\$ -
	Systems Technologist	\$ -	x	100 hrs	=	\$ -
	Support Technician	\$ -	x	100 hrs	=	\$ -
	Others	\$ -	x	100 hrs	=	\$ -
	SUB-TOTAL	\$ -			=	\$ -

The following section has being added to the RFP:

Page 44, Exhibit H– DD FORM 254 & INSTRUCTIONS

Questions Received:

- Q. Can the interviews of the Program Manager and the Systems Engineer be recorded due to the statement in Section 4.1 second paragraph states... *“It is imperative that each Offeror realize that what is written in the proposals and discussed in the interview will become part of the Offeror’s final contract.”*
- A. **Yes.**
- Q. Attachment F-Reference List for the Program Manager and the Systems Engineer is the same table that is being used for the Reference List of the Offeror and the Primary Subcontractor, is this correct or should this table be corrected to request “personal references” or “previous employer references”? Please clarify.
- A. **See page 10 of the RFP, Sec. 4.8—Past Performance Information, specifically Reference List Requirements.**
- Q. The Service Level Agreement references a “System Manager” and a “System Technologist/Technician” but does not reference a “Program Manager” or a Systems Engineer”. Please clarify if the System Manager is being considered as the Program Manager and if the Systems Engineer is the System Technologist/Technician within the RFP. Also, the Cost Model in Section 1 references all three different titles and is not consistent with either the RFP or the SLA. Please clarify.
- A. **See modifications to pages 8, 10, 12, 14, 47, 63, 64, and 66 of the RFP and pertinent attachments.**
- Q. Section 5.2 states that the Alaska Offeror Preference equals 100 points. If the Offeror is a foreign corporation but has an Alaska Business license to do business in Alaska, will the full 100 points still be given or will there be a deduction in points for not being incorporated within the State of Alaska, and if so, how many points would be deducted?
- A. **See page 26 of the RFP, Sec. 8.34—Alaska Offeror Preference.**
- Q. Please clarify the statement in Section 4.9 of the last paragraph... “Offeror must provide a percentage discount for every Optional Maintenance Services Level of the System Maintenance Service. The percentage discounts will be applied to System Maintenance Services Fees as provided in the Offeror’s Cost Proposal.”
- A. **Offeror must provide a proposed fee for each service component of the System Maintenance Services at the current service level set out in Exhibit F. Each of these service components has multiple options for either increase or decrease the service level. For these the Offeror has been asked to provide a percentage fee to increase or decrease the service cost.**

Q. The RFP requirements are vague as whether the proposal should be addressed towards the service level agreement or towards what is requested in the RFP for service level maintenance. Please clarify.

A. Offeror's proposal should be addressed towards what is requested in the RFP and Exhibit F for service level maintenance.

The Service Level Agreement (SLA) serves to outline the operation and maintenance (O&M) services required for the System infrastructure that's currently provided by the current contractor to the User Council in support of network, infrastructure, assets, configuration, security and user management and support. A new SLA will be set with the awarded Offeror based on service level maintenance listed in the scope of work (Appendix A).

Q. It is not clear if the Offeror will be billing the state and then the state and DOD will work out a payment schedule or if the Vendor, once the contract begins, will be billing the State and DOD separately based on some sort of cost sharing. Can you please clarify?

A. The Offeror will be billing to each entity separately.

Q. On the Pricing table, you call for pricing "monitoring" in Table A on a per site basis but then ask for a "monitoring" quote in Table C. This seems to have monitoring priced out twice. Can you clarify?

A. See modifications to the Cost Proposal Form—Attachment I

Q. Can you clarify what is the Appendix I ("Contract security Classification Specification – DD Form 254") referenced in page 38 of RFP, specifically Section 3.1.4.6 "Personnel"? There is no Appendix I in the RFP.

A. See modifications to page 38, Section 3.1.4.6 –Personnel and page 44, Exhibit H – DD Form 254 & Instructions. Exhibits H has been added to the RFP posting.