GENESEE COUNTY PURCHASING DEPARTMENT

GENESEE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BLDG.
1101 BEACH STREET, ROOM 200
FLINT, MICHIGAN 48502
TELEPHONE: (810) 257-3030
FAX: (810) 257-3380
www.gc4me.com

ERIC F. HOPSON
Purchasing Director

September 26, 2012

ADDENDUM #1

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) #12-031
NETWORK INFRASTRUCTURE AND STORAGE SOLUTION
FOR GENESEE COUNTY

1.   The due date and time for the above referenced RFP has been extended to Wednesday, October 3, 2012 by 3:00 p.m. (EDT).

2.   Please note that prior to the due date of proposals; the County may issue a second addendum amending the requirements of this solicitation.

3.   The minutes from the pre-proposal meeting and answers to written questions received have been included in the above referenced RFP.

Indicate on the Signature Page item #5 and the exterior of the envelope containing your proposal:

"ADDENDUM #1 RECEIVED"

ALL PROPOSALS MUST BE RECEIVED AT:
GENESEE COUNTY PURCHASING DEPARTMENT
1101 BEACH STREET, ROOM 200
FLINT, MI 48502

Eric F. Hopson

Eric F. Hopson, Purchasing Director
G:/bid2/2012/12-031 Add1

PRE-PROPOSAL MEETING

**RFP #12-031 NETWORK INFRASTRUCTURE AND STORAGE SOLUTION
FOR GENESEE COUNTY**

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2012

Attendees:

Eric F. Hopson, Purchasing Director
Maxine Daniels, IT Supervisor
Carlotta Brown, IT Network Coordinator
Joe White, IT System Engineer
Jamal Powell, IT Network Technician
Nassie Jamal, Avalon
Rob Rolison, Avalon
Clint Babcock, Data-Strategy
Bryan Johnston, Dell
Valerie Harrison, EMC

Mr. Hopson opened the meeting at approximately 2:05 p.m. He began the meeting by reviewing the following items in the RFP:

- Page 3 - Item 1:   Proposals are due, Monday, October 1, 2012 at 3:00 p.m. to the Genesee County Purchasing Department, 1101 Beach Street, Room 200, Flint, MI, 48502.

  Late proposals and proposals sent by facsimile or e-mail will not be accepted.

- Page 3 - Item 2:   This is not a Mandatory Pre-proposal Meeting. Firms not present may submit a proposal.

- Page 3 - Item 3:   Submit one original, four hardcopies and one electronic copy of your proposal. Your electronic copy can be submitted on a CD, DVD or USB flash drive formatted in Adobe (.pdf), Microsoft Word, and/or Microsoft Excel.

- Page 3 - Item 4:   All communications, any modifications, clarifications, amendments, questions, responses or any other matters related to this RFP, shall be made by and through the purchasing contact reference in this solicitation. No contact regarding this solicitation made with other County employees is permitted. Any violation of this condition may result in immediate rejection of proposal.

- Page 3 - Item 6: The County's Standard Proposed Contract is attached (Attachment 2) to this RFP. Have your firm review the entire RFP including that contract document. Submit a detailed statement of exceptions indicating any exceptions to the terms and conditions listed in the RFP and the proposed contract.

- Page 4 - Item 7: The County of Genesee requires a signed Genesee County Insurance Checklist with each proposal submitted. Insurance required per the specifications – see page 28

- Page 4 - Item 8: Preference for Genesee County Businesses and Veteran-Owned Businesses: Unless the funding source for the contract prohibits such preferences, in the case of requests for proposals where a quantitative based evaluation criteria is used for evaluating responsive proposals, Preferred Businesses shall be afforded an additional five (5) percent of the total evaluation points up to a maximum of five (5) points.

- Page 4 - Item 9: Proposals must be submitted in the format outlined in Section 8.

- Page 8 - Item 3: Questions & Inquiries: The deadline for all questions regarding this RFP was **Friday, September 14, 2012 by 5:00 p.m. (EDT)**, to the Genesee County Purchasing Department so that we could respond to those questions at the meeting today. The answers provided to the questions, as well as minutes of today's meeting, are not final until all of the information is provided in an addendum and posted to our website.

- Page 8 - Item 5: All addenda will be posted to our website at the same location where you downloaded the RFP. It is incumbent upon proposers to monitor our website for any addenda that might be issued relative to this RFP.

- Page 9 - Item 9: Covers the submission of responsive proposals. Given the information referenced here, it is important for firms to submit proposals consistent with the requirements in Section 8. Format of Proposals / Proposal Content.

- Page 9 - Item 10: Statement of Exceptions – Proposers should also note the requirements stated in Section 8.3.C.

- Page 9 - Item 12: Brand Names or Equivalents / Approved Alternates: There are references to Brand Names in this RFP as it relates to specifications. This language is not intended to limit or restrict competition. The reference to brand names is the standard of quality that we are looking for in terms of the various applications that will properly

- Page 9 - Item 13: Validity Period: Any proposal submitted as a result of this Request for Proposals shall be binding on the proposer for 120 calendar days following the due date of proposals.

- Page 9 - Items 15 & 16: Clarification of Proposals and Best and Final Offers:
  We anticipate that when proposals are evaluated, it's possible we are going to short list proposals. As we're short listing proposals, there may be discussions with firms on that short list to clarify items in their proposal. During that process, we don't provide any information about the proposals received or disclose the names of the short listed firms until the County awards a contract. To the extent that we pursue the Best and Final Offer process, then we would engage in negotiations with the short listed firms to obtain the best value for the County. During the Best and Final Offer process, we don't provide the names of short listed firms, or discuss the contents of the proposals submitted with the competition involved.

- Page 10 - Item 17: Disclosure: All information in an offeror's proposal is subject to disclosure under the provisions of Public Act N. 442 of 1976 known as the "Freedom of Information Act". Information that you feel is confidential, we ask that you mark it as Confidential in your proposal, request that we try to maintain the confidentiality of that information and also justify why you feel we should keep the information confidential. If proposals are FOIAed we have to take the steps necessary to remain in compliance with State law as well as protect anything that legitimately should remain confidential.

- Page 10 - Item 19: Project Manager: The proposer must provide a commitment that the Project Manager the proposer assigns to the project will be committed for the life of the project. If there is any change in staff from the original Project Manager the County has the right to approve those changes to the project.

- Section 4 - PROCUREMENT TIMETABLE – Self Explanatory.

- Section 5 - MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS OF PROPOSERS There are five listed.

  1. **Financial Stability:** Proposer shall be financially stable and have the financial wherewithal to carry out the requirements of this solicitation.

2. **Core Competency:** The proposer must be primarily or significantly engaged in providing the solutions and services as required in this solicitation.

3. **Years of Experience**: All proposers must have at least five (5) years of qualifying, direct experience, as determined by Genesee County, in the provision of network Infrastructure & storage solutions (including: implementation, training and support) for large government and corporate entities. That in fact that this is something that the firm actually does, and not something that they dabble in.

4. **Professional Experience & Qualifications:** The proposer's personnel and management to be utilized in the services required shall be knowledgeable in this market with demonstrated expertise. The County reserves the right to perform investigations as may be deemed necessary to insure that competent persons will be utilized in the performance of the contract.

5. **Proposer's Cooperation:** Willingness to supply information requested by Genesee County concerning a determination of its responsibility. If the proposer fails to supply any requested information, Genesee County will base its determination of responsibility upon any available information or may find the proposer non-responsive and not responsible if such failure is unreasonable. During the Clarification of Proposals process and Best and Final Offer process, we may ask for things that weren't originally included in the RFP. And we would want the short listed firms to respond and comply with those things. We don't intend to ask for anything that is unreasonable, but to ask for reasonable things to further determine what proposer and proposed solution is best for the County.

- Section 6. - BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND OVERVIEW

Joe White, IT System Engineer, provided background information and an overview of the project emphasizing the following:

- A comprehensive overhaul of the network environment.
  - ➢ Redesigning our core network infrastructure regarding data switches for just the core central portion.
  - ➢ Implement a storage solution that will meet current and growth needs,
  - ➢ implement new servers that will facilitate larger VM farms,
  - ➢ backup solution that will handle our backup and archival data

> ➤ bring all Microsoft licensing up to date to current standard revisions and include maintenance on all of those to keep those up to date in years going forward

- ▪ Services required with all of these are going to be implementation of said hardware and software,
  - ➤ anywhere from installing hardware into the racks,
  - ➤ configuring the devices on bootup,
  - ➤ getting connectivity going between existing infrastructure to the new infrastructure
  - ➤ and the migration of data between servers
  - ➤ training of staff to carry on existing maintenance

- Section 7. STATEMENT OF WORK/SERVICES

  Mr. White briefly reviewed the Statement of Work/Services in the solicitation.

- Section 8 - FORMAT OF PROPOSALS / PROPOSAL CONTENT

  Mr. Hopson reviewed this section of the RFP. He indicated that it was self-explanatory for the firms that have experience responding to solicitations generated by government entities. However, Mr. Hopson indicated that it was important for all firms to submit proposals that comply with this section of the RFP. In addition, he reminded everyone that proposal organization and format (responsiveness) is an evaluation factor in the RFP.

- Page 21. SECTION 10. SELECTION PROCEDURE

  Mr. Hopson indicated that the process for determining the successful proposal and proposer would be as described in this section. He indicated that members of the selection team would evaluate proposals consistent with the evaluation criteria and Attachment 1. In addition, an average of team members' scores would be used to determine the successful proposal or to shortlist the proposals received. It's important to note that adjustments would be made in the scores based on the County's Preference Policy for Genesee County Businesses and Veteran Owned Businesses.

  Please note the Selection Team may request interviews with the top three scoring proposers and may solicit Best and Final Offers (BAFOs). Selection Team members may recalculate points, based on possible interviews or BAFO scoring (if applicable), from the top three scoring proposers. During this process information concerning the proposals received and the firms that submitted proposals remain confidential.

- REVIEW OF WRITTEN QUESTIONS RECEIVED & ANSWERS PROVIDED

    County staff distributed answers to the questions received by the deadline. However, Mr. Hopson emphasized that answers provided in writing at the pre-proposal meeting are not official until an addendum is released and posted to the website.

Genesee County RFP #12-031 Answers to Submitted Questions (see bold font) – Please note that other questions & answers not highlighted in bold are questions that were asked at the pre-proposal meeting.

1.)   The RFP does not call out for SAN Switches. Would you like us to add Storage Switches to the response? Would (2) Switches be the preference for redundancy?

A1.   Yes – Please quote (2) 8Gb Fibre switches for Fibre connectivity.

Q1a.   Is there a port count?
A1a.   16 port minimum

Q1b.   Preference for switch vendor?
A1b.   Right now most of our switches are Cisco, but we're open to suggestions.

2.)   Does the SAN Storage need to have Block (ISCSI, FC, and FCoE) and File Level Storage (CIFS and NFS)? Would you want the Block and File Level Storage to be managed from the same interface?

A2.   SAN does need to have block level storage. File level storage is not a requirement, however if it's offered it should be managed from the same interface.

3.)   The RFP states the need for Block Level Storage Tiering. Would you want the system to perform File Level Storage Tiering?

A3.   File level storage tiering is not a requirement.

4.)   The RFP calls for 40TB of Useable Capacity.
    a. What type/s of drives would you like?

A4a.   Mixture of 15k, 10k, and 7k SAS drives for 3 tiers. There is no current need for SSD, EFD.

    b. How much performance is needed? (IOPS)

A4b. **A minimum of 4,000 IOPS is required using rotational drives, SSDs and EFDs are not to be used in IOPS calculations.**

c. What RAID Level would you like applied to each storage Tier

A4c. **We will allow vendor to decide RAID level for each tier and provide recommendations.**

4Q1.   Does quantity of drives matter to achieve IOPs or spacing requirement?
4A1.   We don't have a set number, but we don't want the smallest disks utilized for storage capacity, etc. Make vendor recommendation on disk sizing and why.

4Q2.   What raid level for different tiers?
4A2.   We will let the vendor make recommendations for raid level on tiers.

5.) **On Page 14 under the SAN Solution; an additional quote is requested for 10TB of additional storage with high speed disks. How would you like that broken out? EFD/SSD, 15K, and or both types mixed together?**

A5. **10TB of additional space should be quoted out as 15K SAS drives.**

6.) **On Page 14 under the SAN Solution; The ability to mix and match drive types and sizes for storage tiers is called out. Would you like the solution to be able to mix and match drive types EFD/SSD, 15K SAS, 10K SAS, and 7.2K NL-SAS), and sizes on the same drive enclosure? This is typically the best way to guarantee the highest efficiency and lowest cost to expand.**

A6. **Ability to mix/match drives on the same disk enclosure is not a requirement. We do want it to be included for the tiering.**

7.) **Is there a need to have Multi-Pathing built into the array for VMware Performance?**

A7. **Yes, Multi-pathing /MPIO support for VMware & Windows 2008/2012 is a requirement.**

8.) **On Page 14 under the SAN Solution: "Controllers must allow expansion, replacement, or upgrade of controllers without affecting existing system and data availability."**
a.   What type of Expansion on the Controllers?

A8a. **Addition of new data shelves, new disks types, faster disk connectivity, etc.**

      i.   **Cache Expansion?**

A8i.   Addition of new cards (SAS, Fibre, etc.)

      ii.   **The ability to replace the current controllers with bigger controllers?**

A8ii.   Yes – if replacing controllers to a different, larger model.

      b.   **When upgrading a mid tier platform, all processes must be passed to a single controller during the upgrade. To do this upgrade without incurring downtime, that single controller must be able to sustain the entire environment workload. In other words, your system would have to be less than 50% utilized for this to work. A single controller could not sustain more than a 50% workload. Is that acceptable?**

A8b.   Yes – This is acceptable and expected. A single controller should be able to handle the entire work load of the SAN in case of failure or upgrading of other controller.

9.)   The RFP calls out for both 8Gb FC Connectivity and 10Gb iSCSI Connectivity.
      a.   **Why is there a need for both protocols?**
A9a.   8Gb FC is required for local datacenter. 10GB iSCSI might be required for off-site Datacenter or server needs including replication and data mount points. It will also increase capabilities for local connectivity if required.

      b.   **Will you then require 8Gb FC and 10Gb iSCSI SAN Switches?**
A9b.   8Gb FC switches are required as addressed in question 1. 10Gb iSCSI switches are not a requirement if the need can be addressed by the required Core Switch as requested on page 14 of the RFP.

      c.   **Would you also want CIFS and NFS Protocols native on the array?**
A9c.   CIFS & NFS being native on the array is not a requirement.
How are you going to handle the file shares?

Q91.   Does the SAN need to have the ability to serve up NFS or CIFS shares natively? Or will this be handled by windows servers?
A91.   This will be handled by virtual windows servers

10.) On Page 15 under Other Features: "Instant Replay capabilities to have multiple point-in-time copies of data. These blocks of data must not occupy additional disk space, and must be able to be re-assigned to other systems."

a. **Instant Replay is a Snap Shot Technology that takes point in time snaps. Would you want the system to be able to perform Journaling that can go back to the last second (I/O) before an issue or bookmark was established?**

A10a. Snapshots of data and ability to mount said snapshots to same or different server hardware are a requirement. How the system manages these snapshots is not. If additional disks are required to hold these snapshots, please state why this is a requirement.

11.) **On Page 15 under Backup Solution:**
a) **The only way to support Global De-Duplication is for the solution to perform Source Based De-Duplication. Is Source Based De-Duplication then a Requirement?**
A11a. Clarification – We do not want separate DeDuplication pools. DeDuplication should take place across the entire data set. Source DeDuplication is a nice feature to have, though not a requirement.

b) **What Operating Systems would be in mind for Bare Metal Restores?**
A11b. Windows should be supported for Bare Metal Restore

Q11b1.   2003 2008 or both
A11b1.   2008 2003, no 2012 in the environment currently. But future enhancement request.

Q11b2.   Do you have any windows 2000 servers?
A11b2.   Yes – 3 windows 2000 servers

c) **Is Tape Out functionality wanted?**
A11c. Tape functionality of backup software is being requested in current or future implementation plans. LTO5 support with encrypted disks would be requested.

d) **Would the 10 years of Annual Backups be wanted on Tape or the Disk Based Solution?**
A11d. We will consider both platforms for the backup solution.

Q11.   **Do you have a tape backup solution preference currently?**
A11.   There is no preference.

THIS ENDS THE REVIEW OF WRITTEN QUESTIONS RECEIVED & THE ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS ASKED AT THE MEETING RELATED TO THE WRITTEN QUESTIONS.

Q12. Do you currently have a VOIP system?
A12. Yes – It's a Mitel Phone system.

Q13. How much interaction should the project manager have for the project?
A13. More than a handshake. We would like the last two or three migrations turned over to County IT staff.   The contractor's staff is responsible for the first. As far as the project manager, I expect the same project manager throughout the life of the project.

In the event the project is not progressing as it should, the County may request a different project manager to be assigned by the Contractor.

Q14. I'm really looking for what level of involvement do require of the Project Manager. Should the Project Manager be on site daily for the duration of the project?
A14. We do not require that level of involvement. However, interested firms should submit something reasonable as part of their proposal.

Q15. How do you want the SAN to handle future drive technologies?   What kind of requirements do you have for future drive technologies?
A15. That would fall under the upgradeability for the controllers   The SAN should be able to have a new card added to handle expansion of new drive types.

Q16. Regarding the old SANs, what's the need for migration?
A16. In the last six months, the County has experienced three occasions where the whole system has been down. Although we have to take a redundant approach, the system going down is not without problems. It really needs to stop.

Q17. For replication, are you stating between same manufacturer or different manufactures?
A17. Correct – Replication should be possible within the same manufacturer for SAN, but not expected to be able to replicate data to other manufacturer system.

Q18. Is there any idea on how much bandwidth is available for offsite DR or synchronous replication?
A18. We do request a synchronous replication currently, but a lot of that is going to be determined on how much bandwidth can support both. At this point, we do not have a figure for bandwidth for our offsite location.

Q19. Is there a DR site currently identified?
A19. No.

Q20. If you were to consider your offsite SAN, do you want that SAN to be available as a target to bring up your virtual servers in case of DR without any 3rd party software or requirement?

A20. Yes.

Q21. Do you want onsite training, on your own system, or go to class, or training videos?

A21. Hands on training is preferred.

Q22. Will there be a requirement for a performance bond or bid bond?

A22. I doubt that we will require the submission of a bid bond with proposals. In terms of a performance bond, we may consider that.

Q23. Do you have a preference for a local implementer?

A23. We are not requiring the involvement of a local implementer. There may some benefit to having a local firm involved as an implementer, but that is not something that is taken into consideration as it relates to the evaluation of proposals. Further, the local preference policy would not impact this particular issue. The local preference policy applies to the firm submitting the proposal, not a subcontractor.

THE COUNTY ENDED THE MEETING AND PROVIDED FIRMS IN
ATTENDANCE A TOUR OF THE DATA CENTER