

RFP #23RFP8393 - Acquisition of IT Cloud Platform Technology Services

Vendor Questions and State Responses

| Question Number | RFP Section | Question for the State | State Response |
|-----------------|--|---|---|
| 1 | 1.2.3 Description of Components | Please advise - given the current RFP requirements for “partner certifications” is Therap’s offer to meet all functional RFP requirements through its existing SAAS service, for which Therap is an Oracle Gold partner, eligible to respond to his RFP even though Therap is not a certified Azure or ServiceNow product? If the answer is not “yes” will the State modify the RFP requirement minimally to be more open to competition by allowing an “or equal” certification? | The State will only accept offers from vendors who meet the required partner certification/designation level for ServiceNow or Microsoft. The State will not modify the requirements as ServiceNow or Microsoft partner requirements are a must. |
| 2 | Appendix B: Information Technology Security Policy | the following link was provided in the RFP however it requires a SD Microsoft Login Credentials so the information cannot be accessed: https://bit.sd.gov/docs/Informatio%20Technology%20Security%20Policy%20-%20Contractor.pdf | The correct link for this is: https://bit.sd.gov/sys_attachment.do?sys_id=0564e7081b1ca950259ba932f54bcba5&view=true |
| 3 | 7.0 Cost Proposal | Can you please provide what specific cost information you are seeking? Without a Scope of Work it would be impossible to provide costs for development, configuration, data migration, interfacing and SaaS subscription | This section describes your recovery method for services provided. Please provide roles and hourly rates for typical engagements. For example, if you typically provide an account manager, architect, developers, etc. as roles for engagements, those would be listed with hourly rates. The “Total Hours on Project” and “Total Hours on Site” would be TBD, and the “Total” would be the hourly rate, per role. |

| Question Number | RFP Section | Question for the State | State Response |
|-----------------|-------------|--|--|
| 4 | 1.2.3 | <p>Following are the questions from Section, '1.2.3 Description of Components' (page 3,4, and 5) that states 'The cloud platform technology services required partner certification/designation levels, modules/services, and skills/rolls potentially desired are listed in the following tables'.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Are they looking for us to interface with ServiceNow so that we can provide the listed items, or are they wanting us to provide these using our system only? 2. Are they only looking for systems who have these partner designations with ServiceNow? 3. Are they only looking for systems who have these partner designations with Azure and Power Platform? | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is the list of potential ServiceNow roles and/or products an engagement may entail. 2. We are looking for partner designations of Premier, Elise or Global Elite ServiceNow partner. We are not looking for specific systems. 3. We are looking for partner designation of Gold Competency Microsoft partner. We are not looking for specific systems. |

| Question Number | RFP Section | Question for the State | State Response | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------|---|---|------|------------------------|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 5 | | <p>With regard to pricing/staffing, the provided table (p30) includes such columns as “<i>total hours on project</i>” and “<i>total hours on site</i>.” While we can easily provide roles and rates, we can’t provide “<i>total hours</i>,” since this is an open enrollment with no defined scope. Am I correct in thinking the only required columns for this table are Role and Hourly Rate?</p> <p>Likewise, how should “<i>Travel and Expenditure</i>” be populated, since we don’t know the number of trips, or number of days/nights.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Name (optional)</th><th>Role</th><th>Total Hours on Project</th><th>Total Hours on Site</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> </tbody> </table> | Name (optional) | Role | Total Hours on Project | Total Hours on Site | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>This section describes your recovery method for services provided. Please provide roles and hourly rates for typical engagements. For example, if you typically provide an account manager, architect, developers, etc. as roles for engagements, those would be listed with hourly rates. The “Total Hours on Project” and “Total Hours on Site” would be TBD, and the “Total” would be the hourly rate, per role.</p> |
| Name (optional) | Role | Total Hours on Project | Total Hours on Site | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | 4.3 | <p>On p25, you ask for Staff Resumes and References. Given that this is an open enrollment, we wouldn’t assign specific resources until we have a SOW to be paired with a resource’s skill set. How did you want us to address resumes and personal references? Please note that Planet Technologies relies exclusively on internal, full-time employees.</p> | <p>As specified in section 4.3, detailed resumes will be part of a detailed SOW for a specific engagement. The state prefers the actual resumes of resources who would be providing services are part of a typical engagement. The intent of this is to ensure that preferred vendors have sufficient resources to meet the needs of the state.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Question Number | RFP Section | Question for the State | State Response |
|-----------------|-------------|---|--|
| 7 | | Is fingerprinting required for each SOW? Can fingerprinting be completed once there is an SOW, or does it need to be completed prior to being considered for the SOW? | Fingerprint-based background checks will be part of a specific engagement detailed in a SOW. Background checks are not considered in advance of being considered for a SOW. |
| 8 | | How much lead time can the vendor expect when a project is identified to ensure the correct resources are available? | The lead time is mutually agreed upon to give enough time for resources to be engaged. |
| 9 | | Will the SOWs be direct between the vendor and the State of South Dakota, or will it go through the NASPO procurement process? | SOWs will be between the vendor and State of South Dakota directly. |
| 10 | | (Section XV – Password Policies) Does this section refer specifically to passwords used to access cloud platform technologies? | This refers to the vendor’s internally password policies enforced for employees. The State’s cloud platform technologies already have password enforcement for users who authenticate to those services. |
| 11 | | (Section XXXI – Work Product and Ownership and Use) Please clarify what is meant by “correct or review any errors or omissions in its work products.” | The vendor is warranting the product/services provided. |
| 12 | | Is this a new requirement or a follow-on contract? If this is a follow-on, please provide the current incumbent and budget. | This is a new RFP. |
| 13 | | What’s the scope of the Cloud implementation (such as application modernization, what are the different cloud services planned, etc.) | The scope will be defined in specific SOWs |

| Question Number | RFP Section | Question for the State | State Response |
|-----------------|-------------|---|--|
| 14 | | It is mentioned as “Cloud Platform technologies to meet the business needs of State Agencies”. Can we get few business use cases examples (such as data store or deployment pipelines or web application needs or use cases for websites, etc.) | Business use cases will vary across the spectrum of state government. These could be modernizing an existing application, moving to the cloud, etc. Specific scope will be defined in a SOW. |
| 15 | | RFP document stated that “The Cloud Platform technologies include but are not limited to: Platform as a Service (PaaS), Software as a Service (SaaS), Integration Platform as a Service (iPaaS) and Infrastructure as a Service (IaaS)”. Can we specific use case examples for this to understand the purpose of Cloud Platform technologies being used for so that it helps to determine the requirement and expertise accordingly. | Use cases will vary across the spectrum of state government. These could be modernizing an existing application, moving to the cloud, etc. Specific scope will be defined in a SOW. |
| 16 | | We see the skills/roles listed for the Tech stacks BUT it may require 2 or 3 resources for that one skill/role (For example it may need (2) Azure Data Engineer, (2) Microsoft Power Apps Developer, (1) Azure Platform Architect, etc.). Do we have the expected count of roles already defined. If yes, we need that list. If not, we can determine that according to the detailed scope/requirements of the project. We haven’t received the detailed scope yet. | This is the list of potential ServiceNow roles and/or products an engagement may entail. Counts and level of effort will be defined in a specific SOW. |

| Question Number | RFP Section | Question for the State | State Response |
|-----------------|-------------|--|---|
| 17 | 1.2.3 | We see the skills/roles listed for the Tech stacks under 1.2.3 stated as “not limited to” – Upon receiving the detailed scope/requirements of the project, we may need few more additional resources with additional skills/roles – Can we include and consider those new skills/roles according to the scope? | Yes. This is the list of potential ServiceNow roles and/or products an engagement may entail. Counts and level of effort will be defined in a specific SOW. |
| 18 | 4.1.1 | We see in the RFP document that under section 4.1.1. “In detailed SOWs for cloud platform services, resume details for all key personnel will be specified”. Can we assume that the proposal (RFP) doesn’t require any sample resumes/profiles and those will be shared as part of SOW? | Correct. This is the list of potential ServiceNow roles and/or products an engagement may entail. Counts and level of effort will be defined in a specific SOW. |
| 19 | | Are there any limitations to a consultant's off-site location (for example, offshore, nearshore, or onshore)? | The state requires onshore resources. Any deviation of this would require written state permission. |
| 20 | | Do any resources need to be on site? | This will be dependent on the specifics of a SOW for an engagement and the State’s need. |
| 21 | | Any citizenship requirements, such as US citizenship only or no Canadian citizenship, etc.? | Staff must legally be able to work in the US. |
| 22 | | Bid pricing (is there a requirement for on-site resources? If so, what is the expected percentage of on-site work?) | This will be dependent on the specifics of a SOW for an engagement and the State’s need. |
| 23 | | If on-site travel is required, how much of the travel costs will be reimbursed? | All travel will be reimbursed if on-site participation is required and will be details in a specific SOW. |

| Question Number | RFP Section | Question for the State | State Response |
|-----------------|--|--|---|
| 24 | RFP / embedded documents in Appendices A, C and D | <p>We are unable to extract the documents embedded in RFP document appendices. Please make the following documents available:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Certificate of Media Sanitization (Appendix A) • Contractor Security Acknowledgement (Appendix C) • Appendix D – Certification re Proh... (Appendix D) | These are on the website where the RFP is posted. |
| 25 | RFP / Appendix B – Information Technology Security Policy Contractor | We are unable to access the Security Acknowledgement Form (referenced in 10.3.4.2 and 230.74.4.1.). Please provide a copy of the document. | This is on the website where the RFP is posted. |
| 26 | RFP / Section 1.2.3 Description of Components | Are vendors required to apply to provide both the ServiceNow and Microsoft cloud platform technology services, or could a vendor apply for just one cloud platform service? | Vendor can provide either ServiceNow or Microsoft cloud platform technologies, or both. |

| Question Number | RFP Section | Question for the State | State Response |
|-----------------|---|---|---|
| 27 | RFP / Section 1.2.3 Description of Components | Should vendors assume that the cloud platform technology licenses and tools will be supplied by the State? | Yes |
| 28 | RFP Document / 8.1.1 Company Specialization | Scoring in section 8.1.1 mentions Microsoft competencies, but does not explicitly mention ServiceNow competencies. Will ServiceNow competencies be equally scored in the Company Specialization criteria? | Yes. |
| 29 | RFP Document / 8.1.2 Resources | How will the State assess the Contractor's Resources for the purposes of scoring this response? | The state prefers the actual resumes of resources who would be providing services are part of a typical engagement. The intent of this is to ensure that preferred vendors have sufficient resources to meet the needs of the state. |
| 30 | | Do you already have a solution(s) in place that you are looking to replace? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If so, what are the pain points with the existing solution(s)? | The State has a large legacy portfolio of applications. Use cases will vary across the spectrum of state government. Could be modernizing an existing application, moving to the cloud, etc. Specific scope will be defined in a SOW. |
| 31 | | Does the work need to be performed onsite or can it be performed remotely from onshore locations? | Most work can be performed remotely from onshore resources. Onsite resources will be dependent on the specifics of a SOW for an engagement and the State's need. |
| 32 | | If its onsite what is percentage of onsite travel required and is expenses paid for this project? | Percentage will be dependent on the specifics of a SOW for an engagement and the State's need. |
| 33 | | Does this work allow resource can used offshore capacity? | The state requires onshore resources. Any deviation of this would require written state permission. |

| Question Number | RFP Section | Question for the State | State Response |
|-----------------|-------------|---|--|
| 34 | | Is there a budget earmarked for this effort? | All SOWs for the length of the MSAs are not to exceed \$25 million. |
| 35 | | Can work be performed and supported from locations outside the United States as well, Mexico/Canada? | The state requires onshore resources. Any deviation of this would require written state permission. |
| 36 | | When is the project intended to be awarded and what is the potential start date? | Specific engagement, via a defined SOW, are to be determined. The award decision/contract negotiations is detailed in section 1.4 of the RFP. |
| 37 | | Is there an incumbent? If yes, can you provide the name of the company? | This is a new RFP. |
| 38 | | Does the bidder need to provide, install, and configure a monitoring solution as well? | This will depend on the scope defined in a specific SOW. |
| 39 | | Does the RFP submission need to be hard copy or is by email submission acceptable? | This is detailed in section 1.5 of the RFP. |
| 40 | 1.2.3 | <p>Does ServiceNow Exist in the ecosystem today?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If ServiceNow is in place, what release is it at? And how frequent is it upgraded to the next release? • If yes, what is the current status of the ServiceNow Implementation? • What modules are currently installed on it and/or which is the state planning? • Does the requesting RFP business unit have full ownership of the instance? | <p>ServiceNow already exists in the ecosystem.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tokyo, Patch 4. Upgraded approximately every 6 months. Tokyo Patch 4 upgrade was completed in January of 2023. • Tokyo Patch 4 is implemented in our Dev, Test, and Prod environments. • FedRamp instance currently is CSM. No specific plans for any additions at this time. No other plug-in's installed on the FedRAMP instance at this time. Public instance currently is ITSM and ITBM. • Yes |

| Question Number | RFP Section | Question for the State | State Response |
|-----------------|----------------------------|--|--|
| 41 | 1.2.3 ServiceNow | Is this a FedRAMP or public cloud instance? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If FedRAMP what is the level IL3/IL4? | The State utilizes both public and FedRAMP instances. Additional details regarding instances would be discussed as part of a specific SOW. |
| 42 | 1.2.3 ServiceNow | Does this instance of ServiceNow need to have Business to Business integrations? | Yes, the FedRamp CSM instance is in the process of implementing B2B integrations. |
| 43 | 1.2.3 ServiceNow | Can you give more details for expectations for listed integrations? | This will depend on the scope defined in a specific SOW. |
| 44 | 1.2.3 ServiceNow | Are there reporting/dashboard requirements outside of baseline ServiceNow reports/dashboards? | This will depend on the scope defined in a specific SOW. |
| 45 | 1.2.3 ServiceNow | Will ServiceNow act as the primary/master source for the Configuration Items or is there another application/tool that will server that purpose? | Yes, ServiceNow is the primary/master source for Configuration Items. |
| 46 | 1.2.3 ServiceNow | Does there need to be external access to ServiceNow for any of the modules i.e. CSM HR etc.? | This will depend on the scope defined in a specific SOW. |
| 47 | 1.2.3 ServiceNow | Are you planning to incorporate the baseline ServiceNow Mobile Application? | Not currently but could be a future consideration. |
| 48 | 1.2.3 Azure/Power Platform | What is the count of users like Administrator, Database Reader, and Read-only access users? | Details regarding user counts would be discussed as part of a specific SOW. |

| Question Number | RFP Section | Question for the State | State Response |
|-----------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| 49 | 1.2.3 Azure/Power Platform | Can you give more details for expectations for listed integrations? | This will depend on the scope defined in a specific SOW. |
| 50 | 1.2.3 Azure/Power Platform | Are you planning to use Azure as the primary integration layer between the systems? i.e. API Gateway | Yes |
| | | What is the current status on Servicenow Implementation? | The State is currently developing solution in ServiceNow as well and providing maintenance/upgrades of existing solutions. |
| | | <p>Please confirm if partner have silver competencies, they are eligible to submit as per M below in RFP document?</p> <p>M. Corporate resources available to perform the work, including any specialized services, within the specified time limits for the project. For Microsoft Partners, please list the Microsoft Competencies for the related technologies from Section 1.2.3 and whether they are gold or silver competencies.</p> | We require Gold partner competencies related to those services/platforms as specified in the RFP, section 1.2.3. There may be other competencies not listed that Silver level is acceptable. |