

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION

1. AMENDMENT NUMBER 1	2. DATE ISSUED 10-6-2016	3. NUMBER OF PAGES 4 including this top page
4. ISSUED BY University of Maryland Department of Procurement & Strategic Sourcing 2109-C Patuxent Building College Park, Maryland 20742 POINTS OF CONTACT: Jeanne Parker, Assistant Director Carol Munn, Senior Buyer TELEPHONE NUMBERS: 301-405-7416 (Ms. Parker) 301-405-5859 (Ms. Munn) EMAIL ADDRESSES: jparker2@umd.edu cmunn@umd.edu		5. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 4)
6. NAME, ADDRESS AND FEI NUMBER OF CONTRACTOR		7A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NUMBER 972016
		7B. DATED 10/3/2016
8. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION		
<p>The solicitation identified in 7A above is amended as set forth in Item 9.</p> <p>The due date and time specified for receipt of offers/bids _____ is extended, <u> X </u> is not extended.</p> <p>Contractor must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the due date and time specified in the solicitation or as amended, by completing Items 6 and 10 and returning <u>1</u> copy of the amendment to the Issuing Office identified in Item 4 with their Proposal.</p> <p>FAILURE OF CONTRACTOR'S ACKNOWLEDGEMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR RECEIPT OF OFFERS/BIDS PRIOR TO THE DUE DATE AND TIME SPECIFIED MAY RENDER CONTRACTOR'S OFFER UNACCEPTABLE/ NON-RESPONSIVE AND SUBJECT TO REJECTION.</p>		
9. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT (Use additional pages if required) The RFP is amended to correct the numbering in Section C, 2.0 – CATEGORIES AND CATEGORY SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS, beginning on page 24: 2.1 change to <u>2.2</u> for Category 2 – Data Storage Devices and Systems 2.2 change to <u>2.3</u> for Category 3 – Server Class Hardware/ Equipment and Virtual Computing 2.3 change to <u>2.4</u> for Category 4 – Network Hardware 2.4 change to <u>2.5</u> for Category 5 – Computer Hardware Peripherals This amendment also provides answers to questions received to date, as per the attached 3 pages. Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 7A, including previous amendments, if any, shall remain in full force and effect.		
10A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or Print)		11A. NAME OF PROCUREMENT OFFICER (Type or Print) Jeanne Parker, Assistant Director, IT Procurement
10B. CONTRACTOR SIGNATURE (Signature of Person Authorized to Sign)	10C. DATE SIGNED	

Description of Amendment (Continued):

MEEC IT Hardware RFP 972016

Amendment 1 – Questions (Q) and Answers (A)

1. **Q:** This question is to obtain clarification regarding the use of the Technical Proposal Response Submission Matrix; Section C – Specifications and Requirements. Does the responder submit both a written response to the different items in Section C, items 1-7 within the technical response and/or complete the area in the Vendor Response cell in the Matrix document (in other words complete both a written response and complete the cell within the Matrix)? Or does the responder use the Matrix as a guide to make sure they have responses to each item within the section? Or does the responder use the Vendor Response cell within the Matrix to indicate where, in the responder's response document, the response actually resides inside of the responders document?

A: In response to the questions in item 1. above, page 35 of the RFP, Section 8.0 – Technical Proposal Response Submission Matrix, the term "Respondent Comments" is corrected to "VENDOR RESPONSE."

Proposers are to submit responses directly into Section C's Matrix in the "VENDOR RESPONSE" cell. The intention is not to have a separate narrative proposal document in addition to the completed Section C Matrix. Rather, the Proposal shall consist of the completed VENDOR RESPONSE in the Matrix followed by attachments as needed. As noted in Section 8.0 on page 35 of the RFP, it is acceptable to state in the VENDOR RESPONSE cell for some items "See Attached." For example, in meeting the "M" for mandatory requirement of an Executive / Management Summary of what your firm is proposing for MEEC in response to this RFP, it is acceptable to put "See Attached" in the VENDOR RESPONSE cell in the Matrix and include a clearly marked attachment that is an executive summary. Clearly marked means the attachment should be marked with "Requirement Item Number Section A-2, M, 1.a" for this brief synopses. As it is the first response required in the Matrix, that attachment would be the first attachment to directly follow the completed Matrix. Another "See Attached" example would be to attach required Resumes in Requirement Item No. 1.3.6.

Using the Matrix is required for responding to the RFP requirements and therefore it is more than a guide. The Matrix specifies the requirement priority by code and it provides instructions on the VENDOR RESPONSE required. For example, Requirement Item No. 1.12 on Records and Records Retention is a mandatory requirement that requires the Contractor to confirm its agreement to this requirement in the VENDOR RESPONSE.

The Matrix also serves as a checklist. It provides the information and the format needed as a cross-reference to the requirements as stated in Section C items 1-7. For example, for Requirement Item No. 1.2 – an overview of the proposer's firm/company, the Response Checklist cell notes that this response may be up to one page in length.

2. **Q:** This question is to obtain clarification on the submission of a response for each manufacture it will be providing in each category; Section C – Specifications and Requirements. It is noted in 1.1 that "It is not necessary to submit a separate technical proposal for each manufacturer represented." For clarification, the responder is to state the brand name(s) of each manufacturer, provide firm overview, capabilities 1.3 – 1.14, etc. for each category in which it will be offering? For instance, an offeror has three (3) brands/ manufacturers it wants to propose in Category 4. The offeror only needs to state those three (3) brands/ manufacturers and then only provide the firm overview, capabilities 1.3 – 1.14, etc. within the category (once).

A: Section C – Specifications and Requirements item 1.1 on page 18 of the RFP is deleted and its associated Requirement Item No. 1.1 in the Technical Proposal Response Submission Matrix on page 36 of the RFP is also deleted. They are deleted as the information is already covered in the Categories and Category Specific Requirements Section 2 that starts on page 22 of the RFP.

To be clear, for response to the requirements in Section C – Specifications and Requirements 1.0 General Mandatory Technical Requirements Including Base Warranties by Category, vendors are to submit VENDOR RESPONSE directly in the Technical Proposal Response Submission Matrix for each applicable requirement in Requirement Item Nos. 1.2 through 1.14. These Section 1.0 requirements are overall to the proposal to be responded to once as opposed to multiple times by category. For example, the 1.2 Firm Overview is submitted as one VENDOR RESPONSE for Requirement Item No. 1.2. Note that for the Section 1 requirements, the **only** Requirement Item No. that is not applicable to all vendors is 1.13.2. That is, Requirement Item No. 1.13.2 does not apply to a vendor unless they are proposing Category 5 Computer Hardware Peripherals.

To be clear, the Categories and Category Specific requirements for VENDOR RESPONSE in the Technical Proposal Response Submission Matrix are Requirement Item Nos. 2.1 through 2.5. Again, vendors are to submit VENDOR RESPONSE directly into the cells in the Technical Proposal Response Submission Matrix for each applicable requirement in Requirement Item Nos. A vendor proposing only Category 4 must complete VENDOR RESPONSE in the Matrix for the two (2) M/I priority code items in Requirement Item No. 2.4 and may provide VENDOR RESPONSE to any of the additional four (4) desirable items designated as D/I priority code.

3. **Q:** This question is to obtain clarification on the use of References; Section C – Specifications and Requirements, 7.1 References. Does the offeror/ responder only need to complete the reference document once and add that to the technical response or does the offeror/ responder need to complete the reference document for each category in which they are submitting?

A: The reference requirement is overall as opposed to a Category by Category requirement. Proposers are to submit their references using the Reference Form included in Section C 7.0 on Page 34 of the RFP. Per Section 7.1 References, three (3) references are required where at least two (2) must be “active” (as opposed to expired) contracts. In the Matrix Requirement Item No. 7.0, it is acceptable for vendors to state “See Attached” in the VENDOR RESPONSE and attach the Reference Form to include items 7.1.1, 7.1.2 and 7.1.3 for the required three (3) references.

4. **Q:** This question is to obtain clarification on the contents and order of presentation of Volume I – Technical Specifications & Business Requirements; Section M. Two Volume Proposal, 1. Volume I - Technical Specifications & Business Requirements. It is stated that “Volume I must contain the following sections:” a. Executive / Management Summary and b. The Technical Proposal (and the associated documents). For Section C, to further clarify, the offeror/ responder only needs to submit the Category and include within that Category, state the brand(s)/manufacturer(s) and provide firm overview, capabilities 1.3 – 1.14, etc.

I believe I am attempting to gain clarity on the answer to question #2. I also want to confirm what the Technical Proposal must contain (p.11) and the order in which you would like to see it in our proposal. Both are stated clearly in the RFP but the answer from question #2 might affect how we prepare our submission. If the answer to question #2 is Yes ‘It is not necessary to submit a separate technical proposal for each manufacturer represented’ then I believe I have a handle on what the Technical Proposal must contain and the order in which you would like to see it. I guess this is not a question but a desire to confirm what I think I read.

A: See answer to Question 2 above.

Page 11 of the RFP provides the content for what makes up the Technical Proposal. It specifies what must be completed and/or signed on the:

1. Solicitation/Contract Form Section A-1.
2. Section G 5 - on page 47 of the RFP - Contractor’s name, title, address and contact info for any Notices associated with a resulting Award/Contract
3. Section C – Matrix which includes the References

4. Affidavits and Certifications – These required documents for completion are in Section K of the RFP – Representations, Certifications and other Statements and are included in the Matrix where it is acceptable to note in the VENDOR RESPONSE cells of the Matrix “See Attached” and attach them after the Matrix.
5. **Q:** I noticed that some of the product lines we already have on contract are not on the RFP (Nimble, Isilon, Juniper, Wyse). How do we address this so we keep them on contract?
A: Isilon (spelling corrected from Isolon in the RFP) and Nimble are listed under Category 2 (pg. 24) and Juniper is listed under Category 4 (pg. 28).

Wyse is now owned by Dell. Any Wyse equipment would be submitted in Categories proposed as Dell equipment. For clarity, a contractor may specify Dell/Wyse in their proposal.

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION

1. AMENDMENT NUMBER 2		2. DATE ISSUED 10-7-2016	3. NUMBER OF PAGES 4 including this top page
4. ISSUED BY University of Maryland Department of Procurement & Strategic Sourcing 2109-C Patuxent Building College Park, Maryland 20742 POINTS OF CONTACT: Jeanne Parker, Assistant Director Carol Munn, Senior Buyer TELEPHONE NUMBERS: 301-405-7416 (Ms. Parker) 301-405-5859 (Ms. Munn) EMAIL ADDRESSES: jparker2@umd.edu cmunn@umd.edu		5. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 4)	
6. NAME, ADDRESS AND FEI NUMBER OF CONTRACTOR		7A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NUMBER 972016	
		7B. DATED 10/3/2016	
8. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION			
<p>The solicitation identified in 7A above is amended as set forth in Item 9.</p> <p>The due date and time specified for receipt of offers/bids _____ is extended, <u> X </u> is not extended.</p> <p>Contractor must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the due date and time specified in the solicitation or as amended, by completing Items 6 and 10 and returning <u> 1 </u> copy of the amendment to the Issuing Office identified in Item 4 with their Proposal.</p> <p>FAILURE OF CONTRACTOR'S ACKNOWLEDGEMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR RECEIPT OF OFFERS/BIDS PRIOR TO THE DUE DATE AND TIME SPECIFIED MAY RENDER CONTRACTOR'S OFFER UNACCEPTABLE/ NON-RESPONSIVE AND SUBJECT TO REJECTION.</p>			
9. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT (Use additional pages if required)			
<p>9.1 The RFP is amended to provide answers to questions received to date, as per the attached 3 pages.</p> <p>9.2 All questions to this RFP shall be consecutively numbered in the Amendments. For example, this Amendment 2 starts with question number 6 as Amendment 1 included questions 1 through 5.</p> <p>Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 7A, including previous amendments, if any, shall remain in full force and effect.</p>			
10A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or Print)		11A. NAME OF PROCUREMENT OFFICER (Type or Print)	
10B. CONTRACTOR SIGNATURE		Jeanne Parker, Assistant Director, IT Procurement	
(Signature of Person Authorized to Sign)		10C. DATE SIGNED	

Description of Amendment (Continued):

MEEC IT Hardware RFP 972016

Amendment 2 – Questions (Q) and Answers (A)

6. **Q:** *Requirement for Section C, Item 1.3.4* - The USM has stated that the offeror must provide a letter, certificate or other evidence that they (offeror) are a recognized and approved reseller of the hardware and associated software offered in their proposals.

Does the required evidence need to originate from the manufacturer directly on their letter head or will a letter from a global distribution company confirming that the offeror is in good standing and authorized to sell a certain brand(s) suffice?

A: A letter from a global distribution company is acceptable. The letter or certificate must be current and in force and effect. If the Offeror proposes to resell multiple brands, they must provide a letter, certificate or other evidence that they are a recognized and approved reseller for each and every brand or manufacturer (peripheral devices excepted). The USM reserves the right to contact any manufacturer to verify that the Offeror is authorized and approved by the manufacturer to resell the hardware and associated software. If such authorization is denied, the Procurement Official may consider the Offeror's proposal not susceptible of receiving an award, and may reject the Offeror's proposal.

7. **Q:** *Requirement for Section A-2, Items 3, 4 & 6 – Purpose, IDIQ Contracts & Scope of Award*

Does USM have a limited number of contractors that it desires to award a single product line? For example, in Category 1: Desktop, Laptop and Portables, how many contractors will be awarded HP or Dell?

A: There is not a limited number of contractors desired for award of Category brand/manufacturer. The number of contractors that may be awarded HP or Dell for Category 1 is not set.

8. **Q:** *Requirement for Section L, Item C. – Technical Evaluation*

Will USM be utilizing a point system for each of the 9 identified areas of evaluation criteria stated in this section? If so, will the USM share the point system details? If there is no point system, will USM state the proposed evaluation criteria details?

A: No, a point system will not be utilized. Adjectival ratings are determined in evaluating a proposal's strengths and weaknesses in accordance with the 9 criteria in Section L listed in order of importance.

9. **Q:** *Requirement for Section 2.1 Category 2 – Data Storage Devices and Systems*

Can the USM confirm the spelling of the Nexan product line? It is believed that the intended product line is Nexsan.

A: Confirmed. The RFP is updated to correct in Section 2.1 Category 2 – Data Storage Devices and Systems: Nexan is changed to Nexsan.

10. **Q:** *Requirement for Section Pricing Item 2 – ♦Note:* Proposers may add **one (1), and only one**, "other" or additional brand or manufacturer in each category. These additional brands are to be added in the worksheet boxes labeled with the Club symbol "♣" (at the end of each Brand column). The corresponding Discount and Value Added Pricing should be listed with the proposed brand. Acceptance of the brand will be subject to the decision of the evaluation committee, who may designate the brand as acceptable or reject the brand.

If an additional brand is proposed, but rejected by the evaluation committee, would that rejection have a negative impact on our bid for other MFG's within the same category?

A: No.

11. Q: *Requirement for Section A-2, Item 11 – Price Quotes*

The RFQ states that prices may not be adjusted nor additional fees charged if the MEEC participating institution pays by purchase order with Net 30 day payment terms, or if they pay by credit card. Credit card convenience fees are specifically prohibited under the contract for all MEEC participating institutions.

Can the USM anticipate the percent of business that could be transacted via credit card under this contract?

A: MEEC does not have any historical reporting information on the percentage of credit card to other forms of payment.

12. Q: Because we are a manufacturer with several approved resellers, we were hoping to respond to this RFP and provide a shortlist of resellers either with our proposal or upon award. Is this possible? If so, how should we go about giving you this information?

A: No, this is not possible. A vendor may respond as the manufacturer, however cannot then submit their own short list for resellers. Resellers must submit their own Proposals to be evaluated for Award of a Contract under this RFP.

13. Q: Enterprise level solutions contractors provide services that are in demand by MEEC institutions. These enterprise level solutions providers don't necessarily provide category 1 and category 5 products and therefore of they would not place in the top three performers in those categories (1 & 5). We would like to request that solutions contractors be evaluated individually in the categories they propose, or in categories 2,3 and 4 separately. MEEC institutions need the services.

A: The following changes are made to the RFP relating to Solutions Contractors:

Section A-2 – Background/Purpose, Instructions, Conditions and Notices to Contractors. A.
Background & Purpose

6. Scope of Award – Categories and Solutions Contractors Solutions Contractors (page 4 of the RFP): The second sentence is deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

To be eligible for a Solutions Contractor award, a contractor must be rated and ranked as one of the top contractors in at least two of the Categories excluding Category 5 that is not required for submission in order for a vendor to be a Solutions Contractor.

10. DEFINITIONS of Terms Used in this RFP – Solutions Contractor (page 6 of the RFP)
The first sentence is deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

A contractor must be rated and ranked as one of the top contractors in at least two of the Categories excluding Category 5 that is not required for submission in order for a vendor to be a Solutions Contractor.

Section C – Specifications and Requirements 8.0 Technical Proposal Response Submission Matrix

Requirement Item No. 2.0 Description/Requirements Heading (page 38 of the RFP)
The second sentence is deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

Solutions Contractors will be selected based on evaluation of firms that submit in at least two of the Categories excluding Category 5

Section L – Evaluation Factors for Award C. Technical Evaluation

8.0 Solutions Contractors (page 83 of the RFP)

The second sentence is deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

To be eligible for a Solutions Contractor award, a contractor must be rated and ranked as one of the top contractors in at least two of the Categories excluding Category 5 that is not required for submission in order for a vendor to be a Solutions Contractor.

14. **Q:** Value Added Pricing: Is this meant to only mean "volume discount"? Traditionally Value Added Programs are typically something where the reseller adds value through pre and post-sale services related to the hardware sale.

A: No, Value Added Pricing is not meant to only mean "volume discount." It may include a vendor's pricing program that adds value for MEEC members that is not otherwise listed in this RFP.

15. **Q:** Is the RFP for new product only or can a vendor offer refurbished product as well?

A: Revise Section C, paragraph 1.4 New and Unused Equipment to say, "All equipment purchased under this agreement shall be new and unused, unless a participating MEEC Institution issues a Task Order Request for Quotation (TORFQ) or Task Order Request for Proposal (TORFP) that specifically allows submission of offers that include used or refurbished equipment. Used or refurbished equipment may not be substituted without the ordering institutions written approval. As stated under the warranty sections, it is acceptable for replacement parts to be serviceably used, comparable in function and performance to the original part, and warranted for the remainder of the original warranty, or thirty days from the date of installation of the replacement part, whichever is longer.

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION		
1. AMENDMENT NUMBER 3	2. DATE ISSUED 10-14-2016	3. NUMBER OF PAGES 12 including this top page
4. ISSUED BY University of Maryland Department of Procurement & Strategic Sourcing 2109-C Patuxent Building College Park, Maryland 20742 POINTS OF CONTACT: Jeanne Parker, Assistant Director Carol Munn, Senior Buyer TELEPHONE NUMBERS: 301-405-7416 (Ms. Parker) 301-405-5859 (Ms. Munn) EMAIL ADDRESSES: jparker2@umd.edu cmunn@umd.edu		5. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 4)
6. NAME, ADDRESS AND FEI NUMBER OF CONTRACTOR		7A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NUMBER 972016
		7B. DATED 10/3/2016
8. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION		
<p>The solicitation identified in 7A above is amended as set forth in Item 9.</p> <p>The due date and time specified for receipt of offers/bids _____ is extended, <u> X </u> is not extended.</p> <p>Contractor must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the due date and time specified in the solicitation or as amended, by completing Items 6 and 10 and returning <u> 1 </u> copy of the amendment to the Issuing Office identified in Item 4 with their Proposal.</p> <p>FAILURE OF CONTRACTOR'S ACKNOWLEDGEMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR RECEIPT OF OFFERS/BIDS PRIOR TO THE DUE DATE AND TIME SPECIFIED MAY RENDER CONTRACTOR'S OFFER UNACCEPTABLE/ NON-RESPONSIVE AND SUBJECT TO REJECTION.</p>		
9. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT (Use additional pages if required)		
9.1 The RFP is amended to answer questions received since Amendment 2 through 10/13/2016; provide information from the 10/10/16 Pre-Proposal Conference including questions and answers from the conference.		
9.2 The RFP is amended for Section B – Pricing adding item 7. as follows:		
7. Offerors including financing of hardware purchases as allowed per Section A-2 item 7. Financing and Leasing on page 5 of the RFP, must include their leasing terms as an appendix to the financial proposal. (Offerors are not required to offer financing of hardware and are not required to provide hardware on a lease basis.)		
9.3 As a result of questions answered, the RFP is amended to replace Attachment B the Pricing Form with the attached updated Excel File: <Financial Proposal – UMD-MEEC HW – RFP 972016 – Revised 10-14-16>		
Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 7A, including previous amendments, remain in full force and effect.		
10A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or Print)		11A. NAME OF PROCUREMENT OFFICER (Type or Print)
10B. CONTRACTOR SIGNATURE	10C. DATE SIGNED	Jeanne Parker, Assistant Director, IT Procurement
(Signature of Person Authorized to Sign)		

Description of Amendment (Continued):

MEEC IT Hardware RFP 972016

Amendment 3 – Pre- Proposal Conference Information and Questions (Q) and Answers (A)

Questions Prior to the Pre-Proposal Conference:

16. **Q:** On the bid it states discount from the manufacture MSRP. Most all manufacture will have a set spa or discount based on the opportunity so I don't understand how a vendor can say what discount you would give not knowing the opportunity? Say you buy 1 desktop, that discount would be different than if you purchased a 1000. The same would be for every large supplier Cisco, Emc, Dell, etc. I was wondering if you could help me understand that question in the RFP.

A: The RFP response calls for a vendor's minimum discount off of a contractor's published or otherwise verifiable Standard Educational List Pricing (SELP). This RFP is for indefinite delivery indefinite quantity (IDIQ) contracts. For IDIQ orders, it means a minimum discount off of a vendor's SELP. Value added pricing may be proposed. For example, an offeror could propose higher discounts based by thresholds of quantity.

Pre-Proposal Conference – Meeting Summary and Questions & Answers:

A copy of the PowerPoint presentation with a correction to the Contracts Award date is included with this Amendment as an attachment. On slide 2, the Mid-March date was incorrectly listed as 2016 and the year is corrected to 2017.

Timeline review:

- Questions due – 10/17/16 3:00 pm EDT
- Proposals due – 10/28/16 3:00 pm EDT
- Anticipated notification of intent to award is early December 2016
- Approvals process – Award recommendations must be approved by the University System of Maryland (USM) Finance Committee and the USM Board of Regents. We plan to submit the award recommendations to these groups at their January and February 2017 meetings.
- Contracts Awarded – Mid-March 2017
- MEEC Vendor Showcase – 3/30/17. Contract awardees participate in this event. Vendors notified of Intent to Award are to plan their attendance at this event.
- The proposal requirements have been streamlined. Electronic Box submissions through emails helps simplify the process for meeting the RFP timeline.
- Extension of the established deadlines is not anticipated. The timeline for receiving proposals, evaluating them, and submitting award recommendations to the Finance Committee and the Board of Regents timeline is set for award of new contracts by March 2017.

Some difference between this year's RFP and the 2012 RFP:

- The contract term is longer, 3 years plus two optional three year renewals for a total of 9 years.
- The prior Categories 3 (Servers) and 6 (Peripherals) were combined in the new RFP under Category 3.
- The Solutions Contractor requirement is changed from 'top ranked contractor in all categories' to 'top ranked in at least two of the Categories excluding Category 5' (see Amendment 2, Question 13).

17. **Q:** When will vendors get responses to their questions that are due by Oct. 17th?

A: We will provide answers as soon as possible because we know vendors need the answers in order to submit their proposals. Responding to all questions quickly is a priority. Please submit

questions sooner rather than later, so that there aren't lots of questions that need answers on Oct. 17th at 3 pm.

18. **Q:** All categories except Categories 1 and 5 ask for a case study. Should the case studies be addressed per manufacturer/ brand or per category?

A: The case studies should address the category and not the specific manufacturers/ brands. The case study requirements are to submit one each for Categories 2, 3 and 4.

19. **Q:** For the Technical Proposal Response Submission Matrix, 8.0, they understand answers go in the matrix and for detailed responses and they should reference an attachment. However, with the Financial Proposal worksheets, there is only one box per brand. Some brands have different discounts depending on their support level. Products have different discount rates than maintenance/ support. Should they add lines for multiple discounts by brand? Should they provide a range? If ranges are used, how will it be known which end of the range applies to the support versus the product?

A: The Pricing Form is revised to include brand 1) hardware and 2) installation and maintenance services for all Categories except 5 Peripherals.

20. **Q:** Can UMD streamline the Q&As by category?

A: We are answering the questions in the sequence as we receive them. The Amendments will number the questions sequentially to help keep track of them.

21. **Q:** In the Case Studies, what type of information are we looking for?

A: It depends on the Category. Read each Case Study Requirement for Categories 2-4 carefully and stay under the maximum number of pages specified for each.

22. **Q:** Will the awarded contract be available to jurisdictions outside Maryland?

A: No.

23. **Q:** Can we add one additional manufacturer/ brand?

A: Yes, proposers may add **one (1), and only one**, "other" or additional brand or manufacturer in each category. Acceptance of the brand will be subject to the decision of the evaluation committee, who may designate the brand as acceptable or reject the brand.

24. **Q:** Under which category should hyper-converged devices such as Nutanix be offered? Can we add additional brands under the categories that are currently not being called out in the matrix? What about brands that span categories, how do we add them?

A: See answer to Q 51. One additional brand per Category may be proposed. For a brand that span categories, propose it in the Category that it is the best fit to the Category definition (RFP page 4).

25. **Q:** There is always emerging technology. How can vendors add new brands over the life of the contract?

A: See excerpt from Section A-2, A. 8, page 5 of the RFP below. The RFP information below states adding of brands through TORPs potentially annually. It was noted at the Pre-Proposal Conference this could potentially be a twice a year process, meaning as determined by needs during the extended life of this contract.

As per Section A-2, A. 8. (pg. 5) As technology evolves, the USM and the MEEC may add computer/ technology equipment and services to the Contract Awards, by written modification/ amendments to the contracts. It is anticipated that Brands will be added over the life of the Contract.

Awarded contractors may be solicited by TORP (Task Order Request for Proposal), potentially annually, for proposing the addition of Brands offered within their Awarded Categories at discount off of their Standard Educational List Pricing. The additional Contractor proposed Brands shall be considered for Award in terms of their value to MEEC members. Any accepted additional Contractor proposed Brands shall be amended to the Contract through Contract Modification/Amendment. Additional Brands may also be considered to be added on an ad-hoc basis during the life of the contract as needed. As needed requests may be submitted to the Procurement Officer by an individual MEEC member institution or a lead MEEC member institution on behalf of a MEEC member constituency. Ad-hoc requests for adding Brands shall be assessed in terms of the overall value to MEEC members. The ad-hoc Brand requests of value may be solicited to Contractors for proposing the addition of Brands and associated discounted off of their Standard Educational List Pricing within their Awarded Categories. Acceptable additional ad-hoc requested Brands shall be amended to the Contract through Contract Modification/Amendment.

26. **Q:** If a contracted vendor becomes a reseller for a brand they previously didn't offer, how can they be added to the contract as a vendor for that brand under the relevant category?

A: The answer to Question 25 above for adding brands also applies to adding resellers. The contracts may be amended to adapt to market changes.

27. **Q:** The case studies require contact information for references for the examples cited. If you combine those references with the ones in Section C, 7.0 References, the number of required references could be 7-8. Can the same references provided in the 7.1 chart (page 34) be used in the case studies?

A: Yes.

28. **Q:** For the case studies, do the examples need to be with a University/ College?

A: No.

29. **Q:** For the proposal evaluations, what is the overall intent? Lowest price? Complimentary skill sets?

A: See Question 8 in Amendment 2 and Section L – Evaluation Factors for Award of the RFP. The multiple technical evaluation criteria are listed in decreasing order of importance. Technical merit has greater weight than price.

30. **Q:** Vendors won't necessarily be awarded brands and categories in all of the areas that they proposed?

A: Correct. Each of a vendor's proposed categories and brands will be evaluated for consideration for Award. Peripheral category awardees must be awarded in at least one other category.

31. **Q:** Do you plan to limit the number of vendors awarded for a manufacturer/brand?

A: No. To see the number of awardees in each category of the current agreement, visit the current contract webpage at <http://meec-edu.org/hardware-vendors/>.

32. **Q:** Does the minimum 3-year warranty listed on page 20, 1.13.1 (a) apply to all categories?

A: It applies just to Categories 1-4. Institutions may request lesser or extended warranties.

33. **Q:** On the Financial Proposal worksheet, for Value Added Pricing, what are you looking for?

A: Value Added Pricing can be volume discounts, tiered pricing, or other pricing that may be offered of value to MEEC members. See Section B – Pricing #6 and Amendment 2, Question 14 for more information.

34. **Q:** Should we type answers directly in the 8.0 Technical Proposal Response Submission Matrix?

A: Yes, see answer to Amendment 1, question 1.

35. **Q:** Can vendors have multiple Solutions Architects?

A: If you have a team that provides Solutions Architect services, explain that as additional information in your proposal. Provide just one (1) Solutions Architect resume for the primary person that would service MEEC Institutions.

36. **Q:** Is unified communications included in the scope of this RFP?

A: No.

37. **Q:** Is vendor support included in this contract?

A: Yes.

Additional Questions submitted outside of the Pre-Proposal Conference:

38. **Q:** Will the list of Pre-Bid attendees be published?

A: Yes, see attached.

39. **Q:** This question references Section C, 1.0 General Mandatory Technical Requirements, subsection 1.13.1 (a) and (b). For both (a) and (b) do you expect the price of the product to include the 3-year onsite warranty for all parts and labor, or, do you expect the warranty to be priced separately from the product?

A: The discounted pricing an offeror proposers shall be inclusive of the Base Warranty.

40. **Q:** In Section E, Inspection and Acceptance, what is the source of the final acceptance test plan with which the ordering entity's written final acceptance is obtained? (p.44)

A: The ordering entity. The fourth bullet under Equipment and Installation in Section E – Inspection and Acceptance Terms page 44 of the RFP is deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

- Final system acceptance will be provided in writing **by** the ordering entity, only upon satisfactory demonstration via testing, that the complete installed system meets all specifications and requirements per the ordering entity's defined system acceptance plan. System acceptance plans may be included as part of the scope of work in a Task Order Request For Proposal issued by ordering entities or as a deliverable for order requests under the Contract.

41. **Q:** Which Brand list should we follow for Category 4 Network Hardware?

Financial < or > Categories and Category Specific Requirements, (Checkpoint and iBoss are in question)

FINANCIAL

Brands	Minimum % Discount Off SELP*
Avaya	
AeroHive	
Aruba/ HP	
Alcatel	
Barracuda	
Blue Cat	
Blue Coat	
Brocade	
Ciena	
CISCO	
Dell-EMC	
D-Link	
Enterasys	
Extreme Networks	
Force 10	
Force Point	
Fujitsu	
HP	
Huawei	
IBM	
Juniper	
LG-Ericson	
Lightspeed	
Meru	
Meraki/ Cisco	
Motorola	
MVR Comm.	
nCircle	
NetApp	
Nitro Security	
Palo Alto	
Pulse Products	
Q-Logic	
Riverbed	
Smoothwall	
Sonicwall	
Trustwave	

Ubiquiti Networks	
Xirrus	

Categories and Category Specific Requirements

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avaya • AeroHive • Aruba/HP • Alcatel • Barracuda • Blue Cat • Blue Coat • Brocade • Checkpoint • Ciena • CISCO • Dell-EMC • D-Link • Enterasys • Extreme Networks • Force10 • ForcePoint • Fujitsu • HP • Huawei 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • iBoss • IBM • Juniper • LG-Ericson • Lightspeed • Meru • Meraki/Cisco • Motorola • MRV Communications • nCircle • NetApp • Nitro Security • Palo Alto • Pulse Products • Q-Logic • Riverbed • Smoothwall • Sonicwall • Trustwave • Ubiquiti Networks • Xirrus
--	---

A: Checkpoint and iBoss were included in the Category 4 Network Hardware - Acceptable Network Hardware Brands listing that starts on page 28 of the RFP. It was an oversight that they were not included in the Financial Proposal – UMD-MEEC HW RFP 972016 worksheet's Category 4 tab. Checkpoint and iBoss are added in the updated Attachment B Pricing Form that is issued as part of this Amendment 3.

42. Q: Level A service - this is in several Categories, but is not full installation for Server, Storage or Network. Why is Level A-C only listed for Desktop? Others are level A only. Services for Desktop are very different than network and storage

A: Section 2.0 Categories and Category Specific Requirements is amended to add Level B and Level C Installation Services as Desirable Features for Categories 2, 3 and 4:

Level B Installation Service: Proposer may provide an on-site installation service consisting of unpacking, assembling all equipment and cables, installing of all hardware and software required for the operation of equipment as ordered, and testing. Proposer's service may also include assistance with customer's inventory procedures (affixing ID tags, filling out appropriate inventory forms with serial numbers, etc.). All products must be guaranteed as "virus-free" upon completion and delivery.

Level C Installation Service: Proposer may provide an on-site installation service that would consist of the customized configuration of computer operating system and network functions, installation and configuration of telecommunication equipment, servers, and server software.

Section C - 8.0 – Technical Proposal Response Submission Matrix of the RFP is amended:

For each of the Matrix Requirement Item Nos. 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4, Level B and Level C Installation Services with priority code D/I are added.

Vendors seeking to propose Level B and/or Level C Installation Services shall insert the associated line items into the Matrix for Vendor Response with the Priority Code D/I for each. Level B Installation Service and Level C Installation Service with priority code D/I for Categories 2, 3, and 4 shall insert these line items to the Matrix following the Level A Installation Service.

43. **Q:** Will the MEEC Committee review more than 1 case study per Category if supplied?

A: No. Provide your most relevant example for each Category submitted that requires a Case Study and follow the case study length requirement.

44. **Q:** 5.11 is this referencing data on a personal computer (laptop/desktop)

A: Yes. The intent is for moving data for laptops/desktops used at work, not personal purchases.

45. **Q:** Category 1 does not require a case study - please confirm.

A: Confirmed, there is no case study for Category 1.

46. **Q:** Section 4.0 - 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5 are these pre-sales activities or billable projects?

A: They may be a combination. For example, product roadmaps, demos, etc. are typically pre-sales activities whereas disposal services may be billable although stated in 4.5 to be offered at no cost..

47. **Q:** "Value Added pricing" what type of pricing are you looking for? Please expand on request.

A: Please see answer to Question 33.

48. **Q:** Do you want professional services pricing? If so where?

A: No.

49. **Q:** 1.3.8 Proposal Includes the Entire Current Product line. Do you want a list? And a Separate list of exclusions if full product line is not included.

A: Do you want a list? No. And a separate list of exclusions if the full product line is not included? Yes.

50. **Q:** Box Account - will it be set up so competitors will not see each other's proposals?

A: The Box folders are set up to receive the Technical and Financial proposals from vendors and no vendor will have access to the contents of the Box folders. Access to the folder contents will be on a 'need to know basis' where the Technical evaluators will only have access to the Technical proposals and Financial evaluators will only have access to the Financial proposals. The evaluators are from MEEC institutions and all will be required to sign a University System of Maryland Confidentiality Agreement before they are granted access to the Box folders.

51. **Q:** Would MEEC consider adding these manufacturers?

- F5
- Nutanix
- Nusani
- VCE
- Flexpod
- Suse
- Cisco HyperFlex
- Veritas
- VEEAM
- Quantum
- Druva

A: The manufacturers were considered. The following manufacturers are added in Section C – 2.0 to Categories 2, 3, and 4:

- F5 - 2.4, Category 4 Acceptable Network Hardware Brands
- Nutanix - 2.3, Category 3 Acceptable Server Class Hardware Brands
- Nusani - 2.2, Category 2 Acceptable Data Storage Brands
- VCE - 2.2, Category 2 Acceptable Data Storage Brands
- Flexpod - 2.2, Category 2 Acceptable Data Storage Brands
- Suse - 2.2, Category 2 Acceptable Data Storage Brands
- Cisco HyperFlex - 2.3, Category 3 Acceptable Server Class Hardware Brands
- Veritas - 2.2, Category 2 Acceptable Data Storage Brands

These manufacturers have been added to the updated Pricing Form (Financial Proposal – UMD-MEEC HW – RFP 972016 – Revised 10-14-16 excel file) issued with this Amendment 3.

Note: VEEAM was not added as it is software and this is a hardware contract. Quantum is already listed in 2.2 Category 2 and Druva is not added as it is cloud based, outside of the scope of this RFP.

52. **Q:** Which Category includes large format displays?

A: Category 5 – Peripherals.

53. **Q:** Narrative requested for Section C: 1.3 is a summary of 1.3.1-1.3.9 do you want a restate of all of these?

A: That is incorrect. The narrative required as part of Section C. 1.3 Capabilities is defined in Section C 1.3.1 on page 18 of the RFP and is limited to one page. See section C 1.3.1 for the specifics of what needs to be covered in this one page narrative. Sections 1.3.2 – 1.3.9 are separate requirements that make up a vendor's response on its capabilities.

54. **Q:** Section C: 1.3.1 - please expand what you are looking for in this section.

A: This question seems to be referring to the Section C's Matrix. The specifics of what the vendor is to respond to for Section 1.3.1 is covered in Section C 1.3 Capabilities on page 18 of the RFP.

55. **Q:** Section C: 1.3.2 Detailed plan of operations. Is this to service the institutions under MEEC or Faculty, Staff and Students?

A: A plan of operations is required for servicing the people that work for or attend school at a MEEC member institution. For example, at UMD employees – staff and faculty – along with students will be eligible to buy off of the MEEC HW contract for personal use.

56. **Q:** Section C: 1.3.6 requires a lot of information. Should the whole section questions 1-7 fit on one page or multiple pages ok?

A: Multiple pages are required. See Section C 1.3.6 page 19 of the RFP. The initial paragraph of Section C 1.3.6 explains account team requirements. Other specifics are defined items 1-7 under it. The Dedicated MEEC Account Team. Section C 1.3.6 states a staffing plan of no more than one page in total is required. A one page staffing plan needs to address what is covered in the initial paragraph and the first 3 items under it. It may be attached to the Matrix with response "See attached Staffing Plan in Section 1.3.6 of the RFP Matrix." Items 4, 5, 6 & 7 are resume requirements which would also be noted in the Matrix as "See attached" where each attachment would be clearly identified as an attachment for the specific 1.3.6 requirement item.

57. **Q:** Requirement for Section 2.1 category 1, 2, 3, and 4 - The USM requested as a desirable feature that the proposer may provide documentation to verify certification and compliance with the ISO 9000 series of standards for quality assurance, for the development and manufacturing of all products proposed under this contract.

In Section 8 – Technical Proposal Response Submission Matrix there is a "D/I" request in each matrix box for 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4 meaning that USM has deemed this a Desirable Requirement (respond if can be met) and that each contractor must provide the requested Information for the above ISO certification.

Can the USM explain the requirement for this as most of the products being requested are considered Tier 1 or Tier 2 manufacturers who are manufacturing in ISO certified factories?

A: If the manufacturer meets the ISO standards, it is acceptable to respond in the Matrix stating that as opposed to providing additional documentation.

58. **Q:** The three (3) largest distribution partners in the world all operate under ISO 9000, 14000 and 27000 series certifications, would copies of these certificates meet the above requirement, or does the USM want an ISO certificate from each of the manufacturers that are being bid?

A: Yes, copies would meet the requirements. Additionally, see the answer to the previous question.

59. **Q:** I wanted to reach out as we are a Backup and Replication Data Management Software solution that is used by at least 23 of your contract members. Our product also aligned with Microsoft Hyper- V, Azure and System Center and VMWare hyper visors. We also integrate with Dell/EMC, Nimble Storage, Hewlett Packard Storage, Net App and IBM. Veeam Software has been recognized by Gartner as a leader in the Data Center Backup and Recovery Magic Quadrant. We have an additional 10 that are currently looking and more that have we have worked with in the past. We have been asked by all of them to find out how to get added to the MEEC contract. When we have reached out in the past or our partners have reached out as we are a 100% channel only company they have been told we have to wait until the new contract is released under RFP. I have contacted by 7 of our partners stating this was released for re-compete last week. We would like to find out how we can direct our partners to include our solution in their response. Please let us know as soon as possible so we are able to aid them in their response and so we can update our end-users of your decision.

A: This product is software and will not added as this RFP, which is for hardware.

60. **Q:** We have a question regarding Page 4: Solutions Contractors. The requirement to be designated as a Solutions Contractor is for that contractor to be rated and ranked as one of the top 3 contractors in each category. We presume this rating and ranking is done by the MEEC evaluation team, correct?

Is there a definitive ranking profile we can look at to determine if we should request this designation? We hold manufacturer (Vendor) certifications, which will appear in the resumes of the tech and sales staff. However, that seems like a difficult and somewhat haphazard way for you to come up with a "Top 3" determination for a Solutions Contractor. We are thinking a definitive MUST HAVE criteria listing, or profile, would help us provide you a way to make this determination very easily in comparison to others vying for this designation.

A: The question above was "We presume this rating and ranking is done by the MEEC evaluation team, correct?" Correct. Additionally, See Question and Answer # 13 in Amendment 2 to this RFP that includes requirements for being considered as a Solutions Contractor. Note that to be evaluated as a Solutions Contractor, per Section C 1.3.6 of the RFP, offerors must submit a resume for the proposed solutions architect requirement.

61. **Q:** Is it okay to pass through the manufacturer's ISO 9000 certifications?

A: Yes. See answer to Question 57 above.

62. **Q:** There is only Level B and C installation for Category 1. Is there a reason you don't want these installation levels on the other categories?

A: See answer to Question 42 above.

63. **Q:** How recent must the letter of authorization be?

A: Within one (1) year.

64. **Q:** Will a Dell letter of authorization work for EMC or does it need to be an EMC letter of authorization?

A: A Dell letter will work, since the two companies merged.

65. **Q:** Can you please expand on the requirement for a dedicated engineer and solutions architect? We have many engineers and solutions architects that would support this contract. Technical resources are chosen based on the project and customer requirements. Are you just looking for resources that can support a variety of projects?

A: The staff that Vendors propose and provide resumes for must be available to support the MEEC contracts. The resources submitted would be the primary technical contacts to MEEC and its members. It is acceptable that they may need to tap other internal vendor resources for expertise.

66. **Q:** We know that other people have asked for clarification on the Section C Matrix, but we still have some questions. It appears you are asking us to put our response in the vendor response box of this form, as opposed to preparing a traditional RFP response with sections broken out by the RFP format and responses indicated below each section. Most of the responses you are requesting are lengthy. Based on previous amendments, you have indicated that it is acceptable to put "See Attached" for these longer responses and then just include an attachment for each response. This approach will result in a large number of attachments. Would it be acceptable to complete the Matrix and instead of

having 10-20 attachments, prepare a traditional response and have that as a separate attachment that addresses all of the requirements?

A: No. As per the answer to Question 1 in Amendment 1.



Maryland Education Enterprise Consortium

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

No. 972016

For

IT Hardware

Procurement Contacts: Jeanne Parker jparker2@umd.edu

Carol Munn cmunn@umd.edu

Pre-Proposal Conference

October 10, 2016 9:30am – 11am



Request For Proposal (RFP) No. 972016 for IT Hardware

for the

Maryland Enterprise Education Consortium (MEEC)

- Question due 10/17/16 3 PM EDT
- Proposal due 10/28/16 3 PM EDT
- Anticipated Notification of Intent to Award EARLY DECEMBER
- Approvals process – Finance Committee Board of Regents JANUARY-FEBRUARY
- Contracts Award MID-MARCH 2017
- MEEC Vendor Showcase 3/30/2017



IDIQ Multi-vendor Award Contract Term – 3 Years and 2 Three-Year Renewals

Proposal Submission

- Concise Content - Matrix Use
- Electronic Submission
- Due date extension not anticipated

Questions & Answers

University of Maryland - MEEC

Roster of Attendance Pre-Proposal Conference

RFP No.: 972016 Title: UMD MEEC IT Hardware RFP Date: October 10, 2016 Time: 9-30-11:00 a.m.

Printed Name	Organization	E-Mail Address	Telephone
Jeff Swigert	Prosys	jeffrey.swigert@prosys.com	301 509-0542
Egag Whipp	Sun mgt	greg@sunmanagement.net	410-991-1155
Rick Hewitt	Disys Solutions	rick.hewitt@disysolutions.com	301 801-8201
Rich Weaver	CAS Severn	rweaver@CASsevern.com	413-695-2746
Jennifer Mercer	TXO Systems	jmercero@txo-systems.com	410-375-4914
Donnie Orndorff	DSK	dorndorff@der.illc.com	410 579 4500
Craig De Simone	Carousal Industries	CDRESIMON@CAROUSALINDUSTRIES.COM	866-495-5273
Alex Queller	VMware	aqueller@vmware.com	443-867-7695
Rachel McClean	Disys Solution	rachel.mcclean@disysolutions.com	443-204-8731
Josh Stranathan	Insight Systems & Consulting	jstranathan@insightinvestments.com	443-725-5365
Anthony Filardo	IP Data Systems	Anthony.Filardo@ipdatasystems.com	444-294-0080
Sean Reed	IP Data Systems	sean.Reed@ipdatasystems.com	443-294-0086
Susan Cargill-Collura	Dell	Susan_Cargill-Collura@dell.com	301-602-6946
Lynn Voigt	Abu Comp Concepts Inc	lvoigt@abucomp.com	571-385-1120
Amy Bateman	DATA Networks	abatem@datanetworks.com	443-604-7204

University of Maryland - MEEC
Roster of Attendance
Pre-Proposal Conference

RFP No.: 972016 Title: UMD MEEC IT Hardware RFP Date: October 10, 2016 Time: 9-30-11:00 a.m.

Printed Name	Organization	E-Mail Address	Telephone
Melissa Wisniewski	Daly	melissa.wisniewski@daly.com	410-227-1323
Tom Lackel	TXO SYSTEMS	TLACKEL@TXO-SYSTEMS.COM	443-962-4257
Frank Rags	Concentus	frank@concentus.net	240-357-0989
Josh Brown	SCAIT Consulting	josh.brown@saicconsulting.com	240-351-7473
Theresa Besel	HPE	theresa.b.besel@hpe.com	571-280-2764
MARK T. MOSE	HPI	mark.mose@hpi.com	(410) 991-2522
Don Whitehead	System Source	dwhitehead@syssrc.com	410-771-5544
Danielle Burnett	ATS	danielleb@appliedtechnologyinc.com	410-344-1256
Sarah Taggart	Bell	staggart@belltechnologix.com	804-327-5891
TYRONE GREENE	SIRIUS	TYRONE.GREENE@SIRIUSCOM.COM	240-353-1982
Blew Blankenship	Univ of Baltimore		410-837-5714
David Councell	USC Canterbury	DAVIDE@USC-CANTERBURY.COM	410-757-1700
Daniel Vosk	Eplus	Prespa@eplus.com	410 980 8864
Jonathan Harris	APPLIED TECHNOLOGY SERVICES	JON@APPLIEDTECHNOLOGYSERVICES.COM	443-422-5199
Scott Rippey	System Source	srippey@syssrc.com	410-771-5544

University of Maryland - MEEC
Roster of Attendance
Pre-Proposal Conference

RFP No.: 972016 **Title:** UMD MEEC IT Hardware RFP **Date:** October 10, 2016 **Time:** 9-30-11:00 a.m.

Printed Name	Organization	E-Mail Address	Telephone
Bonnie Phelan	Microsoft	Bonnie.phelan@microsoft.com	301-633-0539
Tom McDonough	Alliance Info Systems	tmcdonough@ainfosys.com	410-585-9505
Sam Cohen	"	scohen@ainfosys.com	301-346-9367
Cody Hayes	Carahsoft Technology Corp	Cody.hayes@carahsoft.com	703-230-7564
Bill Hottel	HCCI	bhottel@hcci.com	410-302-0903
Ryan Yu	Daly	RTYE@DALY.COM	301-670-0381
Brian Stubblefield	HCCI	bstubblefield@hcci.com	410-375-2812
Tom Keller	En-tek	FKELLER@EN-TEK.COM	301-846-9901
Albert Dowd	ACC	adownso@acc.net	571-395-4174
Erica Kordes	CDWG	ERICA.Kordes@cdw.com	703-943-0247
Linda Morgan	SHI International	linda_morgan@shi.com	301-529-4540
Kim Zimmerman	CAS	kimz@casservern.com	410-733-9944
Tony Pirrera	Presidio	TPirrera@Presidio.com	443-243-3302
Joe Kline	Presidio	JKline@Presidio.com	703-304-2594
Jeff DBella	Daly	jeff.dbella@	301-670-0381

daly.com

xt. 455

Pre-Proposal Conference

RFP No.: 972016 **Title:** UMD MEEC IT Hardware RFP **Date:** October 10, 2016 **Time:** 9-30-11:00 a.m.

[illegible]

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION		
1. AMENDMENT NUMBER 4	2. DATE ISSUED 10-17-2016	3. NUMBER OF PAGES 3 including this top page
4. ISSUED BY University of Maryland Department of Procurement & Strategic Sourcing 2109-C Patuxent Building College Park, Maryland 20742 POINTS OF CONTACT: Jeanne Parker, Assistant Director Carol Munn, Senior Buyer TELEPHONE NUMBERS: 301-405-7416 (Ms. Parker) 301-405-5859 (Ms. Munn) EMAIL ADDRESSES: jparker2@umd.edu cmunn@umd.edu		5. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 4)
6. NAME, ADDRESS AND FEI NUMBER OF CONTRACTOR		7A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NUMBER 972016
		7B. DATED 10/3/2016
8. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION		
<p>The solicitation identified in 7A above is amended as set forth in Item 9.</p> <p>The due date and time specified for receipt of offers/bids _____ is extended, <u> X </u> is not extended.</p> <p>Contractor must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the due date and time specified in the solicitation or as amended, by completing Items 6 and 10 and returning <u>1</u> copy of the amendment to the Issuing Office identified in Item 4 with their Proposal.</p> <p>FAILURE OF CONTRACTOR'S ACKNOWLEDGEMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR RECEIPT OF OFFERS/BIDS PRIOR TO THE DUE DATE AND TIME SPECIFIED MAY RENDER CONTRACTOR'S OFFER UNACCEPTABLE/ NON-RESPONSIVE AND SUBJECT TO REJECTION.</p>		
9. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT (Use additional pages if required)		
<p>9.1 The RFP is amended to answer additional questions received just prior to Amendment 3 being issued along with the first first set of questions received after Amendment 3.</p> <p>9.2 Due to the number of questions received on the final date/deadline for questions submission on 10/17/16, additional Amendment(s) will be forthcoming as early as possible for the final Q and A.</p> <p>Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 7A, including previous amendments, remain in full force and effect.</p>		
10A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or Print)		11A. NAME OF PROCUREMENT OFFICER (Type or Print)
10B. CONTRACTOR SIGNATURE	10C. DATE SIGNED	Jeanne Parker, Assistant Director, IT Procurement
(Signature of Person Authorized to Sign)		

Description of Amendment (Continued):

MEEC IT Hardware RFP 972016

Amendment 4 – Questions (Q) and Answers (A)

67. **Q:** Is there a ceiling/cap on the .5% fee per order or will the .5% fee be in effect for the entire amount with no cap?

A: The surcharge will be under the full amount of orders placed to a Contractor under a newly awarded contract as a result of this RFP.

68. **Q:** To effectively prepare a compliant, technically sound response that offers the best value to MEEC, we respectfully request a 2-week submission deadline, or a deadline extension that MEEC deems appropriate.

A: The submission due date is not extended. As noted at the pre-proposal conference and covered in Amendment 3, the requirement to keep to the schedule was covered and it was noted that vendors should not anticipate changes to the submission due date.

69. **Q:** Please refer page 19 of the RFP, requirement 1.3.2, for contractors to provide a detailed plan of operations indicating their methodology to resell or distribute personal purchases for MEEC members' Faculty, Staff, and Students. Does this requirement only apply to Category 1, or are we required to provide this for Categories 2, 3, 4, and 5?

A: Requirement 1.3.2 on page 19 is a response required on capabilities of your firm as a general mandatory technical requirement overall as opposed to submission of a separate plan of operation for each category proposed. MEEC's intent for personal purchases is envisioned as primarily for Categories 1 and 5, although the other Categories are not excluded. If a vendor proposes for Categories 1 and 5, the overall plan of operation in supporting faculty, staff and students for personal purchases would need to include a vendor's plan in supporting both Categories. See also Amendment 3, Q. and A for # 55.

70. **Q:** Should the minimum discount off of SELP be just hardware and software or should it include the three years of support as required in the RFP?

A: The discount needs to include the base 3 year warranty. See Q & A # 33.

71. **Q:** If a page limit has not been indicated but a response code of I or E are indicated, do you want that response within the grid only or is it acceptable to provide verbiage separately? Two examples are 2.1 Level A/B/C installation and 4.1 Access to New Technology.

A: The preference is concise response of information/explanation entered directly in the Matrix.

72. **Q:** In the event the contract opens up for new/additional equipment and/or refurbished equipment, how will the potential responder find out about the opening, and would the responder have the ability to jump onto the current contract, mid-term, in the newly added categories?

A: See Q & A # 25.

73. **Q:** Can a reseller of a product piggyback onto the contract with a vendor awarded onto MEEC vs bidding direct?

A: No, the intention is not piggybacking. Vendors are to bid as prime contractors and any sub-contractors must be identified with stated roles and responsibilities per Section C's 1.3.1.

74. **Q:** I just want to let you know that the numbering in the matrix for Section 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3 does not match what's in Page 31 of the RFP.

In Page 31 of the RFP:

Section 3.1 is for the MEEC Collective Purchase Reports

Section 3.2 is for Distribution Report

Section 3.3 is for Purchase Report

However, in the Matrix:

MEEC Collective Purchase Reports is listed as 3.3

Distribution Report is listed as 3.1

Purchase Report is listed as 3.2

Could you please consider aligning the numbering in the Matrix with the listing in Page 31 of the RFP?

A: Yes, the Matrix Requirement Item Nos. 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3 (pg. 41) are revised as follows:

3.1	MEEC Collective Purchase Report	M/C		
3.2	Distribution Report	M/C		
3.3	Purchase Reports	M/C		

75. **Q:** What exactly constitutes "ISO compliance" as stated for each category, how does this relate to being an ISO certified company, doesn't that cover all we do/provide?

A: See Q & A #57. Amendment3.

76. **Q:** Category 3 - Virtual Computing Brands: We would like to request that Nutanix be added to Virtual Computing Brands. Nutanix is the largest Hyper-Converged manufacturer in world.

A: This vendor was added per Amendment 3. See Q and A # 51.

77. Date Due – We would like to deliver a concise, compliant, and detailed response; would the University of Maryland be willing to extend the due date of this RFP 972016?

A: See Q & A #68 above.

78. Printer(s) - Is the End User able to provide any specs for the printer(s) they would like included? I.e. Color or Mono? Approximate number of pages per month printed? Print only or Print/Copy/Scan/Fax? Wireless or wired?

A: No, individual printer specifications will not be provided.

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION		
1. AMENDMENT NUMBER 5	2. DATE ISSUED 10-18-2016	3. NUMBER OF PAGES 4 including this top page
4. ISSUED BY University of Maryland Department of Procurement & Strategic Sourcing 2109-C Patuxent Building College Park, Maryland 20742 POINTS OF CONTACT: Jeanne Parker, Assistant Director Carol Munn, Senior Buyer TELEPHONE NUMBERS: 301-405-7416 (Ms. Parker) 301-405-5859 (Ms. Munn) EMAIL ADDRESSES: jparker2@umd.edu cmunn@umd.edu		5. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 4)
6. NAME, ADDRESS AND FEI NUMBER OF CONTRACTOR		7A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NUMBER 972016
		7B. DATED 10/3/2016
8. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION		
<p>The solicitation identified in 7A above is amended as set forth in Item 9.</p> <p>The due date and time specified for receipt of offers/bids _____ is extended, <u> X </u> is not extended.</p> <p>Contractor must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the due date and time specified in the solicitation or as amended, by completing Items 6 and 10 and returning <u> 1 </u> copy of the amendment to the Issuing Office identified in Item 4 with their Proposal.</p> <p>FAILURE OF CONTRACTOR'S ACKNOWLEDGEMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR RECEIPT OF OFFERS/BIDS PRIOR TO THE DUE DATE AND TIME SPECIFIED MAY RENDER CONTRACTOR'S OFFER UNACCEPTABLE/ NON-RESPONSIVE AND SUBJECT TO REJECTION.</p>		
9. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT (Use additional pages if required)		
<p>9.1 The RFP is amended to provide the following questions and answers on pages 3-4.</p> <p>9.2 Due to the number of questions received, additional Amendment(s) will be forthcoming as early as possible for the final Q and A.</p> <p>Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 7A, including previous amendments, remain in full force and effect.</p>		
10A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or Print)		11A. NAME OF PROCUREMENT OFFICER (Type or Print)
10B. CONTRACTOR SIGNATURE	10C. DATE SIGNED	Jeanne Parker, Assistant Director, IT Procurement
(Signature of Person Authorized to Sign)		

Description of Amendment (Continued):

MEEC IT Hardware RFP 972016

Amendment 5 – Questions (Q) and Answers (A)

79. **Q:** Please clarify what constitutes an applicable purchase for inclusion in the 0.5% surcharge. This is a three-part question.

1) Is any purchase of equipment listed on contract by a "MEEC member" included? We have existing contracts to provide out-of-warranty maintenance, including parts, to MEEC members. A surcharge has not been contemplated in these contracts.

2) If in response to #1, you are limiting the surcharge to only sales quoted through the MEEC contract vehicle, does that include contract riders? We have customers that issue their own contracts that ride MEEC and we quote under their contract.

3) If in #2 you state that contracts that ride MEEC are applicable to the surcharge, what about purchases that already go through a chargeable procurement system? We have some purchases from MEEC members that come through K12 Buy and which already have a surcharge of 1.5% for hardware and .75% for services. Are these purchases also applicable to the MEEC surcharge?

- A:**
1. The surcharge will not apply to existing contracts to provide out-of-warranty maintenance. Any new equipment and services purchased through this new contract shall include the surcharge.
 2. The contracts are not available for non-MEEC entities to ride. Member Institutions may have their own contracts under the MEEC contract terms and conditions, where the surcharge will apply.
 3. Yes, it applies.

80. **Q:** Discount Percentages – REF: Financial Proposal

Comment: Upon reviewing the existing Approved Hardware Vendors on the MEEC website, a number of current vendors provide a range of "Discount from List Prices" for a single OEM under a single Group. When completing the Financial Proposal response, how should bidders provide such a range of discounts? In other words, if bidding desktop computers from HP at x% off list and HP laptop computers at y%, how should such a range (between x% and y%) be shown in the Financial Proposal?

A: List the minimum discount with additional discounting by product classes in the Value Added area. Do not provide a range.

81. **Q:** We intend to provide a discount range off of list price per vendor for each applicable product category. Is this acceptable?

A: See Q & A #80 above.

82. **Q:** For Category 2 - Data Storage Devices: Infinidat and Pure Storage are two manufacturers that are widely used in the largest Maryland State Agencies and they are considered major manufacturers. Would it be possible to add these to the manufacturer list for this category?

A: Yes. Infinidat and Pure Storage are added to Section C, Category 2 & the Financial Proposal Pricing Form.

83. **Q:** Thank you for the update. This interesting decision as the current contract and the includes VMware, Citrix, Redhat and Oracle which are all softwares. 3 of which we work very closely with. The feedback we have received from our customers it would be a lot easier to include Veeam on the contract for purchases. It would take out the need for placing formal bids. We that you please reevaluate your decision or help us gain a better way to serve both of our customers.

A: These brands are on the contract because they are specific to virtualization. Other types of software will not be added as manufacturers/ brands.

84. **Q:** What is the desired process for reporting .5% funding stream? Are the bi-annual funding stream transfers expected to be sent on alternating quarters, eg. Q2 & Q4 of the calendar year, or does MEEC have established dates that funds are going to be received?

A: This is answered in Section C, Reporting Requirements 3.0-3.4 of the RFP, starting on page 30 of the RFP.

85. **Q:** How will open returns and open AR effect the funding stream transfers Eg. If an agency has a return that hasn't been credited back from the vendor, or open AR, will the respondent be expected to provide .5% stream to MEEC prior to resolution of outstanding debts?

A: No. The surcharge will be disbursed once the revenue is received.

86. **Q:** Will participating institutions have leasing relationships that they would prefer respondent to use?

A: Possibly, this is at the discretion of the Member Institution.

87. **Q:** Will the respondent be permitted to provide brands that were not awarded to the respondent on an off-contract basis? Eg. Respondent is awarded HP desktops and it not awarded Belkin cables, but USM institution would prefer to have both lines ordered at one vendor.

A: No, vendors should only quote what they are awarded under the MEEC contract. To add brands, see Q & A #25 in Amendment 3.

88. **Q:** Additional Manufacturers – REF: Section B – Pricing (Page 17) of the RFP.

Question: The RFP states that “proposers may add one (1), and only one, ‘other’ or additional brand or manufacturer in each category.” Upon reviewing the list of currently approved manufacturers, we believe there are categories where bidders could suggest more than one additional manufacturer that would be appropriate for the contract. Therefore, would the agency allow bidders to add up to two (2) other manufacturers in each category?

A: No.

89. **Q:** Hardware versus Software – REF: Section 2.2 – Category 3 – Server Class Hardware/Equipment and Virtual Computing (Page 26) of the RFP.

Question: In Section 2.2 of the RFP for Category 3 products, there is a table for “Acceptable Virtual Computing Hardware Brands.” This table, however, includes software providers (Redhat, VMWare). Please confirm that the reference to hardware for these manufacturers is in error and that the agency accepts software from them.

A: Correct. These are acceptable software brands required for virtual computing hardware.

90. **Q:** Case study write ups - REF: Section 2.0 – Categories and Category Specific Requirements of the RFP

Question: Bidders proposing Product Categories 2 through 4 are required to provide a case study of a completed installation for each category as part of the proposal. If bidders anticipate utilizing partners for the installation and maintenance services, is it acceptable to provide as the case study details of a project completed by the partner organization?

A: Yes.

91. **Q:** Discount Percentages – REF: Financial Proposal

Comment: Upon reviewing the existing Approved Hardware Vendors on the MEEC website, a number of current vendors provide a range of "Discount from List Prices" for a single OEM under a single Group. When completing the Financial Proposal response, how should bidders provide such a range of discounts? In other words, if bidding desktop computers from HP at x% off list and HP laptop computers at y%, how should such a range (between x% and y%) be shown in the Financial Proposal?

A: See Q & A #80 above.

92. **Q:** Current Members – REF: Contract Usage

Question: The Current Members page on the MEEC website lists a number of organizations that are currently allowed to utilize the MEEC contract. Are there any other organizations not listed on the website that are authorized to use the contract? If so, can you please identify them?

A: No, the list is all MEEC Members in good standing that may utilize the contract.

93. **Q:** For the contract reference section (see example below), if using similar scope IDIQ contracts for any of these references, is the desire for the Client contact section to be an actual end client utilizing the contract vehicle or a contract administer of the overall IDIQ?

<u>7.1.1 CONTRACT REFERENCE 1</u>	
Name of Client:	
Name of Contact:	
Address:	
Phone Number:	
E-Mail Address:	
Annual Dollar Value of Contract:	
Start Date:	
Completion Date:	
Description of Service	
Justification of Similar Size and Scope	

A: Either may apply. The reference must be able to demonstrate the contractor's capability to perform the requirements of this RFP. This is the person that has hands-on experience with the day-to-day use of the contract, which is most likely the end client utilizing the contract vehicle.

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION		
1. AMENDMENT NUMBER 6	2. DATE ISSUED 10-20-2016	3. NUMBER OF PAGES 13 including this top page
4. ISSUED BY University of Maryland Department of Procurement & Strategic Sourcing 2109-C Patuxent Building College Park, Maryland 20742 POINTS OF CONTACT: Jeanne Parker, Assistant Director Carol Munn, Senior Buyer TELEPHONE NUMBERS: 301-405-7416 (Ms. Parker) 301-405-5859 (Ms. Munn) EMAIL ADDRESSES: jparker2@umd.edu cmunn@umd.edu		5. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 4)
6. NAME, ADDRESS AND FEI NUMBER OF CONTRACTOR		7A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NUMBER 972016
		7B. DATED 10/3/2016
8. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION		
<p>The solicitation identified in 7A above is amended as set forth in Item 9.</p> <p>The due date and time specified for receipt of offers/bids _____ is extended, <u> X </u> is not extended.</p> <p>Contractor must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the due date and time specified in the solicitation or as amended, by completing Items 6 and 10 and returning <u>1</u> copy of the amendment to the Issuing Office identified in Item 4 with their Proposal.</p> <p>FAILURE OF CONTRACTOR'S ACKNOWLEDGEMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR RECEIPT OF OFFERS/BIDS PRIOR TO THE DUE DATE AND TIME SPECIFIED MAY RENDER CONTRACTOR'S OFFER UNACCEPTABLE/ NON-RESPONSIVE AND SUBJECT TO REJECTION.</p>		
9. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT (Use additional pages if required)		
<p>9.1 The RFP is amended to provide the following questions and answers to the RFP that were received by the deadline for submission of questions.</p> <p>Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 7A, including previous amendments, remain in full force and effect.</p>		
10A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or Print)		11A. NAME OF PROCUREMENT OFFICER (Type or Print)
10B. CONTRACTOR SIGNATURE	10C. DATE SIGNED	Jeanne Parker, Assistant Director, IT Procurement
(Signature of Person Authorized to Sign)		

Description of Amendment (Continued):

MEEC IT Hardware RFP 972016

Amendment 6 – Questions (Q) and Answers (A)

94. **Q:** Page 20, Section C, 1.9 Operable Peripherals/Adaptors – Would this be considered an additional service/configuration cost? We could offer this added service. It is per the customer's request?

A: No, this is not considered an additional service/configuration cost. This is a mandatory technical requirement. Under the heading of Section C 1.9 Operable Peripherals/Adaptors all software and/or necessary drivers related to peripherals and/or adaptors, and ordered at time of processor purchase, must be installed and operational prior to time of delivery.

95. **Q:** Page 23, Manufacturer's Extended Warranty Service – Above this section it says warranty commences on delivery. In this paragraph it states on acceptance. Which statement is correct?

A: The "Base" Warranty begins upon delivery of equipment; whereas the manufacturer's 'extended' warranty for equipment and services commences on acceptance of the equipment or services.

96. **Q:** Due to the revisions to pages 36-42 of RFP #972016, would MEEC/University of Maryland reissue a new technical response matrix?

A: Yes. The updated Section C to the RFP is attached as Attachment C to the RFP. The Revised Section C supersedes and replaces Section C in the original RFP and consists of changes to all of Section C resulting from the previously issued Amendments, including a revised 8.0 – Technical Proposal Response Submission Matrix. Section J of the RFP is updated to add:
Attachment C – Revised Section C – Specifications and Requirements [Microsoft Word File]

97. **Q:** Would University of Maryland MEEC IT accept a lesser coverage limit for General Liability, Automobile Liability and Excess Liability?

A: While vendors may submit exceptions taken to the RFP terms with their Proposal, it is noted, as per the RFP's cover page, "Contractors are cautioned not to make changes to any of the terms and conditions in this solicitation. Doing so may render a Contractor's proposal unacceptable and subject to rejection." Changes to the required standard terms and conditions as stated in the RFP for award are not anticipated.

98. **Q:** Would University of Maryland MEEC IT be willing to review redline terms for Indemnification and Limitation of Liability?

A: See Q & A #97 above.

99. **Q:** Regarding section 1.3.4, evidence of approved reseller status, we would like to propose that only Letters of Authorization specific to this contract be accepted for categories 1-4. This will ensure that all authorizations are current and that vendors have demonstrated their capabilities to the authorizing manufacturers while potentially minimizing the number of responses per product line the evaluation committee will have to review.

A: As per Section C. 1.3.4 (pg. 18) evidence is only required for Categories 1-4 and Category 5 peripheral devices is excepted, that is, it is an exception in being excluded from the requirement.

100. **Q:** For each product category 1-4 beginning on page 22 there is a requirement for “Manufacturers Extended Warranty Service” and “Manufacturers Extended Service Agreement.” Both requirements appear to be nearly identical. Can you elaborate on the difference between the two?

A: Manufacturers Extended Warranty Service – refers to warranty of the equipment and its parts. Manufacturers Extended Service Agreement – refers to service in support of the equipment, for example services may include on-site service technician trouble shooting and maintenance services such as health checks or assessments.

101. **Q:** We’re looking for additional clarification around Q/A #19 from Amendment #3. As stated in that question, there are typically different discount levels associated with hardware vs. maintenance. However, there are often differences in the discount structure of various hardware categories within a manufacturer’s offering. Should those differences be expressed as a range of discount for all hardware from that manufacturer, or should we add a line for each hardware category with the minimum discount indicated for each?

A: See Q & A #80 (Amendment 5).

102. **Q:** Does this contract include “Hyper-Converged” (vendors like Nutanix, Dell EMC VXRail, etc) and/or “Converged” (VCE, etc) technology solutions? If so, which category would these fall under? I can provide a detailed description around hyper-converged and converged, if requested, but these solutions include storage, compute, and network into a single appliance.

A: Yes. Brands should be proposed in the Category that is the best fit in meeting their primary function of the hardware. See also Q & A # 24 and #51 (Amendment 3).

103. **Q:** How should we address different product classes, with different discount structures, within the same vendor portfolio? ie. EMC/Dell has a variety of storage solutions (VMAX, VNX, Unity, etc) and they all have different discount matrixes.

A: List the minimum discount with the option of additional discounting by product classes in the Value Added area. See Q & A #80 (Amendment 5).

104. **Q:** On page 24 in the “Acceptable Data Storage Brands”, I noticed “Isolon” listed. I believe this is a typo and the appropriate technology is “Isilon”. I just wanted to ensure this was an accurate assumption.

A: Isolon was corrected to Isilon per Q & A # 5 (Amendment 1).

105. **Q:** Sections 7 requires certain information that we would not be able to provide such as point of contact information or contract dollar value of the contract because of the classified nature of the customer. If we do not provide all information request for the reference form would our proposal be compliant since this section is a mandatory requirement?

A: This information is mandatory. There is no way to check a reference if a reference point of contact and contract information is not provided. References are required for evaluation of past performance.

106. **Q:** Will there be a process for offeror’s to add additional brands that they do not offer currently but my offer down the road. (i.e company has the ability to sell brand X and few years later would like to add brand Y even though brand Y was on the original list of manufacturers when the contract was competed)?

A: See Q & A # 25 (Amendment 3).

107. **Q:** What is the criteria that would be used to evaluate to add in the write in brand? Also is background information required for brands that we would like to add?

A: Products should be of interest and value to the MEEC membership. No other information is required.

108. **Q:** I would like to ask a follow up to a question that was asked at the pre-proposal conference regarding hyperconvergence. What category does hyperconvergence fall under since this type of hardware falls under all three categories of Server, Storage, and Networking.

A: See Q & A #102 above and #24 and #51 (Amendment 3).

109. **Q:** If (i) Contractor is awarded a specific manufacturer for a specific group, (ii) a MEEC member requires support/maintenance for certain hardware that they already own, and (iii) that hardware can be sold to MEEC members based on Contractor's award, may Contractor sell that support/maintenance? (E.g. May Contractor sell UMD support/maintenance for a Dell server already owned by UMD, if Contractor has a Dell Group 3 award?)

A: Yes.

110. **Q:** If (i) the list price of a product is \$1000, (ii) the Contractor's award guaranties a 10% discount, and (iii) a MEEC member institution purchases that product from the Contractor, how much does the end user pay the contractor **including** the MEEC surcharge? (We believe the answer is \$900, and the Contractor remits \$4.50 to MEEC).

A: Your answer is correct, noting the "list" price in this example would be the vendor's Standard Educational List Price.

111. **Q:** We respectfully request a 2-week extension to the due date.

A: As answered previously, the Proposal due date is not extended.

112. **Q:** Regarding insurance coverage requirements, will MEEC accept a \$1m/\$2m GL and \$1M CSL auto with a \$6M umbrella as equivalent to the RFP terms?

A: Yes, the required insurance minimum limits may be reached by means of an Umbrella or Excess Liability policy that provides coverage over the GL and Auto policies.

113. **Q:** In the Technical Proposal Response Submission Matrix; Section C, for Categories we are not proposing should we leave the VENDOR RESPONSE blank or insert "N/A?" Is this also the case for other sections where there is no response?

A: Either is acceptable where a blank will be evaluated as a no-bid for that Category.

114. **Q:** This question is to clarify submission details. In Section D. SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS on page 8, the first paragraph states "The file format for the technical proposal is Adobe PDF. The file format for the financial proposal is Microsoft Excel." Further down, item (4) states: "Separated in Technical and Financial Proposals in PDF document format." Then, item (5) specifies that "Each PDF Proposal document file must be clearly labeled as follows", then lists the Financial proposal is an .xls file. Can you confirm that we should submit the Technical Proposal in PDF and the Financial Proposal in .xls format? If the Financial proposal is to be submitted in .xls, should we then provide the required

Section G.5 Notices, required to be included in the Financial Volume, as a separate PDF file attachment in the Financial proposal email?

A: This is to confirm, the Technical Proposal is to be submitted in PDF format and the Financial Proposal (Pricing Form) needs to be submitted in Excel format.

Item (4) on page 8 of the RFP is corrected to state: "Separated into Technical and Financial Proposals"

Item (5) on page 8 of the RFP is corrected in the first line to state: "Each Proposal document file must be clearly labeled as follows:"

The PDF technical proposal file needs to be submitted as one PDF file that includes all attachments noted in the Matrix Vendor Response.

The Section G.5 Notices needs to be completed to provide your firm's contact information and included in the **Technical Proposal**. The Section G.5 Notice Requirement Item No. is added to the revised Section C 8.0 – Technical Proposal Response Submission Matrix.

115. **Q:** Where should we place pricing for the following: In reference to (4.0 Highly Desirable Services/ Options pg. 31) Section 4.2 Design and Consulting- "to assist customers in long range planning, network design, infrastructure planning, etc. by providing a concise overview of up to 2 pages in length of their professional services roles", on the document named Financial Proposal – Updated Pricing Form.

A: Design and consulting may be pre-sales support in the context of 4.2. Rates are not requested and should not be included. (As per the Matrix 4.2 Response Checklist - Do not list any rates). In the event a MEEC member requires billable design and consulting services in relation to a hardware order under resulting contracts, rates would need to be quoted as part of a response to the individual MEEC member's TORP/quote request.

116. **Q:** Some of our Partners (Palo Alto, Juniper) provide different additional services, where can we highlight and explain in detail what additional services they provide for their IT Hardware?

A: Additional partner services are not requested under this RFP. Responder's should not be submitting information of additional partner services offerings. If there is something that the vendor offers that is seen of value to MEEC members and is priced under a responder's offerings, it could be included in the information submitted for Value Added Pricing in the Financial Proposal Pricing Form. Refer to Instructions #7 in the Pricing Form and previously answered questions on Value Added Pricing.

117. **Q:** Is an awarded Contactor able to name subcontractors under this contract?

A: See Q and A # 73 (Amendment 4). To be clear, Contractors do not receive awards and then name subcontractors or resellers under their awarded contract. Contracts (and/or POs) will be between MEEC participating institutions and the Contractors. Contractors may use subcontractors and suppliers to provide hardware under the contract. The MEEC Contractor will be responsible for all warranty requirements, service requirements, shipping, invoicing, and all other requirements under the contract. Payments will be made to Contractors only (if we get an invoice from a subcontractor, the invoice will be rejected and returned).

118. **Q:** Is an awarded Contractor able to name Authorized Resellers under this contract?

A: No. See Q & A #12 (Amendment 2).

119. **Q:** Does the Collective Purchase Report Template need to be completed and returned as a part of our submission?

A: No. This is a sample report template as per the Reporting Requirements 3.1.

120. **Q:** Section E- Inspection and Acceptance Terms, (pg. 44) Equipment and Installation (5th bullet) - Will the testing protocols be shared with the Contractor at the time of the TORFP?

A: This is at the discretion of the individual MEEC Member Institution/ordering entity.

121. **Q:** Should this sentence read “If the products were provided *with* the installation terms, the contractor is responsible for the installation of the replacement equipment as defined in the RFP”?

Referring to this paragraph:

Any warranty period for equipment and services will not commence until acceptance of the equipment or services by the requesting MEEC Member Institution. All defective items must be replaced at no additional cost. ***If the products were provided without the Installation terms, the contractor is responsible for the installation of the replacement equipment as defined in the RFP. If the products were provided without installation, the contractor, at its option and at no additional cost, may provide on-site service or next-day drop ship replacements for the MEEC Member Institution to install.***

Manufacturer’s Extended Warranty Service”

Category 1 – p. 23

Category 2 - p. 25

Category 3 - p. 27

Category 4 - p. 29

A: Correct. This is an error in the last paragraphs of ***both*** the Manufacturer’s Extended Warranty Service and the Manufacturer’s Extended Service Agreement descriptions for Categories 1-4.

In Section 2.0 – CATEGORIES AND CATEGORY SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS, for Categories 1-4, under the Manufacturer’s Extended Warranty Service and the Manufacturer’s Extended Service Agreement descriptions (8 places), the sentences:

“If the products were provided without the Installation terms, the contractor is responsible for the installation of the replacement equipment as defined in the RFP.”

are deleted in entirety and replaced with the following sentence in each of the 8 places:

“If the products were provided with the Installation terms, the contractor is responsible for the installation of the replacement equipment as defined in the RFP.”

122. **Q:** Will the University of Maryland and the Maryland Education Enterprise Consortium consider extending the date of the response in order for contractors to gather necessary manufacturer documentation and to provide most the complete response?

A: As answered previously, the submission date is not extended.

123. **Q:** Will exceptions to contract terms be allowed or reviewed? If we have exceptions to certain contract terms can we submit as an attachment?

A: See Q & A # 97.

124. **Q:** Will we need to provide Energy Star Compliance for every product from every brand we list as a part of our SELP?

A: No.

125. **Q:** Will the base warranty information for every product be required as a part of our response or only needed to produce upon request?

A: Upon request. The Section C Response Matrix Priority Code for the Base Warranty is M/C which stands for Mandatory/Confirmation. The Vendor Response in the Matrix must confirm the requirement is met.

126. **Q:** Do you plan to extend this RFP?

A: As answered previously, the submission date is not extended.

127. **Q:** Can we bid a range of discounts or should it be a fixed discount? Many manufacturers give different discounts per product, even within a specific product line. There is also no breakout for maintenance pricing, which is often at a different discount than the hardware. How should we address this?

A: See Q & A #80 (Amendment 5) and Q & A # 19 (Amendment 3) adding maintenance & support to the Pricing Form.

128. **Q:** Please verify that there is NO requirement for a case study for Category 1.

A: No case study is required for Category 1.

129. **Q:** Do firewalls and security solutions fall in the Networking category (Category 4)?

A: Yes.

130. **Q:** Is there a minimum spend for the MEEC members to seek lease / lease-purchase financing?

A: No.

131. **Q: RFP Reference:** Financial Proposal - UMD-MEEC HW RFP 972016.xls - MEEC IT Hardware RFP Instructions, 5. Enter the minimum percent (%) off of your firm's published or otherwise verifiable Standard Education List Pricing (SELP) in the cell for each Brand bid.

Question: Is it permissible to enter a minimum discount range for Category #1 and Category # 5; as there are many different types of products with varying acceptable minimum discounts within Category #1 and Category #5?

A: See Q & A #80 (Amendment 5).

132. **Q: RFP Reference:** 2.0 – CATEGORIES AND CATEGORY SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS

Question: You list HP as an acceptable brand, and Hewlett Packard (HP) is now 2 distinct companies; so are you defining HP as being inclusive of both HP Inc. (HPI) and Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE), when the accurate HP listing would be to have both HPI and HPE listed separately?

A: Section C, Categories 2.1-2.5, the Acceptable Brands are modified to replace the HP listings as listed below. This update is reflected in the Revised Section C – Specifications and Requirements [Microsoft Word File]. The Pricing Form has also been updated.

- Category 1 – Desktop, Laptop, and Portable Computers/ Tablets –HPI
- Category 2 – Data Storage Devices and Systems – HPE
- Category 3 – Server Class Hardware/Equipment and Virtual Computing – HPE
- Category 4 – Network Hardware – HPE
- Category 5 – Computer Hardware Peripherals – HPI & HPE

133. **Q: RFP Reference:** 4. IDIQ Contracts - The Contractor may sell any product that falls into the awarded Category (for example, desktop computers, or data storage devices) within the manufacturer or brand awarded.

Question: Will you stipulate that this contract is for Commercial products only from the specified manufacturer or brand that fall into the Category, and that this contract is not open to Consumer products from the specified manufacturer or brand that fall into the Category?

A: No, as noted in the RFP, faculty, staff, and students are eligible to purchase off the contracts for personal use.

134. **Q:** The Acceptable Data Storage Devices and Systems (Category 2) and Network Hardware (Category 4) categories list Dell-EMC brands. While Dell did purchase EMC, the two brands have not been integrated to date. Will the University consider listing the brands separately at this time?

A: Section C, Categories 2.1-2.5, the Acceptable Brands are modified to include Dell and Dell-EMC brands as listed below. This update is reflected in the Revised Section C – Specifications and Requirements [Microsoft Word File]. The Pricing Form has also been updated.

- Category 1 – Desktop, Laptop, and Portable Computers/ Tablets – Dell, Dell / Wyse
- Category 2 – Data Storage Devices and Systems – Dell, Dell - EMC
- Category 3 – Server Class Hardware/Equipment and Virtual Computing – Server - Dell
- Category 4 – Network Hardware – Dell, Dell - EMC
- Category 5 – Computer Hardware Peripherals – Dell

135. **Q:** Section 1.6, Compatibility: All peripherals and components configured and ordered with a system must be compatible with that system. All components must be manufacturer approved, unless otherwise noted, and therefore, eligible for full manufacturer's warranty. Are you excluding the use of third party memory? The memory manufacturer would have their own warranty separate from the system. And, of course, this memory is compatible with the system and there can often be a significant cost savings.

A: Third party memory is not the norm, but it is not excluded. It may be provided at the request of the MEEC member institution.

136. **Q:** Section: 1.13.1, Categories 1-4 Base Warranty Requirements: (g) Manufacturer's warranty shall apply for all peripherals and accessories and for 1.13.2 Category 5 Base Warranty Requirements: For peripherals and accessories (categories 1-4) and Category 5 items, how long does the warranty need to be? Onsite? Or is whatever the manufacturer's warranty covers sufficient?

A: To clarify, peripherals and accessories is Category 5, not Categories 1-4. The Base Warranty Requirements for Categories 1-4 Base Warranty are listed in Section 1.13.1, and for Category 5 they are listed in Section 1.13.2. See Section 1.13.1 for what is required in the minimum 3 year on site

warranty for Categories 1-4. See Section 1.13.2 for Category 5 base warranty requirements where the term is not specified - it is set to what is offered by the manufacturer's base warranty.

137. **Q:** On page 9, Section A-2 Subsection A Paragraph 6, where the categories are defined, Category 3 talks about "Virtual Computing system hardware." Please specify in more detail what that refers to exactly: Virtual Host servers? Virtual desktop hosts? Further in that paragraph, it talks about a "virtual computing environment, including hybrid models." What is meant by "hybrid models?" Whether a server is a physical host or a virtual host, it's still a server, and it's not clear why there is a distinction between a server and "Virtual Computing system hardware," and also not clear why the word "hybrid" is used, as hybrid is most often used when discussing cloud solutions.

A: In the previous RFP, server hardware and computer virtualization were separate Categories and they were merged for this RFP. The category descriptions are general to provide a framework for a response and to not limit the response to a point in time, so that new technologies can be incorporated into that category. The term Hybrid is used to capture new and emerging technologies including on premises and off premises solutions.

138. **Q:** On page 10, Section A-2 Subsection A Paragraph 7, Financing and Leasing: we offer leasing but use a 3rd party. Can we answer this question in the affirmative that we offer financing? In terms of stipulating leasing terms, this seems too open ended, as terms depend on the length of the lease (3-yrs, 4-yrs, etc.) and the prevailing rates, which are tied to interest rates, out of anyone's control. How should we address the terms specifically?

A: Third party is acceptable. The lease terms would be negotiated directly with the Member Institution for order placement.

139. **Q:** Section 2.3 Category 4- One of the brands is Pulse Products. Is this Pulse Secure? **Pulse Secure** provides a consolidated offering for access control, SSL VPN, and mobile device security.

A: Pulse Secure is correct. This update is made as applicable in Section C for Category 4 and to the Pricing Form.

140. **Q:** On average, how much spend has been generated each year for this MEEC Hardware agreement since 2012 and what's anticipated spend for the next 3 years of the renewal period?

A: The average spend per year has been approximately \$100,000,000. It is estimated that the spend will remain consistent and therefore the anticipated spend for the next 3 years is estimated to be \$300,000,000.

In Section A-2 – Background/ Purpose, Instructions, Conditions and Notices to Contractors, 5. Contracts Use, 3rd paragraph (pg. 4), the sentence:

"It is estimated that the resulting contract(s) have the potential of expenditures in excess of \$650 million over a full, nine-year contract life."

Is deleted in entirety and replaced with the following sentence:

"It is estimated that the resulting contract(s) have the potential of expenditures in excess of \$900 million over a full, nine-year contract life."

141. **Q:** What's the process for MEEC members to seek leasing / lease-purchasing financing?

A: The MEEC Institution may request leasing as needed under the awarded Contract. A process definition of the individual Member Institution is not needed for Proposal submission. Depending on the scope, this could be requested through a TORP.

142. **Q:** Can the vendor arrange for leasing / lease-purchase financing through a 3rd party specialized lessor?

A: Yes.

143. **Q:** Will MEEC members accept the lease / lease-purchase financing contract language of the vendor / lessor OR is there already an approved MEEC lease / lease-purchase financing contract available for review?

A: There is no MEEC lease. A lease would be directly between the vendor/lessor and the Member Institution that makes a request.

144. **Q:** What terms (years, months) should the lease / lease-purchase financing be for - 3 years & 5 years, for example?

A: A three (3) year term can be presented for evaluation. MEEC members may require different terms based on the Member Institution's needs.

145. **Q:** What disposition services have the MEEC members used during the last contract?

A: MEEC does not capture this information.

146. **Q:** Can disposition services be outlined within the lease / lease-purchase financing response?

A: Yes. This would be worked out directly with the individual MEEC institution.

147. **Q:** Our Computer Peripheral catalog is vast in products that meet your criteria. Please explain organize by manufacturer?

A: If a vendor offers peripherals by multiple manufacturers, they may organize by manufacturer. See the Pricing Form tab for Category 5 that includes peripheral manufacturers.

148. **Q: SELP:** Contractor's published or otherwise verifiable Standard Educational List Pricing. Most manufacturers do not have Standard Education List pricing. Will MEEC take alternative options?

A: No. If a vendor's manufacturer list price - what is often referred to as "MSRP" - is the same price that is offered as their standard list price for education, then they need to use their MSRP as their SELP in preparing the Pricing Form, and state in their Financial Proposal their SELP is MSRP equivalent.

149. **Q:** If we cannot provide Asset Disposal due to the terms and conditions, can we waive that requirement?

A: Effectively yes as Section C, 4.5 Disposal Services, is not a Mandatory requirement.

150. **Q:** Section 1.3.4 - Please clarify if it is mandatory to have a letter or certificate for Category 5 peripherals?

A: See Q & A # 99 above, Category 5 peripheral devices is excepted (excluded) from the requirement. In 1.3.4 of Section C, the letter, certificate or other authorization as a reseller documentation requirement does **NOT** apply to Category 5 – Computer Hardware Peripherals.

151. **Q:** Bid document is unclear in this statement (Category 5 peripheral devices is expected).

A: The word is excepted and not expected.

152. **Q:** Given the multiple LOTS offering, will the University extend the Proposal due date by at least one week?

A: As noted previously, the due date is not extended.

153. **Q:** Part 1, Section A-2, A-11(Price Changes). Will Contractor be able to raise prices in the event of serious industry-wide shortages in materials or resources or significant increases in the cost of manufacturing, or other factors outside Contractor's reasonable control?

A: In the event of such catastrophic factors such as these described, a vendor would need to appeal to the procurement officer supporting the MEEC IT HW Contract.

154. **Q:** Notwithstanding Part 1, Section A-2, I (Alternate Proposals) and Part 1, Section A-2, S (Formation of Contract with Successful Contractor), will the University agree to consider and negotiate exceptions and requested additions to the terms and conditions in the RFP? If so, what is the procedure for Responder to take exceptions or request additions?

A: See Q & A #97 above. USM is under the State of Maryland. The RFP has standard (required) terms and conditions that include State of Maryland mandatory terms. The University may consider exceptions taken to the RFP's terms and conditions, however exception submissions are discouraged. A vendor's exceptions taken may be submitted as an attachment in the Technical Proposal.

155. **Q:** If a Responder submits exceptions/additions to terms and conditions of the RFP that are not accepted by the University, can the University still issue an award to that Responder and require such Responder to enter into the Agreement without the University either accepting Responder's exceptions/additions or coming to a negotiated agreement with the Responder as to the exceptions/additions?

A: No, that is not the intention. In the event a vendor is unwilling to accept the RFP terms, and mutually agreed to terms cannot be reached, the vendor would not be awarded a Contract.

156. **Q:** If a Responder submits exceptions/additions to terms and conditions of the RFP that are not accepted by the University, will the University allow Responder the option to withdraw its request for exceptions/additions and still be considered for an award?

A: Yes.

157. **Q:** If a Responder submits exceptions/additions to terms and conditions of the RFP that are not accepted by the University, will Responder's Proposal be deemed rejected and Responder not eligible for an award?

A: See Qs & As # 150 & 151 in this Amendment 5.

158. **Q:** Do all purchases under the resulting contract require a TORP?

A: No. Secondary competition via a TORP may be requested by MEEC Member Institutions but is not required, although is recommended on large dollar orders to receive the very best pricing. The higher the estimated dollar value of a purchase, the greater the likelihood a TORP may be issued.

159. **Q:** Can a purchasing entity issue a Task Order or a purchase order for equipment or services under this contract without first issuing a TORP?

A: Yes. See Q & A #154 above.

160. **Q:** Will an awarded Contractor have an opportunity to negotiate, with the MEEC member institution purchasing entity, modifications or additions to the contract terms before accepting a purchase order or task order that wasn't part of a TORP if such negotiated terms are allowed by the purchasing entity (not including the scope of what goods and services can be sold under the contract or the 0.5% surcharge to MEEC)?

A: No. A MEEC IT HW Contract will be awarded to each of the selected vendors. The contract cannot be modified by MEEC Member Institutions; however, terms may be added specific to a TORP, SOW, or Member Institution's PO.

161. **Q:** Is a Contractor required to bid every TORP?

A: No.

162. **Q:** Is a Contractor required to accept a task order or purchase order that is not the result of a TORP from a MEEC member institution purchasing entity if the purchasing entity and Contractor cannot agree on modified or added negotiated terms?

A: No. However, it is not envisioned that typical orders would require negotiations for MEEC Member Institutions to place orders under the Contract. Rather, special negotiations would only be seen as potentially needed for adding terms given the scope of a TORP.

163. **Q:** Proposer understands the importance of acceptance to the University and the MEEC members. Acceptance also has a critical impact on when a Contractor can recognize revenue and, under the contract, when the warranty and service periods begin. Will the University agree to add language that would deem acceptance if the purchasing entity does not notify the Contractor within 15 days of delivery of a nonconformance to the specifications?

A: No. Section E – Inspection and Acceptance Terms (pg. 44) does not include details such as days that may be required for an acceptance timeframe. Acceptance and installation timeframe requirements would need to be specified by the specific Member Institution's needs and agreed to prior to order placement.

164. **Q:** Will the University agree that any orders fulfilled for overseas (outside the USA) shipment will be contingent upon : (a) Proposer having an affiliate in the overseas region where it is being shipped, (b) such Proposer affiliate agreeing to accept the order and the contract terms and being deemed "Proposer" under the contract (c) mutually agreed upon modifications or additions to the contract between the Proposer Affiliate and the purchasing MEEC Institution that either of the parties deem necessary for Proposer Affiliate to accept the order

A: No, the University cannot make this contingency on behalf of MEEC Member Institutions that require overseas shipment. Again, terms would need to be specified and agreed to by the Member Institutions prior to order placement.

165. **Q:** Under Part II, Section I – Contract Clauses, 22. Termination for Convenience (pg. 55), will the University agree to provide advance written notice of 30 days, or in the alternative some other reasonable notice period?

A: No. This Termination for Convenience clause is a State of Maryland required term.

166. **Q:** Under Section 23 of Part II, (Termination of Default), will the University agree to extend the cure period in subsection (b) from 10 days to 30 days?

A: No. This Termination for Default clause is a State of Maryland required term.

167. **Q:** Will the University agree that any payment by the University or a MEEC member by credit card needs to be made at the time of order?

A: No. The University's P-card is a payment method, not a purchasing method. P-card may be used to pay invoices for orders that are under \$5,000.

168. **Q:** Are the two (2) three (3) year renewal options subject to both parties agreeing to the renewal?

A: Yes. The renewal options will be exercised via a Contract Modification that must be signed by both the Contractor and the Procurement Office. It is anticipated that Contractors in good standing will renew their MEEC IT HW contracts to continue service to MEEC Member Institutions over the full nine (9) year life of the Contract.

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION		
1. AMENDMENT NUMBER 7	2. DATE ISSUED 10-27-2016	3. NUMBER OF PAGES 1
4. ISSUED BY University of Maryland Department of Procurement & Strategic Sourcing 2109-C Patuxent Building College Park, Maryland 20742 POINTS OF CONTACT: Jeanne Parker, Assistant Director Carol Munn, Senior Buyer TELEPHONE NUMBERS: 301-405-7416 (Ms. Parker) 301-405-5859 (Ms. Munn) EMAIL ADDRESSES: jparker2@umd.edu cmunn@umd.edu		5. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 4)
6. NAME, ADDRESS AND FEI NUMBER OF CONTRACTOR		7A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NUMBER 972016
		7B. DATED 10/3/2016
8. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION		
<p>The solicitation identified in 7A above is amended as set forth in Item 9.</p> <p>The due date and time specified for receipt of offers/bids <u> X </u> is extended <u> </u> is not extended.</p> <p>Contractor must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the due date and time specified in the solicitation or as amended, by completing Items 6 and 10 and returning <u>1</u> copy of the amendment to the Issuing Office identified in Item 4 with their Proposal.</p> <p>FAILURE OF CONTRACTOR'S ACKNOWLEDGEMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR RECEIPT OF OFFERS/BIDS PRIOR TO THE DUE DATE AND TIME SPECIFIED MAY RENDER CONTRACTOR'S OFFER UNACCEPTABLE/ NON-RESPONSIVE AND SUBJECT TO REJECTION.</p>		
9. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT (Use additional pages if required)		
<p>9.1 The RFP is amended to extend the Proposal Due Date to <u>Monday, October 31, 2016 by 3:00 pm EDT</u>. There will be no further extensions.</p> <p>9.2 The RFP is amended for Section A-2, E. CLOSING DATE as follows:</p> <p>Proposals must arrive at the location at the email addresses listed in D. SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS (6) above on or before <u>October 31, 2016 at 3:00 pm</u> in the format set forth herein.</p> <p>Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 7A, including previous amendments, remain in full force and effect.</p>		
10A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or Print)		11A. NAME OF PROCUREMENT OFFICER (Type or Print) Jeanne Parker, Assistant Director, IT Procurement
10B. CONTRACTOR SIGNATURE (Signature of Person Authorized to Sign)	10C. DATE SIGNED	