DATE: October 21, 2021

TO: All Potential Vendors

FROM: Michael Callahan, RFP Coordinator

SUBJECT: Amendment #1 to 22-RFP-001 – *Managed File Transfer Modernization*

**Summary:**

This document is prepared by the Washington State Consolidated Technology Services (CTS) and shall serve as the sole official reply to Vendor Questions submitted in response to RFP 22-RFP-001.

Questions and responses are numbered for ease of reference only and are in no particular order or priority. Questions and comments have generally been stated as they were received except that some questions have been modified to maintain vendor confidentiality or to reduce redundancies. The answers may only explain or clarify some aspect that is already addressed in the RFP. Some of the answers may also supplement or change what was previously stated in the RFP or in an appendix. It is important that Vendors review all questions and answers. Vendors are advised to obtain and thoroughly review the complete, formal RFP located at: <http://watech.wa.gov/procurement-announcements>. In the revised RFP deleted text appears ~~struck through in black font~~, while added text appears underlined in red font.

**V****endor Questions and Official Answers**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| # | **QUESTION** | **CTS RESPONSE** |
| 1 | You are looking for a completely architected and proposed solution from a vendor correct? | Correct.  |
| 2 | Why is the SOW different between the version in Appendix G of the RFP and the version in Schedule B of the separate contract document? | The SOW in the Schedule B of the Appendix B *Proposed Contract* is merely a template whereas Appendix G reflects the services CTS desires for the MFT engagement.  |
| 3 | If we are aware of existing technology in your organization, but not referenced in the RFP document, that can be incorporated into the proposal to minimize costs, can we take that into consideration? Or does the RFP response need to be ‘turn key’. | CTS is looking for a ‘turn key’ solution.See related response to question 1.  |
| 4 | Is there a specific FIPS 140 level desired by CTS for this RFP, other than described throughout the RFP such as Section 5.12? | No. There is not a specific FIPS 140 level desired by CTS for this RFP.  |
| 5 | How much pre-paid support can WaTech purchase upfront for a perpetual license solution? | WaTech can pay no more than one year in advance for license support, although, it can commit to a multi-year agreement.  |
| 6 | Should we design a test/dev environment with this solution architecture? | Yes. The Cost Proposal Form has been modified in Section B to include a line item for costs associated with additional environments. Please see the amended RFP released with this amendment. |
| 7 | Does the WaTech use IPSEC or MACSEC today in their network? | This is out of scope for the RFP. CTS will not modify the network for this effort.  |
| 8 | Is there an existing backup solution to protect the proposed solution for recovery in the case of a disaster? | Yes. Vendors are not required to propose a backup solution for recovery. |
| 9 | Is the data traversing WaTech networks contained complete in WaTech network? | No. Data is currently transferred throughout the United States and Canada. |
| 10 | Is there a need for flow control enforcement for this bid? | Yes. CTS currently administrates flow control on the existing application. |
| 11 | Are there any instances where CJIS data is being transmitted outside the boundary of the physical secure location of the SGN? | Yes. See related response to question 9. |
| 12 | With CTS' intent to award up to three contracts for this procurement, does that mean CTS is going to operate three different file transfer environments in the overall architecture?  | This is an error and CTS intends to award one contract for this procurement. Please see the amended RFP released with this amendment.  |
| 13 | Is CTS intending to award multiple contracts for this procurement?  | CTS intends to award one contract for this procurement. Please see the amended RFP released with this amendment. |
| 14 | Does the CTS desire or need a certain FIPS 140-2 Level (Soon 140-3) level certification for this solution? For the encryption Thales has options to provide level 1, level 2 or level 3. Other than might be described throughout the RFP, such as Section 5.12? | No.See related response to question 4. |
| 15 | The RFP states “WaTech is most interested in a clustered infrastructure”. Does that mean that WaTech is more interested in an on prem solution? | No. CTS is interested in solutions that meet the requirements of the RFP. See Appendix E, Section A.  |
| 16 | The RFP states the following “WaTech’s SFT service provides strong audit trails to demonstrate compliance”. Does that mean you expect strong audit trail to be provided by the new solution? Or are you just stating that your current solutions offers that. If you require strong audit trails what are the requirements?  | Yes. CTS is expecting the solution to support strong audit trails.See Section 5.5.3 |
| 17 | Is there an existing SIEM to aggregate logs from our proposed solution? | No. Not at this time. |
| 18 | Do current clients use a VPN to access the service, or is it accessed over the public internet? | SFT.wa.gov is public facing.  |
| 19 | What is the preferred way to designate information in our proposal response that is proprietary or confidential? This question concerns the contact information of the references we will provide, and the organizations they represent. | RFP Section 3.7 *Confidential or Proprietary Information* addresses how Confidential and Proprietary information is addressed. For information Vendor’s deem Confidential or Proprietary, a clear and obvious notation in the header or footer is acceptable. |
| 20 | This section states: “The ASV will be expected to execute the Contract within three (3) Business Days of its receipt of the final Contract. “It is in contradiction to Sec. 7.10, which states: “The Apparently Successful Vendor will be expected to execute the Contract within five (5) calendar days of its receipt of the final contract. “Which Section, 3.13 or 7.10, is correct with respect to the time period the Contract must be executed by the ASV? | Section 3.13 *Contract Requirements* has been corrected to align with Section 7.10 *Contract Negotiations.* Please see the amended RFP released with this amendment. |
| 21 | What does it mean to CTS that a vendor is certified in managed files transfer tools? | See requirement 4.1.1. Vendors need to be either the Original Equipment Manufacturer or certified by the OEM. |
| 22 | What does it mean to CTS that a vendor has a minimum of 5 years’ experience with managed file transfer tools? | See answer to question number 21. |
| 23 | Can you please clarify the statement: “integration with SSO” ? What SSO is in use at WaTech currently? | SSO is not used in the current application. CTS desires to incorporate SSO with the new solution.See Definitions, Section 1.5.  |
| 24 | Does WaTech have a deployment preference of the options presented in the table? | No. CTS is looking for a solution that meets the desired requirements. |
| 25 | What restriction does WaTech having regarding where the data is stored? In a SaaS model the data will be stored in the Cloud and managed by Thales. Any specific requirement around that? Can hybrid cloud model deployment be acceptable such as one end on-prem and the other in public cloud? | The guidelines will be determined based on the RFP replies. Solutions will undergo a security review from the Office of Cyber Security. |
| 26 | In a SaaS model, is data storage, compute, etc included as part of the solution for the vendor to provide? | Yes. CTS is pursuing a complete solution which should include data storage for a SaaS solution. |
| 27 | For on-premise architecture, would the solution be deployed at both WaTech data centers for redundancy? | No. Vendors are not expected to propose a solution at this time. |
| 28 | What performance impact are you referring to regarding the statement: “Must routinely support large file transfer, up to and including at least 200GB, without impacting performance.“ ? | The performance cannot be impacted within scope of application |
| 29 | What is the average size of data uploaded and downloaded each day and what is the average number of uploads/downloads? | The average size is 20 MB. An average daily 90K |
| 30 | What is an average file size being transferred? | The average size is 20 MB |
| 31 | Is this requirement is for on-prem option? A SaaS solution will include scalability and High availability. | Yes. CTS requires the on-prem solution to include scalability and High availability. |
| 32 | When specifying 20,000 files per hour at peak volume what would be the average size file? | The average size is 20 MB. |
| 33 | What is the current bandwidth provided for individual uploads/downloads, is it throttled in any way? | No. Our current State Government network is up to 10 GBPS and is not throttled by the network.  |
| 34 | What current Identity Provider (IDP) is used to store the existing 20,000 users? | None. All user credentials are stored locally inly in the current application |
| 35 | What information or metadata is currently stored against each user account? | Credentials and home folders are stored in each user account |
| 36 | Are all 20,000 users stored in the one domain or are they spread between domains or shards within the one identity provider? | All user credentials are stored locally in the current application. |
| 37 | Does SAW (Secure Access Washington) and/or Active Directory Federated Services (ADFS) supports SAML or OIDC? | SAW supports SAML.  |
| 38 | For data encryption at rest what kind of encryption do you need? Encryption to protect against what threat? | CTS requires data encryption at rest. The method of encryption is open. Encryption will protect against insider threat. See section 5.4. |
| 39 | For data encryption in Flight does that mean protecting the data while it is sent to someone? Typically TLS will be used here. | Yes. CTS requires all connections to be secure.See section 5.4. |
| 40 | What is an average file size that is transferred? | The average Size is 20 MB |
| 41 | Are the existing user accounts local to the current solution or are they located in an LDAP repository? | No. All user credentials are stored locally in the current application. |
| 42 | Do you need to migrate the current data to the new solution? Do you have encryption on the current MFT? | No. Current transfer files data will not require migration to the new solution.  |
| 43 |  |  |
| 44 | Is this SLA in regard to support?  | Please refer to section 5.11. |
| 45 | Regarding data backup, does WaTech want to have a copy of the data on prem? | No. The new solution is not required to provide a backup.  |
| 46 | How much storage is allocated to support the FMT modernization? | Storage will not be allocated for a SaaS solution. Storage will be allocated for on prem solutions. Current storage allocation is 2 T. |
| 47 | Are there existing 2FA and MFA tools that we can integrate with our solution? | No. |
| 48 | Does CTS expect to award up to three contracts as noted in 1.1? Or as stated in 1.6 will only one ASV be selected?  | This is an error and CTS intends to award one contract for this procurement. Please see the amended RFP released with this amendment.  |
| 49 | In section 5, you mention multiple deployment models, is there a prefered deploymentmodel at WATech? | No. CTS is pursuing a solution that meets the defined requirements. |
| 50 | For the 20,000 accounts you currently have setup in your existing MFT solution, could you please provide a further breakdown of those accounts?a. Are those accounts ad-hoc login accounts vs recurring file transfer system to system accounts?b. What percent of the the existing accounts send files via web browser uploads and downloads vs automated system file transfers? | a. No accounts are currently ad-hoc.b. The percentage breakdown of protocols utilized are below:15 % HTTPS, 15% FTPS & 70% SFTP/SSHThe end users determine if the processes are automated or manual. |
| 51 | We see 1,000 to 50,000 files transferred per hour. Could you please share the total filestransferred in the period of a week or a month? | The average is approximately 1.2 Million files transferred per month. |
| 52 | Do you have seasonality where file transfer activity goes up, vs other times? What’s the highest season? | Yes, the reason for peak coverage. A large spectrum of business process are involved. |
| 53 | We understand that you will experience a 25% in MFT file growth, could provide more specific numbers as they relate to the following factors:a. Current total data volumes transferred through the system in a week?b. Current total file transfers processed during a week?c. How many accounts will you onboard in the next 3 years? Currently at 20,000 | a. The data volume is not currently monitored.b. The current total file transfers processed during a week is approximately 600,000.c. The number of accounts onboarded is determined at the state agency level. |
| 54 | The current SFT solution for web browsers via HTTPS is FIPS 140-2 complaint today? | The current HTTPS connection is FIPS 140-2 enabled. All current protocol connections are FIPS 140-2 enabled |
| 55 | Could you share you current breakdown of protocol usage for file transfers today:a. By HTTPS percent of file transfers?b. By SFTP percent of file transfers?c. By FTP/SSL percent of file transfers? | Here is the breakdown. 15 % HTTPS, 15% FTPS & 70% SFTP/SSH |
| 56 | The RFP states that you comply with HIPAA, SOX, PCI GDPR, GLBA regulations with strong audit trails. Could you please explain the current usage of these regulations and the payloads that are affected by them? | We have annual audits by various parties that the State is exchanging data with requiring proof of compliance. |
| 57 | Is 200GB the largest possible size of a file transfer you process today? | There is not a limit on the size of file within the existing application. |
| 58 | Do you currently have a single engine for the whole enterprise or do you have multiple instances of your MFT solution? Meaning different instances for different agencies? | The current architect is proxy and backend servers within the virtual VMware. All agencies use the same solution. |
| 59 | How do agencies today self-administer their own accounts in the same application? | The rights of each administer is define by group within the existing application. |
| 60 | In Section 5.3.2 could you please explain what you mean by “Screen reader compliance” and how you use this feature today? | This feature is to be utilized by users who have a sight disability. |
| 61 | In Section 5.3.10 what percent of the total file transfers in the system are “ad-hoc”? | The existing application does not have any Ad-Hoc accounts setup. |
| 62 | For “ad-hoc” account setup, do those file transfers still require the provisioning of auserid, password/certificate/etc? | An addition that was requested by the State Agencies. Vendor will state how their application covers this feature. |
| 63 | In Section 5.4.3 “Segregation transferred data by domain.” Could you explain what this requirement is and how it is implemented today? | Segregation of data transferred by organizational unit.The data can only be access by account associated with the data stored by their group. |
| 64 | In Section 5.10.2 do you require that we provide installation procedures of step by step how the product is installed? Or would a document pointing to our documentation suffice? | Existing Document is acceptable. |
| 65 | In Section 5.11.1 your SLA requirement is 100% uptime. Is this a requirement for theSaaS solution only, or do you also expect 100% uptime with our on-prem solution? Keep in mind that in uptime requirements, all single points of failure must be eliminated and redundancy has to be implemented across data centers. This makes the implementation extremely expensive. Is there ever a downtime available to do things such as OSupgrades, Application upgrades, etc. | The expectation of uptime of the application is required regardless of infrastructure. The vendors will not be held to uptime of on perm infrastructure.  |
| 66 | Other than the production environment, how many lower environments will need to implement? Which ones? (i.e. QA, System Test, User acceptance, Dev, etc.) | We require just one lower environment for test/dev . |
| 67 | Are we right to assume that you expect a cloud environment that includes infrastructure as a service, application as a service, implementation and configuration, as well as migration costs in the proposal? | Correct, if the vendor solution proposal is cloud based. |
| 68 | What caliber/segmentation of user is going to be performing the MFT? This will dictate the degree to which WaTech could leverage some of the higher function UI/UX, versus something more basic and constrained | Vendor will provide information on how their application provides separation of activity. |
| 69 | [Regarding 5.2.2] Does this mean clustered, or are there resiliency requirements (HA) in mind?How many 9s of durability does that equate to? What are the Durability and Availability requirements WaTech has in mind? | Ability to cover peaks in usage and high availability. The existing applications has been down for approx. 4 hours per year over the past two years which is acceptable from state agencies. |
| 70 | [Regarding 5.3.2] Please describe a screen radar compliance, and how can this be accomplished? Would it be O/S, Web browser? | This feature is to be utilized by the users with sight disability the vendor will need to provide a documentation on a solution for this utilizing a browser connection. |
| 71 | [Regarding 5.3.14] Is this a permission concern? Who is expected to accomplish this in the user community? Sync AD to IAM? Use Cognito? Is this sharing across accounts? What are some business examples of how you might accomplish/use this? | The exchange of data is currently done by one to many, many to one, many to many. This is all determine by how the agencies setup their users accounts. |
| 72 | [Regarding 5.3.15] Can you please provide a business case as to how this might work in a real-time environment. Would this be Active Directory? | A notification of password is due to expire in 10 days for local accounts to the application. This not an requirement for Active Directory accounts. |
| 73 | [Regarding 5.4.2] What endpoints are you interested in comparing? Can you speak to the business scenario that drives this requirement? Could versioning help support this? "Man in the middle attack?" - Network protocols, encryption in transit | Protocols with secure connection. Data encrypted at rest. Data is stored for only group access whom has ownership. All within application setup. |
| 74 | What constitutes a domain of data? Can you provide examples? Different agencies? | The data is stored for only group access for whom has permission for that group. |
| 75 | [Regarding 5.5.1-5.5.4] Does this mean monitoring, dashboard? Thoughts - Cloudwatch, CloudTrail (less likely), Lambda, GuardDuty? | The method of monitoring and dashboards will be provided by the vendor in the capabilities of their application. |
| 76 | [Regarding 5.6.1] Are there any specific protocols that we might need to be concerned with HTTPS will be a function of the website? | The existing application provides a HTTPS client upon a HTTPS connection. This is required for the new solution. |
| 77 | [Regarding 5.6.2] Can you please provide a business example? Is this follow up functionality after moving the file (e.g. rename)? | Here is one example of business process. End users upload files to their connection point and the file is moved to a central access point for the agency. Only users with permission have access to that location. |
| 78 | [Regarding 5.6.5] On which protocols do you require this? Multi-part uploads in S3? | Vendor will provide information on how their application covers this feature for various uploads. The requirement originally was for ssh/sftp connection then expanded. |
| 79 | [Regarding 5.6.6] Can you describe a business scenario? What are servers? Various storages? On prem? O/S versions?FSx for on prem? Pull should be fine… push might be a question They have a co-lo, on prem, various cloud | The ability of the vendor application to automate connection to various points (servers, storage) and upload of file to the various platforms. |
| 80 | [Regarding 5.8.2] What does this mean -- WAF? Guard Duty? | Please provide access restrictions information on your application |
| 81 | [Regarding 5.9.2] Are you retiring any existing directory services or is this a matter of integrating with them? Are you presently using file transfer right now?Use Amazon Directory services and run a sync WaTech manages their ADFS and can point to solutions like Connect Is this a configuration question using existing assets? | All user credentials are stored locally in the current application. |
| 82 | [Regarding 5.9.2.1] Is this providing some high-level roadmap as to how to implement the solution? | Correct, providing a high level roadmap is all that is required at this time. |
| 83 | [Regarding 5.12.1-5.12.9] How do you do with e-Discovery nowadays? Criminal Justice? Potentially GovCloud? Or is it because this is a state concern? | We have annual audits by various parties in which the State is exchanging data with, requiring proof of compliance. |
| 84 | [Regarding 5.9.2] Question 1) - Where is the data being stored? Question 2) - How much data is utilized?  | Currently on prem utilizing 2T. |
| 85 | Please elaborate further on what is meant by a multi-tenant solution? Are you referring to a desired architecture or cloud vs on prem deployment choice? Does that mean a cloud architecture is preferrable to on prem deployment? | The reference to separate domains is that each agency is segregated to their own accounts/data by permissions. We are looking for the solution which meets our requirements regardless of infrastructure. |
| 86 | What is the peak files transferred ceiling? What is the expected average? What is the average volume of file data per transfer? What should an environment be sized to handle? Is it the max load with max volume with max users at the same time? | The current usage of the secure file transfer service is 20,000 accounts with 1,000 to 50,000 files transferred per hour. An average size of transfer file is 20MB |
| 87 | 50,000 transfers per hour at 25% year over year growth would be approximately 36Million transfers per month #1, 45M per month #2, 56M per month #3, 72M per month #4, and 90M per month #5. Please confirm this is the traffic this application should be sized to support? | The current usage of the secure file transfer service is 20,000 accounts with 1,000 to 50,000 files transferred per hour. An average transferred file size is 20MB. Based on the history, an increase by 7% yearly was seen. |
| 88 | 20,000 users at 25% year over year growth would be approximately 20,000 users year #1, 25,000 users year #2, 32000 users year #3, 40,000 users year #4, and 48,000 users year #5. Please confirm this is the user growth this application should be sized to support? Please note that there may be minimal correlation of numbers of users to volume of data or numbers of transfers, but we need some guidelines for capacity planning. | The current usage of the secure file transfer service is 20,000 accounts with 1,000 to 50,000 files transferred per hour. An average transferred file size is 20MB. Based on the history, an increase by 7% yearly was seen. |
| 89 | It appears "2021" is a typo and the Contract will be available to begin work Jan 7, "2022".  | That is correct. Section 2 *Schedule* has been amended to reflect that correction. Please see the amended RFP released with this amendment.  |
| 90 | Is it possible for the contract execution/signature to occur before the end of 2021? | The January 7 date in Section 2 *Schedule* is a not-to-exceed date – i.e. the actual date of execution depends on how quickly the contract can be executed.  |
| 91 | If a reseller is involved, will the reseller's signature be required for this section without that of the vendor? In this case the vendor would work under their reseller contract and the reseller would have the direct contract with WATECH. | See 4.1.2. The vendor submitted the Response would be the party with who CTS will contract. |
| 92 | If this solution is provided via a reseller, can this notice of willingness come from the reseller who would have that contract, or renew the one he has? | See 4.1.2. No, the vendor submitted the Response would be the party with who CTS will contract. |
| 93 | Please confirm the MWBE Certification (Appendix C), is not a requirement for this RFP. | Per Section 3.15 *Minority and Women’s Business Enterprises (MWBE)* certified Vendors are encouraged to complete the certification in Appendix C, but it is not a requirement. |
| 94 | Agreements between Vendor and Reseller are confidential. Alternatively, would a letter from the vendor indicating the reseller's official/authorized reseller status suffice? | Yes, that is acceptable. See 4.1.2 |
| 95 | If our bid is provided via a reseller, can that reseller not be considered as an unallowed "3rd party," and be allowed to team with the solution vendor to resell the vendor’s solution? Can we assume WATECH does not preclude use of resellers? | A reseller is not considered a 3rd party for purposes of this requirement.  |
| 96 | Please elaborate more on this like expected details, contract performance milestones, and phases of such evaluation.  | “Performance-based” means the resulting contract and any SOW has payment tied to deliverables where deliverables are governed by an acceptance criteria agreed to by the parties and memorialized in the contract or SOW. |
| 97 | The vendor name appears clear as the name of the supplier, but this form asks for “Your Entity name:” Question: Isn’t “entity” meant to be the referred party who uses the proposed solution? In that case then, don’t you need the referring entity’s telephone and email and not necessarily ours as the vendor? | “Your Entity Name” on the Appendix H *Vendor Client Reference Form* is the name of the entity giving the reference.  |
| 98 | Please elaborate more on this like expected details, testing milestones, success criteria, and term. This topic also may be addressed with contract based warranties which would warranty the product to perform as advertised. Will that be an alternative to performance testing? | There will not be any alternate performance testing. The performance testing will ensure the application is not the bottle neck during the test. |
| 99 | Is the POC expected to be performed on prem, in a lab environement, or an existing WATECH facility/cloud? | The test platform will be at the Vendor discretion. |
| 100 | Can technical and service responses be added in-line under each paragraph in this RFP document for our vendor responses and then submitted as our Volume 1 content for Response to Vendor Requirements or is there a preferred alternative way to respond? | This is acceptable, but there is no prescribed format for Vendor’s response (other than those requirements in Section 3. |
| 101 | If deployment models are available for all options, does WATECH desire pricing for all those options or do you have a preference for deployment in your environment, your Cloud, or use of a Vendors Managed Cloud? | Please provide pricing for all options in your response. |
| 102 | What is the min and max peak files per hour? How does this contrast with questions above in #2 and 3? | The current usage of the secure file transfer service is 20,000 accounts with 1,000 to 50,000 files transferred per hour. An average size of 20MB. Based on the history saw an increase by 7% yearly. |
| 103 | Is Azure AD also in use? | This is not currently used. |
| 104 | Please define your definition of ad hoc transfers or characterize them. What are the specific requirements for Ad hoc? | As defined by industry standards, describe how your application covers. |
| 105 | SLA's are typically dependent on CTS infrastructure and not vendor dependent if the solution is managed by CTS. If the solution is cloud resident where the cloud solution is provided by the vendor, then SLA's are applicable. Is this the context of this question? If the solution is vendor managed cloud resident, please clarify if this 7/24/365 availability can be considered as achieved successfully with SLA’s of 99.9% or 99.99%? | Correct, the on prem is CTS’ responsibility and cloud solution is the vendor responsibility.  |
| 106 | Does WATECH expect the vendor to deliver and install hardware for this solution if on premise?   If Hardware is required, might it also be specified and installed by WATECH?    | CTS will provide on perm utilizing VMware virtual servers. |
| 107 | What does this mean or can you describe what aspects of the Organizational structure needs to be up loaded? Is this referring to the users of the service or the various delegations of administration and WATECH organization or agencies? | Currently 67 different groups utilize the service with control over their accounts/transfer data within their group only.  |
| 108 | What does this mean or can you describe what Legacy data exists, where it resides, and how it is to be relocated? | Current account information is the data and resides within current application. |
| 109 | How many people need to have training in this new application? Will this training need to be for experienced MFT administrators or new IT personnel? | Please provide information on training regardless of level of student and cost per student. |
| 110 | Should this be included in both of the 2 proposal parts with separation of price and scope per Volume 1 and Volume 2 guidelines? | Appendix G is merely the SOW template. It does not need to be included in Vendor’s Response.  |
| 111 | Is the growth rate year over year for 5 years, or static? | We have seen approximately 7% per year. |
| 112 | Is the file size mentioned, average file size that is transferred through the existing system. Are we forecasting any growth in this file size in the future? | The current usage of the secure file transfer service is 20,000 accounts with 1,000 to 50,000 files transferred per hour. An average size of 20MB. Based on the history saw an increase by 7% yearly. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 113 | We seek clarification on what this means?, Does this mean that the accounts certificates are expiring?, or the account password is expiring? | The requirement is for both expiring account certificates and password which are stored within the application. |
| 114 | Does this mean the data integrity is verified somehow in the file tracking mechanism?  | The existing application utilizes MD5 checks. This is verified with the file tracking logs. Please provide how your solution would provide the same feature. |
| 115 | Can you please clarify what is referred to as "domain" here? | A group of accounts and transferred data that is with distinct permissions. |
| 116 | Can you please quantify the term "large numbers". If possible, can you specify a minimum number? | The large number refers to 50,000 or above. |
| 117 | Can you please clarify this question- two user accounts accessing a shared folder? | Describe how your application, shares transferred files on the service. |
| 118 | [Regarding 5.7.7] Can you please clarify this question? | This is a POC context item. We want to document the process of creating two accounts that have the files renamed upon uploading. |
| 119 | [Regarding 5.7.8] Can you please clarify this question? | This is a POC context item. We want to document the process of creating two accounts which have their uploaded files move to another location or transferred to another server via a file push. |
| 120 | How many unique MFT use cases are currently in use? | CTS scope has been we provide the service and agencies utilize the service to meet their needs. The quantity of unique use cases is unknown. |
| 121 | How many additional unique use cases are planned for the future state? | CTS scope has been we provide the service and agencies utilize the service to meet their needs. The quantity of unique use cases is unknown. |
| 122 | How many lower environments (for example, Test, QA, UAT, DR, etc.) are required and should they mirror Production and be clustered? | We require one Test/dev without mirroring. |
| 123 | What tools are currently used for detailed audit compliance monitoring and alerting? | Logs files. |
| 124 | What is the source of detailed audit compliance data? | Logs files. |
| 125 | What’s the current active total of delegated administrators? | There is over 150 at this time. |
| 126 | What is the anticipated growth of delegated administrators over the next 3-5 years? | This is an unknown as the future demand is unknown. |
| 127 | Can a vendor Statement of Work be used in lieu of the version provided in the RFP request? |  No. This is unacceptable.  |
| 128 | Are there any other legacy/outside MFT environments to be consolidated into this project? | This is not within scope of this RFP.. |
| 129 | What are the specific use cases for Email Alerts? | Transfers, Credential expiring, internal process. |
| 130 | What are the operational visibility and tracking requirements for the future state? | Please provide cabilities of your application in regard to tracking, dashbords, & monitoring of application activity. |
| 131 | Are any external tools (i.e. Splunk, etc) currently used to parse MFT logging? | The use of external tools is not in use to parse logs. |
| 132 | Are there any data archiving requirements for a Vendor Managed Cloud deployment and if so what is the data retention period? | The archiving of transfer data is not a requirement regardless of infrastructure. |
| 133 | Will the migration be a phased approach or single cutover event? | See Appendix G “Migration and Deployment Plan of Action and Milestones”. |
| 134 | If a reseller is involved, will the SOW be signed by both vendor and reseller? Alternatively, if the SOW is provided by the reseller for the Vendors SOW scope, is it understood that reseller is simply passing vendors SOW on to purchaser? | Please see 4.1.2 and answer to question number 91. |
| 135 | This URL is general. Are addenda posted to this site as well or can you offer more specifics?: https://watech.wa.gov/Managed-File-Transfer-Modernization |  In addition to WEBS, Amendments to the RFP shall be posted to the procurement page of WaTech’s web site along with the other procurement documents.  |
| 136 | In regards to Appendix G SOW will a signature by the reseller suffice if the solution is provided via a reseller?  | See answer to question #134 |
| 137 | Does WaTech have any use cases that require "out of the box" scirpts or customizations outside of current solution configuration options? | There is not any requirement of out of the box use cases or customized scripts. |
| 138 | Who will be evaluating the proposal responses?What is the criteria that Vendors will need to explain in orders to provide “completeness and validity of responses” Regarding the scoring, is there a more detailed breakdown of the criteria that bidders need to meet with individual scores? If so, will you provided the breakdown of those weighted score criteria for the scoring process?  | The RFP will be evaluated as described in Section 7. Volume 1 will be evaluated by a team of technical subject matter experts, while volume 2 will be evaluated by someone in WaTech’s Finance department.  |
| 139 | [Regarding Section 5.3.2] Is this in reference to HHS.gov 508 compliance?  Please explain a business use case for this requirement. | Yes. This service may be used by people who require the use of a screen reader for accessibility. |
| 140 | Could you please elaborate how 5.3.12 is different from line item 5.3.13? | 5.3.12 would be satisfied by domain, or delegated, administrators for example. 5.3.13 would allow users to authenticate with a token or pre-shared key in lieu of a username and password combination for example. |
| 141 | [Regarding 5.4.3] Could you please provide additional detail on what you are wanting to know here and how it is used? Also how do you define a domain? | Data is segregated based on domain, which could mean an account, tenant, or agency for example. |
| 142 | [Regarding 5.6.5] Are you asking if the file transfer can resume from point of failure? | Yes. Upon network disconnect |
| 143 | [Regarding 5.7.6] Could you please describe a use case for this so we can understand better? | Statement is for demonstration of solution provided. |
| 144 | [Regarding 5.7.7] Could you please describe a use case for this so we can understand better? | Statement is for demonstration of solution provided. |
| 145 | [Regarding 5.8.3] What is internal SGN? How is it utilized and configured? | SGN stands for State Government Network. Configuration is beyond the scope of this RFP. It is utilized by many state agencies to transfer data. |
| 146 | [Regarding 5.11] Could you please help us understand and clarify what you are needing here? | See Section 1.2 and 1.3. |
| 147 | [Regarding 5.12.1-5.12.10] We are unsure what you are asking for here. Is this the SLA for Customer Support? | No. Section 5.12 is titled “Regulatory Compliance Requirements” |
| 148 | SECTION – 2.2 – If consulting work is to be performed for any reason beyond say for example the support and maintenance period are there any exceptions to continue the SOW and related services? | This will be determined at the time. |
| 149 | In Section 4.5 are the most favored nation pricing terms limited to Government companies or industry wide? |  Assuming the reference is in regard to the Appendix B *Proposed Contract,* there are no limitations. Vendors must state their exceptions to the contract terms in accordance with RFP Section 3.13 *Contract Requirements.*  |
| 150 | In Section 7.1, the reference being tied to performance is based on what criteria – the statement of work? If not what is meant by performance and what terms does your organization seek here? | There is no reference to performance in Section 7.1. However, if this is in reference to the performance-based contracting requirement in Section 4.6 *Performance Based Contracting,* it is applicable to any services provisioned under the contract. |
| 151 | Regarding Term 13, our firms is not a value added reseller but if it were more advantageous to your organization for a vendor bidding on this agreement to propose its software and services via a VAR (meaning a software reseller and/or systems integrator) is that permissible under your agreements? |  If Vendor is not a Reseller than this section would not apply. Vendors must state their exceptions to the contract terms in accordance with RFP Section 3.13 *Contract Requirements.*  |
| 152 | Regarding Section 15, are you expecting vendors to disclose their intellectual property prior to the project if selected so as to exclude from your Work Product ownership in the future? | No, WaTech does not expect Vendors to disclose their intellectual property prior to the project. Vendors must state their exceptions to the contract terms in accordance with RFP Section 3.13 *Contract Requirements.*  |
| 153 |  Regarding Section 38 are you asking our firm to allow assignment of the purchased software to any US government agency within the State of Washington and outside the state? | Section 38 pertains to assignment to another agency within political boundaries of Washington State. While technically, that would include an assignment to an agency of the US government, that is not expected. Vendors must state their exceptions to the contract terms in accordance with RFP Section 3.13 *Contract Requirements.*   |
| 154 | For 40.1 can you elaborate on the scope of information we need to retain for the 6 year period? | As stated in Section 40 *Review of Vendor’s Records,* subsection 40.1, “books, records, documents and other evidence relating to this Contract, including but not limited to Minority and Women’s Business Enterprise participation (if applicable), protection and use of Purchaser’s Confidential Information, and accounting procedures and practices which sufficiently and properly reflect all direct and indirect costs of any nature invoiced in the performance of this Contract.” Vendors must state their exceptions to the contract terms in accordance with RFP Section 3.13 *Contract Requirements.*   |
| 155 | Can you please elaborate on 42.1 in terms of what is meant by “mask work”, “utility model” and other infringements? | While WaTech cannot provide any legal advice, “Mask Works” means the same as defined in the Semiconductor Chip Protection Act. “Utility Model” is not applicable and has been deleted from Appendix B *Proposed Contract*. See the amended Appendix B *Proposed Contract* released with this amendment. |
| 156 | Can you please explain the coverage needed under Section 45? | While WaTech cannot provide any legal advice, information is available from the Department of Labor and Industries. [Labor & Industries (L&I), Washington State](https://www.lni.wa.gov/) |
| 157 | Regarding Section 57 is the non-performance based on the statement of work or what criteria? | Non-performance is based on non-performance of any obligation in the contract.  |
| 158 | In 59.1 is the term set for 15 days or negotiable to a longer term given that some remediation often requires cooperation and access to systems/information from the Purchaser (customer)? | Vendors must state their exceptions to the contract terms in accordance with RFP Section 3.13 *Contract Requirements.*   |
| 159 | For 60 what would be examples of canceling contract when not in the best interests of the State? | Vendors must state their exceptions to the contract terms in accordance with RFP Section 3.13 Contract Requirements.  |
| 160 | Regarding 1.3 on Page 4 does this mean that your organization does not prefer a third-party VAR or systems integrator to perform the services on behalf of the software vendor? Are you open to running the MFT software vendors solutions on premises as well as hosted in Cloud? Is your preference being deployed on private cloud and which cloud providers do you prefer if so? | This is correct, vendor responsible for solution entirely. |
| 161 | In 1.3 how many approximate trading partners or counter-parties does the State communicate with today and projected tomorrow for its MFT platform? | This is unknown item, as only the throughput is known including total of user accounts. |
| 162 | Regarding 1.6 if a prior proof of concept were done could this be used for Step 3 so that the vendor would not have to complete this step again? Does the POC require an on premises or cloud based sandbox environment? Do you provide the cloud sandbox or does the vendor under consideration? |  A prior proof of concept would not be accepted. CTS cannot answer the rest of this question. It depends on what solutions are proposed by the responding Vendors.  |
| 163 | Regarding 4.7 may the references also be eligible if they are non-government agencies? | No, the requirement is the references must be government references.  |
| 164 | Regarding Section 5.1 are you interested and/or prefer that if a MFT deployment by vendor is done on premises (or your own private cloud) that vendor assist with managed services such as monitoring, assistance with version management, and related services? | WaTech is interested in solutions that meet the requirements of the RFP. See Appendix E, Section A. |
| 165 | What are the number of setups in terms of rules we need to export? | The uses of terms and variables is unknown when migrating from one application to another without knowledge of said applications. |
| 166 | Can you please provide additional details around the use case and what you are trying to achieve regarding line 40 in the technical requirements: “Allows the creation of two accounts with renamed file name”. We want to make sure we understand what you are wanting to do so we can write up the correct response.  | Statement is for demonstration of solution provided. |
| 167 | Can you please provide additional details around the use case and what you are trying to achieve regarding line 41 in the technical requirements: “Allows the creation of two accounts with file transfer and/or move based on folder placement and/or file name”. We want to make sure we understand what you are wanting to do so we can write up the correct response. | Statement is for demonstration of solution provided. |