



STATE OF WASHINGTON

WASHINGTON TECHNOLOGY SOLUTIONS

Washington's Consolidated Technology Services Agency
1500 Jefferson Street SE • Olympia, Washington 98504-1501

DATE: January 7, 2020
TO: All Potential Vendors
FROM: Michael Callahan, RFP Coordinator
SUBJECT: Amendment #1 to C20-RFP-032 – *IBM z Series Mainframe as a Service*

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 C20-RFP-032.

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.

Vendor Questions and Official Answers

#	Question	CTS Response
1	Is CTS open to software product substitutions where financial benefit would result by replacing certain products with alternatives of equal or greater functionality?	This information is contained in the RFP. Please review section 5.14.
2	What structures are resident in the ICF LPARs and which SYSPLEX functions are enabled?	The following structure are residents in the ICF LPARs and enabled: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• RLS cache• RACF cache• GRS lock• Log stream• XCF signaling• JES checkpoint• Computer Associates CCI
3	The following vendors' products are listed in Appendix-J-Software-List, but costs for them have	The following software is owned by customer agencies. CTS does not have a cost associated with

	<p>not been provided, and they are not listed in the cost proposal worksheet. Please advise if they are in scope or not.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cannon • Chicagosoftware • Data21 • EMC • Informatica • Legacy Solutions • Napersoft • Oce • Tibco Software Inc. 	<p>the software, the cost is pass through to the customer agency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cannon • Chicagosoftware • Data21 • Informatica • Legacy Solutions • Napersoft • Tibco Software Inc. <p>(EMC and OCE are hardware related; should not have been listed on the software list.</p>
4	<p>Costs for the following vendors have been provided, but they are not listed in Appendix-J-Software-List. Please provide the products for each vendor, along with the installed version/releases, consistent with Appendix J.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSI International/BI Moyle • DataKinetics • Elixir • SPL Software 	<p>CTS needs more time to answer this question and will issue another amendment no later than January 8, 2020.</p>
5	<p>Our request is that you remove the following phrase from the third paragraph in 4.5, “, to at least three (3) client using approximately one thousand two hundred (1200) MIPS for a minimum of three (3) years in the Vendor’s data center facilities” As stated elsewhere in section 4.5, references must be for similar scope of the services anticipated in this RFP, and further requires us to quantify the level of services provided to those references. In addition, we can provide details of the full breadth and scope of capabilities that will be available to CTS through our services. We’re confident that all of this past performance and future capabilities information will be more than sufficient for CTS to confirm our ability to meet your needs on this contract. Thank you for your consideration of my request.</p>	<p>No, CTS has determined that it will not remove the requirement.</p>
6	<p>In Appendix E, Cost Proposal Worksheet, please clarify the “Forecasted utilization” of 130, 95, 55 MSUs for Years A, B, C, respectively. Are these forecasted MSUs the anticipated Peak capacity usage or the 4-Hour Rolling Average?</p>	<p>This is not the anticipated peak capacity. The pricing model was developed to evaluate the pricing.</p>

	<p>Based on the four SCRT reports provided, the “forecasted utilization” may be more closely aligned to the 4-Hour Rolling Average, but we want to make sure we understand the requirement/forecast.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="183 474 849 577"> <thead> <tr> <th>SCRT reported MSUs</th> <th>June</th> <th>July</th> <th>August</th> <th>September</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Machine MSU</td> <td>213</td> <td>213</td> <td>213</td> <td>213</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Peak MSU (SCRT N7)</td> <td>160</td> <td>160</td> <td>179</td> <td>170</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Peak 4HRA MSU</td> <td>117</td> <td>120</td> <td>121</td> <td>116</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	SCRT reported MSUs	June	July	August	September	Machine MSU	213	213	213	213	Peak MSU (SCRT N7)	160	160	179	170	Peak 4HRA MSU	117	120	121	116	
SCRT reported MSUs	June	July	August	September																		
Machine MSU	213	213	213	213																		
Peak MSU (SCRT N7)	160	160	179	170																		
Peak 4HRA MSU	117	120	121	116																		
7	<p>In Appendix K, Total Customer Monthly Jobs is assumed to be batch jobs and shows a range of 75K to over 100K per month, and the last 7 months consistently at or over 100K. In the Appendix N Q&A responses, #29, about batch failure rates it states: "OCT19 failed jobs 315 - monthly batch total jobs 46664 =.68%". What is the correct monthly batch job baseline to assume for the RFP response?</p>	<p>This only represents the failure rates of batch job running via CA7.</p>																				
8	<p>Follow up to Appendix N Q&A response #22: Describe in more detail the services required for the Service Desk.</p>	<p>This information is contained in RFP - please review section 5.3 (MS 20) General Support.</p>																				
9	<p>Follow up to Appendix N Q&A #32: What Linux OS and versions are running each of the 5 guests identified as in scope? Since it states they are not backed up, please confirm the assumption the 5 guests are not a part of the scope for DR testing and recovery.</p>	<p>CTS is running SUSE Linux Enterprise Server (SLES) 11, SP2.</p> <p>The CTS z/VM & Linux environments are not recovered on our current DR vendor’s z/VM environment.</p>																				
10	<p>Is 17 TB ECKD DASD storage capacity inclusive of zVM/Linux storage as well? Please specify how much disk capacity zVM/Linux storage has.</p>	<p>Yes, 650 GB (95 3390-9) DASD and 500 GB FCP allocated.</p>																				
11	<p>Please share the list of all the started tasks.</p>	<p>CTS will provide this information to the ASV, this is not applicable for the RFP.</p>																				
12	<p>How many numbers of Adabas "databases" are running within these Adabas environments?</p>	<p>This information is in the RFP Appendix N.</p> <p>ADABAS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 17 Production • 61 Development / Test 																				
13	<p>Please provide HCD (Hardware Configuration Definition) report to check the OSA definitions.</p>	<p>CTS will provide this information to the ASV. This information was also provided in the RFP and associated documents.</p>																				
14	<p>Please confirm that the 63 TB uncompressed Virtual tape library capacity is z/OS reported sizing.</p>	<p>It is uncompressed and the system is mirrored.</p>																				

	(Assume the capacity does not include the Data Dedup amount).	
15	<p>Please run the following JCL and send the .txt data to analyze the current Disk utilization.</p> <pre> //***** ***** //* THIS STEP CREATES THE BASIC DCOLLECT DATA ***** //***** ***** //STEP01 EXEC PGM=IDCAMS //SYSPRINT DD SYSOUT=* //OUTDS DD DSN=DISKDATA.DCOLLECT.FOR.EXTRACT, // DISP= (NEW, CATLG), UNIT=SYSALLDA, // DCB= (DSORG=PS, RECFM=VB, LRECL=644), // SPACE= (CYL, (200,150), RLSE) //SYSIN DD * DCOLLECT OFILE(OUTDS) VOLUMES (*) NODATAINFO </pre>	<p>Please see the reports released with this amendment:</p> <p>Report 1 - MVSDS.SOFTP155.DISKDATA.DCOLLECT.FOR.EXTRACT .2020-01-06@11.01.59.RP00155.V1RA.TXT</p> <p>Report 2 - MVSDS.SOFTT155.DISKDATA.DCOLLECT.FOR.EXTRACT .2020-01-06@11.03.37.RP00155.VV51.TXT</p>
16	<p>C20-RFP-031.docx, Section 4.10 and Appendix E: CTS intends to assign its current contracts for software (ISV) to the contracting Vendor. Can you please identify which ISVs contract are assignable to the contracting Vendor and which ISVs are NOT assignable? For which ISV vendors/products do you have sub capacity rights?</p>	<p>CTS needs more time to answer this question and will issue another amendment no later than January 8, 2020.</p>
17	<p>Follow up to Appendix N Q&A response #4: Please clarify if the connectivity between WaTech and proposed sites need to be through dedicated layer 2 Ethernet circuits (as specified in C20-RFP-032.docx 5.8.a), or if Internet VPN can be used to establish connectivity between the two networks?</p>	<p>CTS currently utilizes site to site IPsec VPN service we do not do layer 2 services.</p> <p>All proposed solutions must pass the Office of Cybersecurity Security Design Review (SDR) process before being deemed acceptable. A SDR would take place once a contract is executed with the ASV.</p>
18	<p>C20-RFP0-32.docx Appendix M Security Administration What tools and processes are used by WATech to review Sensitive/Critical Data Sets for excessive access?</p>	<p>CTS is using Vanguard Administrator.</p>
19	<p>C20-RFP0-32.docx Appendix M Security Administration What tools and processes are used to create the violations/anomalies and obsolete reports ?</p>	<p>CTS is using Vanguard Administrator.</p>