



# State of New Jersey

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY  
DIVISION OF PURCHASE AND PROPERTY  
Purchase Bureau  
P.O. Box 230  
TRENTON, NEW JERSEY 08625-0230

RICHARD J. CODEY  
*Acting Governor*

JOHN E. MCCORMAC, CPA  
*State Treasurer*

**September 30, 2005**

RE: 06-X-37950 : Computer Consulting Services for MVC IT Management Oversight  
BID OPENING DATE: October 12, 2005

## **Addendum # 1**

**Question #1.** **Ref: Section 1.1: states that the vendor that wins the RFP development, cannot bid on the subsequent development/implementation work generated. Please clarify whether this restriction extends to HW and SW, or just services.**

Answer:

The vendor awarded this RFP (MVC IT Project Management Oversight) is excluded from providing 'services' for any future MATRX oriented RFP (the rewrite of MVC COMPs and Agency applications).

**Question #2** **Ref: Section 1.1: The State provided requirements documents. How do those documents specifically pertain to the RFP in question (e.g., are they examples of the type/format of business requirements deliverables expected as a result of the engagement, or are they meant to provide guidance in responding to the scope of this RFP)?**

Answer:

The appendixes are NOT examples; they ARE the high level design we plan to implement. This high level design was developed with the participation of over 100 MVC key personnel regarding their impressions on what works well, what need improving, and the input of our technical staff with a statement of direction on the architecture of the proposed system. In addition, the documents are presented so bidding vendors understand the scope of the project they are proposing to manage.

**Question #3** **Ref Section 1.1: How much of the requirements definition has been completed to date?**

Answer:

The appendix attached is the high level design of the proposed MATRX system. The implementation vendor chosen as a result of the RFP that you would assist us in writing, will revisit each component of the application with MVC staff to develop a detailed design for MATRX, which they (not you) would then develop.

**Question #4** **Ref Section 1.1: Is it expected that there will be a single RFP generated as a result of this engagement, or will the vendor be expected to release multiple RFPs?**

**If multiple RFPs, how does the list of COMPS subsystems relate to the anticipated number of RFPs?**

Answer:

It is intended that the BULK of the MATRX system will be developed out of a single RFP. However, there may be incidental pieces or requirements which are discovered later or new technologies that arise during the project, which dictate that a supplemental RFP be written for a secondary – related application. The awarded vendor may be asked to develop RFP's or other work as listed in the section labeled optional engagements.

**Question #5** **Ref Section 1.1: The RFP states the bidder should demonstrate that it has participated on or written RFPs for projects with a total budget in excess of \$5,000,000. Does the mean to imply that the State of New Jersey has already established a budgetary/funding threshold in this range?**

Answer:

Vendors should not infer any given threshold from this statement. It simply is a quantifying number to state we desire to see experience with 'large' projects. If we do not give a number, someone will ask "how big is large? ".

On a related note, vendors can be assured funding is budgeted for this project. We will not discuss funding thresholds.

Consider that your bid for Management Oversight is a fractional percentage of the project cost, not the entire project cost.

**Question #6** **Ref 1.2.1.1 COMPREHENSIVE (COMPS) SYSTEM; 1.2.1.2 COMPS DATABASE: Is the application and Datacom database deployed on the same IBM / System 390?**

Answer:

The existing COMPs application is a large set of COBOL batch and COBOL/CICS online programs, which are hosted beside the Datacom database on the same mainframe System 390 complex.

**Question #7 Ref 1.2.1.1 COMPREHENSIVE (COMPS) SYSTEM; 1.2.1.2 COMPS DATABASE: What are the versions of the Bull Cobol and Datacom Databases?)**

Answer:

The Agency application is written in Bull COBOL 74. The Computer Associates Datacom database version is V10, with short term plans to migrate to V11.

The bidding vendor should NOT assume that we are looking for a factory re-engineering of the Bull COBOL Agency system. We are transforming that system into a completely new application, with different business drivers, such as customer-centric rather than transaction-centric, Point-of-Service orientation, etc.

**Question #8 Ref 1.2.1.1 COMPREHENSIVE (COMPS) SYSTEM: Are there any subsystems that depend on each other?**

**If they do, then which ones depend on each other?**

Answer:

Most COMP subsystems have a dependency on each other. Some typical examples are:

- Agency system uses COMP fee tables to derive cost of over-the-counter transactions, and posts the money received back into the COMP Revenue subsystem.
- Many systems use Driver History to validate drivers, and edit for violations, suspensions, etc.
- Information Abstracts uses Driver History
- Driver Management and Vehicle (Registration and Title) Management have a hierarchical interdependency
- Etc. You can consider that Drivers, Vehicles, and Driver History form a core which many subsystems read and post data.

**Question #9 Ref 1.2.1.1 COMPREHENSIVE (COMPS) SYSTEM: Will the external systems, which will interface with the new system (MATRX System), be able to handle messages from web services? In other words, will these external systems be upgraded to support the new interface architecture?**

Answer:

Many external systems are not under the control of MVC. Therefore, it may be necessary to generate those interfaces in the same way as we do today, unless the external system is receptive to change. However, as the high level design states, we have a desire to build a 'framework' for external data exchange which allows us to externalize business with partners using a common solution, possibly using web services. We welcome business partners to participate in this new approach to interfacing, but we cannot force all business partners to comply. Many business partners will welcome this approach.

**Question #10 Ref 1.2.1.2 COMPS DATABASE: How many rows are in each table? How many columns are in each row of each table? Is there any business logic in this database?**

Answer:

There are over 200 tables (files) in the Datacom database supporting the COMP system. We are not going to list here the detailed statistics of that entire DB, since a characterization of the database should suffice for bidding in your role as Management Oversight vendor.

The database can be characterized as containing master files, transaction files, history files, and reference files. Many files are small (in the hundreds, thousands or tens of thousands of rows), others are large (in the millions of rows). The following files are some of the more significant entities, and contain active, expired, and out-of-state drivers, vehicles, documents, and events:

Drivers and vehicle owners = 15.5 Millions  
Vehicles= 26.6 Millions  
Title= 47.5 Millions  
Registration= 40.3 Millions  
Driver History Accident= 7.5 Millions  
Driver History fee event = 8.5 Millions  
Driver History Information Event = 22.3 Millions  
Driver History Suspension event = 33 Millions  
Driver History Point (violation) event= 34.5 Millions  
Rehabilitation Events= 1 Million  
Business License = 47,000  
Driver Test Results = 4.9Millions  
Multiple Driver License record = 120,000  
State Interface = 2.1 Millions

There is no business logic at the data layer within Datacom.

**Question Ref 1.2.1.3 AGENCY SYSTEM:**

**#11**

- 1) How many servers are at each location? Is the distributed application deployed on each server?**
- 2) What other applications are deployed on each server? Are the servers in Cluster at each location?**
- 3) How many PCs at each location?**
- 4) What is the version of IBM MQ Series? Will all these servers be upgraded or replaced to support the new system?**

Answer:

1) In the present application, there is one server at each location which hosts the 'Agency' application. There is one Windows server at each location which is a consolidator for MQ traffic between Agency workstations and Trenton central mainframe. There is one Windows server which facilitates workstation management and code distribution.

The Agency application is distributed to each server.

- 2) There are no clustered servers at each location at this time.
- 3) Typically there would be between 8-15 PC's at each location.
- 4) The Agency server runs MQ v5.3

Whether this distributed architecture survives into the next generation MATRX application remains to be seen based on development vendor recommendations and technologies. We are clearly looking NOT to replicate the existing Agency distributed application in the next generation solution. Some examples: MQ might disappear entirely, Web services might be used, and the architecture might be centralized rather than decentralized. These are options for consideration.

**Question Ref 1.2.1.3 AGENCY SYSTEM: Can we obtain the current Network Topology (for security reasons: include only network components without any physical names and IP address)?**

**#12**

Answer:

The included diagram provides a highly sanitized diagram showing the State is divided into four quadrants, each supporting a number of Agencies. A more detailed view can be provided to the awarded vendor.

**Question #13**    **Ref Section 1.2.1.3:**

- 1) There is reference to some 57 servers being used across the MVA. Is an inventory listing available that reflects the brand name of the hardware and associated software load set that resides in each server?**
  
- 2) Is the software load set standardized across all 57 servers? If not, why not?**

Answer:

1) The general server image is:

Bull Escala server which is a re-branding of an IBM P series server, with a Power4 Chip, 1 Gig memory, AIX 5.1, Bull HVX 32.4 and IBM MQ v5.3, with an Agency Application written in BULL interactive COBOL. The image is basically standard across all servers.

2) Vendors should NOT assume this is the solution we wish to continue with in the future. We wish to retire this application and software platform. We may wish to leverage this server at a native AIX platform level, as they are fairly new, if they could be useful in a new solution.

**Question #14**    **Ref Section 1.2.1.3:**

- 1) Is the state of New Jersey entertaining the replacement or upgrading of the existing 57 servers during the course of this RFP?**
  
- 2) Is the acquisition of any additional or new hardware outside the scope of this RFP? If yes, has an RFP been established addressing the associated hardware needs separately?**

Answer:

1) No. Your role would be a management oversight engagement, not a systems development engagement. Therefore hardware acquisition is not under discussion for this RFP.

Systems development would come out of the RFP which you assist us in writing, via the vendor you would assist us in managing. The disposition of the 57 Agency servers would be discussed in proposals from the development vendor, not this Management Oversight RFP.

2) Yes. Acquisition of hardware is outside the scope of this RFP.

**Question #15**    **Ref Section 3.11: The RFP states the State Contract Manager will review and submit comments on each deliverable to the contractor within seven (7) to twenty-eight (28) days of receipt, depending on the complexity of the delivery and the volume of information submitted.**

- 1) Is this range an acceptable business practice within the State?**
- 2) If yes, it is much longer than in commercial engagements and as such, elongates the overall project timeline. Is the State willing to accept the elongated project timeline under these circumstances?**

Answer:

1) If the deliverable is very small, review could be significantly less than 7 days, (perhaps 1 or 2). If the deliverable is hundreds of pages, it might very well take a month for the organization to review. We stand by our statement.

2) The MVC understands that State review time is fundamentally bound to project schedules, delivery dates and dependencies.

**Question #16**    **Ref Section 3.3.3.2: The RFP states the MVC will require approximately two months to review the IT Modernization RFP and to agree upon its content. Is the two months the best or worse case scenario? Could it be longer?**

Answer:

This is our best estimate, review time may vary. This 'to be written' RFP, will be a significant RFP with review by a number of parties within the State.

**Question #17**    **Ref: Section 3.6.1: The RFP states the State of New Jersey reserves the right to engage the contractor for an additional 12 months after the initial 24 month period.**

- 1) What is the likelihood of this happening?**
- 2) If this is highly likely, the period of execution might best be calculated for the 36 months vs. 24 months. Is the State receptive to this as an alternative solution?**

Answer:

1) Likelihood is fairly high, if your vendor performance is good.

2) The State will not entertain a 36 month bid up front. The original specification stands.

**Question #18** Ref Section 3.6.1: The last paragraph suggests there is additional work effort envisioned by the State of New Jersey that is outside the stated scope of the RFP. Does the State have any ideas as to what type of skills and efforts they are alluding to? Is the State willing to share their insights into this statement?

Answer: The possible additional work discussed in the last paragraph of 3.6.1, is defined in detail in the next section 3.7 "Optional Support Services for upgrade project".

The skill sets you will be pricing are defined in appendix D. You would propose the skills to the optional task in your proposed Statement of Work for optional support services. We feel the skills as defined in appendix match with the optional activities fairly clearly. For instance, you would not put an Architect on testing, and you wouldn't put a Junior Technician on Architecture Guidance.

**Question #19** Ref Section 4.4.3.3: Because of the typical delays between the submission of the RFP response and the contract award, the personnel and associated resumes of those personnel submitted with the original RFP response may not available at the time of the award. Contractor reserves the right to staff the contract, with similar knowledge consultants.

Answer:  
MVC understands the dynamic nature of staffing. However, MVC must interview and approve any principle personnel change other than those presented in your proposal.

**Question #20** Ref Section 4.4.3.3.4: The RFP states the bidder should submit with its bid proposal two (2) sample RFPs from projects of similar size and scope that it has prepared. In an effort to protect our client's confidentially, the bidder reserves the right to sanitize any submitted sample that will be devoid of any client names, locations, company logos or other identifying data. Is this acceptable to the State of New Jersey?

Answer: Yes.

**Question #21** Ref Section 5.10: Regarding the substitution of staff, the bidder requests the State of New Jersey enter into discussions as to what is a reasonable elapse time for this process to be executed. The RFP leaves this as an open ended process which in of itself could put the success of the project at jeopardy if the vacancy is not filled promptly. The bidder suggests that the State of New Jersey consider the acceptance/rejection process be in the range of five (5) to ten (10) business days. Is this acceptable to the State of New Jersey?

Answer:  
Within the context of interviewing and accepting alternate staff, this is acceptable.

**Question #22** **Ref. app B. 3.17: The requirements document, app B, includes an Identity Management system which provides user credentials for user and system authentication and authorization. Is single signon required as part of this security system?**

Answer:

Single Sign-on or Reduced Sign-on is a strongly desired goal of MVC. We envision a marriage of the Windows desktop identity with the Enterprise Web identity (at least for intranet applications). Your role is management oversight of a vendor who would propose and implement this, and as such you need to understand the issues to manage the implementer, not execute the Sign-on solution.

**Question #23** **Ref Appendix D/D3: Regarding the comment - "Experienced in project management methodology is required - The bidder reserves the right to use its own, award winning methodology as evaluated by the Gartner Group.**

Answer:

Yes, this is acceptable.

**Question #24** **Will the firm that was used to develop this RFP also be involved in the evaluation of the responses and selection of the winner?**

Answer:

The vendor chosen from this process will act in an advisory capacity to provide technical support to the Evaluation Committee.

**Question #25** **When will responses to the RFP questions be provided to the bidders?**

Answer: < 2 weeks

**Question #26** **The RFP doesn't directly include details about system / network infrastructure requirements: Is bidder responsible for addressing the requirements of the system / network infrastructure, such as computer room requirements, network capacity, firewalls and load balancers?**

Answer:

No. Your role would be to assist the MVC in the management of the project and the vendor who WOULD be responsible for proposing and developing the solution, including network, hardware, and software.

**Question #27** **The RFP doesn't address the development, test and stage environments. Is the bidder responsible for these environments?**

Answer:

No. Your role would be to assist the MVC in the management of the project and the vendor who WOULD be responsible for creation of the various environments.

However, note one of the optional activities in 3.7 is "Testing Assistance", where if we agree to an optional Statement of Work, you could be asked to validate that the implementation vendor is performing adequately, through independent testing of the new application.

**Question #28** **The RFP doesn't address the hardware and software standards. Is the bidder free to propose any hardware and software?**

Answer:

No. This is a management oversight RFP. Not a systems development RFP.

The vendors bidding on the 2<sup>nd</sup> RFP, which you will assist the MVC in developing, would suggest hardware and software. However, we have hard and soft contracts in place we wish to leverage. If proposal includes others, State may be required to take other procurement avenues such as a Waiver, which delay the project. Standards and preferences will be stated in the 2<sup>nd</sup> RFP, which you will assist us in developing.

**Question #29** **How long does the State of New Jersey think it will take to respond to the questions posed by the bidders? Can the bidders anticipate receiving responses to their questions within three (3) to five (5) business days?**

Answer:

< 2 weeks.

**Question #30** **Will the State of New Jersey share the name(s) of any third party consulting firms that are involved in the bidder selection process?**

Answer:

The awarded vendor of this RFP will be a matter of public record, as are all awards. (also see #31below).

**Question #31** **Is it the policy, procedure or practice of the State of New Jersey to post bidder responses to a publicly accessible Internet website? If yes, how does the State of New Jersey protect those aspects that are deemed proprietary and confidential to the bidder?**

Answer:

No, the State of New Jersey does not post bidder responses to a publicly accessible Internet website.

Refer to the following sections of the RFP:

Section 1.4.6 Contents of Bid Proposal – addresses general confidentiality issues.

Section 4. 4.4.3.7 Financial Capability of the Bidder – addresses financial statement confidentiality.

However, the bids are available for public review, at the Purchase Bureau, upon request. The State will redact the following :

- Federal Employer Identification Numbers (FEIN)
- Social Security Numbers (SSN)
- Tax Identification Numbers (TIN)
- Home Telephone Numbers
- Home Addresses
- Individual's Date of Birth
- Individual's Marital Status
- Individual's Family Information
- Individual's Hobbies, Personal Interests, etc.
- Bank Account Numbers
- Insurance Account Numbers
- Stockholder Disclosure – Individual's Number of Shares or Percentage Owned.
- Drivers Licenses
- Other Types of Licenses Which May Divulge an Individual's SSN

Refer to the following sections of the RFP:

1.4.6 Contents of Bid Proposal

Section 4. 4.4.3.7 Financial Capability of the Bidder – for information regarding financial information.