

RFP Questions and Clarifications Memorandum

To: Vendors Responding to RFP Number 3723 for the Mississippi Department of Information Technology Services (ITS)

From: Craig P. Orgeron, Ph.D.

Date: April 22, 2014

Subject: Responses to Questions Submitted and Clarifications to Specifications

Contact Name: Debra Spell

Contact Phone Number: 601-432-8132

Contact E-mail Address: debra.spell@its.ms.gov

RFP Number 3723 is hereby amended as follows:

1. “1) One clearly marked original response, 12 identical copies, 12 identical copies of the cost proposal, and an electronic copy of the complete proposal. Label the front and spine of the three-ring loose-leaf binder with the Vendor name and RFP number. Include the items listed below inside the binder. Please DO NOT include a copy of the RFP in the binder.”
2. **Section IV, Legal and Contractual Information, Item 36, the first paragraph is being modified to read:**

“The Vendor must include a proposal bond in the amount of \$5,000.00 with its RFP proposal. Vendor is specifically disallowed from taking exception to the proposal bond requirement. Proposals without proposal bonds will be rejected. ~~is not required to include a proposal bond with its RFP proposal} (TC should select one sentence and delete the other.)”~~
3. **Section VII Technical Specifications, Item 10.1.7 is being modified to read:**
 - 10.1.7 The proposed solution must support platform-independent end-user access to support functionality utilizing the following web browsers:
 - 10.1.7.1 Internet Explorer 7+
 - 10.1.7.2 Mozilla Firefox 3+
 - 10.1.7.3 Apple Safari 3+
 - 10.1.7.4 Google Chrome 3.0+

~~10.1.7.5 Microsoft Outlook 2010~~

10.1.7.6 Safari v3.1+

4. Section VII, Technical Specifications, Add the following as Item 10.4.13:

“Some state entities will require that some or all of the existing e-mail be moved from existing archives to the Vendor’ proposed cloud solution. Vendor must provide details on how this will be accomplished.”

5. Section VII, Technical Specifications, Item 19.1 is being modified to read:

“The Vendor must propose a fixed amount for all services requested in this RFP including equipment, software, professional services, implementation, equipment maintenance, software support, training, and any travel, subsistence or lodging costs as applicable. A fixed price proposal must be submitted using the table in Section VIII, *Cost Information Submission*. Section VIII, *Cost Information Submission*, must be submitted in a separately sealed envelope.”

6. Appendix A, Standard Contract, Article 1.2 is deleted and Article 1 is being modified to read:

“ARTICLE 1 TERM OF AGREEMENT AND PRICE RE-DETERMINATION

1.1 Unless this Master Agreement is extended by mutual agreement or terminated as prescribed elsewhere herein, this Master Agreement shall become effective on the date it is signed by all parties (the “Effective Date”) and shall continue in effect for five (5) years thereafter (“Initial Term”). At the end of the Initial Term, this Master Agreement may, upon the written agreement of the parties, be renewed for two (2) additional two (2) year terms. Sixty (60) days prior to the expiration of the Initial Term or any renewal term of this Master Agreement, Contractor shall notify ITS in writing of the impending expiration and thereafter ITS shall notify the Contractor of its intent to either renew or cancel the Master Agreement.”

Vendor must include in their proposal a response to each amended requirement as listed above. Vendor must respond using the same terminology as provided in the original requirements.

The following questions were submitted to ITS and are being presented as they were submitted, except to remove any reference to a specific Vendor. This information should assist you in formulating your response.

Question Number	Section/Page/Item	Question	Response
1	Standard Contract	The final page of the RFP is a page titled "Exhibit A" and appears to be an orphaned page. Please verify.	The Exhibit A is the last page of the contract. That page will be completed when the actual contract is drafted.
2		Is the Vendor to include a Sample SLA in the response?	Yes
3	Section III – Item 17	<p>Integration of existing ITS products and right to use existing products:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. As the RFP is a request to provide a new service (hosted email services) then in what instance could existing products be used? b. If relevant, please identify these products. Integration to products that are not defined cannot be properly estimated in the response. c. Does this imply using products under existing contracts such as the Express Products Lists (EPLs) instead of the same products proposed by the bidder? d. Would existing contracts other than the EPLs have products that might impact the proposed engagement? If so, what? e. Are all the products licensed directly to the Mississippi Department of Information Technology Services or are they licensed to State of Mississippi individual agencies and institutions? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. It could be used if the product for the new service is currently in use at a state entity. b. The State is not aware of any products. c. Yes, see Section VII, Item 5.15. d. We are currently not aware of other contracts, but there could possibly be other contracts that may be used. e. They are licensed to each individual agency.
4	Section IV – Item 27	Please clarify the requirements that are requiring web and portal development outside of native hosted MS Exchange.	Sections I through VI are standard boilerplate language items that appear in all RFPs released by ITS. Section IV, Item 27 is in place to cover any web and portal development work that might be proposed.
5	Section IV – Item 30	Please clarify why the terms of software licenses would be relevant to the intent of RFP 3723 since the RFP specifies a request for a service that provides hosted email services in a MS Exchange or other environment. Such a service is normally on a non-licensed model.	Sections I through VI are standard boilerplate language items that appear in all RFPs released by ITS. Section IV, Item 30 is in place to cover any licenses that might be required by the Vendor's proposed solution.

Question Number	Section/Page/Item	Question	Response
6	Section IV – Item 36	Please clarify this statement: “Proposals without proposal bonds will be rejected.” is not required to include a proposal bond with its RFP proposal} (TC should select one sentence and delete the other.)”	This statement has been revised. See Amendment #2 above.
7	Section IV – Item 37	What will drive the decision to require or not the acquisition of the performance bond at contract award?	The decision will be based on the associated risk with the selected proposal.
8	Section VII – Item 3.1, third paragraph, last sentence	“The proposed hosted solution must take into account the existing infrastructure and must not have a significant architectural impact on existing deployed architectures.” Please describe the existing infrastructure and architectures that will be impacted by the proposed solution. Also describe how they will be impacted since it is our understanding this RFP is purely to acquire services for a hosted e-mail solution	ITS does not have knowledge of the current infrastructure for each state entity that may select to use the proposed solution. While this RFP is primarily for services, there may be some impact on the infrastructure used to access the hosted environment. The intent of the requirement is to protect the State from a proposed solution that is outside of what is reasonably expected for the services being requested. Although the State does not expect any changes to the entity’s infrastructure, the intent is to ensure an expected outcome.
9	Section VII – Item 3.1, paragraph 4	<p>Current ITS MS Exchange environment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. What release of MS Exchange is now running in the ITS hosted environment? b. How many mailboxes are in that environment and for what agencies or entities? c. What are the current mailbox sizing options offered? In particular, what is the maximum mailbox size configuration in use? d. What is the size of the database(s)? e. What is the maximum number of messages sent/received per day for the system? f. What email clients are in use / what version(s)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Exchange 2010 b. Currently approximately 1000 mailboxes for the agencies listed in Attachment A. c. Mailboxes are offered in 100MB, 500MB, 1GB, and Custom size quotas. The Custom mailbox sizes are offered in increments of 1GB, from 2GB to 10GB maximum d. MDB100A – 120 GB MDB500A – 65 GB MDB1000A – 30 GB MDBCustom – 35 GB e. Total messages sent and received may approach 30,000 per day f. Client connectivity is offered to MAPI clients (RPC over https) and web browsers (OWA). Customers use Outlook 2003 – 2013, and web browsers. Additionally, mobile device client connectivity via ActiveSync is supported.

Question Number	Section/Page/Item	Question	Response
10	Section VII – Item 3.1, paragraph 4	<p>Other State entities running MS Exchange:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. What releases of MS Exchange are running and where, and how many individual systems? b. How many mailboxes are in each environment? c. What are the various mailbox-sizing options? In particular, what is the maximum mailbox size configuration in use? d. What is the size of the databases? e. What is the maximum number of messages sent/received per day for each system? f. What email clients are in use / what version(s) 	ITS has a limited amount of information on some state agencies' environments. See Attachment B.
11	Section VII – Item 3.1, paragraph 4	<p>Non- MS Exchange environments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. What are the other types and how many individual systems? b. How many mailboxes are in each environment and for agencies or entities? c. What are the various mailbox-sizing options? d. What is the size of the databases? e. What is the maximum number of messages sent/received per day for each system? f. What email clients are in use / what version(s)? 	ITS has a limited amount of information on some state agencies. See Attachment B.
12	Section VII – Item 3.1, fifth paragraph, last sentence	<p>"The Vendor must provide details concerning how the separation of governmental and educational entities will be handled under the contract, since there may be a difference in how each is licensed."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Is this somehow tied to the licensing categories on the current Microsoft EPL posted at http://www.its.ms.gov/Procurement/Pages/Microsoft.aspx? b. Please clarify that a different pricing model is expected for government and educational entities. c. Please also clarify by potential user volume how the entities identified in the requirement would be classified (state and local government, k-12, community colleges, institutions of higher 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. No b. A different pricing model is expected only if there is a difference in the discount offered to governmental vs. educational entities. c. This information is not available. The intent of having a local account team (Section VII, Item 8) is to work closely with the State to discover this type information for potential use of the contract. Also, see Section VII, Items 5.8 and 5.9.

Question Number	Section/Page/Item	Question	Response
		learning, or other).	
13	Section VII – Item 3.1	Is there is a standard mailbox size already determined that you would like as a default?	No. Agency assessments are currently in progress that will recommend mailbox specifications for small, medium, and large agencies.
14	Section VII – Item 3.1	Will administrators have financial authority to make account changes directly? If not, will our proposed solution need to integrate into any management approval processes currently in place?	Each agency will be responsible for administering their accounts within the guideline of the proposed solution. ITS does not have knowledge of current integrated management approval processes used by other state entities.
15	Section VII – Item 5.4	<p>a. Section III.11 states a price increase will not be accepted over the duration of the award or renewal period but the State will always take advantage of a decrease. The statement in Section VII.5.4 implies that pricing may be adjusted based annually based on industry standard pricing. Since industry standard pricing may increase or decrease, does this requirement support the assumption that a price increase may be negotiated, should the market reflect that, on an annual basis?</p> <p>b. Will proposed year-to-year pricing escalations be accepted for consideration by the State in response to RFP 3723, thus considered for inclusion in any resulting agreement as noted in Section III.11?</p>	<p>a. No pricing increases will be negotiated.</p> <p>b. Yes</p>
16	Section VII – Item 6.2	Regarding the work plan, should our plan include to take on any storage for existing archived emails? If so, can you share sizing, number of current repositories, product name, and version of each?	Yes. See Amendment #4. See also the response to question #13 above.
17	Section VII – Item 7.2.5	Are you looking for professional accreditations/certifications at the proposed individual team member level or corporate level?	This applies to both individual team members and the corporation as applicable. The State wants to ensure the respondent has the appropriate credentials and certifications to host the services requested and to ensure that the individuals supporting the environment are certified at the appropriate skill levels.
18	Section VII – Item	Can ITS provide what it believes will be the projected	The projected initial base is estimated to be

Question Number	Section/Page/Item	Question	Response
	7.2.7	growth in the use of this service starting with the projected initial user base over the next nine (9) years (projected life of the engagement)?	15,500 up to 24,000. There is no estimate for the term of the contract.
19	Section VII – Item 8.3.6	Are the reports referenced in Attachment A, Article 5.2 and in Section VII.9.4.1 the only regularly scheduled reports required or are their others that are expected to be provided? If so, on what schedule and to whom? (Please provide a complete list with frequency.)	Yes, they are the only regularly scheduled reports. Other reports may be requested using adhoc capability on a timely bases as stated in this requirement.
20	Section VII – Item 9.2.2	<p>On-line portal requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Is the portal described in 9.2.2 an administrator portal or one for the end user employee? b. Is the portal described in 9.2.2 subject to WC3 and Section 508 requirements? c. Is this the only portal expected or is the State looking for multiple portals for different purposes? Please clarify. d. 9.2.2.1 – This appears to be an environment administration requirement. How are these changes expected to impact customer charges? Is it implied here that orders include changes and deletes of users as well as adds? e. Are there requirements to integrate the order processing with the State’s ERP or other financial and purchasing systems since it is expected due to State purchasing requirements that a purchase order will be required for acquisition of these services? f. Is the portal the only means (other than as noted for 9.2.3 for large orders) for placing an order? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Administrator b. Yes, if a portal is designed, developed, and implemented. c. Yes. d. It is anticipated that additions and deletions will impact the customer’s monthly charges. We are looking for the respondent to describe how this will be done and the impact to the customer. e. No. f. No. Respondents can take exception to any requirement and/or propose an alternative, providing details on how the requirement will be accomplished.
21	Section VII – Item 9.4.4	<p>“Extra consideration will be given to Vendors whose Windows billing analysis software can provide”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Does this imply that the Vendor is expected to provide this as part of the portal in Section VII.9.2.2? b. 9.4.4.9 and 9.4.4.10 – Are these requirements, in effect, duplicates? c. Can the State provide formats required to integrate with the State’s ERP and other existing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. This is for extra consideration if bill analysis software exists, and may be proposed at the Vendor’s discretion. b. No. c. Integration is currently not a requirement.

Question Number	Section/Page/Item	Question	Response
		financial systems for electronic invoicing or is that integration with those systems for billing purposes not a requirement?	
22	Section VII – Item 10.1.7.5	Why is Microsoft Outlook 2010 defined as a web browser as described in 10.1.7?	The requirement is being revised to exclude Microsoft Outlook 2010. See Amendment #3 above.
23	Section VII – Item 10.1.9.3	<p>“Must support single sign-on capabilities for all state users.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. How are users currently logging in today? And do all platforms conform to the same password policy? Are passwords known? b. Is the State using Active Directory today? c. What State systems are to be aggregated under this single sign on? d. Does this include login at the desktop? e. Are these systems within a single domain or across multiple domains? (10.1.10) f. Is there an existing single sign on product/protocol in use today? 	There are currently multiple systems and ITS does not have this information for each entity. This will be part of the review and migration plan for each entity.
24	Section VII – Item 10.1.11	<p>Summary reporting and statistics and on-demand reporting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Is this also tied to the portal referenced in Section VII.9.2.2? b. 10.1.11.5 “Maximum mailbox size and end-users approaching mailbox quota limits;” – Is this implying a user-by-user comparison of authorized mailbox size with those approaching their individual quota flagged? Does this also imply that the end-user is to be warned? c. To clarify, 10.1.11.1 – 10.1.11.6 are to be available at the agency/entity administrator level regardless of how the proposed solution is architected 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Not necessarily. The State expects that the Vendor will provide details on how this information can be extracted to assist the agencies with the overall management of their accounts. b. No. No. c. Yes.
25	Section VII – Item 10.1.12	<p>The proposed solution must designate the standard minimum individual mailbox size as well as...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Please clarify that “standard minimum” means the smallest mailbox supported with additional categories of mailboxes that are larger available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Standard minimum is the smallest mailbox supported by the proposed solution. As stated in the requirement, the solution must provide options larger mailbox capacity.

Question Number	Section/Page/Item	Question	Response
		<p>for those who require a larger capacity mailbox.</p> <p>b. Also clarify that pricing is to be provided for all volume quantities for all tiers of mailbox size across the various type entities that are projected to participate in this engagement (State government, local government, K-12, community colleges, institutions of higher learning, other)?</p>	<p>b. Yes.</p>
26	Section VII – Item 10.1.18	<p>Concerning e-discovery:</p> <p>a. Are requirements based on the native functionality of MS Exchange or is the State seeking something more?</p> <p>b. Please clarify that the State does not expect the Vendor to have legal responsibility in execution of a legal hold only to provide the capability for the State to place legal holds.</p>	<p>a. Yes, these requirements are based on native functionality.</p> <p>b. The intent of the requirement is for the solution to be capable of allowing legal holds to be placed on an e-mail address.</p>
27	Section VII – Item 10.1.18.3	<p>“Verify authenticity, reliability, and integrity of e-mail messages;” Please clarify. Is this requiring a “chain of custody” type validation or something else?</p>	<p>The intent is to verify authenticity, reliability, and integrity of e-mail messages. Any additional functionality, types of validations, etc. proposed is at the Vendor’s discretion.</p>
28	Section VII –Item 10.1.18.11	<p>What is meant by “maintain the State’s attorney privilege”? Is the Vendor to provide eDiscovery solutions/software beyond the native function of Exchange?</p>	<p>The intent is to maintain the confidentiality of e-mails between sender and receiver of privileged information.</p> <p>No.</p>
29	Section VII – Item 10.1.18.12	<p>What “geographic legal requirements” would be applicable?</p>	<p>United States.</p>
30	Section VII – Item 10.1.19	<p>a. What are the back-end 3rd party applications/systems? Please provide Vendor, product name, and version of each.</p> <p>b. What protocols and what type API calls must be considered?</p> <p>c. How does this requirement tie to Section VII.10.1.9.3?</p>	<p>ITS does not currently have this information. The intent of this requirement is to gauge the capability of the proposed solution to accommodate various environments.</p>
31	Section VII – Item 10.3.3.3	<p>“Data encryption in transit and at rest”:</p> <p>a. Can the State provide specific encryption requirements for email that is considered “at rest” and “in transit”?</p> <p>b. Does the State currently have a policy in place</p>	<p>a. Encryption for data “at rest” and “in transit” must adhere to standards defined by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST). The Vendor must address if the proposed solution meets FIPS</p>

Question Number	Section/Page/Item	Question	Response
		that covers encryption and/or security requirements as it relates to email “at rest” and/or “in transit”? If so, can this policy be supplied to the Vendor	140-2 encryption standards for data at rest and in transit. b. Enterprise Security Policy (ESP). This can be provided to Vendors upon request as stated in Section IV, Item 32, page 21 of the RFP.
32	Section VII – Item 10.3.9	a. Is this requirement tied to #10.3.3.3 and, if so, how? b. What “selected” state data is required to be encrypted? c. Is this in addition to or instead of 10.3.10?	a. This requirement seems to be the same question for 10.3.3.3. The Vendor must address if the proposed solution meets FIPS 140-2 encryption standards for data at rest and in transit. b. The State’s expectation is that each state agency/entity should have the capability to selectively encrypt any and all data, c. Using the FIPS 140-2 information provided in item a above, this could replace 10.3.10.
33	Section VII – Item 10.3.11	Does this requirement apply to data protection at the Vendor level or is the State seeking something broader? Does this section mean you request a data loss prevention tool or program?	The State expects the Vendor to provide the options available and details about the options. Additional tools may be required.
34	Section VII – Item 10.3.12	Is the State seeking only what is offered natively in MS Exchange or a full PKI solution as part of the RFP response? Are you asking for us to list PKI certificates?	The State expects the Vendor to provide the options available and details about the options. Additional tools may be required.
35	Section VII – Item 10.3.17	How will engaged contractor be notified of updates to the Enterprise Security Policy?	ESP Revision dates are posted to the ITS website at the following link: http://www.its.ms.gov/Services/Pages/ESP-Revision-Dates.aspx). The State expects the Vendor to check the website on regular basis.
36	Section VII – Item 10.3.18	Regarding two-factor authentication, is this for certain employees and/or agencies only? Are there existing solutions in place already that we would need to integrate or support?	The State desires that two-factor authentication options would be available to all employees and/or agencies. ITS uses an RSA 2-factor solution today specifically for ITS systems and ITS employees only. The ITS solution would not be the enterprise 2-factor solution for the State. The State expects the Vendor to provide the options available and details about the options.
37	Section VII – Item	“The Vendor must identify the support that is provided	a. Specific uses of the capability have not

Question Number	Section/Page/Item	Question	Response
	10.3.19	<p>for e- signature capabilities.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. How does the State intend to use this capability? b. How does this requirement tie to Section VII.10.3.12? 	<p>been determined.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Items 10.3.12 and 10.3.19 are related. In Item 10.3.12, the State is requesting details on the availability of this specification in the proposed solution, and in 10.3.19, the State is requesting detail on how it will be supported.
38	Section VIII – Item 10.3.23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. What are federal mandates and Executive Orders? b. Are these within a specific date range or, if federal mandate, under what law or regulations? c. Should this have referenced State mandates and Executive Orders? If, so, which specifically? 	<p>There are numerous federal requirements that must be met hosting email. These requirements, for example, include FISMA, CJIS, NIST, and HIPAA that are specific to the type information being hosted and standard for this type information will be protected. This specification is to ensure that the Vendor can meet the current standards as well as stay current with new federal requirements as they are adopted and required</p>
39	Section VII – Item 10.4	<p>“Archive, Backup, and Disaster Recovery Requirement”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. This section or requirements seems to mix requirements for e-discovery, standard data archiving, standard backup requirements, and full disaster recovery? Can these be clarified and segmented? b. It appears that archived message access requirements are based on e-mail access requirements (same functions/capabilities as if email is active) described in this section are to be a historical repository with a requirement that the email be retained forever (10.4.6) and to be transferred according to legal retention schedules (10.4.9, 10.4.10, 10.4.11). Why once the data is transferred must it be retained “forever?” c. 10.4.2 – What “standard DR operations” - Are these the standard cycles proposed for COOP and Disaster Recovery plan? d. 10.4.3 – Since MS Exchange natively does not have an archiving solution as described, it is 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Item 10.4 contains 12 individual sub-items. Vendor should respond to each sub-item independently. Vendor may segment the response (answer out of sequence for this item only) if the flow of the response is affected by how these items are listed. b. For 10.4.6 some agencies maintain e-mail forever. 10.4.9, 10.4.10, and 10.4.11 pertain to legal retention period. c. Recovery Point Objectives and Recovery Time Objective service level commitments. d. Vendor may propose an archiving solution that satisfies this requirement. e. More recovery points are available if the proposed solution allows for multiple redundant backups. f. (i) Based the number of entities involved, it is desirable that the proposed solution be flexible; (ii) This will vary based on entity; (iii) All; (iv) Rules-based for each entity. g. Yes/Vendor proposed solution/All.

Question Number	Section/Page/Item	Question	Response
		<p>assumed that the State is seeking a full third party archiving solution that must be included and priced in the proposal. Please confirm.</p> <p>e. 10.4.4 – Why does the State seek a solution with multiple redundant backups as long as the proposed solution for backup and recovery can ensure data restoration in accordance with the timeframes agreed to for RTO and RPO?</p> <p>f. 10.4.5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Is the e-mail data referenced here that which is immediately accessible or is some sort of short-term archiving anticipated? ii. What is the “specified time period?” iii. Is this requirement applicable to all e-mail accounts or certain flagged accounts (elected officials, specific positions, etc.)? iv. How is the e-mail data to be “automatically processed for long-term archiving” and by whom? <p>g. 10.4.6 – Is this “centralized message archiving” the “long-term archiving” specified in 10.4.5? Is this intended to be stored by the Vendor or the State? Would permanent archiving be for all email accounts, or only for specified individuals (e.g. Governor, etc.)?</p> <p>h. When archived, is email to be stubbed out in the user’s inbox or completely removed?</p> <p>i. 10.4.9 – How is the service provider to know what e-mail data is of permanent value?</p> <p>j. Historical e-mail archives – additional information is needed since this will impact pricing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Does the State intend that these be included in the migration efforts? ii. If so, what is the projected volume of archived email that must be migrated? <p>k. Is the MS Exchange environment hosted at ITS expected to be migrated first and in its entirety</p>	<p>h. The State does not have an established guideline for this specification.</p> <p>i. This is a user-defined requirement.</p> <p>j. It is expected that archived e-mail would be migrated. The will vary from entity to entity. See Amendment #4 above. ITS does not have volume information for each entity that could potentially use this contract.</p> <p>k. Yes.</p>

Question Number	Section/Page/Item	Question	Response
		(in other words, none of those existing clients moving from ITS to another environment prior to the migration?	
40	Section VII – Item 12.2	Is end-user training intended for administrators only, or for individual email end-users?	Individual end-users
41	Section VII – Item 13.1	What are other potential environments for migration (Gmail, Office 365, other)?	Other than what is stated in this requirement, ITS does not have this information for all potential entities.
42	Section VII – Item 13.6	<p>a. Does this requirement imply that to reduce costs existing licenses today held by State agencies and institutions will be transferred to the service provider OR be left with the State agencies and institutions to maintain and those licenses used and that a corresponding cost reduction will be calculated into that particular using agency’s month to month costs?</p> <p>b. How does this requirement tie to Section IV.30, Section VII.3.1 (paragraph3 3-5), Section VII.5.13-Section VII.5.17?</p>	<p>a. The State does not plan to transfer licenses, nor be charged for acquiring a particular license when the particular license is currently owned.</p> <p>b. They are all related. Each covers a different aspect for providing software under this RFP.</p>
43	Section VII	What are the differences in these requirements: Section VII.15.3 and Section VII.15.12, and Section VII.15.13?	Item 15.3 is system capability, Item 15.12 refers to administrator access requirements, and Item 15.13 refers to the method of access.
44	Section VII – Item 15.10-11	Can you provide any extra clarification on what the desired help desk? Would the end user be the agency administrator or the mailbox user? How full-service would the help desk be and would it be restricted to the use of Microsoft Exchange?	The State does not have an established guideline for this specification other than what is stated in the RFP. The State envisions that the end-user would contact the entity and there would be one point of contact between each entity and the Vendor help desk.
45	Section VII – Item 16.15	This requirement is self-conflicting. In the first sentence you ask for “unlimited concurrent users.” The second part of the first sentence implies the option of all accounts having concurrent access and then asks for the maximum number in the final number. Is what you are seeking is the maximum number of concurrent users that can be supported at any time?	Yes. Also, the maximum number must be equal to or greater than the number of accounts under contract.
46	Section VII – Item 16.16	Is this referencing the maximum number of users that the system can sustain to meet the required three (3) seconds per command response time? How is this	No, the focus of this requirement is based on not exceeding a three-second response time per command regardless of the number of users on

Question Number	Section/Page/Item	Question	Response
		related to Section VII.16.15?	the system.
47	Section VIII	Is the Cost Proposal to be included as a tab for Section VIII and included with the technical proposal or is it to be submitted and sealed separately?	Separate sealed proposal. See Amendments #1 and 5.
48	Appendix A	Appears Attachment A, Article 1.2 and Article 4 may be in conflict?	Appendix A, Standard Contract, has been revised to delete Article 1.2. See Amendment #6 above.
49	Appendix A – Article 5.2	Appears to be a requirement not in Section VII. Is there a form or format for these reports that is required?	No.
50	Appendix A – Article 7	See question 24 re #16.5 in Section VII	The State could not determine the question being asked.
51	Appendix A – Article 36	An effective 9 year engagement – it is unreasonable to believe that even if proposed staff stay with the Vendor there will not be promotional opportunities or transfers for them – there needs to be a means to negotiate replacements for other reasons than stated without penalty and include in the requirements the appropriate knowledge transfer at no cost to the State.	This Article allows for “other compelling reasons that are acceptable to ITS” to be considered as a basis. Vendor may take exception to any point in this RFP including the Standard Contract.
52		Can the State verify that only Vendors who attended the pre-bid conference, either in person or by conference line, will be allowed to participate?	Yes.
53		Can you provide a list of the Vendors that were in attendance?	This list is posted on the ITS website at the following link: http://www.its.ms.gov/procurement/rfps/3723Vendorconferenceattendees.pdf
54		Can the State to the best of its ability, provide a breakdown of email boxes that are to be migrated to a cloud based platform using the following format (a sizing key is provided below): Small (0-100MB), Regular (101-500MB), Large (501-4.25GB), Extra Large (4.26GB-6.25GB), and Custom (>6.25GB) for Exchange 2003 Exchange 2007 Exchange 2010 Exchange 2013 IMAP	See the response to questions 9, 10, and 11 above. Also see Attachment B.

Question Number	Section/Page/Item	Question	Response
		Notes Managed Notes Hosted (last 30 days) Other (Zimbra, Gmail, etc.) *Shared Resources Custom >6.25GB *(AV, Conf. Rooms, end.)	
55		If the State cannot provide the information requested in question 3, can you provide an estimated percentage of the number of mailboxes for each of listed categories by Platform (Exchange, Notes, IMAP, etc.)?	See the response to questions 54 above.
56		Will the State permit Vendor/Contractor employees located outside the United States to perform services arising from the RFP, and to access state systems through VPN, provided that the services performed by those employees do not require the transmittal of state data outside the United States? (See Sections IV, Paragraph 41 and Section VII, Paragraph 10.3.8 of RFP)	No, employees must meet all of the requirements in Section IV, Item 41, Mississippi Employment Protection Act.
57		Is the State willing to utilize an existing Master Services Agreement between the successful Vendor/Contractor and MS ITS as the basis for the terms and condition governing the services proposed in response to this RFP?	A new contract will be signed for this project utilizing the terms and conditions in Appendix A, Standard Contract.
58	Section VII – Item 3.1	Is there a list of departments that have committed to be migrated to the proposed hosted solution? Is there a list of departments that have committed to be migrated to the proposed hosted solution? Will a list be published of all agencies with agency specific current email information, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total number of mailboxes • Average mailbox size • largest mailbox size • size requirements • retention periods • existing email application, version, database, version • custom application integrations 	This information is very volatile and the exact number is unknown at the current time. The specifics by agency will be determined by the local account team during the discovery phase and defined in the project plan.

Question Number	Section/Page/Item	Question	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • feature requirements, functions, add on products • mobile device platforms supported (provider, phone model, os version, data plan) • agency specific security requirements • Microsoft licensing (exchange) • Other licensing required for integrations or 3rd party applications • Probability of interest in migrating to proposed solution 	
59	Section VII – Item 3.1	What are the approximately 30 distributed systems referenced in the RFP? Are the functions and add-ons referenced in the listed and defined by agency? Can these be provided?	See Attachment B. Yes. Some of the add-ons are located in Attachment B, but this list is not complete.
60	Section VII – Item 5.9	Is there any consideration for a minimum mailbox guarantee (i.e. 5,000, 10,000) to substantiate Vendor infrastructure investment required by the RFP?	No.
61	Section VII – Item 10.1.9	Will all domains be hosted at the provider or is a Federated environment expected?	Hosted at the provider.
62	Section VII – Item 10.1.9.3	Reference to Single Sign On - Does this imply non-hosted Active Directory with integration with the hosted service?	The State will consider all options presented.
63	Section VII – Item 10.3.18	Does ITS have an existing or preferred 2 factor authentication system?	ITS uses an RSA 2-factor solution today specifically for ITS systems and ITS employees only. The ITS solution would not be the enterprise 2-factor solution for the State. The Vendor is expected to provide the options available and details about the options. Additional tools may be required.
64	Section VII – Item 10.3.23	Can ITS provide a listing of the primary mandates and/or Executive Orders of concern?	See the response to question #38 above.
65	Section VII – Item 9.4.2	Need an example of The States expectations.	The intent of Section 9.4 is to provide the State with a means to easily reconcile the monthly bill payments for the services actually consumed.

Question Number	Section/Page/Item	Question	Response
			Many large agencies may pay only one monthly bill, but have numerous internal departments that must verify their particular sections. The specifications in Section 9.4 are to see what electronic reporting capabilities are available to the State. Specific to 9.4.2, the record layout can be used to extract the necessary information at that agency level for internal chargeback.
66	Section VII – Item 9.4.3	Need clarification of the intent of this language from, The States perspective.	State agencies are accustomed to having billing information arrive in a standard format, especially if they use the electronic information for internal chargeback purposes. The intent of Item 9.4.3 is for the awarded Vendor to notify the State before any significant change occurs with the monthly billing format so agencies can make the necessary changes to their reporting.
67	Section VII – Item 9.4.4.4	Please clarify if the State is asking for internal assigned or reassigned billing charges.	The intent of Item 9.4.4.4 is for internal chargebacks within an agency, if applicable
68	Section VII – Item 9.4.4.8	Please provide further explanation as to the meaning of “assigned billing media charges” as required by The State.	The intent of Item 9.4.4.8 is for internal chargeback within an agency, if applicable.
69	Section VII – Item 9.4.4.12	Please provide further explanation of this requirement	9.4.4.12 is related to Item 9.4.1.2 for the purpose of internal and external audits of bills to ensure payments match the services consumed.
70	Standard Contract – Article 25	Need clarification as to whose Executive Director of IT is as referenced in this article.	The third sentence of Article 25 states, “Any such dispute which is not disposed of in a mutually satisfactory manner shall be submitted to and decided by the Executive Director of ITS (“Executive Director”) or such person as the Executive Director may select.”
71		On average, how many Microsoft Exchange calls (for trouble, MAD, repair, general end user question, anything) should the Help Desk expect to receive each month?	The State does not have an average, since this cannot be determined with the current multiple system environments.
72	Section III Vendor Information – Page 13, Item 17	Will need to pose a question on inventory of existing Exchange Licensing throughout the Agencies...their desire is to leverage existing licensing?	Where possible.

Question Number	Section/Page/Item	Question	Response
73	Section IV Legal and Contractual Information – Page 15, Item 7.3	If we take exception to Unlimited Liability clauses in the agreement, are we eliminated from consideration on this project?"	No.
74	Section IV Legal and Contractual Information – Page 15, Item 7.6	We need clarification on cancelable funds. If we get 1 year down the road, and ITS decides not to elect funding email, what happens?	ITS is not the funding authority. See Article 13 in the Standard Contract in Appendix A of this RFP.
75	Section IV Legal and Contractual Information – Page 21, Item 32	Will you provide a copy of this policy?	Vendor must provide contact information (name, e-mail address, phone number) to the State's contact person identified in Section II, Item 14.1 of the RFP who will coordinate the secure delivery of the requested information.
76	Section VI RFP Questionnaire – Page 30, Item 5	Please clarify. What policies are in place to protect against this? Are we responsible for prohibiting employees from sending attachments that contain SSNs?	This disclosure applies to any information system proposed, developed, or modified under this RFP and the Vendor's responsibility to put a mechanism in place to prevent inadvertent disclosure to those that it was not intended. The Vendor is not responsible for information willingly sent to an intended specified recipient.
77	Section VII - Page 37, Item 5.11	Please clarify, we cannot guarantee that an email may be sent to a server outside of the US.	"Stored" refers to the Vendor's cloud infrastructure not residing outside the continental United States, not where an e-mail is sent.
78	Section VII - Page 52, Item 10.1.18.12	Please clarify what the intent behind this question is. The state of California has specific requirements, if a MS agency sends an email to CA, are we responsible for meeting these email requirements?	The intent of Item 10.1.18.12 is to ensure Mississippi data remains within the United States and protected from unauthorized access.
79	Section VII - Page 55, Item 10.3.7	Please clarify. If an Agency user sends an email to Russia and they store the Attachment, would Vendor be responsible?	See the response to question #77 above.
80	Section VII - Page 55, Item 10.3.8	Please clarify. If an Agency user sends an email to Russia and they store the Attachment, would Vendor be responsible?	See the response to question #77 above.
81		Will the State release the names and companies represented at the bidders conference?	See the response to question #53 above.
82	Section II - Page 7,	We will be submitting some pre-existing documents	Any pre-existing document that is not/cannot be

Question Number	Section/Page/Item	Question	Response
	Item 9.3	(e.g., financial reports) that have existing page numbering and some pages may not be numbered. Because these are long and complex documents, may we leave them unaltered?	combined with the primary proposal response document, or is identified as a separate publication, can maintain its numbering.
83	Section IV - Page 22, Item 36	Would this State please clarify the following RFP text: "Proposals without proposal bonds will be rejected./ is not required to include a proposal bond with its RFP proposal} (TC should select one sentence and delete the other.)"	This statement has been revised. See Amendment #2 above
84	Section VII - Page 33, Item 3.1	Would the State provide supporting detail regarding additional resource, license, and environment costs?	ITS has a limited amount of information on some state agencies' environments. See Attachment B.
85	Section VII - Page 33, Item 3.1	Please provide information regarding today's existing infrastructure to assist Vendor with understanding existing deployed architectures.	ITS has a limited amount of information on some state agencies' environments. See Attachment B.
86	Section VII - Page 33, Item 3.1	Please provide current email cost information by agency.	ITS has a limited amount of information on the cost of e-mail for some state agencies since these purchases may have been made without ITS' involvement.
87	Section VII - Page 33, Item 3.1	The State has confirmed that DITS currently hosts approximately 1100 mailboxes for 30 smaller agencies. Will the State release the current pricing structure offered to the agencies to provide this email hosting solution?	No, this information will not be provided in this document.
88	Section VII - Page 35, Item 4	Will the State consider extending the proposal submission date by two weeks to April 24, 2014? If possible, can the State respond to the request for an extension quickly? It would be very helpful to have a response in the next few days rather than March 28.	See the information at the following link: http://www.its.ms.gov/procurement/rfps/3723amend2.pdf
89	Section VII - Page 35, Item 4	Will the State consider releasing answers to Vendor questions prior to March 28 - in part or in whole? The answers to many of these critical questions may/will affect the strategy and may require Vendors to re-write portions of the proposal response.	The schedule has been revised. See the revised schedule in the link included in response to question #88 above.
90	Section VII – Page 40, Item 7.1.10.1	Would the State permit Vendors to provide an internet URL/link to their financial statements or provided them only in electronic format on our CD/DVD or USB media rather than providing hard copies in our response?	Financial information must accompany the proposal. CD/DVD or USB media is acceptable.

Question Number	Section/Page/Item	Question	Response
91	Section VII – page 45, Item 9.1.1	Please provide examples of the type of administrative support that may be required by State agencies.	The intent of Item 9.1.1 is to establish if the Vendor has the capability to support smaller agencies that may not have a system administrator. Examples of work include setting up and deleting accounts, increasing/decreasing storage, resetting mailboxes on they behalf and at their request.
92	Section VII – Page 49, Item 10.1.6	Are there any multi-function (printers, copiers, scanners, etc.) devices that need to route or relay mail? If so, please provide additional detail on these devices.	There are multi-function devices at various agencies that will need email capabilities. Unfortunately, the quantity is unknown and will be identified in the preliminary meetings with the agencies.
93	Section VII - Page 49, Item 10.1.2.5	Are there any legal holds in place today? If yes, how many?	ITS has a limited amount of information on potential users. This information is not available.
94	Section VII - Page 49, Item 10.1.5	Would the State confirm if mobile device management (MDM) is in scope for this RFP? If so, what are the requirements?	MDM is not within the scope of this RFP.
95	Section VII - Page 50, Item 10.1.9.1	What version of Active Directory is in place, and can the State provide a Directory Services landscape showing AD (Domain, Forest) structure?	This varies by agency. ITS has not compiled this information.
96	Section VII - Page 50, Item 10.1.9.1	What is the authoritative record for the Directory Services environment?	Each Active Directory is local for each agency.
97	Section VII - Page 50, Item 10.1.8	What are the State's requirements for the Exchange/Messaging supplier to provision mailboxes? Is administrative support for mailbox provisioning a base service or part of the separate administrative pricing request?	Administrative support is expected as part of the administrative help desk support required in Section VII, Item 15, which is part of the base services.
98	Section VII - Page 50, Item 10.1.11	Please provide additional detail on the types of reports that the supplier will be required to provide.	The State believes that adequate information has been provided. It is incumbent upon the Vendor to propose a solution with various reporting options covering at a minimum, each of these categories.
99	Section VII - Page 51, Item 10.1.17	How many mobile devices are currently being managed and is there a break out of type (i.e. BES, iOS, etc.)? If so, please provide list of types.	ITS has a limited amount of information on mobile devices used by entities within the state.
100	Section VII – Page 52, Item 10.2.1	How many SMTP domains does the State accept mail for?	ITS only has this information for the agencies hosted by ITS. Detail for the state is not available.
101	Section VII - Page	Are there any applications that need SMTP relay or	Yes.

Question Number	Section/Page/Item	Question	Response
	52, Item 10.2.1	Exchange routing?	
102	Section VII - Page 52, Item 10.1.18.12	Please provide additional information / examples for Vendor to meet the requirement for geographic legal requirements for user privacy / disclosure / preservation.	See the response to questions # 29 and #77.
103	Section VII - Page 56, Item 10.3.26	Will the State entertain offering Vendors co-located space within the State's data center?	Yes. The State will review and consider all options presented by Vendors to this RFP for e-mail hosting.
104	Section VII - Page 57, Item 10.4.9	Can the State provide the supplier with the total size of the e-mail Archive? Also please provide clarity on the retention period requirements and if they differ by agency.	Since there are currently multiple stand-alone environments, the State does not have this information.
105	Section VII - Page 57, Item 10.4.9	Are there any backups or archives on a previous platform that need to be maintained as part of this contract?	See Amendment #4, and the response to questions #16 and #39 above.
106	Section VII - Page 57, Item 10.4.4	What does the State currently use for Exchange backup?	Since there are currently multiple stand-alone environments, the State does not have this information.
107	Section VII - Page 60, Item 13.2.1.1	Can the State provide supplier with list of mailbox counts by size or tiers and by agency?	Since there are currently multiple stand-alone environments, the State does not have this information. Some of this information can be found in Attachment B of this document.
108	Section VII - Page 60, Item 13.2.1.1	Can the State provide the supplier with the total size of the Exchange mailstore?	Since there are currently multiple stand-alone environments, the State does not have this information.
109	Section VII - Page 60, Item 13.1	Can the State provide the supplier with all the versions of Exchange in the State's email environment?	ITS has a limited amount of information on some state agencies' environment. See Attachment B.
110	Section VII - Page 60, Item 13.2.	Are there any public folders in place today if so can the State provide the supplier with the size and quantity of public folders?	Since there are currently multiple stand-alone environments, the State does not have this information.
111	Section VII - Page 61, Item 13.6	Vendor respectfully requests information regarding current licenses to facilitate recommendations for changes.	See the response to questions #3, #42, #72, and #84.
112	Section VII – Page 62, Item 15.3	Can the State provide the supplier with a breakout of the email support tickets?	Since the State is currently not operating in a consolidated environment, there is no history with trouble tickets. This information cannot be provided.

Question Number	Section/Page/Item	Question	Response
113	Section VII – Page 63, Item 16.1	What tools are in place currently for e-Discovery?	ITS has a limited amount of information on tools available across the State. This information is not available.
114	Section VII – Page 63, Item 16.1	Please confirm the scope of the base services to assist with definition of SLAs for: e-mail calendar contact collaboration tools legal archive e-discovery mobile device access mobile device management other components	This list of covered service components could vary by Vendor. The scope is to provide a list of all services components covered in the Vendor's SLA to include at a minimum, those item listed in requirement 16.1 in the RFP.
115	Section VII, Page 70	Please confirm that it is the State's intention to differentiate between tiered variable mailbox cost and Initial start-up fixed costs given that the State cannot guarantee a minimum number of mailboxes during the contract term. This will allow the State to accurately calculate the total per mailbox costs at various quantities of hosted email mailboxes.	The State expects that there will be initial cost associated with start-up for each entity (See Table 2 on page 71 of the RFP). The State envisions that each entity would pay recurring cost (hosting, support, etc.) based on the appropriate pricing tier for the aggregated total number of mailboxes being supported by the Vendor.
116		Is existing in an o365 community cloud an acceptable solution?	All proposed solutions will be evaluated.
117		Is the ST of Mississippi ITS open to using the WSCA (Western States Contracting Alliance) Public Cloud Hosting Services contract?	This is not the State's preferred direction.
118		The State indicated that there are 60 agencies that are in scope, for these agencies could the State provide information on: a. AD Topology and Relational Information b. Network Topology & Capacity of Networking c. Mailbox Capacity d. Archive Capacity e. PST File Capacity f. Public Folders Usage & Capacity	Not all of this information is available, and it would take a considerable amount of time to gather. Attachment B contains some of this information. Additional information cannot be provided at this time.

Question Number	Section/Page/Item	Question	Response
		g. Breakdown of users by location and associated agency	
119	Section IV - Page 21, Item 32	Can the State execute an NDA with Vendor to facilitate the sharing of the Enterprise Security Policy during the RFP process? If yes, can you please describe the process as we would like to obtain the entire Enterprise Security Policy document to ensure that our response is in compliance with such policy?	The Enterprise Security Policy can be provided to Vendors upon request as stated in Section IV, Item 32, page 21 of the RFP.
120	Section IV - Page 22, Item 36	Can you clarify whether a Proposal Bond is required for this RFP? The FRP language is unclear due to some typographical errors.	This statement has been revised. See Amendment #2 above.
121	Section VII - Page 33, Item 3.1	Can you please elaborate on the context of the word "private" in "private cloud"? For The State, does "private cloud" mean a hosted solution where hardware resources that make-up the hosted solution are used by multiple tenants and their data is logically separated by the hosted solution's Vendor? If not, please elaborate	The intent of Item 3.1 is to ensure that state information is safeguarded and not accessible by any other entity. This can be either physically or logically done within the respondent's framework.
122	Section VII - Page 39, Item 6.7	If The State currently utilizes a Change Management System, can you please describe what it is e.g. MasterControl, Inc.? Can you describe the requirements for the Change Management System for the work to be completed under this RFP? The Change Management System, for example, must include an automated approval workflow	ITS currently follows ITIL guidelines for change management.
123	Section VII - Page 52, Item 10.1.18.12	What are the geographic legal requirements?	See the response to questions #29, #77, and #102.
124	Section VII - Page 53, Item 10.2.2	Can you describe how each of the protocols in the subsections of this sections are used today at The State, and its use cases?	ITS has a limited amount of information on tools available across the State. This information is not available.
125		How many Active Directory forests does The State currently operate across all of its departments and agencies within the context of this RFP? Can you please provide a list mapping Active Directory environments to the individual departments and agencies?	There are currently multiple systems and ITS does not have this information for each entity. This will be part of the review and migration plan for each entity.

Question Number	Section/Page/Item	Question	Response
126		What e-mail system (product name and version) does each agency and department use today? How much server-side, "live" data does each of these e-mail systems contain? How many mailboxes does each e-mail system serve? How many users does each e-mail system serve?	ITS has a limited amount of information on some state agencies' environments. See Attachment B.
127		Would it be valuable to the State to be able to view, and report on the solution's licensing consumption and other data through delegated administration within each of the State Agencies and departments at any time within a single web-based portal?	Yes.
128		What is the current level of integration between the various disparate Exchange environments within The State? For example, can users of one Exchange organization look-up the free/busy information of another Exchange organization? Please provide all such points of integration.	There are currently multiple systems with no current integration between the various disparate Exchange environments within the State.
129		Is The State open to evaluating the use of an Infrastructure as a Platform (IaaS) environment to host some of the supporting infrastructure e.g. servers for Single Sign-on (SSO) that will be needed to meet the RFP requirements?	Each respondent will be responsible for providing and detailing their best solution to the services being requested. The State will evaluate the respondent's proposal based on meeting the objectives and overall costs.
130		<u>For each State Agency:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How many total users do you have? ▪ Where are your users located? How many users are at each location? ▪ What is your Active Directory Forest Name? ▪ What is your Forest Status (i.e. Single Forest, multiple forests)? ▪ What is your Active Directory Functional Level? ▪ How many Domain Controllers do you have? ▪ What are the SMTP Domains are used and do all of them need to be present in the cloud? ▪ What is the current Messaging Platform? Is it Distributed or local? ▪ If Exchange is used, is RPC over HTTPS configured? ▪ How many mailboxes do you have? 	ITS has a limited amount of information on some state agencies' environments. Most of this information will be determined at the agency/entity level. Attachment B contains information on mailbox size and number for 25 agencies. Currently, most platforms are local. Additional information cannot be provided at this time.

Question Number	Section/Page/Item	Question	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What is the total mail data size? ▪ What is the current message receive size restriction? ▪ What is the current message send size restriction? ▪ Do you use Public Folders? If so, how? ▪ Do any users access email via thin clients or terminal services only? ▪ Is there an existing archive solution in place? What is it? ▪ If there is an archiving solution, how much data exists in the archive? ▪ What Anti-Spam solution is used? ▪ Are any applications reliant on the messaging platform to send out email? For example, scanners that can scan to email or any type of ticketing system that sends emails. ▪ Are there any external mail relays in place? Any external Routing? ▪ Do you take backups of your environment? If yes, please detail the specifics. ▪ Do you have a Data Loss Prevention application? ▪ 	
132	Section VII – Item 10.1.19	Can the State of Mississippi provide a representative list of 3 rd party applications or systems and the function they provide that the State of Mississippi anticipates may be impacted?	See the responses to question #30 above.
133	Section II – Page 7 Item 9.2	Is the State/ITS referring to the cover page of the RFP itself or the SECTION I SUBMISSION COVER SHEET & CONFIGURATION SUMMARY page included as page 4 of the RFP regarding the requirement: “RFP cover page must be clearly typed and affixed to the package in a clearly visible location.”? We were under the impression that the SECTION I SUBMISSION COVER SHEET & CONFIGURATION SUMMARY page should be the first page of each Vendor’s proposal. Please clarify.	The RFP cover page and the proposal cover page are not synonymous. This item is referring to the cover page of the RFP as the source to obtain information for package labeling. It must contain the RFP number, contact person, address, and due dates information. This information appears outside of the package to allow it to get to the designated person within ITS. The Section I Submission and cover sheet should not appear outside of the package, but within the proposal.

RFP responses are due May 13, 2014, at 3:00 p.m. (Central Time).

If you have any questions concerning the information above, or if we can be of further assistance, please contact Debra Spell at 601-432-8132 or by e-mail at debra.spell@its.ms.gov.

cc: ITS Project File Number 40437

Attachment A

Agencies Within ITS' Hosted Environment

ARCHBD - Board of Architecture
ARTS - Arts Commission
BNHA - Board of Nursing Home Administrators
BTA - Board of Tax Appeals
DMH - Department of Mental Health
DMR - Department of Marine Resources
ESS - Ellisville State School
ETHICS - Ethics Commission
JUDPERF - Commission on Judicial Performance
LF - LifeTracks
LPC - Board of Licensed Professional Counselors
MBP - Board of Pharmacy
MEC - Electronic Courts
MMVC - Motor Vehicle Commission
MOHS - Office of Homeland Security
MREC - Real Estate Commission
MSBC - Board of Cosmetology
MSBDE - Board of Dental Examiners
MSBFS - Board of Funeral Services
MSBMT - Board of Massage Therapy
MSBN - Board of Nursing
MSBO - Board of Optometry
MSBORF - Board of Registration for Foresters
MSBPA - Board of Public Accountancy
MSBPT - Board of Physical Therapy
MSBRPG - Board of Registered Professional Geologists
MSFA - State Fire Academy
MSHIN - Health Information Network
OSPD - Office of State Public Defender
PCC - Post Conviction Council
PEPLS - Professional Engineers & Professional Land Surveyors
PRBDD - Pearl River Basin Development District
SMRC - South MS Regional Center
STF - Specialized Treatment Facility
SWMFT - Examiners for Social Workers & Marriage & Family Therapy
VHPB - Veterans Home Purchase Board
WCC - Wireless Commission

Attachment B

Known State entities running MS Exchange:

Agency	Number of Mailboxes	Sizing Options (Max. Size)
MS Department of Education	716	1GB
MS Dept. of Corrections	1900	None
MS Community College Board	50	250MB
Dept. Finance & Administration	500	1GB
MS Dept. of Wildlife, Fisheries, & Parks	450	None
State Auditor's Office	155	1GB
MS Dept. of Employment Services	900	1GB
MS Dept. of Public Safety	1200	1GB
MS Secretary of State	130	250MB
Public Employees' Retirement System	180	250MB
MS Emergency Management Agency	450	500MB
MS Forestry Commission	300	1GB
MS Dept. Rehabilitation Services	955	1GB
MS Development Authority	512	None
MS Insurance Dept.	200	1GB
MS Dept. of Transportation	2500	1GB
MS Dept. Mental Health	3000	500MB
State Treasurer's Office	60	1GB
MS Dept. of Medicaid	1250	2GB
MS Dept. of Health	3000	None
Attorney General's Office	250	None

Non- Microsoft Exchange environments:

Agency	Email Platform	Number of Mailboxes	Sizing Options (Max. Size)
Dept. of Revenue	GroupWise	625	None
MS Dept. of Human Services	Lotus Notes	3300	Litigation Hold
MS Dept. of Environmental Quality	Lotus Notes	500	100MB