

Virginia Information Technologies Agency



COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
VIRGINIA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES AGENCY (VITA)
SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT DIVISION
11751 MEADOWVILLE LANE
CHESTER, VIRGINIA 23836

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION (RFI) 2017-14
FOR:
SERVER, DATA CENTER, AND SECURITY SERVICES

Issue Date: September 29, 2016
Due Date/Time: October 21, 2016 @ 3:00 pm Eastern
Response Delivery Method: E-mail attachment to Single Point of Contact
Single Point of Contact (SPOC): Greg Scearce, VITA Supply Chain Management (SCM)
Telephone: (804) 416-6166
E-mail Address: gregory.scearce@vita.virginia.gov

NOTE: This public body does not discriminate against faith-based organizations in accordance with the Code of Virginia, §2.2-4343.1 or against a Supplier because of race, religion, color, sex, national origin, age, disability, or any other basis prohibited by state law relating to discrimination in employment.

VITA is committed to increasing procurement opportunities for small, women-owned, and minority-owned (SWaM) businesses, strengthening the Commonwealth's overall economic growth through the development of its IT suppliers.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction.....	3
A. IT Infrastructure Services Program (ITISP) Overview	3
B. RFI Purpose.....	3
2. Submission Logistics and Contact Information	5
3. Overview of RFI Documents	5
4. Respondent Contact Information.....	6
5. Questions.....	7
A. Server/Storage Services.....	7
B. Financial/Server Storage	11
C. Managed Security.....	12
D. Financial/Managed Security	15
6. Feedback Regarding RFI Documents	17

1. INTRODUCTION

The intent of this Request for Information (RFI) is solely to gather information; it is not a formal procurement. Responding to the RFI is not a pre-requisite to submitting a proposal for any subsequent procurement. Respondents should not provide any confidential or proprietary information.

Ownership of all data, materials, and documentation originated and prepared for VITA pursuant to the RFI shall rest exclusively with VITA. All information provided to VITA as part of this RFI will not be publicly disclosed, but shall be subject to public inspection in accordance with the §2.2-4342 of the *Virginia Public Procurement Act and the Virginia Freedom of Information Act*.

A. IT Infrastructure Services Program (ITISP) Overview

This procurement event is a component in VITA's overall strategy to implement a new IT Infrastructure Services Program (ITISP). This program will position VITA to fulfill its vision to "deliver agile technology services at the speed of business" by better balancing the needs of the individual agencies and the enterprise in a multisupplier ecosystem. The ITISP is intended to accomplish the following:

- **Maintain and improve service quality.**
 - Develop the capability to address evolving agency needs and create opportunities to improve service performance without degrading service reliability, security, and quality.
- **Ensure cost competitiveness – both now and in the future.**
 - Structure service offerings so they can be more easily compared to market services at market rates; offer a menu of service options to customers.
- **Create a platform view of service delivery that is highly visible and accountable.**
 - Provide for Enterprise and Agency visibility of consumption, cost, performance, and the responsiveness of suppliers. Establish a governance structure and forums to promote stakeholder engagement and improve the balance of agencies and enterprise needs.

Procurement of new services that will transition the Commonwealth from a single supplier model to an integrated multisupplier model is occurring over three waves. VITA has begun implementing Wave 1 of this transition by awarding a contract for Messaging services in July 2016 and a contract for IBM Mainframe services in September 2016. Wave 2 of this transition begins with this Request for Proposal ("RFP") soliciting proposals for the services of a multisourcing service integrator (MSI). That procurement was released on September 29, 2016 under RFP# 2017-03. The Wave 2 procurements are also intended to include services for Server, Storage, Data Center LAN, Data Center Facilities, and Managed Security Services (abbreviated as "Server, DC, and Security").

Respondents to this RFI are encouraged to review the publicly available RFP# 2017-03 documents for additional context. Note also that there will be a Pre-Proposal Web Conference for the MSI RFP, scheduled for Tuesday, October 4th at 2 pm. Information to register for the conference is indicated in the RFP Instructions for RFP# 2017-03.

B. RFI Purpose

VITA has decided to accelerate its MSI implementation, such that the contract for RFP# 2017-03 is awarded while the other Wave 2 procurements are still underway. The initial focus on the MSI RFP allows additional time at the front-end of the timeline to gather further market research for Server, DC, and Security via this RFI. This RFI will allow VITA to improve the quality of the resultant RFP or RFPs to be released around the end of 2016.

Currently, VITA's Wave 2 internal RFP teams are structured around two separate potential RFPs: 1.) Server, Storage and Data Center Services and 2.) Managed Security Services. However, VITA is interested in identifying the most efficient demarcation or bundling of these services between RFPs. For example, perhaps it would be more efficient to separate the Data Center facilities from the other Server services; or perhaps it would be better to include some or all of the Security services with the Server RFP. VITA anticipates resolving these decisions, and other questions as detailed in the Section 5 (Questions) below, in part by considering feedback obtained from marketplace participants via this RFI.

The Commonwealth has the following goals for the procurements:

Server, Storage, and Data Center Services

- Assume all existing Services for Server, Storage, Data Center LAN, and Centralized Data Center facility currently provided to the Commonwealth via the Comprehensive Infrastructure Agreement (CIA) with Northrop Grumman.
- Transition to the next generation of delivery for Server, Storage, and Data Center services to VITA and Customers, taking advantage of the ever-changing technology landscape while decreasing costs to VITA and Customers.
- Provide compute, storage, and Data Center LAN services that are flexible, rapidly provisioned, cost effective, transparent, and elastic to meet VITA and Customer needs while preserving enterprise requirements such as security and compliance management.

Managed Security Services

- Replace the existing security services included within the Comprehensive Infrastructure Agreement (CIA) with Northrop Grumman.
- Support VITA's Commonwealth Security and Risk Management (CSR)M) directorate by acting as its operational "hands and feet":
 - Advising on risks and standards development
 - Assessing vulnerabilities and compliance (suppliers and agencies)
 - Provide security monitoring and integration tools across the environment
 - Respond to and address security risks and incidents
 - Provide tools and technologies to protect the environment from compromise
 - Provide security services that are adjustable to meet compliance needs of the Customer and adaptable to advancements in both security and technology industries
 - Establish, implement and maintain a secure enterprise information technology environment ensuring the confidentiality, integrity and availability of critical Commonwealth information and systems

- Provide VITA and its Customers with access to their data and metadata, in real-time

2. SUBMISSION LOGISTICS AND CONTACT INFORMATION

Issue Date:	September 29, 2016
Due Date / Time:	October 21, 2016 at 3:00 pm EST
Response Delivery Method:	E-mail attachment or CD sent to Single Point of Contact. Note: e-mail must be received by the due date and time; CD must be post-marked by the due date, but can be received later. E-mail attachments must be limited to 10 MB.
Single Point of Contact (SPOC):	Greg Searce
Telephone:	(804) 416-6166
E-mail Address:	gregory.searce@vita.virginia.gov
Mailing Address:	11751 Meadowville Lane, Chester, VA 23836
Pricing:	No pricing information should be submitted
Document Format:	Return this document, having populated Section 4 (Respondent Contact Information), Section 5 (Questions) below, and Section 6 (Feedback Regarding RFI Documents)
RFI Questions and Answers:	Suppliers may submit questions regarding this RFI at any time via e-mail to the SPOC.

3. OVERVIEW OF RFI DOCUMENTS

Within this RFI, VITA has chosen to release the following documents, which are drafts of some key documents anticipated for release in a final RFP or RFPs.

- Exhibit 2.1-a: Server, Storage, Data Center LAN Services
- Exhibit 2.1-b: Data Center Facilities Services
- Exhibit 2.1-c: Managed Security Services
- Exhibit 2.2: Cross-Functional Services
- Exhibit 3.1-a: Server, Storage, Data Center LAN, and Data Center Facilities SLA Matrix
- Exhibit 3.1-b: Managed Security SLA Matrix

- Exhibit 3.2-a: Server, Storage, Data Center LAN, and Data Center Facilities SLA Descriptions
- Exhibit 3.2-b: Managed Security SLA Descriptions
- Exhibit 4: Pricing and Financial Provisions
- Exhibit 4.1-a: Server, Storage, Data Center LAN, and Data Center Facilities Pricing and Volumes Matrix
- Exhibit 4.1-b: Managed Security Pricing and Volumes Matrix
- Exhibit 4.2-a: Server, Storage, Data Center LAN, and Data Center Facilities RU Definitions
- Exhibit 4.2-b: Managed Security RU Definitions
- Exhibit 4.4: Form of Invoice

4. RESPONDENT CONTACT INFORMATION

Please provide your contact information in the box below.

Contact Information	Enter your response here, enlarging the box as needed
Company Name	Raytheon Foreground Security
Company Mailing Address	801 International Parkway 5th Floor Lake Mary, FL, 32746
Company Website Address	foregroundsecurity.com
Name of Contact Person	Alison Kidd
Contact Person E-mail Address	akidd@foregroundsecurity.com
Contact Person Telephone #	703.622.9607

5. QUESTIONS

Please use the table to respond to the Commonwealth's questions.

Ref#	Category	Question	Supplier Response
A. Server/Storage Services			
Q1.	Server/Storage	The Commonwealth has upwards of 10 non-centralized Data Centers in Agency-operated buildings, primarily in the metro Richmond area. What are examples of Suppliers' best practices in managing the Servers, Storage, Firewalls, and Data Center LANs in non-centralized (Agency) facilities?	
Q2.	Server/Storage	What does the Supplier recommend for the length of the contract for Server, Storage, and Data Center Services? Please describe benefits and trade-offs.	
Q3.	Data Center	What do you recommend for the length of the contract for the Data Center Facility for this type of environment?	
Q4.	Server/Storage	What does the Supplier recommend for technology refresh rate for the different types of Devices in VITA's environment? Is there an impact on the length of the services contract?	
Q5.	Server/Storage	The Commonwealth is interested in a separate hardware charge in the Server RUs to account for the initial capital outlay for physical servers. Is there a better way to represent the cost differences and hardware refresh cycle in the Server RU structure?	
Q6.	Server/Storage	The Commonwealth is proposing tiering of services for Server and Storage in an attempt to align costs with availability and performance. Based on your experience, do these tiers of service have any challenges in developing a solution? Do you have experience with these service tiering model? Do you have any recommendations or enhancements for the Commonwealth to consider?	
Q7.	Server/Storage	The Commonwealth currently spreads costs across a very simple RU model. Do you have an enhanced RU model that could offer a larger variety of services while minimizing the RUs and their complexity?	
Q8.	Server/Storage	The Commonwealth is including Bronze thru Platinum service levels for Server as examples of service categories. What would be required to implement this model in the Commonwealth?	

Ref#	Category	Question	Supplier Response
Q9.	Server/Storage	Do you see a better way to bundle or spilt the services we are requesting, in order to more effectively integrate with other towers (including MSI), and obtain more flexibility in the Commonwealth's IT environment while maintaining appropriate Governance and security?	
Q10.	Server/Storage	Are their new Storage offerings, like Object Based Storage or predictive storage, that the Commonwealth should include in storage or enhanced services? How do you offer and charge for virtual storage?	
Q11.	Server/Storage	The Commonwealth is interested in ensuring it provides optimal storage performance and availability for VITA and VITA's Customers. How do you propose to provide and measure this performance?	
Q12.	Server/Storage	The Commonwealth has traditional x86 virtual servers, but it is also interested in the capabilities of a private cloud. Could they be combined or left separate? Please describe how this could be accomplished most effectively.	
Q13.	Server/Storage	How does Database as a Service make sense for an Enterprise like the Commonwealth? Do you have any recommendations for how to charge for enhanced Database services (i.e., Development DBA)?	
Q14.	Server/Storage	The Commonwealth wants to provide cost effective solutions to VITA and the Agencies. What do you describe as the key cost and value drivers that would help the Commonwealth offer services that are not cost prohibitive to deliver? Do you see any requirements in the description of services in this RFI that would cost more to meet than the business value they provide?	
Q15.	Security	The Commonwealth is interested in an Enterprise Key Management System for compliance and security. How do you propose the Commonwealth request Key Management services?	
Q16.	MSI	Identity and Access Management (IAM) services and the systems supporting those functions are currently split between multiple providers. How do you propose bringing these services together to provide a single integrated service?	
Q17.	MSI	The Commonwealth has defined the cross-functional requirements in Exhibit 2.2. Do you have any comments in the structure and handoffs identified in this document? Do you have any prior experience	

Ref#	Category	Question	Supplier Response
		working with MSIs? Do you have any recommendations regarding the approach for how the MSI should interact with the other suppliers?	
Q18.	MSI	Do you see any benefits or challenges in requiring the Data Center facility provider to also be responsible for providing common operating monitoring groups in the same solution (e.g., CMOC, ITOC, SOC, NOC)?	
Q19.	MSI	The Commonwealth currently has a single traditional DR solution that requires the entire backup Data Center to be failed over. There is a desire to move to a more flexible solution that allows single Agencies or even applications to be failed over individually. This process requires design, development, operations, testing, and coordination. What role should VITA's MSI should play in this effort in relation with the Server Services provider?	
Q20.	Data Center	The Commonwealth is interested in Multi-site High Availability and Disaster Recovery Services. At a high-level, what do you recommend on the number and locations of centralized Data Centers the Commonwealth should utilize for that purpose? Any tradeoffs?	
Q21.	Migration	Suppliers will be required to provide an implantation plan to specify how they will take over responsibility for the existing environment. The Commonwealth is also interested in recommendations with regard to how the Commonwealth could migrate or transform to new Service offerings. What do you recommend for this migration plan?	
Q22.	Enhanced Services	The Commonwealth is interested in receiving proposals to include new enhanced services, (e.g., Cloud, Analytics, Managed File Transfer) Can you recommend any other such enhanced services the Commonwealth should also consider including at the moment? How would you recommend these services be delivered?	
Q23.	Enhanced Services	As the technology landscape changes in the Commonwealth's environment, could you describe other enhanced services that VITA and VITA Customers should consider in the future?	
Q24.	Enhanced Services	What would you propose as a good business case for virtualizing the desktop (offering VDI)?	
Q25.	Data Center LAN	What do you recommend as the best demarcation point between the Data Center LAN and the Network or WAN? The Commonwealth	

Ref#	Category	Question	Supplier Response
		wants to make the cleanest scope separation for a future WAN Network RFP.	
Q26.	Data Center LAN	In the current RFI, the Commonwealth has bundled Data Center LAN services (e.g., switching, routing, load balancing and firewall) with Server and Storage services. Do you find any challenges, issues, or concerns with this approach and why? Any recommendations?	
Q27.	Data Center LAN	The Commonwealth did not bundle Data Center LAN services (e.g., switching, routing, load balancing and firewall) with the Data Center Facility services (e.g., HVAC, power, raised floor). Do you believe this is the correct approach? Do you have any recommendations?	
Q28.	Data Center LAN	The Commonwealth is considering decoupling the Data Center Facility services from the Server, Storage, and Data Center LAN services. What do you think of this approach? What do you think are the advantages, disadvantages and tradeoffs of splitting the facility services out versus coupling these services with Server, Storage, Data Center LAN?	
Q29.	Data Center LAN	Supplier is expected to provide centralized Data Center LAN services. Should LANs in non-centralized Data Centers be part of the scope for Data Center LAN services or bid as part of Network/WAN in a future procurement? What would be the pros/cons and tradeoffs?	
Q30.	Data Center LAN	If the solution includes new Data Centers, who should provision and manage the network connections between the Data Center locations? Should it be the Network Provider, the Data Center Provider or the Server, Storage, Data Center LAN Provider?	
Q31.	Data Center	How does the Supplier propose to migrate Server, Storage, Data Center LAN services out of the CESC datacenter by June 2019 or earlier? Describe how the Supplier would seamlessly migrate out of CESC like-for-like, transform to new services, or a combination of the two? What are the recommended approaches?	
Q32.	Cloud Services	The Commonwealth is interested in a solution that integrates traditional hosting services with new private, community, and public cloud offerings. How do you propose integrating these services?	
Q33.	Cloud Services	What would be the best practice with regard to Suppliers owning the cloud contracts and potentially transferring that contract to the Commonwealth? Should the Commonwealth own that contract outright? Are there any other alternatives to be considered?	

Ref#	Category	Question	Supplier Response
Q34.	Cloud Services	When the Commonwealth buys cloud services offerings how do you propose to identify where the data and services are located?	
B. Financial/Server Storage			
Q35.	Pricing Structure	<p>The Commonwealth is interested in creating the best possible pricing structure for the Services. In light of that fact, Supplier is invited to both comment on the structure described in Exhibit 4.1 and 4.2, and to propose an alternate pricing structure if they believe that it will better serve the interests of both parties.</p> <p>The Commonwealth will contemplate any proposed pricing structure along five dimensions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Predictable: To the greatest extent possible, customers should be able to forecast charges ahead of time; changes in pricing that occur over time should not be a surprise. 2. Manageable: The pricing should not be so complex that it is needlessly difficult to administer. If quantities of work or equipment in the environment must be measured, then those quantities should be as easy and transparent as possible to measure. 3. Fair: The service pricing must be a reasonable proxy for a services provider's underlying costs and should adequately recover those costs. Additionally, to the extent possible, the party that causes any incremental cost should bear that cost. 4. Incentives: All pricing structures will incentivize certain behaviors and discourage others. The goals of the sourcing program must be kept in mind when considering the behaviors that might be driven by a pricing structure. For example, a goal to encourage server consolidation might include reduced cost at a centralized data center. 5. Flexible: As consumption moves up and down, the charges should also adjust. Technology is an evolving industry, and the ability to turn down an old service to turn up a new service is one of the benefits of an efficient 	

Ref#	Category	Question	Supplier Response
		IT sourcing agreement. Such adjustments may include minor volume changes month to month, significant scope additions, reductions, or terminations, and ability of large service providers to re-deploy investments.	
Q36.	Inventory and Volume Collection	The Commonwealth is interested in introducing new Resource Units that do not exist in the current contract; in order to fairly compensate Supplier for service delivered, and support the other goals described in question 36, Supplier is asked to describe their experience and approach to collecting and verifying volumes both before and after contract signing, and the approaches they use to adjusting financials in the event that the initial count is incorrect. For example, today database support is provided by the Supplier, but is not separately billable. The Commonwealth sees an advantage to separating out database support and making it a separate chargeable unit, how would the service provider collect and verify the volumes to support this chargeable unit?	
Q37.	Asset Ownership	The Commonwealth consumes certain services today which are underpinned by a set of assets (servers, firewalls, etc.). The Commonwealth (or their designee) has the right to acquire these assets. The Commonwealth has a desire to consume services; rather than own assets, and envisions Supplier acquiring these assets and using them to provide services back to the commonwealth. Please describe experiences acquiring assets from an incumbent, and also describe your recommend financial treatment of their cost recovery for these assets.	
C. Managed Security			
Q38.	Security	The Commonwealth's Managed Security description of services includes all the required scope bundled for a single experienced Security Supplier. Do you see any challenges or issues with this bundled model?	No
Q39.	Security	Do have any concerns or recommendations regarding how to scale Managed Security Services to organizations of the size and complexity of the Commonwealth?	No. RFS has experience in managing and monitoring SOCs/NOCs for companies that range from small to very large, including some government organizations. We can successfully scale to size and complexity.

Ref#	Category	Question	Supplier Response
Q40.	Security	Can you provide examples of comparable environments where you offer security services similar to those required by the Commonwealth?	We will provide references if necessary.
Q41.	Security	Have you supported Managed Security services in distributed environments - both physical and virtual including on premise and off premise implementations?	Yes, we have a Virtual Security Operations Center (V-SOC) service offering and we also provide on-site, physical SOC build-out and support services and staff augmentation and/or related professional services, as needed.
Q42.	Security	Do you offer solutions supporting geographically diverse locations (e.g., remote location with satellite)?	Yes
Q43.	Security	How have you implemented solutions similar to those in the Commonwealth making use of a centralized federated environment?	Yes
Q44.	Security	What do you consider to be the key challenges and tradeoffs for the implementation of Managed Security Services in an environment similar to the Commonwealth?	<p>The key tradeoff with any remote managed service are willingness to be supported by a set of shared resources versus dedicated, exclusively-onsite resources in return for a lower total cost. As part of the tradeoff, organizations also tend to sacrifice quality of service and understanding of their business on the part of the delivery teams.</p> <p>We have designed our managed services to make this trade off more attractive and more effective by adopting a flexible staffing model (bringing more resources to bear in supporting any given customer), and by ensuring our Engineers and Analysts are better trained and more highly skilled than any other team in the MSS market. Our activation process and delivery approach is designed to capture critical business processes, risks, and strategic goals and deliver all services with those in mind.</p>
Q45.	Security	What do propose at a high level to be the key strategies and implementation elements of any typical security services solution migration?	Typical security services place an emphasis on "monitoring," which in most cases means they are collecting and viewing customer data. A critical component that is often missing from this approach is the deriving of value from that data; that is,

Ref#	Category	Question	Supplier Response
			offering true risk assessment, incident identification and investigation, and ultimately decision support based on that data. In our service, data acquisition (visibility), business context, and strategic objectives for security are prerequisites and comprise a significant portion of our activation and ongoing delivery processes.
Q46.	Security	Can you recommend additional Managed Security Services that are not currently included or considered in the scope of described services?	We would recommend including network security monitoring (and proactive hunting as a component of that monitoring) as well as digital forensics and incident response when an incident is identified.
Q47.	Security	Based in your experience, what are the key challenges with regard to the regulatory requirements included in the scope of services? Do you have any recommendations based on your experience?	A key challenge is often demonstrating compliance with event review and security monitoring requirements. Often, our clients err on the side of documentation: logging every event or alert reviewed along with its disposition (incident or not incident). This can be an extremely time consuming, and ultimately not very valuable, endeavor for either the client or a managed services partner. We have worked through this challenge most often by providing digests that outline, on a weekly or monthly basis, work done on the client's behalf to demonstrate compliance with security auditing and monitoring requirements.
Q48.	Security	Do you have any guidelines or best practices regarding whether the various Managed Security Services are better off being remotely hosted or on premise?	We have found that a hybrid solution is often the most effective. In such a solution, there are full time/dedicated resources on the client premises to facilitate collaboration, information sharing, and remediation of security threats in a way that is closely aligned with the client's organization and business processes. The remote managed service component then performs the ongoing engineering, monitoring, auditing, and escalation functions with that on-site resource being a single point-of-contact.

Ref#	Category	Question	Supplier Response
Q49.	Security	Do you think you would be able to provide all the described Managed Security Services yourselves or will you require to subcontract any services to other third parties?	Yes, RFS is capable of providing all of the MSS services ourselves. However, certain circumstances might make the enlistment of a third party preferable.
Q50.	Scope Demarcation	VITA is interested in identifying the most efficient demarcation or bundling of these services between RFPs. For example, perhaps it would be more efficient to separate the Data Center facilities from the other Server services; or perhaps it would be better to include some or all of the Security services with the Server RFP. Please provide any further experience or suggestions regarding scope demarcation between potential RFPs.	We would recommend splitting infrastructure management and security monitoring/auditing components to discourage collusion and ensure compliance.
D. Financial/Managed Security			
Q51.	Pricing Structure	<p>The Commonwealth is interested in creating the best possible pricing structure for the Services. In light of that fact, Supplier is invited to both comment on the structure described in Exhibit 4.1 and 4.2, and to propose an alternate pricing structure if they believe that it will better serve the interests of both parties.</p> <p>The Commonwealth will contemplate any proposed pricing structure along five dimensions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Predictable: To the greatest extent possible, customers should be able to forecast charges ahead of time; changes in pricing that occur over time should not be a surprise. 2. Manageable: The pricing should not be so complex that it is needlessly difficult to administer. If quantities of work or equipment in the environment must be measured, then those quantities should be as easy and transparent as possible to measure. 3. Fair: The service pricing must be a reasonable proxy for a services provider's underlying costs and should adequately recover those costs. Additionally, to the extent possible, the party that causes any incremental cost should bear that cost. 4. Incentives: All pricing structures will incentivize certain behaviors and discourage others. The goals of the sourcing 	N/A

Ref#	Category	Question	Supplier Response
		<p>program must be kept in mind when considering the behaviors that might be driven by a pricing structure. For example, a goal to encourage server consolidation might include reduced cost at a centralized data center.</p> <p>5. Flexible: As consumption moves up and down, the charges should also adjust. Technology is an evolving industry, and the ability to turn down an old service to turn up a new service is one of the benefits of an efficient IT sourcing agreement. Such adjustments may include minor volume changes month to month, significant scope additions, reductions, or terminations, and ability of large service providers to re-deploy investments.</p>	
Q52.	Inventory and Volume Collection	<p>The Commonwealth is interested in introducing new Resource Units that do not exist in the current contract; in order to fairly compensate Supplier for service delivered, and support the other goals described in question 36, Supplier is asked to describe their experience and approach to collecting and verifying volumes both before and after contract signing, and the approaches they use to adjusting financials in the event that the initial count is incorrect. For example, today database support is provided by the Supplier, but is not separately billable. The Commonwealth sees an advantage to separating out database support and making it a separate chargeable unit, how would the service provider collect and verify the volumes to support this chargeable unit?</p>	N/A
Q53.	Asset Ownership	<p>The Commonwealth consumes certain services today which are underpinned by a set of assets (servers, firewalls, etc.). The Commonwealth (or their designee) has the right to acquire these assets. The Commonwealth has a desire to consume services; rather than own assets, and envisions Supplier acquiring these assets and using them to provide services back to the commonwealth. Please describe experiences acquiring assets from an incumbent, and also describe your recommend financial treatment of their cost recovery for these assets.</p>	<p>Typically, any products associated with RFS's MSS are procured by the client. Our experience does include asset transition from incumbents and/or previous service providers.</p>

6. FEEDBACK REGARDING RFI DOCUMENTS

Please use the table below to provide commentary regarding specific documents included within this RFI, adding rows as necessary.

Ref#	Document/Section	Supplier Commentary
C1.		
C2.		
C3.		
C4.		
C5.		
C6.		
C7.		
C8.		
C9.		
C10.		