

Addendum No. 1

RFP # 19-10350-8476

Enterprise Applications Managed Services

Prospective Respondents: You are hereby notified of the following information in regard to the referenced RFP:

REVISIONS

1. Replace the Calendar of Events on page 2 of 55 of the RFP (3 of 534 in original RFP PDF file) in its entirety with the following:

| Activity | Date | Time |
|--|----------------------------|---------|
| Request for Proposals Issued | August 1, 2019 | N/A |
| Deadline for Proposers to Submit Questions via email to RFP-Q@paturndpike.com | August 22, 2019 | 2:00 PM |
| Answers to Proposers questions posted to the Commission website at https://www.paturndpike.com/Procurement/Bidlist.aspx?RTYPE=O (<i>Estimate Only</i>) | August 29, 2019 | N/A |
| Due Date for Proposals | September 18, 2019 | 2:00 PM |
| Oral Clarifications/Presentations | October 2019 (estimate) | TBD |
| Anticipated Notice to Proceed (<i>Estimate Only</i>) | April, 2020 | N/A |

2. Replace the second bullet within page 5 of 5 of Appendix G – Cost Matrix (page 92 of 534 in original RFP PDF file) in its entirety with the following:

* This is not intended to be an all-inclusive list. It is both possible and probable that additional position types will be required to perform work order based application services over the duration of the contract. Additional positions, when required, will be identified within RFP and/or negotiated to be added to the contractor(s) rate card.

3. Replace the first sentence within section IV-1a, Item 5 on page 21 of 55 of the RFP (22 of 534 of the original RFP PDF file) with the following:

Perform routine status check on the systems and applications to assure the proper operation of these systems and applications and to report to the Commission on all findings.

4. Replace Section I-15 Economy of Preparation on page 6 of 55 of the RFP (7 of 534 of the original RFP PDF file) in its entirety with the following:

Economy of Preparation. Proposals should be prepared simply and economically, providing a straightforward, concise description of the Proposer’s ability to meet the requirements of the RFP. The Issuing Office limits the Technical Proposal to twenty-five (25) double-sided pages not counting Appendices, financials, and draft project plans and excluding proposed staff resumes.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Following are the answers to questions submitted in response to the above referenced RFP as of August 22, 2019. All of the questions have been listed verbatim, as received by the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission.

| RFP 19-10350-8476 Proposer Questions | | | Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission (PTC) | | |
|---|------|---------|--|---|--|
| | | | Enterprise Applications Managed Services | | |
| # | Page | Section | Section Description | Proposer Question | Commission Response |
| | | | | | |
| 1. | | | | Has funding been secured for this requirement? | Yes |
| 2. | | | | How much does the Commission anticipates spending for this project? | This information will not be provided. |
| 3. | | | | And a clarification in the procurement timeline: The anticipated release of the Notice to Proceed indicated in RFP document is April 2019? | See Revision #1 above. |

| RFP 19-10350-8476 Proposer Questions | | Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission (PTC) | | | |
|--|------|--|---------------------|--|--|
| Enterprise Applications Managed Services | | | | | |
| # | Page | Section | Section Description | Proposer Question | Commission Response |
| 4. | | | | What is the estimated cost of the Enterprise Applications Managed Services project? | See response to question #2 |
| 5. | | | | Has the Department allocated funding for the Enterprise Applications Managed Services yet? If so, through which source (budget, CIP, state/federal grant, etc.)? | See response to question #1 |
| 6. | | | | How is the Department currently meeting this need? | See RFP Section IV-1-a (General) page 22 of 55 of the RFP (23 of 534 of the original RFP PDF file) last paragraph in section |
| 7. | | | | Which vendor provides the incumbent Enterprise Applications Managed Services? | This is a new contract. There is no incumbent. |
| 8. | | | | Would it be possible to name the three greatest challenges the Department is having with their current solution? | No |
| 9. | | | | Who is the technical contact and/or project manager for the Enterprise Applications Managed Services? | This information will be provided when the contract is awarded. |
| 10. | 2 | Date Table | Calendar of Events | There appears to be a typo in the month or year provided for the “ Anticipated Notice to Proceed (Estimate Only) April 2019 ”. Request clarification of this date. | See Revision #1 above. |
| 11. | | | | Just wanna ask if you can help me obtain or able to send me who the incumbent contractor for the following project, or direct me to the proper channel for this request? Bid Number 19-10350-8476 Name: Enterprise Applications Managed Services Due Date: 09/18/2019 | See response to question #7 above |

| RFP 19-10350-8476 | | Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission (PTC) | | | |
|--------------------|----------|--|--|--|--|
| Proposer Questions | | Enterprise Applications Managed Services | | | |
| # | Page | Section | Section Description | Proposer Question | Commission Response |
| 12. | 2 | Date Table | Calendar of Events | There appears to be a typo in the month or year provided for the “ Anticipated Notice to Proceed (Estimate Only) April 2019”. Request clarification of this date. | See Revision #1 above. |
| 13. | 2 | Date Table | Calendar of Events | Please explain what the driver was that moved out the “Anticipate Notice to Proceed” date to April 2020. Has the funding for the RFP been secured? | 1.) The date was set as an estimate based on the historical timelines from previous and similar procurements. 2.) Funding has been estimated and set. |
| 14. | 3 | Part I | General Information I-5 & I-8 | Would the PTC consider an alternate proposal for Managed Services support of the GIS component <u>only</u> ? | No |
| 15. | 18 | Part III | Criteria for Selection Paragraph 4 | Please explain what % of the selection criteria will be assigned to “Additional selection factors” | The Commission does not use a scoring methodology. |
| 16. | Appendix | Appendix | Appendix K through T | Please provide the existing Staff counts and Org Chart supporting the in-scope functional areas listed in Appendix K-T | This will not be provided |
| 17. | Appendix | Appendix W Volumetrics and Projects | Appendix W Volumetrics and Projects | Please confirm that 100% of all Service Ticket counts (as defined on page 36 and shown in Appendix W) are reflected in Appendix W and reported in ServiceNow. | The information provided is to be used for the basis of submitting proposals. |
| 18. | Appendix | Appendix W Volumetrics and Projects | Appendix W Volumetrics and Projects Page 5, Knowledge Articles | Has the Knowledge Article functionality in ServiceNow been in use from March – December. Is the December volume more reflective of the expected monthly volume? | 1.) Yes 2.) No |

| RFP 19-10350-8476 Proposer Questions | | Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission (PTC) | | | |
|--|------|--|---------------------|--|---|
| Enterprise Applications Managed Services | | | | | |
| # | Page | Section | Section Description | Proposer Question | Commission Response |
| 19. | 11 | I-30 | Performance Bond | To enable a more cost-effective performance bond structure for the project, our insurer has suggested an annual renewable bond where the value of the bond declines each year as services are rendered. Under this approach Year 1 = total contract value for five years, Year 2 = remaining contract value (four years), Year 3 = remaining contract value (three years), etc. Will this be acceptable to the Commission? | The Commission will negotiate with the awarded firm |
| 20. | 25 | General Requirements | GeoAnalytics | Please confirm that PTC will provide the infrastructure required to compile mobile applications for the desired mobile target devices. | Confirmed. |
| 21. | | | | Can a vendor provide the response to few parts of the RFP instead of the whole? | See response to question #14 |
| 22. | | | | Can the solution be a combination of onsite, nearshore, onshore and offshore? | See RFP IV-3 a ii (Location of Performance) page 27 of 55 of the RFP (28 of 534 of the original RFP PDF file) |
| 23. | | | | Is there an incumbent? | See response to question #7 |
| 24. | | | | Can we perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside USA? | See response to question #22 |
| 25. | | | | Is there any limit for percentage of cost that can be increased each year? | No |
| 26. | | | | Once the Contract is started can we change sub-contractor? | See RFP Part I Section I-8 (Subcontracting) page 4 of 55 of the RFP (5 of 534 of the original RFP PDF file) |
| 27. | | | | Is there any limit to how many sub-contractors we can have? | No |
| 28. | | | | How do we determine the severity of the incident ticket raised? | See Appendix I – Section Incident Ticket Priority Definition |

| RFP 19-10350-8476 Proposer Questions | | Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission (PTC) | | | |
|--|------|--|---|---|--|
| Enterprise Applications Managed Services | | | | | |
| # | Page | Section | Section Description | Proposer Question | Commission Response |
| 29. | | | | If incident ticket is raised with wrong severity and minimum response time is passed can we change the severity then? | See RFP Part IV Section IV-3 b v (Altering Incident Priority) page 43 of 55 of the RFP (44 of 534 of the original RFP PDF file) |
| 30. | 170 | 2.4.6 | Business Warehouse/Business Intelligence Object | What is the tool used to load data into SAP BW objects? | SAP Business Warehouse |
| 31. | 199 | 2.4.9 | SAP Reports | Assuming reports are built in SAP BI, where is the BI Dev Type? | We don't understand the question |
| 32. | 220 | 3.1 | Current Incident Requests | What is the Incident volumetrics by technologies and mention the complexities, average ticket resolution time? | 1.) See Appendix W 2.) We don't understand the question on complexities 3.) For 2018, the overall average resolution time was 10 calendar days |
| 33. | 221 | 3.3 | Completed Change Requests by Year | We understand there is only one Change for BI in 2018. What is the average person hours for BI changes per year? | The Commission only track hours by project and not by other activities. This information is not available. |
| 34. | 342 | | Informatica Cloud | What is the number of Informatica code objects for each of the interfaces (SAP, GIS, Service Now, Dynamic CRM)? | We don't understand the question |
| 35. | 342 | | Informatica Cloud | What is the data load window and please mention the critical time where the failures happen? | 1.) 24 X 7 2.) Between Midnight and 6 am |
| 36. | 342 | | Informatica Cloud | What is the scheduler being used for Informatica jobs? | Informatica's native scheduler |
| 37. | 342 | | Informatica Cloud | What is the level of customizations for Informatica? | Every interface is customized |
| 38. | 342 | | Informatica Cloud | What are the typical failures in Informatica Jobs. Are there any automations currently available? | 1.) Bad data causing processing errors 2.) No |

| RFP 19-10350-8476 | | Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission (PTC) | | | |
|--------------------|------|--|----------------------------------|--|---|
| Proposer Questions | | Enterprise Applications Managed Services | | | |
| # | Page | Section | Section Description | Proposer Question | Commission Response |
| 39. | 342 | | Informatica Cloud | What is the ticket volumes, Enhancements and CR volumes for Informatica Cloud? | The Commission is currently implementing Informatica Cloud and volumes are growing |
| 40. | 383 | 7.1 | Applications | Are the applications under Dashboards developed in Qlik or power BI? | Qlik unless the source data are completely contained within a single software tool and that tool has a dashboard capability. Then that tool will provide the dashboard. An example is ServiceNow. |
| 41. | 383 | 7.1 | Applications | Currently Power BI and Qlikview is being used. Is QlikSense deployed? | Yes |
| 42. | 383 | 7.1 | Applications | What is the ticket volumetrics, defect patterns for Power BI, Qlik? | See Appendix W |
| 43. | 20 | Enterprise Applications Managed Services | PART IV - WORK STATEMENT | It is mentioned that Cost submittal shall be on the applications mentioned in Appendix H. However, Appendix R, page 1, says that "Selected Proposer must support this list of applications systems". So will there be a separate costing for supporting COTS applications? | No. |
| 44. | 4 | Appendix M - 3.1 | MS Dynamics Environment Overview | 1. What information is pulling out from Emergency Notification System (ENS) to CRM? 2. Is it a real time or batch job integration? | None |
| 45. | 5 | Appendix M - 6.2 | MS Dynamics Support Pack Levels | It is mentioned that "Dynamics 365, Update 9.0.2 scheduled approximately for August/September 2018". Is this activity completed? | Yes |

| RFP 19-10350-8476 | | Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission (PTC) | | | |
|--------------------|------|--|---------------------------------|--|---|
| Proposer Questions | | Enterprise Applications Managed Services | | | |
| # | Page | Section | Section Description | Proposer Question | Commission Response |
| 46. | 5 | Appendix M - 6.3.1 | MS Dynamics Interfaces | It states that "A future enhancement to the Card Management will be required to avoid hard coding" WHEREAS Appendix W, Under Work Item / Project Description, 105# says that "Access Card Management System – replacement for the MS Dynamics application into a new system". What is the current and future scope of card management in Dynamics 365? | The requirements for this project are being developed now and currently are not finalized. |
| 47. | 6 | Appendix W - 106# | Work Item / Project Description | Review email-based business processes and write them into ServiceNow - So can we conclude there is no email trigger from Dynamics 365? | Correct |
| 48. | 12 | Appendix M - 6.3.5 | MS Dynamics Enhancements | Is "Active Open-End Meeting Report" a SSRS or fetchxml report? | The enhancements listed in this section of Appendix M are for informational purposes only. Their development and implementation are outside the scope of the immediate RFP. |
| 49. | 12 | Appendix M - 6.3.5 | MS Dynamics Enhancements | Request an enhancement to a system other than SAP - which system is referred here? What type of enhancement request? | See response to question # 48 |
| 50. | 12 | Appendix M - 6.3.5 | MS Dynamics Enhancements | Card Management - Changes to the Fare Collection District ID data maintenance for Tour and Maintenance cards - what kind of changes referred here? | See response to question # 48 |
| 51. | 12 | Appendix M - 6.3.5 | MS Dynamics Enhancements | Card II Enhancements - MS-Dynamics solution - Can you provide details on enhancements to be done? | See response to question # 48 |

| RFP 19-10350-8476 Proposer Questions | | Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission (PTC) | | | |
|--|------|--|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| Enterprise Applications Managed Services | | | | | |
| # | Page | Section | Section Description | Proposer Question | Commission Response |
| 52. | 12 | Appendix M - 6.3.5 | MS Dynamics Enhancements | "Enhancements include the automation of Cards requests, SAP integration, PRINTQ dashboard upgrades, On-Base integration, and processing of Payments and Refunds by Accounting" - 1. What is the trigger point for card request automation? 2. PRINTQ dashboard is a CRM dashboard or a other application dashboard? Where is the data coming from? 3. What type of enhancement to SAP and On-Base integration? 4. Payment and Refund processes are in CRM or in SAP? | See response to question # 48 |
| 53. | 13 | Appendix M - 6.3.5 | MS Dynamics Enhancements | CRM 2016 Upgrade - Is the upgrade completed? | See response to question # 48 |
| 54. | 13 | Appendix M - 6.3.5 | MS Dynamics Enhancements | "13.Implementation of Consultant Eval and Engineering Contract Status MS Dynamics Apps Integration" - Can we get details on it as not clear with the statement? | See response to question # 48 |
| 55. | 13 | Appendix M - 6.3.5 | MS Dynamics Enhancements | MS Dynamics - Card Management special revenue cards expiring letters - Can we get details on it as not clear with the statement? | See response to question # 48 |
| 56. | 13 | Appendix M - 6.3.5 | MS Dynamics Enhancements | "Work Zone Conflicts - New MS Dynamics Application for the Traffic Engineering Department" - 1. Is it a new app with common data in dynamics 365? 2. How data flows in and out of Dynamics 365? 3. How security model will work for it? | See response to question # 48 |

| RFP 19-10350-8476 Proposer Questions | | Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission (PTC) Enterprise Applications Managed Services | | | |
|---|------|--|---|--|--|
| # | Page | Section | Section Description | Proposer Question | Commission Response |
| 57. | 13 | Appendix M - 6.3.5 | MS Dynamics Enhancements | Provide ability to create TransCore maintenance cards - Can we get more details ? Is there an integration to any portal or an application? | See response to question # 48 |
| 58. | 15 | Appendix M - 8.1 | Current Card Control System (CCS) Process | 1. 'IVIS' DB stores employee info, card # and phot ID to take print from fargo printer. How is 'Hlrsh Velocity' DB different since it also stores the same information? | Hirsh Velocity is the card swipe system and the information within its database is defined by the manufacturer. |
| 59. | 5 | Appendix M - 3.2 | MS Dynamics Functional Areas Implemented | 1. Do these 6 functionalities have one DB or separate DBs? 2. What is the current security model of CRM in view of multiple applications? 3. Do you use Dynamics 365 Common Data Model? | 1.) One database and one cloud instance 2.) MS Dynamics's standard native security 3.) Yes |
| 60. | 16 | Appendix M - 8.1 | Create employee ID Card Process | 1. When you say 'New Card Screen", does it mean a new record in dynamics 365? 2. How card number is generated? Is it in Dynamics 365 or fetching from other system? 3. What is meant by 'Swipes' in the statement "AC swipes photo id card in CCS" | 1.) Yes 2.) MS Dynamics creates the card number 3.) The card administrator tests the card before sending to customer |
| 61. | 17 | Appendix M - 8.1 | Create Summer Help or Temp Empl. Card Process | Card number is systematically added to positive list - Is it a flag and related view in Dynamics 365? | 1.) Yes 2.) Yes |
| 62. | 18 | Appendix M - 8.1 | Mtc Card for TransCore Employee Card Process | Does Card printing occur directly from dynamic 365 or from local machine? If from dynamics 365, how it is connected? | Local machine |
| 63. | 1 | Appendix W | Change Management | How many change requests did you receive for MS dynamics 365 in 2018? | There were 7 change requests for 2018 |
| 64. | 2 | Appendix W | Incident Management | How many tickets were raised in a month for dynamics 365 in 2018? | There were 11 incident tickets for 2018 |

| RFP 19-10350-8476 | | Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission (PTC) | | | |
|--------------------|------|--|--|---|---|
| Proposer Questions | | Enterprise Applications Managed Services | | | |
| # | Page | Section | Section Description | Proposer Question | Commission Response |
| 65. | 2 | Appendix W | Incident Management | Currently, how many resources supporting Dynamics 365? | This will not be provided |
| 66. | 6 | Appendix M - 6.3.2 | MS Dynamics Business Processes and Sub-Processes | Do damage claim created in SAP needs to be copied in dynamics 365? | Yes, a damage claim must be manually created in MS Dynamics |
| 67. | 6 | Appendix M - 6.3.2 | MS Dynamics Business Processes and Sub-Processes | The Repairs Stage will provide a view of all logged work elements in SAP for the DC - how does this view get created currently in Dynamics 365? | Through an interface with SAP via a scheduled task |
| 68. | 6 | Appendix M - 6.3.2 | MS Dynamics Business Processes and Sub-Processes | Are "repair activities" Dynamics 365 OOB activities? | No |
| 69. | 7 | Appendix M - 6.3.2 | MS Dynamics Business Processes and Sub-Processes | Accounting Staff will utilize the exported data to create a Draft Summary Invoice - Is it manually or any automation taking place? | Manual |
| 70. | 7 | Appendix M - 6.3.2 | MS Dynamics Business Processes and Sub-Processes | The Accounting Supervisor utilizes the attached Draft Summary Invoice and attachments to input the Invoice into SAP - Is this a manual process? | Yes |
| 71. | 7 | Appendix M - 6.3.2 | MS Dynamics Business Processes and Sub-Processes | In the Payments Stage, the EU will be able to view payment information recorded in SAP - Is this view within dynamics 365? If yes, how is taking place? | 1.) Yes 2.) An integration provides the data to MS Dynamics which is displayed on the screen to the end user |
| 72. | 8 | Appendix M - 6.3.2 | MS Dynamics Business Processes and Sub-Processes | Convert incident case to claim case - Does a new case record is created or existng case record is updated? | New case record created |
| 73. | 8 | Appendix M - 6.3.2 | MS Dynamics Business Processes and Sub-Processes | Does claim notification letter get sent directly from an email directly from dynamcis 365? | No |
| 74. | 11 | Appendix M - 6.3.2 | MS Dynamics Business Processes and Sub-Processes | Print Evaluation reports - Is it a SSRS report? | Yes |

| RFP 19-10350-8476 | | Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission (PTC) | | | |
|--------------------|------|--|-------------------------------|---|--|
| Proposer Questions | | Enterprise Applications Managed Services | | | |
| # | Page | Section | Section Description | Proposer Question | Commission Response |
| 75. | 4 | Appendix M - 2.3 | Cloud Applications | Is it possible to share home screen of all 5 applications? | No |
| 76. | 24 | Appendix M - Figure 18 | Super User Use Case Diagram | Planning Manager accessing Super User screen - Does it mean records access? | Yes |
| 77. | | | | As major enhancement are not part of scope for the application management services contract, is this understanding true? | Yes |
| 78. | | | | What is the level of customization in Dynamics 365? | 100% customized |
| 79. | | | | Planning Manager accessing Super User screen - Does it mean records access? | See response to question # 76 |
| 80. | | | | Will the new development track in Dynamics 365 be same as that of Enhancement track? | We don't understand the question |
| 81. | | | | Is it possible to share Dynamics 365b major enhancement road map for next 5 years? | No |
| 82. | 503 | Appendix T | Supported System Environments | There seems to only 1 landscape and meant for Production. In which environments are projects executed? In the same for Production landscape? In which environment is project testing conducted? | 1.) Projects are developed within the development environments just like all other development activities 2.) Yes 3.) All unit testing and user acceptance testing is conducted within a sub-prod environment. |
| 83. | 525 | Appendix V | Incident Management | What is the active user count per SAP module? | This will not be provided |
| 84. | 23 | Part IV | IV-1.Objectives | Can vendor bring in own developed tools / accelerators / bots and install them in Dev / QA / Prod systems to improve service delivery? | Yes, with Commission prior review, approval and additional stipulations. |
| 85. | 529 | Appendix W | Projects | Are projects and upgrades part of BAU scope and to be covered within AMS base services FP quote? Or will they be estimated and price quoted as and when they are proposed? | We don't understand the question |

| RFP 19-10350-8476 | | Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission (PTC) | | | |
|--------------------|------|--|---|--|---|
| Proposer Questions | | Enterprise Applications Managed Services | | | |
| # | Page | Section | Section Description | Proposer Question | Commission Response |
| 86. | 227 | Appendix K | 3.4 Yearly Upgrade Frequency | What is the scope for “End of Fiscal Year Upgrade”? Does this cover HR Service Pack upgrade? | 1.) Typical SAP fiscal yearend close and carry forward. 2.) No |
| 87. | 227 | Appendix K | 3.5 Yearly Number of Releases | What is the purpose of a Release Moving changes against CRs to SAP production system? For projects go-live? For applying system patches or minor upgrades? | Yes for both |
| 88. | 46 | Part IV | ServiceNow Ticket Acknowledgement and Resolution | Is the vendor required to perform any system monitoring activities outside the 10X5 service window (matching PTC weekday business hours 7:30 am – 5:30 pm)? | Monitoring is outside the scope of the immediate RFP |
| 89. | 29 | Part IV-3 | a. General Requirements v. Coordination with Other Entities and Agencies | Does PTC use SAP Success Factors cloud application? Is support for SAP Success Factors in scope for this RFP? | 1.) Yes 2.) Yes |
| 90. | 526 | Appendix W | v. Coordination with Other Entities and Agencies | Is SAP Syclo (Work Manager) in scope for this AMS? | Yes |
| 91. | 525 | Appendix W | Incident Management | Is the assignment group SM_ProjSys_PlantMaint_InvestMgt meant for recording SAP PM/PS issues? | We don’t understand the question. |
| 92. | 481 | Appendix R | 2. Miscellaneous Application List | How often are test and development environments refreshed with the production data and setups? | This is application dependent and is performed as needed. |

| RFP 19-10350-8476 Proposer Questions | | Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission (PTC) Enterprise Applications Managed Services | | | |
|---|------|--|---------------------|--|---|
| # | Page | Section | Section Description | Proposer Question | Commission Response |
| 93. | | | | <p>Please provide approximate frequency of major activities performed per year in PTC SAP Landscape. Some major activities are listed below.</p> <p>(a) System Refreshes / Copies</p> <p>(b) SAP Client copies</p> <p>(c) Kernel Upgrades</p> <p>(d) Support Packages stack Upgrades</p> <p>(e) One-off Support pack updates</p> <p>(f) DBA Hot Fixes</p> <p>(g) System Installations</p> <p>Do you have any major activities in addition to the above, then please add and provide their frequency?</p> | <p>a.) Approximately 10 per year for all environments and/or as needed</p> <p>b.) Approximately 4 per year and/or as needed</p> <p>c.) Approximately 1 per year and/or as needed</p> <p>d.) Approximately 1 per year and/or as needed</p> <p>e.) As needed</p> <p>f.) In frequently as needed</p> <p>g.) Approximately 1 per year and/or as needed</p> <p>h.) Please see RFP Part IV (Work Statement)</p> |
| 94. | 25 | Part IV Work Statement | IV-3 Requirements | Does the 160 hours of task work per calendar month for non-project requests apply to each application group (e.g. SAP) or all the applications in support scope? | All applications in whole |
| 95. | 25 | Part IV Work Statement | IV-3 Requirements | Can the vendor use a Flex services model with shared resources to deliver services to PTC? | Yes |

| RFP 19-10350-8476 Proposer Questions | | Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission (PTC) Enterprise Applications Managed Services | | | |
|---|------|--|----------------------------|---|--|
| # | Page | Section | Section Description | Proposer Question | Commission Response |
| 96. | | | 2.4.8 Interface Management | <p>Is centralized Monitoring configured for monitoring of all SAP Production and Non Production systems? If yes which tool is in use for monitoring?</p> <p>Is it integrated with ITMS tool for auto ticket creation for critical alerts?</p> | <p>1.) Production and several non-production systems are monitored</p> <p>2.) Solutions Manager and Solar Winds</p> <p>3.) No</p> |
| 97. | 525 | Appendix W | Volumetrics | <p>As mentioned there is an assignment group with name SM_End_User_Support. Please let us know what types of tickets will be addressed by this group.</p> | <p>This group supports the end user devices such as laptops, tablets, pc, printers. They do support end users relating to the in-scope applications when end user support has the documentation, training and knowledge to do so.</p> |
| 98. | 165 | Appendix K | SAP System brief | <p>SAP GRC is under scope of support. Please specify which of the following functionalities of GRC Access control are used: Access Risk Analysis Access Request Management Emergency Access Management Business Role Management</p> <p>Does any other functionality get used?</p> | <p>The PTC has currently implemented the GRC Access Control Module including Access Risk Analysis (ARA), Emergency Access Management (EAM), Business Role Management (BRM), Access Request Management (ARM), and User Access Review (UAR).</p> |
| 99. | 6 | Appendix D | Security services | <p>What all security services does the existing commission security team retain?</p> | All |

| RFP 19-10350-8476 Proposer Questions | | Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission (PTC) | | | |
|--|------|--|----------------------|--|--|
| Enterprise Applications Managed Services | | | | | |
| # | Page | Section | Section Description | Proposer Question | Commission Response |
| 100. | 6 | Appendix D | Application Security | <p>Do you expect supplier to carry out dynamic application security testing and secure code analysis. If yes then please share the response on the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Can we assume the rough average size of applications (in terms of number of web pages) for Black box and Grey Box pen testing across a classification of SMALL (e.g. 50 pages for a small app), MEDIUM (100 pages for medium app), LARGE (200 pages or more for large app)? 2. Is it possible to provide a breakup on the number of applications in each category? 3. How many web applications that will be in scope for security testing. 4. Are there any tools currently for security testing? Does the customer want Wipro to continue using the same tool or can we propose the same? 5. What is the expected Frequency of Scans for web applications (During Release, Monthly, and Quarterly, Annually)? | No. |
| 101. | 6 | Appendix D | IDAM | What is the Identity and Access Management solution currently in use? Do you anticipate supplier to manage it? | There is no Identity and Access Management (IAM) solution currently in operation at the Commission |
| 102. | | Industry Day ppt | Staff Aug | How many staff augmentation personnel are used for the Operational Support Activities for Health Checks, Patches & Upgrades, Year End Activities, and Minor Enhancements? | This information will not be provided. |

| RFP 19-10350-8476 Proposer Questions | | Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission (PTC) | | | |
|--|------|--|-----------------------------|--|--|
| Enterprise Applications Managed Services | | | | | |
| # | Page | Section | Section Description | Proposer Question | Commission Response |
| 103. | 2 | Calendar of Events | General | What is the date to proceed? Does this include time to negotiate? | 1.) See Revision #1 above. It is called "Anticipated Notice to Proceed" 2.) Yes |
| 104. | 3 | Part 1 - General Information | 1-4 Problem Statement | In the event that enhancements to the in-scope systems require modification to Commission's security solutions such as Single Sign-on solution, will Commission be responsible to perform changes to security solutions? | Yes |
| 105. | 6 | Part 1 - General Information | 1-15 Economy of Preparation | Does the cover page, table of contents or transmittal count toward the 25 double sided page count? | Yes |
| 106. | 10 | Part 1 - General Information | I-29. Security Requirements | Does the Commission maintain a baseline of vulnerabilities based on vulnerability testing including Dynamic Application Security Testing (DAST) and Static Application Security Testing (SAST) for applications listed in the RFP? | We do not understand the question. |
| 107. | 10 | Part 1 - General Information | I-29. Security Requirements | Is the commission responsible for running Dynamic Application Security Testing (DAST), Static Application Security Testing (SAST) and Server Vulnerability Scans as part of every release/change for in-scope applications? | No. |
| 108. | 14 | II-1 Technical Submittal | E. Personnel | Do resumes count against page limit? | See Revision #4 above. |

| RFP 19-10350-8476 Proposer Questions | | Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission (PTC) | | | |
|--|------|--|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| Enterprise Applications Managed Services | | | | | |
| # | Page | Section | Section Description | Proposer Question | Commission Response |
| 109. | 14 | II-1 Technical Submittal | F. Relevant Experience and Expertise | On page 14 in Relevant Experience you note that the proposer must provide production support/managed services for minor to medium enhancements. On page 24 and 47 you state that 160 hours of task work is to be included in the fixed fee cost for ongoing support. Is the minor and medium enhancements scope of work to be included within the 160 hours of task work? | Yes |
| 110. | 15 | II-1 Technical Submittal | F. Relevant Experience and Expertise | Please confirm that the proposal of industry-accepted SLAs be included in section 3 of Appendix I? | Confirmed |
| 111. | 16 | Appendix I - SLAs | | On Page 16 you include an Incident Priority matrix that indicates cross section of Impact and Urgency. Please provide some clarity and definition behind the terms "Urgency" and "Impact" | <p>The Commission sets the priority solely at its discretion; however, the Commission attempts to use the following as a guideline for selection.</p> <p>The guideline generally, but not always, follows these criteria.</p> <p>Impact is the effect that an incident has on business</p> <p>1-High</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employee or Public Safety is in Jeopardy • Failure or sever impact to Payroll, Finance, Communication or Network • A failure affecting multiple Business units • A security related Incident affecting >20 users • A security related Incident where PII data is at risk of damage or theft • A core network outage or a network outage affecting a mission critical location • A failure affecting >= 100 users • Mission-critical application(s) are fully unavailable or unusable |

| RFP 19-10350-8476 Proposer Questions | | Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission (PTC) Enterprise Applications Managed Services | | | |
|---|------|--|---------------------|-------------------|---|
| # | Page | Section | Section Description | Proposer Question | Commission Response |
| | | | | | <p>2- Medium</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A network outage affecting a business-critical PTC location • A security related Incident where non-PII business information may be at risk of damage or theft. • A failure or serious degradation affecting >= 50 users • A failure that affects a public facing “non-guaranteed” service offering • A failure of business-critical application(s) • A failure affecting all users in a single Business Unit <p>3- Low</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All remaining failures • A failure affecting <50 users • A small isolated group of users with a common failure (single application, location, a failure on one of several IT business services utilized) • Security related Incident affecting single or small number of users • A security related Incident where business data may be subject to limited compromise <p>Urgency is the extent to which the incident's resolution can bear delay</p> <p>1-High</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employee or Public Safety is in Jeopardy • The Incident is extremely time sensitive • The damage associated with the Incident will increase rapidly • Multiple executives and / or VIP users have service interruptions |

| RFP 19-10350-8476 Proposer Questions | | Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission (PTC) | | | |
|--|------|--|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| Enterprise Applications Managed Services | | | | | |
| # | Page | Section | Section Description | Proposer Question | Commission Response |
| | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No known workaround exists <p>2- Medium</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Incident is time sensitive The damage associated with the Incident will increase considerable over time Single executive or VIP user has service interruptions A workaround can be performed for a short period <p>3- Low</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The incident can be delayed and is not time sensitive The damage associated with the Incident is not expected to increase considerably No executive or VIP user has service interruptions A workaround is available |
| 112. | 16 | Appendix I - SLAs | | Does this statement indicate that all critical systems in appendix H will be given an incident priority of CRITICAL and held to 7x24 SLAs even if urgency or impact would otherwise evaluate to a different priority? | No |
| 113. | 24 | IV-3 Requirements | | On page 24 there is a requirement for 160 hours of task work. On page 47 under item iv. Tasks, there is a second reference to 160 hours. Is the provider to include 160 or 320 hours of work in its monthly fixed fee cost for ongoing support. | A single 160 hours per month |
| 114. | 49 | IV-4 Services/Tasks | Transition Tasks and Deliverables | During transition, will PTC service desk staff transition existing incidents and problems or will tickets already assigned be resolved by PTC staff? | These will be transitioned. |

| RFP 19-10350-8476 Proposer Questions | | Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission (PTC) | | | |
|--|------|--|--|--|---|
| Enterprise Applications Managed Services | | | | | |
| # | Page | Section | Section Description | Proposer Question | Commission Response |
| 115. | 53 | IV-4 Services/Tasks | Transition Tasks and Deliverables e. ServiceNow Modifications | Is the proposer or PTC responsible for making the ServiceNow changes required to support this engagement during the transition phase? | See RFP Section IV-4 e. (ServiceNow Modifications) page 53 of 55 of the RFP (54 of 534 of the original RFP PDF file) and Appendix I Section 1 Deliverable #5 (ServiceNow modifications ...) page 3 of 19 of Appendix I (page 129 of 534 of the original RFP PDF file) |
| 116. | 5 | Appendix G | | The second bullet on page 5 of Appendix G is incomplete. What is the remaining sentence text? And/or what? | See Revision #2 above |
| 117. | 1 | Appendix I - SLAs | | Page 45 of the RFP indicates that SLAs for low medium and high tickets are to be calculated during business hours. Please provide guidance on Critical priority SLA time metrics. | Critical systems and critical priority incidents are 24X7 |
| 118. | 1 | Appendix K | Section 2.4 | Is Database management support in scope for the proposer or will PTC provide necessary DBA skills sets, if yes then please specific which applications contained in Appendix H are responsibility of proposer. | No. |
| 119. | 1 | Appendix K | | Please provide details on your current batch schedule including timings, frequency and numbers by application. | This will be provided to the awarded vendor |
| 120. | 1 | Appendix K | | Please provide details on your batch program monitoring capability | Solutions Manager generates alerts via email for failures and anomalies |
| 121. | 1 | Appendix K | | What tools are currently in place for monitoring the systems in scope as outlined in Appendix H. | See response to question #96 |
| 122. | 5 | Appendix K | | What is the number of concurrent users by application and expected rate of increase over the course of the contract? | See response to question #83 |

| RFP 19-10350-8476 Proposer Questions | | Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission (PTC) | | | |
|--|------|--|---|--|--|
| Enterprise Applications Managed Services | | | | | |
| # | Page | Section | Section Description | Proposer Question | Commission Response |
| 123. | 1 | Appendix T | | Appendix T lists supporting technologies and environments for in-scope applications. Is the proposer responsible for System Administration duties of these technologies or only application maintenance services? | There are no infrastructure support services within the scope of the immediate RFP. |
| 124. | 2 | Appendix W | Incident Management | What is the average incident backlog by application in the past 6 months (i.e. number of tickets in the queue without resolution)? | As of August 23, 2019, there are 16 active incident tickets of all priorities with 8 under 2 calendars days old. |
| 125. | 11 | Part 1 - General Information | I.30. Performance Bond | We routinely provide performance bonds to public entities using the surety's form which does not contain the commitments requested but does provide for standard industry/surety commitments for performance bonds. Please confirm industry standard surety forms will be acceptable. In addition, we request the 100% contract price be clarified--and we specifically request the amount of the bond be set at the highest annual amount for the 5 year based term and the subsequent 5 year option period (e.g., if the highest annual cost in the first 5 year period is \$5M, then the bond for the based period will \$5M). Alternatively, we request the Commonwealth to identify a specific amount for the bond for the base 5 year period and for the 5 year option period. | See response to question # 19 |
| 126. | 9 | Part 1 - General Information | I.27. Data/Information Security Breach Notification | We request the categories of cost for which the Proposer be liable be those costs for which the Proposer is liable for under the applicable law. | No |

| RFP 19-10350-8476 Proposer Questions | | Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission (PTC) Enterprise Applications Managed Services | | | |
|---|------|--|------------------------|---|--|
| # | Page | Section | Section Description | Proposer Question | Commission Response |
| 127. | 22 | Part 1 - General Information | IV-1.c Contract Intent | With respect to the statement of intent that the "selected Proposer shall be completely responsible for solving any and all issues that may arise without placing the burden of responsibility back on the Commission[,]" please clarify that the selected Proposer is not responsible for "solving any and all issues" for matters that are not within the Proposer's control or scope, or otherwise allow for future clarification prior to contract award. For purposes of illustration, the selected Proposer is not responsible for defects in third party software that must be corrected by the Software vendor and the selected Proposer is not responsible for PTC managed software. | SLAs will be finalized during negotiations. |
| 128. | 26 | Part 1 - General Information | IV-3.iii. Invoicing | Given the various contract remedies and processes set forth in the contract and further given the extensive SLAs and Liquidated Damages, we request the Commission's "right to withhold and/or adjust payment for work not completed, unsatisfactory work, or work that is deemed inadequate and/or not meeting the requirements" be stricken and/or clarified to provide those rights will be exercised per the provisions of the contract and the applicable SLAs. | No |
| 129. | NA | NA | Generic | Please specify the support model that PTC is looking for. E.g. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 24/7 support 2. 16/5 support ET 3. 8/5 support ET 4. Any other? | 24X7 for Critical Systems <p style="text-align: center;">and</p> 8X5 for all others |

| RFP 19-10350-8476 | | Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission (PTC) | | | |
|--------------------|--------------|--|------------------------------|---|---|
| Proposer Questions | | Enterprise Applications Managed Services | | | |
| # | Page | Section | Section Description | Proposer Question | Commission Response |
| 130. | NA | NA | Generic | Kindly elaborate on following required information: 1. Current user base on all applications and YOY growth projection 2. Number of tickets that are opened in a month for each application 3. Peak user usage for applications in question | See response to question #122 |
| 131. | NA | NA | Generic | What is the frequency of the application release? How many Service/Change Requests are there in a release (average)? | Application releases are set by the manufacturers. The Commission created application enhancements, projects, and fixes are released, based on the need. There is no predetermined release schedule for these. |
| 132. | NA | NA | Generic | Please mention any operational challenges & bottlenecks faced in the current applications. | See response to question #8 |
| 133. | Page no – 21 | Statement no. 1 | IV-1. Objectives and General | We understand that tickets would be generated through ServiceNow. Is there any other communication channel for critical incidents? E.g. phone, email and so on? | During a critical event, additional communication channels will be expected to be used. |
| 134. | Page no – 21 | Statement no. 5 | IV-1. Objectives and General | Apart from Application Support, are there any requirements around operations? E.g. Monitoring of applications, defining/managing alerts, logging and technical housekeeping, system health checks, capacity planning, application deployment & configuration, license management and so on. | No. However, logs and dashboards may indicate an out of scope system or equipment is at fault. The awarded vendor will work with those responsible to assure the application(s) are returned to full service. |

| RFP 19-10350-8476 Proposer Questions | | Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission (PTC) | | | |
|--|------|--|--|--|--|
| Enterprise Applications Managed Services | | | | | |
| # | Page | Section | Section Description | Proposer Question | Commission Response |
| 135. | 21 | 5 | Perform routing status check on the systems and applications to assure the proper operation of these systems and applications and to report to the Commission on all findings. These may occur daily, hourly, weekly, monthly based on the needs and criticality of the systems / application. The intervals for these check points are at the sole discretion of the Commission. Each application may have one or more status checks to be performed that may include test transactions, reviewing logs, and dashboards, and other tests as defined by the Commission. This may include reviewing sub-systems to the relevant applications such as Databases, and Hardware. | Any workflow is designed to perform routing status check on the systems and applications | See Revision #3 above Currently, there are no workflows that automatically or routinely check on the status of the applications |

| RFP 19-10350-8476 Proposer Questions | | Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission (PTC) Enterprise Applications Managed Services | | | |
|---|------|--|---|--|---|
| # | Page | Section | Section Description | Proposer Question | Commission Response |
| 136. | 21 | 8 | Perform Unit and / or User testing on all changes, including the changes made by the Commission or other party assigned by the Commission. | How the changes made by the Commission or other party assigned by the Commission will be notified? | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) The Commission uses the ITIL change management functionality within ServiceNow and the awarded vendor is expected to participate. Thus, gaining this information. 2.) See RFP Part IV-1 a #8 page 21 of 55 of the RFP (Page 22 of 534 of the original RFP PDF file). |
| 137. | 22 | 11 | Create enhancement and fixes as requested and approved by the Commission following the Commission's Change Management processes and procedures. | Is development is required to enhance features / functionalities of the applications? If yes, then enhancements will be major / minor? | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) Yes 2.) Each enhancement will be evaluated to determine if major or minor. |
| 138. | 22 | i | Provide application support, management, enhancements, and upgrades as defined within this RFP that meet or exceed the defined Service Levels | Support : How is end-user support currently handled in relation to this RFP? | See response to question # 97 |

| RFP 19-10350-8476 Proposer Questions | | Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission (PTC) | | | |
|--|------|--|--|--|---|
| Enterprise Applications Managed Services | | | | | |
| # | Page | Section | Section Description | Proposer Question | Commission Response |
| 139. | 36 | xi | The Selected Proposer shall be required to maintain and develop comprehensive documentation for all required assets/services to enhance lifecycle visibility and to centralize/consolidate required documents, reports, plans, and other information related to the Contract. The Selected Proposer shall be responsible for updating ServiceNow with knowledge articles as applicable for the entire life of the Contract. The Selected Proposer shall coordinate and work with the Commission and the ServiceNow support entity to obtain existing knowledge base article templates, or create new templates as applicable, for use in the Contract. | Documentation / Knowledge base articles : Does this documentation needs any approvals from any of the Commission's staff? | Yes. |
| 140. | 10 | I-26 & I 27 | Indemnification & Data/Information Security Breach Notification | Are these terms subject to negotiation after the submission of this proposal? | Yes. However, do not assume any requested modifications to the requirements will be accepted. |

| RFP 19-10350-8476 | | Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission (PTC) | | | |
|--------------------|----------|--|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| Proposer Questions | | Enterprise Applications Managed Services | | | |
| # | Page | Section | Section Description | Proposer Question | Commission Response |
| 141. | 1 | Appendix A | Standard Agreement | Is this agreement a complete and all-inclusive version of all the terms? | Appendix A is a sample document and will be used as a template for the final agreement |
| 142. | 11 | I-29. | Liquidated Damages. | Are the liquidated damages in this section subject to a liability cap? | The value of liquidated damages is determined in Appendix I |
| 143. | 2 II. #2 | Appendix XX | Contractor Integrity Provisions | What does “establishing and implementing” a written business integrity policy entail? | See Appendix XX (at the bottom of Appendix A) Section II 2 (page 68 of 534 of the original PDF file). |
| 144. | 4 | Appendix A | Audits | Will there be a notice period before audits and how frequently can customer request audits? | See response to question #141 |
| 145. | 50 | Appendix I Section 1 | Transition Tasks and Deliverables | Does failure to meet the transition obligations in this section constitute grounds for the material breach? Are there notice/ cure periods in the event transition obligations are not met due to a fault? | 1.) Yes 2.) See RFP Part IV IV-3 b ix (Performance of the Selected Proposer) page 46 of 55 (page 47 of 534 of the original PDF file) and Appendix A Section Liquidated Damages d – page 6 of 10 (page 62 of 534 of the original PDF file) |
| 146. | 2 | Appendix A | Termination | Is there a distinction between termination for cause vs. convenience? Can we recover stranded costs from early termination? Are there notice and cure periods in the event of termination due to material breach? | See Appendix A Section Termination, page 2 of 10 (page 58 of 534 of the original PDF file) |

| RFP 19-10350-8476 Proposer Questions | | Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission (PTC) | | | |
|--|------------|--|------------------------------|--|--|
| Enterprise Applications Managed Services | | | | | |
| # | Page | Section | Section Description | Proposer Question | Commission Response |
| 147. | 1-82 | Appendix K – SAP System Brief | Knowledge transfer documents | Which of the following SAP implementation documents are readily available at PTC so that our deployed resources can gain knowledge on your system landscape and process quickly? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business Process Procedure documents (BPP) • End-User Training documents (Module wise) • KEDB – Known Errors Database • Functional and Technical Specs for RICEFW developments (all SAP modules) • Test scripts (all SAP modules) | The Commission maintains many of these documents and will provide access to the awarded vendor as part of transition |
| 148. | 23, 24, 34 | IV-2, IV-3 a.vi | Transition period | Is it possible to extend the transition timelines to four months considering the high number of modules under each application? Will the shortlisted vendors be allowed to conduct due diligence to assess landscape complexities and available implementation/end-user documents to estimate exact transition timelines? | 1.) No 2.) The awarded vendor will be provided with this information |
| 149. | 34 | IV-3 a.vi | Transition period | Is it possible to waive SLA penalties for at least first six months of steady-state? | No |
| 150. | 1-82 | Appendix K – SAP System Brief | SAP Skill count | What is the number of resources that are supporting SAP applications? Please provide a breakdown of resources by the module for SAP applications. | See response to question # 65 |
| 151. | | General | Employee rebadging | Are there opportunities to re-badge existing contracted technical support personnel? Approximately how many existing personnel can be rebadged? | 1.) The Commission will not limit our contractors in any opportunities. 2.) Unknown at this time |
| 152. | 27 | ii. Location of performance | Delivery location | Please provide a list of applications that must be supported from US locations only. | See response to questions #22 |

| RFP 19-10350-8476 | | Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission (PTC) | | | |
|--------------------|----------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| Proposer Questions | | Enterprise Applications Managed Services | | | |
| # | Page | Section | Section Description | Proposer Question | Commission Response |
| 153. | 15 | II-1-E Personnel | CV/Resume | Is the TPC referencing Key Personnel or is it mandatory that we information for all of the technical personnel that will be supporting the project (CV/Resume)? Since the contract start date is over eight months from today, can we submit provisional CVs at this stage? | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) See RFP Part II-1 E (Personnel) last sentence page 14 of 55 (page 15 of 534 of the original RFP file) 2.) Yes, submission of resumes should be based on what you know at the time of the submission. If you know the resource will not be available in the future, do not submit it. We do understand there is turnover in all companies. |
| 154. | 479 | Appendix R | 2. Miscellaneous Application List | What will be the knowledge transfer location and is there any constraint on staffing locations? | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) The current knowledge is located at the Commission's campus in Middletown PA 2.) See response to question # 22 |
| 155. | 479 | Appendix R | 2. Miscellaneous Application List | Please provide us with a one-year ticket dump for the miscellaneous applications listed in Appendix R. Please include the following information – Incident Count, Severity, Create Date, Resolve Date, Resolver Group, CI Name along with L1, L2, L3 breakup. | This information will be provided to the awarded vendor |
| 156. | | Appendix R | COTS application | For COTS applications will the selected vendor be provided with source code and related documentation for support purposes? | The Commission will provide the awarded vendor with any relevant information provided to the Commission. |
| 157. | 357 (Page 3 of Appendix P) | Appendix P | GeoAnalytics System Brief | Is there any aspect of the implementation of the projects in the Upcoming Projects and Proofs of Concept (Figure 2) in scope? | No |
| 158. | | Appendix D | | What tools are used for infrastructure and Application monitoring? | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) Infrastructure monitoring is outside the scope of the immediate RFP 2.) Application monitoring is via Solar Winds and Solutions Manager. |

| RFP 19-10350-8476 Proposer Questions | | Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission (PTC) | | | |
|--|------|--|-------------------------|---|--|
| Enterprise Applications Managed Services | | | | | |
| # | Page | Section | Section Description | Proposer Question | Commission Response |
| 159. | | Entire RFP | Generic Question | What are the support coverages and On-call requirements? | 24X7 for Critical Systems |
| 160. | | Appendix W | | The ongoing enhancements projects listed in Appendix W, will it be completed by the current stakeholder before transitioning it to the new vendor? | Yes |
| 161. | 80 | Appendix D | Commission Requirements | Is there a list of off-premise hosted applications with hardware and software details for the new proposer to take in during transition? | We do not understand the question. |
| 162. | | Appendix D | Commission Requirements | It is vendor's understanding that currently a 3rd party is managing these non-Windows OS instances. Would OS management of these non-windows OS instances also be in scope or is it just the OS patch management/updates which is in scope? | Infrastructure and operating systems are outside the scope of the immediate RFP. |
| 163. | | Appendix D | Commission Requirements | How many non-Windows servers need to be updated. Please provide the total OS, and deployment locations cloud (physical + Virtual)? | See response to question #162 |
| 164. | | Appendix D | Commission Requirements | Please provide the list of all non-windows OS which needs to be updated. | See response to question #162 |
| 165. | | Appendix D | Security | Please provide the list of compliance requirements to be met. | All items within Appendix D, RFP Section I-27, RFP Section I-28, plus items finalized in the Standard Agreement apply. |

| RFP 19-10350-8476 Proposer Questions | | Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission (PTC) | | | |
|--|------|--|---------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| Enterprise Applications Managed Services | | | | | |
| # | Page | Section | Section Description | Proposer Question | Commission Response |
| 166. | | Appendix D | Security | <p>Does vendor need to WITO (Walk-in Take over) the existing security controls deployed by commission. If Yes, please provide below information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who is managing the security services? • What are the services and technologies used? • Vendor/product details • Volume for each service • Which are the security controls considered for HIPAA compliance requirement? <p>Who owns the license for services?</p> | No |
| 167. | | Appendix D | Security | What type of audit reporting required? SOC 1 or SOC 2 | There are no SOC audit requirements |
| 168. | | Appendix D | Security | <p>Please provide application hosted server count (cloud and On-prem) with OS breakup:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. of Linux • No. of Windows • Total no. of applications? <p>Application names?</p> | See response to question #162 |

All other terms, conditions and requirements of the original RFP dated August 1, 2019 remain unchanged unless modified by this Addendum.