



ADDENDUM NUMBER TWO

**RFP 12-2066
Enterprise Data Storage Solutions**

Clarification to Addendum Number One, Question 5.2 concerning adding a paragraph that would let other government agencies leverage the work done in this RFP by expanding the opportunity to the selected vendor. In Metro's response, it was stated that Metro would research this possibility. However, by the time this Addendum Number One was published it was determined that it was possible and the change to the RFP was listed in the same document at the top of page two, under "F. Intergovernmental Cooperative Agreement."

Answers to additional submitted questions.

We heard in the Pre-bidders conference that Metro's e-mail environment consists of 1,300 active mailboxes.

1. What is the average mailbox size?

Answer: Approximately 550 MB.

2. What is the average User Concurrency % for e-mail?

Answer: Not easily determined. However, our user base is predominately desk based during traditional business hours using Microsoft Outlook.

3. What is the average number of messages per day that users send and receive?

Answer: Not easily determined. However, the Internet only bound messages average around 8,000 messages.

4. What is the mail retention policy?

Answer: 90 day minimum; currently no enforced deletion or retention period. This may change by policy in the future.

5. How many mailboxes are moved in a month?

Answer: Less than 10 per month.

6. How many users receive e-mail via mobile devices?

Answer: Not easily determined.



Addendum One / RFP 12-2066

There is storage capacity data for four HPUNIX systems in the RFP.

1. Are there any plans to move the applications that currently reside on HPUNIX hosts to another platform and if so what platform is Metro considering using?

Answer: Metro is currently studying the future roadmaps of our Unix / Oracle based systems and may be considering a more unified approach, which might include moving off directly attached storage to other solutions. This depends on the results of this current storage RFP. Key items that could influence this migration move would be cost, speed, ability to work with database files, throughput, cloning and reporting.

2. In the RFP on Table 2 there are six references to applications that look like they are associated with the HPUNIX platforms, specifically the third, sixth, thirteenth, fourteenth, fifteenth and nineteenth applications listed. These applications are a mix of NFS, CIFS, and locally attached storage, is this observation correct?

Answer: Only items 13, 14, and 15 are related to the HPUNIX platforms. The two references for "ERP" are CIFS shares used by client PCs. The references to Oracle are for RLIS, SDE Photos, Web Applications, and TRIM archiving system.

There was a concern raised during the Pre-Bidders meeting about applications at MRC possibly needing local storage if the Data Center is consolidated to the OCC. Please elaborate on that concern in terms of exactly which applications Metro feels may need local storage and the existing IT equipment that is involved.

1. Also, is the storage concern related to the data path between the end user clients and the application(s) or between the host(s) and the storage?

Answer: Some of the concern is the potential bandwidth and latency issues between the combination of storage and server (which would be hosted in the same location) and the impact to users that might be in different locations.

2. What observations are driving the concern about the need for local data storage?

Answer: Applications that we are concerned about needing local storage (which we prefer not to keep on desktop storage) are:

- Aerial photography and map data used by Planning Department via ArcGIS and CIFS shares (30 users, large image data)
- Large datasets used by Travel Forecasting via CIFS shares (10 users, high performance statistical modeling needs)
- Photo images used by Zoo staff via CIFS shares (10 users, historical valuable large image data, plus scratch working space)
- Windows roaming profiles used by staff at MRC and the Zoo (682 users)



Addendum One / RFP 12-2066

3. How many users access the applications that are of concern?
Concerning video editing at the Zoo, how much video data is currently being stored for this application? How many employees perform video editing and is this a full time operation? Does Metro anticipate that the Video Editing function at the Zoo will be expanding beyond current levels? Over the next five years how much growth in Video storage does Metro anticipate? Are there any issues today with the Video Editing operation?

Answer: At the Zoo only, video editing and photography (digital assets) total about 600GB on enterprise storage and 3.5TB on local storage. Video editing is currently done by a half time employee and a volunteer. We anticipate that video editing staff hours will increase and storage expand by 1.5TB/yr. The Zoo wants to expand staff availability to videos as well as increase the resolution. Current issues with video editing are files are not backed up frequently enough and there is storage that is susceptible to a single point failure.

All other questions raised in the meeting were pertaining to information contained in the RFP and the information set forth above.

Issued April 10, 2012

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Tim Collier', written over a horizontal line.

Tim Collier
Finance and Regulatory Services Deputy Director

