AMENDMENT TO REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
2015 Alaska Satellite Facility Data Storage Project
of Current University Policies and Procedures on Certification of Activity on Federal Awards
(Effort Certification)

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL NO. 15P0019SAS
Procurement Officer: Scott A. Snedden

SUBMITTAL DEADLINE:
May 7, 2015 4:00 PM AT

ISSUED TO:
All Prospective Offerors

Dear Vendor:

The following clarifications and changes have been made to Request for Proposal No. 15P0019SAS for 2015 Alaska Satellite Facility Data Storage Project:

The submittal deadline has not changed. A table of questions followed by answers has been provided. All other terms and conditions remain the same.

Sincerely,

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FAIRBANKS

Scott A. Snedden
Senior Contracting Officer

ACKNOWLEDGMENT
Not Required.
TABLE OF QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Questions from Vendors Regarding Storage RFP follow by response in italics.

1. The RFP, on Page 9 under Timeline, states an evaluation period of 90 days for an award, with shipment within 30 days ARO.
   - When does The University of Alaska expect to issue a PO, upon award notification or sometime after that with final configuration review and procurement processing?
   - Can you provide an estimated date for a PO?
   - The timeline as described on Page 9 seems to reflect a shipment estimate of September 7, 2015. Is this accurate?

The timeline allows for review and selection to take this long, but we are extremely motivated to make this purchase sooner rather than later. We anticipate a one-week review, issue a Notice of Intent to Award, followed by a ten day protest period concurrent with a 1-2 week period for internal approval (to include approval and verification of funding), and a final week for issuing a PO. The vendor would then have 30 days ARO.

Seagate is asking this in order to propose the latest technology available (capacity, density and performance) and needs to approximate shipment day to account for proposed products.

2. The RFP, on Page 7 of Marketing Group I section, describes the growth up to 9 PB of data storage needs with a margin of error of 50%.
   - This could mean 4.5 PB up to 13.5PB of usable storage?
     Yes
   - Does the University have a date when this will be more definitive for the required capacity?

No, because one of the dependencies is cost, which will be determined by this RFP. If the costs are too high, the facility will consider using near line or a cloud service like S3, for a portion of the storage, which would change the total. It will also be difficult to estimate until satellite missions have flown and exact product specifications, along with product size, are firmly established. Hence the large range.

   - Regarding the Replication of the data, will this additional storage be acquired by ASF in a data center and be managed by ASF or will it potentially be a service like Amazon S3, requiring no additional physical storage purchase or support?
   - Replication is yet to be determined, based on the outcome of the RFP. We do know that any arrangements with Cloud Services for replication will likely not occur for at least 24 months, if ever.
     - If so, can vendor propose an S3 like managed offering for the Replicated Data?
   Not for this offering. If the vendor’s proposal is successful, we will be interested in additional discussions.

3. The RFP appears to be requesting DDN WOS. We are not a DDN Reseller.

This is NOT the case. We are soliciting any solution using any hardware/software combination that will meet the requirements at the best value for the organization.

We would propose a solution based on commodity x86 hardware and SwiftStack’s supported version of OpenStack Swift.

The solution would be based on OpenStack Swift, but have the roadmap and update support of a vendor.

https://swiftstack.com/
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ImrYe0CBL-E

The commodity x86 based hardware would allow you to decouple hardware (specifically) HDD sourcing from the implementation without disrupting the SwiftStack software deployment.

We could exceed your request of 4PB Usable per rack density with 2:1 replication. This coupled with a 2 site solution which would contain 2 additional replicas. As an archival usage profile, this would achieve the goals while maintaining a high density.

Alternatively, if 2PB per Rack was acceptable we could configure with 3:1 replication at each site (6 total replicas across primary and backup site).
The replication level can be selected on an object store basis, so you could easily add new use cases to the infrastructure. We believe that this offers the best initial cost and deployment flexibility. Would you consider discussing this as a basis for your solution instead of a DDN WOS based solution? In order to get a proper engagement going we need to get a conversation started between Silicon Mechanics, SwiftStack and UAF in order to fully investigate the fitness of the solution. Unfortunately, with an RFP deadline looming this would be difficult without some engagement.

*I think you are trying to solve the wrong problem. We have provided the background so you would know about the use of the solution we are soliciting. But we are looking for you to provide only part of the total system: a WOS appliance for a single site, and guaranteed pricing for additional storage and services.*