

# COUNTY OF FRESNO

## ADDENDUM NUMBER: ONE (1)

RFP NUMBER: 208-5278

### 2014 IT SYSTEM EXTERNAL AUDIT

June 17, 2014

PURCHASING USE

ssj

G:\PUBLIC\RFP\208-5278 ADD 1.DOC

IMPORTANT: SUBMIT PROPOSAL IN SEALED PACKAGE WITH PROPOSAL NUMBER, CLOSING DATE AND BUYER'S NAME MARKED CLEARLY ON THE OUTSIDE TO:

COUNTY OF FRESNO, Purchasing  
4525 EAST HAMILTON AVENUE, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
FRESNO, CA 93702-4599

CLOSING DATE OF PROPOSAL WILL BE AT 2:00 P.M., ON JUNE 26, 2014.

**PROPOSALS WILL BE CONSIDERED LATE WHEN THE OFFICIAL PURCHASING TIME CLOCK READS 2:00 P.M.**

All proposal information will be available for review after contract award.

Clarification of specifications is to be directed to: **Caleb J. Brooks, phone (559) 600-7110,**  
e-mail [CountyPurchasing@co.fresno.ca.us](mailto:CountyPurchasing@co.fresno.ca.us), **FAX (559) 600-7126.**

**NOTE THE FOLLOWING AND ATTACHED ADDITIONS, DELETIONS AND/OR CHANGES TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL NUMBER: 208-5278 AND INCLUDE THEM IN YOUR RESPONSE. PLEASE SIGN AND RETURN THIS ADDENDUM WITH YOUR PROPOSAL.**

- Reference **COST PROPOSAL** section, pg. 26, Item B references Attachment A, now provided in this addendum.
- Vendor questions and County responses can be found on the following pages.

#### **ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF ADDENDUM NUMBER ONE (1) TO RFP 208-5278**

COMPANY NAME: \_\_\_\_\_  
(PRINT)

SIGNATURE: \_\_\_\_\_

NAME & TITLE: \_\_\_\_\_  
(PRINT)

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

**Q1. Please provide the number of devices for the following items: External Penetration Testing — Websites; Web servers, Customer Portals, Virtual Machines, Firewalls, Routers, Switches, DNS and other external services including servers on the DMZ, E-mail servers, DNS services, Other Servers**

**Wireless Penetration Testing for wireless infrastructure; iOS devices, Wireless access points, Encryption algorithms (please specify those used), Mobile Devices**

*A1. The County's position is that the appropriate amount of information has been included in the RFP. A vendor with sufficient experience in auditing a government entity similar to Fresno County should be able to bid on the work from the information already provided.*

**Q2. Please provide the range of external IP addresses?**

*A2. Decline to specify. If there are concerns with the number of IP addresses, websites, etc., a bidder may submit a tiered bid.*

**Q3. Please specify the number of physical locations in scope for this project.**

*A3. Approx. 500.*

**Q4. Can you provide us with a network architecture diagram?**

*A4. No.*

**Q5. Can we see the results of previous audits?**

*A5. No.*

**Q6. For your Internal network please specify the number of each item in scope:**

- a. Servers**
- b. Workstations**
- c. Mobile Devices**
- d. Routers**
- e. Switches.**

*A6. Decline to specify. See answer to Question #1.*

**Q7. Is there a testing timeframe by which testing may be performed during the day?**

*A7. No.*

**Q8. On page 20 of the RFP, it states that the time covered by the tests will be one month including the report writing phase or other meetings. Does this one month window apply to the External Penetration Only assessment as described initially in the RFP or for an assessment inclusive of external penetration testing, internal penetration testing, wireless testing, etc.?**

*A8. Includes all activities.*

**Q9. On page 7, within the overview section, the County is requesting proposal to perform an external penetration test of its IT environment. However, later in the proposal on page 21 within the Scope of Work, section D. Penetration testing, the city [sic] requires an internal Penetration testing and wireless assessments. Does the County expect an onsite presence and conduct penetration testing from within the County's internal network?**

**A9. No.**

**Q10. How many 'live' external IP Addresses are in scope for External Penetration Testing?**

**A10. Decline to specify. See answers to Questions #1 and #2.**

**Q11. How many Internal network devices are in scope for Internal Network Penetration Testing?**

- a. Number of Servers**
- b. number of Workstations**
- c. Number of Routers & Switches**
- d. Number of Firewalls**
- e. Other:**

**A11. Decline to specify. See answers to Questions #1 and #6.**

**Q12. How many wireless networks are configured within the County's in-scope IT environment? At how many locations/buildings do the wireless networks exist?**

**A12. Decline to specify. See answer to Question #1.**

**Q13. Is social engineering part of this assessment? Would the County approve testing of simulated virus / trojans through social engineering assessment such as phishing emails?**

**A13. See answer to Question #1.**

**Q14. How many locations are to be covered for physical security?**

**A14. Decline to specify. See answer to Question #1.**

**Q15. Are Non-US citizens eligible to participate in the execution of this RFP?**

**A15. See General Conditions, Item 19. OBLIGATIONS OF CONTRACTOR:**

**Q16. Is this RFP an all-or-none matter? Is it possible to bid on some, but not all, items indicated in the scope of work?**

**A16. All or none. Partial bids will be considered non-responsive.**

**Q17. Regarding General Conditions/2F, do we need a contractor license?**

**A17. Contractor's license is not applicable to this RFP.**

**Q18. Are there any specific guidelines with respect to what is considered “white hat” testing?**

*A18. No.*

**Q19. Can this phase [external network penetration test] be performed from Internet?**

*A19. See answer to Question #1.*

**Q20. Total number of Internet facing IP addresses in scope (IP address list or network ranges/subnets).**

*A20. See answers to Questions #1 and #2.*

**Q21. Approximately number of live hosts to be tested?**

*A21. See answer to Question #1.*

**Q22. What kind of technologies are in scope (Database Servers, Operating Systems, Routers, ERP Applications, etc.)?**

*A22. See answer to Question #1.*

**Q23. Are there any web applications within scope? How many?**

*A23. See answer to Question #1.*

**Q24. Are you looking us to test the web applications from an authenticated perspective? If that's the case, briefly describe each application, specifying the amount of dynamic pages/functions and the user profiles/roles.**

*A24. See answer to Question #1.*

**Q25. Are there web services in scope? How many?**

*A25. See answer to Question #1.*

**Q26. Are you looking us to test the web services from an authenticated perspective? If that's the case, briefly describe each web service. Will any detailed information be available to bidders to properly estimate the web service's size?**

*A26. See answer to Questions #1.*

**Q27. For the Internet facing infrastructure, is it possible to conduct the whole exercise from a remote location (targets in scope are internet-facing public networks)? If that is not the case specify which parts of the exercise should be executed on a specific location or via VPN.**

*A27. See answer to Question #1.*

**Q28. Total number of Internal IP addresses in scope (for the internal penetration test phase).**

*A28. See answers to Questions #1 and #2.*

**Q29. Approximately amount of servers/network devices.**

*A29. See answer to Question #1.*

**Q30. Approximately amount of workstations.**

*A30. See answer to Question #1.*

**Q31. Will there be any restrictions on hardware that can be used to execute the internal phase of the penetration test? It is assumed that external hardware will have to be inspected and approved by the County officials before it can be connected to internal networks.**

*A31. See answer to Question #1.*

**Q32. Will the County provide temporary credentials and/or workstations for the consultants during this phase in order to simulate their legitimately assigned access level?**

*A32. See answer to Question #1.*

**Q33. Will the County provide credentials for any specific application to be tested during the Internal Penetration Test.? Please describe.**

*A33. See answer to Question #1.*

**Q34. What kind of technologies are in scope (Database Servers, Operating Systems, Routers, ERP Applications, etc.)?**

*A34. See answer to Question #1.*

**Q35. Is it possible to perform the assessment via VPN? If not, is it possible to conduct the whole exercise from a single location?**

*A35. See answer to Question #1.*

**Q36. Are there predefined targets, high-priority assets we should consider for this project?**

*A36. See answer to Question #1.*

**Q37. Number of APs the Wireless infrastructure supports?**

*A37. See answer to Question #1.*

**Q38. Number of Wireless Networks deployed (Corporate, Guest, etc.)?**

*A38. See answer to Question #1.*

**Q39. Is the amount of days already defined to execute the penetration test exercise?**

*A39. See RFP.*

**Q40. Do you have any special requirement regarding the testing time frame?**

*A40. See RFP.*

**Q41. Are there any technicalities or known specific details that might influence the overall size or complexity of the project, or any phase of it?**

*A41. See answer to Question #1.*

**Q42. Are there items in Section E of the Scope of Work to be considered as separate as the items on Section D?**

*A42. See answer to Question #1.*

**Q43. Is the contractor executing the section E of the scope to conduct a formal audit, including interviewing Fresno County ITSD staff, reviewing written producers, evaluating user roles, evaluating written policies, etc.?**

*A43. No.*

**Q44. Could you clarify items E2, E4 and E5 on the general scope? Can you provide a simple example of what is expected from the bidder for each item?**

*A44. No.*



Bidder Letter: \_\_\_\_\_ Rater #: \_\_\_\_\_

## Separately Priced Options

[illegible]

**Bidder Letter:\_\_\_\_\_ Rater #:\_\_\_\_\_**

- 1 The document examination compares the accuracy and content of the RFP response document.
- 2 What percentage of the document did the bidder respond to? (Completeness)
- 3 Are the responses direct and complete? (Accuracy)
- 4 Does the document reflect a high level of understand of the problems? (Knowledge;
  - A. Complexity and completeness of diagrams.
  - B. Level of detail throughout the document.)
- 5 Does the document reflect a high level of competency? (Competency)
- 6 How much does the bidder really want our business? (Motivation)

WEIGHT AS FOLLOWS: 3=VERY IMPORTANT, 2=SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT, 1=NOT IMPORTANT

SCORE = RATE \* WEIGHT

[illegible]

**Bidder Letter:\_\_\_\_\_ Rater #:\_\_\_\_\_**

The functional / technical examination is designed to determine if the proposed solution meets the business requirements specified in the RFP. Will the proposed solution meet the business needs of ITSD?

RATE AS FOLLOWS: 5= EXCELLENT, 4=GOOD, 3=FAIR, 2=POOR, 1=INSUFFICIENT, 0=NON-EXISTANT  
WEIGHT AS FOLLOWS: 3=VERY IMPORTANT, 2=SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT, 1=NOT IMPORTANT  
SCORE = RATE \* WEIGHT

Mandatory External Audit Categories	Vendor A				Vendor B				Vendor C				Vendor D				Vendor E				Vendor F				Vendor G			
SCORE = RATE * WEIGHT	Rate	Weight	Total	Comments	Rate	Weight	Total	Comments	Rate	Weight	Total	Comments	Rate	Weight	Total	Comments	Rate	Weight	Total	Comments	Rate	Weight	Total	Comments				
Overall Approach			0				0				0				0				0				0					
Firewalls Test			0				0				0				0				0				0					
Routers Test			0				0				0				0				0				0					
Modems Access			0				0				0				0				0				0					
Wireless Access			0				0				0				0				0				0					
VPN Access			0				0				0				0				0				0					
Virus (simulated/non-intrusive) test			0				0				0				0				0				0					
FTP Test			0				0				0				0				0				0					
SFTP Test			0				0				0				0				0				0					
Denial of Service (simulated/non-intrusive test)			0				0				0				0				0				0					
E-Mail Ttest			0				0				0				0				0				0					
IRC servers Test			0				0				0				0				0				0					
SSH configuration information test			0				0				0				0				0				0					
HTTPS Test			0				0				0				0				0				0					
Sample reports			0				0				0				0				0				0					
ITSD			0				0				0				0				0				0					
ITSD			0				0				0				0				0				0					
Quality of Staff			0				0				0				0				0				0					
Performance:																												
Does the vendor have the processes to handle a project of this size and complexity?			0				0				0				0				0				0					
Does the vendor have the skills to handle a project of this size and complexity?			0				0				0				0				0				0					
Does the vendor have the tools to handle a project of this size and complexity?			0				0				0				0				0				0					
Planning:																												
Does the vendor have the people, skills, tools and processes to plan a project of this size and complexity?			0				0				0				0				0				0					
Does the vendor have the ability to meet the proposed timeframes to complete work?			0				0				0				0				0				0					
Mandatory Category Totals			0				0				0				0				0				0					
Optional Categories	Rate	Weight	Total	Comments	Rate	Weight	Total	Comments	Rate	Weight	Total	Comments	Rate	Weight	Total	Comments	Rate	Weight	Total	Comments	Rate	Weight	Total	Comments				
			0				0				0				0				0				0					
			0				0				0				0				0				0					
			0				0				0				0				0				0					
			0				0				0				0				0				0					
			0				0				0				0				0				0					
			0				0				0				0				0				0					
Optional Category Totals			0				0				0				0				0				0					
Total Scores			0				0				0				0				0				0					

Bidder Letter: \_\_\_\_\_ Rater #: \_\_\_\_\_

$$\text{SCORE} = \text{RATE} * \text{WEIGHT}$$

Categories	Vendor A				Vendor B				Vendor C				Vendor D				Vendor E				Vendor F				Vendor G			
SCORE = RATE * WEIGHT	Rate	Weight	Total	Comments	Rate	Weight	Total	Comments	Rate	Weight	Total	Comments	Rate	Weight	Total	Comments	Rate	Weight	Total	Comments	Rate	Weight	Total	Comments	Rate	Weight	Total	Comments
CORPORATE MATURITY																												
1 Does the vendor have the business experience and longevity to give us confidence they can perform both in the near and long term?			0				0				0				0				0				0				0	
2 How many years has company has been in business as it is structured now?			0				0				0				0				0				0				0	
3 How many years of experience does the company have with similar or larger systems?			0				0				0				0				0				0				0	
4 Has the vendor has prior experience with the County?			0				0				0				0				0				0				0	
QUALITY OF REFERENCES																												
5 Do the provided references indicate that the vendor has enough experience with systems activities similar to the proposed activities?			0				0				0				0				0				0				0	
6 How many references are equal or greater in size and complexity?			0				0				0				0				0				0				0	
QUALITY CONTROL																												
7 Does the vendor have the quality control systems in place necessary to insure the delivery of quality products and services?			0				0				0				0				0				0				0	
8 Has the vendor successfully implemented quality control?			0				0				0				0				0				0				0	
9 How long has the vendor been involved in quality control?			0				0				0				0				0				0				0	
FINANCIAL STABILITY																												
10 Can the vendor withstand the financial stress experienced in normal business cycles?			0				0				0				0				0				0				0	
11 Is the company a division or subsidiary of a larger parent company?			0				0				0				0				0				0				0	
12 Is the company an independent organization with a few principles?			0				0				0				0				0				0				0	
ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY																												
13 Does the organization have sufficient staff to provide the needed level of service?			0				0				0				0				0				0				0	
14 How many local support staff are proposed?			0				0				0				0				0				0				0	
15 How many management personnel will be assigned to the project?			0				0				0				0				0				0				0	
16 What is the management-to-staff ratio?			0				0				0				0				0				0				0	
STAFF QUALIFICATIONS																												
17 Does the staff have the qualifications to perform the functions necessary to complete the project and provide the level of product and service desired by the Information Technology Services Department? <i>Evaluate the resumes and rate on a scale of 1 to 10</i>			0				0				0				0				0				0				0	
TOTAL SCORE																												
			0				0				0				0				0				0				0	

## APPENDIX A: Summary Comparison

Bidder Letter:\_\_\_\_\_ Rater #:\_\_\_\_\_

The Summary Comparison summarizes all the major evaluation criterion on a single worksheet.

Categories	Vendor A	Vendor B	Vendor C	Vendor D	Vendor E	Vendor F	Vendor G
Primary Pricing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Separately Priced Options	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Document Comparison	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
External Comparison	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Organizational Comparison	0	0	0	0	0	0	0