



425 S. Palos Verdes Street Post Office Box 151 San Pedro, CA 90733-0151 TEL/TDD 310 SEA-PORT www.portoflosangeles.org

Eric Garcetti

Mayor, City of Los Angeles

Board of Harbor
Commissioners

Jaime L. Lee
President

Edward R. Renwick
Vice President

Diane L. Middleton
Commissioner

Lucia Moreno-Linares
Commissioner

Anthony Pirozzi, Jr.
Commissioner

Eugene D. Seroka

Executive Director

DATE: July 20, 2020

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR CYBER RESILIENCE CENTER

Pursuant to the Cyber Resilience Center Request for Proposals (RFP), all proposers were to submit any questions regarding this RFP no later than Wednesday, July 15, 2020. Questions were to be answered in writing and all questions and responses were to be posted on the Department's website. Below is a list of questions received from proposers and the Department's response:

1. Q: Will the City of Los Angeles Harbor Department consider moving the proposal due date until at least mid-September 2020 or later?

A: No. Based on feedback from the posted draft RFP, eight weeks is believed to be sufficient time to prepare a proposal.

2. Q: Does the CRC expect acknowledgement back from stakeholders on actions they may or may not have taken?

A: No. Acknowledgement is not expected. Stakeholders will have the control to decide if, and how, to use information from the CRC.

3. Q: Will the CRC have detailed technical understanding of the different stakeholder environments?

A: No. The CRC will not be intrusive to the stakeholders' environments.

4. Q: Will the CRC have to tailor the cyber threat notifications by stakeholder?

A: Yes. Stakeholder cyber threat notifications will be different and will have to be tailored by the CRC when received.

5. Q: Would the Port of Los Angeles consider "hot-hot" operations at two geographically dispersed sites?

A: Yes, provided it meets the requirements.

6. Q: The RFP does not mention integration of tactical indicators into various technologies within the sharing group. Is the intent for the CRC to provide the system and allow stakeholders to implement as they see fit, or simply to provide the system for record for strategic and tactical intelligence?

A: Stakeholders will have the control to decide if, and how, to use information from the CRC.

7. Q: Can you provide additional information regarding 2.1.4, “the CRC shall be compliant with relevant state, federal and international laws and regulations”? This is a very broad and general statement, can you provide specifics?

A: This a broad and general statement because the CRC must be compliant with all applicable laws, but specifics may depend on the solution that is proposed.

8. Q: 2.6.1: Primary Facility Location. “Contractor can assume that sufficient power, lighting and HVAC exists in the room.” Can the contractor also assume that the City of Los Angeles Harbor Department will also have responsibility for ensuring that the premises are ADA compliance and meet the State and local building codes?

A: The contractor can assume that the Harbor Department premises/room is currently in compliance. If the proposed CRC solution changes the current compliance, then the contractor will be responsible for re-compliance relative to its solution.

9. Q: What is the total number of stakeholders anticipated for the CRC?

A: For the purpose of your proposal, assume 100 stakeholders. See pages 15 and 16 of the RFP for the desired on-boarding schedule.

10. Q: What are the capabilities of external stakeholders to exchange information? For example, do they have the ability to handle protected information?

A: Some stakeholders will have minimal capabilities while others will be more mature. The proposed CRC solution must be able to handle this range of stakeholder capabilities.

11. Q: What is your preferred technology stack for developing an API?

A: There is no preferred technology stack.

12. Q: What are your preferred tools for authorization, authentication, and accounting?

A: There are no preferred tools.

13. Q: What are your preferred tools for data collection and integration?

A: There are no preferred tools.

14. Q: This section states only a design of the alternate facility is required. However 2.1.12 states “The CRC shall have a minimum availability of 99.9%, with fail-over and redundancy of critical components”. Additionally, 2.1.13 states “The CRC shall have a hot standby disaster recovery solution”. Please clarify how does 99.9% availability and a hot standby solution applies to the alternate facility.

A: The 99.9% availability and disaster recovery refers to the systems. The alternate facility would be a physical location, such as another room with an internet connection.

15. Q: Does Port of LA have a list of approved vendors and sub-contractors for construction projects at the Port of LA?

A: No. This is not a construction project. The physical build-out work for this project is to install equipment, furniture and cabling. This will be done in an existing building.

16. Q: Will the Alternate Facility Location design require a second set of furniture, hardware, software, and supplies ("Hot site"), or is the expectation that equipment from the CRC be used to equip this location?

A: No. The Alternate Facility Location design does not require a second set of the mentioned items. For the purpose of the proposal, the Alternate Facility Location design requirement does not have any physical design. The Alternate Facility Location design requirement is for the CRC systems, such that the CRC systems can be accessed from another location with an internet connection.

17. Q: What is the expectation of readiness of the Alternate Facility, and acceptable downtime before standup of the CRC functions there?

A: There should be no downtime to access the CRC systems from the Alternate Facility with an internet connection.

18. Q: What types of source data (what formats) are to be received from Stakeholders and other monitor sources?

A: Stakeholder formats will vary. The proposed solution must be capable of ingesting different formats.

19. Q: What are expected daily amounts of data to be ingested from sources?

A: The proposed solution will ingest cyber threat information from up to 100 stakeholders, but not their full logs. Contractor should state their assumption based on their experience with ingestion from up to 100 similar stakeholders for their proposed solution.

20. Q: Where is data to be stored and how long is data to be retained?

A: Assume 90 days retention per requirement 2.2.4. Where the data will be stored will depend on the proposed solution.

21. Q: Please define further requirements for machine learning and artificial intelligence capabilities.

A: The proposed CRC solution should incorporate advanced tools. ML and AI capabilities are part of that. How they are employed will depend on the proposed solution.

22. Q: What SOAR and SIEM platforms will the system need to integrate with?

A: The proposed solution should be capable of ingesting cyber threat information from different platforms.

23. Q: Is there a preferred data lake solution?

A: No.

24. Q: Are there any restrictions on using open source solutions?

A: No, provided they meet the requirements.

25. Q: Are there other automation actions expected to be generated in addition to real time alerts? For example, containment or remediation functions.

A: Containment or remediation functions would not be performed by the CRC.

26. Q: Is there room to have the facility be a larger size?

A: For the purpose of your proposal, use the facility size provided in the RFP.

27. Q: What are expected staffing levels for 247 shifts?

A: For the purpose of your proposal, on-site staffing of a minimum of two analysts from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm, Monday to Friday, and automated alerts and notifications for after-hours on-call coverage and call-back if needed.

28. Q: Can you further define the expectations for CRC Stakeholder staff Annual trainings?

A: This would be for the stakeholder staff that interact with the CRC. Stakeholders training would include CRC refresher/updates and a tabletop exercise conducted on an annual basis.

29. Q: Can you further define the expectations for general cyber security awareness training for their end users?

A: The general cyber security awareness training for end users is expected to be an on-demand on-line course.

30. Q: Please provide further details and clarifications on the both current IT and Operational Technology environments

A: The CRC will not be intrusive to the stakeholders' internal operations.

31. Q: Draft RFP mentions NIST SP 800-150, but what about other required Cyber Security and privacy guidance, standards, laws, and regulations? Will the port of LA provide all materials for communication or are they also looking for based on function requirements for data exchange per NIST 800-150.

A: Per requirement 2.1.4, the CRC must be compliant with relevant state, federal and international laws and regulations. The contractor must provide all materials for this turn-key solution.

32. Q: Is there expectation the successful bidders' resources also need to be cleared for TSA TWIC?

A: No.

33. Q: Overall time line and deadlines to implement?

A: See Schedule on pages 15 and 16 of the RFP.

34. Q: Are there other State Privacy guidelines we need to adhere to that also require any sort of secure data exchange and/or encryption?

A: This depends on your solution, but the CRC must be compliant with relevant state, federal and international laws and regulations. Contractor is expected to know what applies to their proposed solution.

35. Q: Is a dedicated room necessary for the CRC as we have been successful doing this on the cloud for City of Los Angeles

A: Yes, a dedicated room is necessary. The CRC will be similar to what the City of Los Angeles is doing, but with a different concept and mission.

36. Q: If a dedicated room is a must?

A: Yes. See answer to #35.

37. Q: Are you looking for the vendor to procure the furniture if so who will be responsible to maintain the furniture once procured?

A: The vendor will be required to procure and maintain the furniture for the duration of the contract.

38. Q: What cabling standard Port of LA adhere to?

A: The CRC will be separate from the Port of LA IT infrastructure. However, CRC cabling should follow ANSI TIA standards and be appropriate for the proposed solution to meet the requirements.

39. Q: Are there any special insurance or bond requirements for installers of any hardware or cabling or equipment we need to be aware of?

A: Insurance or bond requirements for installers would be under the responsibility of the prime contractor.

40. Q: Please specify Switches and Firewalls Port of LA require and any standards to follow in order to architect the environment?

A: The CRC will be separate from the Port of LA IT infrastructure. However, switches and firewalls should be appropriate for the proposed solution to meet the requirements.

41. Q: Describe the participating stakeholders and the entity who will be the final decision-maker during the project.

A: The CRC will receive, analyze and share information to and from direct stakeholders (e.g. – cargo handlers, tenants) and cross-sector stakeholders (e.g. – providers of essential services to direct stakeholders) who choose to become members of the CRC. The CRC Executive Steering Committee will be the decision making body for the CRC design and operations. The Port of Los Angeles will be the decision maker for the contract.

42. Q: Describe stakeholder systems that stakeholders use to share data. And do the stakeholders share information from these systems today.

A: The proposed solution must be able to share data from different stakeholder systems. Stakeholders do not share cyber threat information directly from their systems today.

43. Q: Will there be an implementation date to ensure stakeholders dedicate sufficient resources to the project?

A: See Schedule on pages 15 and 16 of the RFP.

44. Q: Does ITD or CRC plan to use the information sharing platform to support other initiatives like mobile application development or integration with other information sharing and analysis entities?

A: For the purpose of your proposal, do not include plans for such use.

45. Q: Does ITD or CRC plan to use other project management consulting services? or will the select vendor provide project management?

A: This is a turn-key solution that will be awarded to one prime contractor. The prime contractor will be required to provide those services directly or thru their subcontractors.

46. Q: Please list all of the specific compliance requirements for the CRC.

A: This depends on the proposed solution. Contractor is required to know compliance requirements for its proposed solution.

47. Q: Is the Port of LA a member of the Maritime Security Council ISAC? Will any collaboration or integration be required with this or other ISACS?

A: No, the Port of LA is not a member of the Maritime Security Council ISAC. The proposed solution may receive information from ISACs and other external sources, however, the CRC will not distribute CRC information outside of the participating stakeholders. Information from ISACs and external sources will be one-way into the CRC.

48. Q: What are some examples vendor information sources from the stakeholders that are to be sent to the CRC?

A: An example of vendor information sources might include intelligence of known threats to their technologies.

49. Q: What are some examples of how intelligence generated from the CRC is expected to be utilized by the stakeholders?

A: Stakeholders will have the control to decide if, and how, to use the intelligence from the CRC.

50. Q: information from the CRC. What are some information and intelligence examples from the stakeholders that will be expected to be sent to and ingested into the CRC?

A: Stakeholders would send information about cyber threats that they see.

51. Q: What are the expectations for the 24x7 requirements? Is 8x5, M-F coverage with automated high priority alerts being used after hours acceptable?

A: See answer to #27.

52. Q: What, if any, IT operational support will the Port of LA provide to the CRC?

A: This is a turn-key solution. Contractor must provide all IT operational support for the CRC. Assume that the Port of LA will not provide any IT operational support.

53. Q: What is the data and its associated formats the stakeholders will be providing to the CRC?

A: The data would be cyber threat information. The associated formats will vary, therefore the proposed solution must be able to ingest the different formats.

54. Q: What is the scope and function of the Port of LA CSOC?

A: For the purpose of the CRC, the Port of LA CSOC will be one of the stakeholders. It will provide cyber threat information that it sees to the CRC, and it will receive information from the CRC which it may, or may not, use as appropriate to its operations.

55. Q: Who performs SOC, security monitoring, and CSIRT duties for the CRC as an entity if it is not being protected by the Port of LA CSOC?

A: This is a turn-key solution. All services to be provided by the contractor.

56. Q: Is it expected the CRC will join and participate with the maritime ISAC?

A: No, there is no expectation.

57. Q: Can the CRC share information received from the maritime ISAC with non-member ISAC stakeholders?

A: Sharing of data, whether from an ISAC or other sources, would depend on the agreement with the data provider.

58. Q: Are utilities available such as mechanicals and restrooms at the designed facility Harbor Department building located at 300 Water Street?

A: The staff working in the CRC may use building restrooms.

59. Q: Does the alternative site need to be up and running? Or does the alternative facility only need to be designed?

A: The alternate site will not be built under this contract. This design requirement for the alternate site is not for a physical design, but for the CRC systems. This requirement points toward a cloud-based solution or an on-premise solution that is configured to be accessible anywhere with an internet connection. See related questions #16 and #17.

60. Q: Does the Port of LA have an existing data sharing agreement?

A: No.

61. Q: Is a ServiceNow stand-alone/independent instance required?

A: No, provided the proposed solution meets the requirements.

62. Q: Is this after action report for the Port of LA CSOC and or the stakeholders or is it for "incidents" generated from the CRC?

A: The after-action report is to inform stakeholders of what happened and lessons learned following an incident.

63. Q: Do all staff members have to be located in the US?

A: Yes.

64. Q: Do all staff members have to be US citizens?

A: Yes.

65. Q: While the CRC website is hosted under the Port of LA domain, will the CRC use any other Port of LA infrastructure (expected to be segmented/separated) such as Active Directory?

A: No. The CRC will be separate from the Port of LA IT infrastructure.

66. Q: Does the Port of LA plan to provide the network connectivity to the stakeholders?

A: No.

67. Q: Does the Port of Los Angeles plan to host a site inspection of the CRC facility to enable prospective bidders examine the room and speak with the facilities team to ask relevant questions to develop construction estimates?

A: No. Site inspection is not available due to the ongoing pandemic. This is not a construction project. The facility work will primarily involve installing equipment, furniture and related cabling into the existing room.

68. Q: How will third-parties be vetted for participation in the information sharing program, or to become stakeholders?

A: New stakeholders to potentially join the CRC will be vetted through the CRC Executive Steering Committee.

69. Q: Will any form of clearance be required for employees of the CRC?

A: Yes, per 6.5.3, CRC staff must meet security requirements, including criminal and drug background checks.

70. Q: In light of COVID19, the proposed room appears small for 24x7 use by an appropriately-sized staff.

A: For the purpose of your proposal, use the facility size provided in the RFP.

71. Q: Would the provision of a second site, geographically distinct from the main site, be a preferred solution to this space limitation?

A: This may be considered.

72. Q: Alternatively, would the transition to a remote-first model, with the described physical site for use as a meeting space or "War Room" be considered?

A: This may be considered.

73. Q: The general operational duties of the analysts are understood, but what are the strategic or leadership duties of the proposal? Will a Risk Officer responsible for setting priorities and evaluating risk be employed under this proposal, or directly by the Port?

A: Strategic and leadership duties will be provided through the CRC Executive Steering Committee as stated in the RFP. The contractor may propose additional advisory services, which the contractor will provide, if needed for their proposed solution.

74. Q: What staff will be responsible for making decisions regarding the tuning of the system output? When an alert is generated, who is responsible for ascertaining whether that alert is a false positive, and for determining whether or not that alert should be sent in the future?

A: The contractor staff will be responsible for proper operation of the CRC, including tuning the system, ascertaining false positives and all other issues. The alert thresholds will be collaboratively determined with stakeholders as part of the CRC design.

75. Q: 2.2.5 contains a requirement we require further elaboration upon: "Data shall be transmitted from the source system to the CRC in real-time such that source data are available in the CRC at the same time as in the source system."

A: Stating this requirement another way, the data shall not be transmitted in batch mode to the CRC.

76. Q: Are leases and real estate assumed part of this proposal, or will real property be leased or purchased in the name of the Port?

A: Real property leases or purchases are not believed to be required for this solution. However, if the proposed solution requires a lease or real estate, then the contractor must provide it as part of the proposal.

77. Q: In section 8.1, for licensed software, is it understood that the maintenance of a license may include ongoing fees, which will be transferred to the Port at the time of cutover to Port ownership? Alternatively, does this request require proposals with perpetual license fees, to be paid in the initial setup activities?

A: Yes to both. However, all fee payments must be current at the time of cutover.

78. Q: In section 9, we believe that the data sharing agreement cannot precede the completion of design. Though some of the language may be developed, and the structure of the data sharing program may be elaborated in parallel with the technical design work, the first signatures to this agreement should be garnered only after the design is complete, to manage program changes.

A: Agree. Section 2 is Design, Section 3 is Data Sharing Agreement (DSA). Further, requirement 3.1 states that the DSA shall be based on the CRC Design. Section 9 asks that both Design and DSA be completed within 4 months, but does not state that DSA is before Design.

79. Q: Is there an existing inventory of stakeholders and information sharers, or will this be developed as part of this proposal?

A: The Port of LA will identify the first group of 20 stakeholders. This first group has not been identified yet, but will include stakeholders from different sectors of the supply chain, such as those mentioned on pages 5 and 6 of the RFP. Future stakeholders will be identified by the CRC Executive Steering Committee.

80. Q: We would like to request if available, a list of the businesses that have downloaded this RFP. A planholders list.

A: A list of users that downloaded the RFP from LABAVN.org is attached.

Users Who Downloaded All Files			
Last Name	First Name	E-Mail	Company
Amar	Eli	info@kyma.co.il	KYMA
Appalaneni	Vas	vendorregistration@ardentinc.com	Ardent Technologies, Inc.
Arora	Priyanka	bids@elegantsolutions.us	Elegant Enterprise-Wide Solutions, Inc.
Bartsch	Adam	adam@bandbc.com	Bearfield & Bartsch Consulting
Beaman	Tony	tbeaman@hackingsolutions.com	Hacking Solutions
Bello	Carlos	cbello@bellotech.net	Bello Technologies
Bergh	Katrina	katrina.bergh@accenture.com	Accenture
Binns	Michael	michael.binns@northhighland.com	The North Highland Company LLC
Block	Chip	cblock@evolverinc.com	Evolver Inc
Blount	Jason	jason.blount@emnit.com	EMnIT
Bordei	Denis	db@insomniacdesign.com	Insomniac Design
Boyd	Loren	loren@faithgrouppllc.com	Faith Group, LLC
Branchaud	Andy	abrandaud@integrationpartners.com	Integration Partners Corporation
Brown	Abdelrahim	abdelrahim.brown@pixida.com	Pixida USA Inc.
Brown	Hilary	ekapr@ekapr.com	EKA
Carroll	Megan	office@wellingtonsigns.com	Weston Industries Inc.
Chan	Gary	gchan@alfizo.com	Alfizo
Chin	Joshua	josh.chin@net-force.net	Net Force
Cho	Alex	vojonco@gmail.com	VOJON
Cline	Rick	rick.cline@revsec.com	Revolutionary Security LLC
Coche	Sylvana	sylvana.coche@gravitypro.com	Gravity Pro Consulting LLC
Crump	Jeffrey	jcrump@cybersecuritytrainingco.com	Cyber Security Training and Consulting LLC
Dixon	David	david.dixon@dav-lear.com	Dav-Lear Systems, Inc.
Ernst	Tom	tom.ernst@unicomgov.com	UNICOM Government, Inc.
Errichetti	Zachary	zerrichetti1@bloomberg.net	Bloomberg LP
Gill	Tanya	tanya.gill@maculatechnology.com	macula group llc
Goyal	Devendra	Dave.Goyal@thinkaicorp.com	Think AI Consulting Corporation
Hahn	Jinny	accounts@senryo.com	Senryo Technologies, Inc
Hali	Dana	info@ceteramktg.com	CeteraMarketing, LLC
Holguin	Mitchell	mholguin@netsync.com	Netsync Network Solutions
Holmes	Derek	derek@tec-link.com	TEC-LINK, LLC
Hopper	Rosemarie	studio@pastilla.co	Pastilla
Inc	AESI	businessdevelopment@aesi-inc.com	AESI-US, Inc.
Italasano	David	david.italasano@infomagnus.com	Infomagnus
Jones	Shannon	shannon@anvayasolutions.com	Anvaya Solutions, Inc.
Kang	Steve	gostevecompany@gmail.com	Steve Kang DBA GoSteve Consulting
Karimzadeh	Massoud	mk@armyofquants.com	Massoud Karimzadeh
Kaster	Janey	Janey.Kaster@Honeywell.com	Honeywell International Inc.
Kendall	Kelly	kelly.kendall@kncss.com	KNC Strategic Services
Kewo	Brian	brian.kewo@kewocorp.com	Kewo Engineering Corporation
Kinder	Samuel	ltcs@itcentsol.com	IT Century Solutions
Knapton	Mark	mknaption@teksystems.com	TEKsystems, Inc.
Kotlerewsky	David	dk@evotek.com	EVOTEK
Krishnamurthy	Anand	cscontract@gmail.com	COOLSOFT LLC
Kucheria	Harshada	harshada@kucheria.com	Trinus Corporation
Kurahashi	Robert	rkurahashi@acorio.com	Acorio LLC

Users Who Downloaded All Files			
Last Name	First Name	E-Mail	Company
Ladwig	Stephanie	Stephanie.ladwig@gdt.com	GDT
Lee	Stephanie	stephanie.lee@navigant.com	Navigant Consulting, Inc.
Lopez-Dee	Joseph	joseph.ldit@gmail.com	LD Integrated Technologies LLC
MCLEOD	JAMES	james.mcleod@getgsi.com	GSI (Global Systems Integration)
Mahjoub	Nina	Nmahjoub@holmesculley.com	Holmes Culley
Management	Source	sourcemgmt@onvia.net	Onvia
Martin	Colin	colin.martin@wwt.com	World Wide Technology
Matheny	Patty	pmatheny@secsol.com	Security Solutions
McCaskill	Diana	diana@fruitionmultimedia.com	Fruition Consulting LLC
McCaughin	Daniel	dan@bluenoseit.com	Blue Nose IT Solutions
Mehta	Nilesh	Nilesh.Mehta@ngeniousolutions.com	Ngenious Solutions Inc.
Mikayelyan	Armine	armine.mikayelyan@microsoft.com	Microsoft
Morales	Elmer	elmer@koder.com	Koder
Moser	Stephanie	bids@Nth.com	Nth Generation Computing, Inc.
Muntz	A	alana.muntz@ibm.com	IBM
Nantambu	Jabani	jabani@jbsoftwareconsultant.com	JB Software Consultant
Noor	Arshad	arshad.noor@strongkey.com	StrongAuth, Inc. (DBA StrongKey)
Nordine	Carol	bids@netxperts.com	NetXperts, Inc.
O'Loughlin	Laura	laura@sharpdecisions.com	Sharp Decisions, Inc.
Owens	Hunter	owens.hunter@gmail.com	Hunter Owens
Parsana	Sharad	sharad@scalecapacity.com	Scalecapacity, Inc.
Perez	Nikki	LogicalisGovEdContracts@us.Logicalis.com	Logicalis, Inc
Reider	Sabrina	sabrina.reider@atos.net	Atos Public Safety
Richland	Claire	crichland@upperdiamond.com	Upper Diamond
Riggio	James	jriggio@birdi-inc.com	Birdi & Associates Inc.
Rivers	Nancy	gbs@bidnet.com	Bidnet
Rosen	Jonathan	jrosen@sunesys.com	Crown Castle Fiber
Sabbagh	Souheil	souheil.sabbagh@snclavalin.com	SNC-Lavalin Telecom Inc.
Schur	Don	don.schur@worldnettechnology.com	10forward
Schwartz	Gary	gschwartz@netskope.com	Netskope
Sewall	Adam	adam@waterleafinternational.com	Waterleaf International LLC
Shah	Aashna	aashna.shah@exygy.com	Exygy Inc.
Sharma	Ashish	ashish.sharma@parsons.com	Parsons
Sharma	Priyank	priyank_sharma@trinus.com	Trinus Corporation
Sibelman	David	david@getots.com	Operational Technical Services, LLC
Sleggs	John	john.sleggs@nccgroup.com	NCC Group Security Services, Inc.
Smith	Eddie	eddie@memcsolutions.com	MEMC Solutions LLC
Smock	Suzanne	ssmock@compasscentral.com	Compass Solutions, LLC
Soyemi	Sanya	tsgcorp@outlook.com	The Soyemi Group LLC
Stephens	Kelsie	region3@cjisgroup.com	CJIS GROUP
Sypniewski	Richard	rsypniewski@saginllc.com	SAGIN, LLC
Terry	Parker	parker.terry@analystplatform.com	Analyst Platform
Vedel	Mark	mark.vedel@sharpusa.com	Sharp Business Systems
Veerasasu	Srini	srinivas@wati.com	West Advanced Technologies, Inc
Young	Kyle	kyle@myaslanllc.com	Aslan Consulting, LLC
Yunus	Imran	bidteam@zones.com	Zones LLC

Users Who Downloaded All Files			
Last Name	First Name	E-Mail	Company
aslanian	ara	ara@inverselogic.com	Inverselogic, Inc
mendonsa	alia	bidwatch@centerdigitalgov.com	E.Republic
rittenhouse	susan	marketing@westat.com	Westat
suezaki	larry	lsuezaki@goldengatesystems.com	golden gate systems
walse	steve	rfpalerts@gmail.com	SEVENOUTSOURCE