



## REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL No.2466

### Electronic Document and Records Management System (EDRMS)

#### Addendum No. 1

December 11, 2019

This Addendum shall form an integral part of the project scope of Work and shall be read in conjunction therewith. This Addendum shall take precedence over related specifications as they relate to the information below, and of the previously issued scope of Work with which it may prove to be a variance, unless otherwise clarified by the City.

All Proponents **MUST** sign and include this Addendum with their submission.

#### Questions and Answers

**Q1** In section 5.3 (pages 23-24) of RFP the City has provided high-level details pertaining to the scope of work, including a general breakdown of Viewers, Contributors, Super Users, IT Administrator and Administrators for Phase 1 and Future Phases. Given that the most significant item on the Evaluation Criteria is pricing, we believe that addition details related to the number of users and documents would greatly improve each Proponent's ability to estimate the effort and cost required. As such we respectfully request that the City provide a detailed a breakdown of Viewers, Contributors, Super Users, IT Administrator and Administrators BY DEPARTMENT for both Phase 1 and Future Phases of the project. Additionally, we respectfully request that the City provide an estimate of the number of documents BY DEPARTMENT that will need to be migrated to the new EDRMS.

**A1** **City of Nanaimo Proposed Costing should be based on the following information**

Position	Usage and Responsibilities
Viewers	View documents
Contributors	Viewer (+) create, edit, save working documents
Former Employee	Audit trail
Super Users	Contributor (+) create folders and close files
IT Administrator	Ability to perform all technical functions
Administrators	Super Users plus all other available functionality within the EDRMS application

#### Phase 1

- **Departments – 5 (IT, HR, Leg Services, Communication, CAO office)**
- **Minimum estimated documents to import into EDRMS: 200,000**
- **Any additional costing information for each additional group of 100,000 documents**
- **Data storage space 200 GB**

- **Users for estimating**
  - Viewers – 1
  - Contributors – 42
  - Super Users - 9
  - IT Administrator - 1
  - Administrators – 4
- **Any additional per user costs for each individual user type**
  - Viewer
  - Contributor
  - Super User
  - Administrator
  - IT Administrator
  - Former Employee

**Optional Phase 2**

- **Departments – 9 (Finance, Police, Fire, Community Dev, Development Approvals, Bylaw, Engineering, Public Works, Parks & Recreation)**
- **Minimum Estimated documents to import into EDRMS: 800,000**
- **Any additional costing information for each additional group of 100,000 documents**
- **Data storage space 800 GB**
- **Users for estimating (we are using lowest possible estimate plus costs for additional users)**
  - Viewers – 49
  - Contributors – 358
  - Super Users - 51
  - IT Administrator - 0
  - Administrators – 0
- **Any additional per user costs for each individual user type**
  - Viewer
  - Contributor
  - Super User
  - Administrator
  - IT Administrator
  - Former Employee

**Grand Totals (Phase 1 + optional Phase 2)**

- **Departments – 14**
- **Minimum estimated documents to import into EDRMS: 1,000,000**
- **Any additional costing information for each additional group of 100,000 documents**
- **Data storage space 1 TB**
- **Users for estimating**
  - Viewers – 50
  - Contributors – 400
  - Super Users - 60
  - IT Administrator - 1
  - Administrators – 4
- **Any additional per user costs for each individual user type**
  - Viewer
  - Contributor
  - Super User
  - Administrator
  - IT Administrator
  - Former Employee

**Q2** In section 6.2 (pages 27-28) of RFP the District has provided high-level details pertaining to the scope of work, including a general breakdown of Viewers, Contributors, Super Users, IT Administrator and Administrators for Phase 1 and Future Phases. Given that the most significant item on the Evaluation Criteria is pricing, we believe that addition details related to the number of users and documents would greatly improve each Proponent’s ability to estimate the effort and cost required. As such we respectfully request that the District provide a detailed a breakdown of Viewers, Contributors, Super Users, IT Administrator and Administrators BY DEPARTMENT for both Phase 1 and Future Phases of the project. Additionally, we respectfully request that the District provide an estimate of the number of documents BY DEPARTMENT that will need to be migrated to the new EDRMS.

**A2 RDN response**

Phase 1	Building and Bylaw	Communications	Human Resources	IT Department	Legislative Services
Contributors	11	8	6	5	2
Super Users	4	1	0	0	3
IT Administrator	0	0	0	3	0
Administrators	0	0	0	1	1
Viewer		1			

Phase 2	Finance Department	Planning	Recreation and Parks	Regional and Community Services	Solid Waste	Strategic and Community Development	Transportation Services	Utilities
Viewer	0	2	98	9	22	0	99	0
Contributors	15	14	28	33	32	1	15	9
Super Users	0	4	2	3	3	0	3	0

- Minimum estimated documents to import into EDRMS: 750,000
- Any additional costing information for each additional group of 100,000 documents
- Data storage space 1 TB

**Q3** On pages 26 and 28 of the RFP the Purchaser’s have stated that the solution must have the “Ability to integrate with Microsoft Outlook to allow users to quickly store emails in the EDRMS”. Can the Purchaser’s please elaborate on what capabilities that they require from this integration?

**A3 Joint Response: At minimum, the City requires the ability to save and classify documents and emails directly from MS Outlook into the EDRMS. Functionality beyond that is hard to identify as we want Proponents to show what options are available.**

**Q4** Regarding page 67 of RFP 2466, Appendix C – Evaluated Criteria, 4.8.3 Proposed Solution, specifically (c) “Clearly describe whether the System is hosted (cloud-based) or installed on premise”. As we offer both cloud-based and on-premise solutions for Local Governments, can the Purchaser’s please provide their preferred option?

**A4** **City Response: The City’s preferred option is on-premise, although having the ability to move to the cloud in 5-10 years is useful to document.**

**RDN Response: The RDN does not have a preferred option. In case of cloud-based solutions, the Proponent needs to take the responsibility for making sure all personal data will be stored in a server hosted in Canada.**

**Q5** On page 71 of RFP (EDRMS Response Matrix Spreadsheet), the Purchaser’s have requested that the proposed solution "Integrate with Sharepoint 2010 and 2016 on-premise and future versions of SharePoint" and "with SharePoint Online and Office 365". Can the Purchaser’s please confirm the version of SharePoint in use today for each Purchaser and the version that each would prefer to use for the EDRMS going forward?

**A5** **City Response: The City has now fully upgraded to SharePoint 2019 on premise, but could be using SharePoint Online in 3-6 years.**

**RDN Response: Currently, the RDN is using SharePoint 2016. There is a plan to upgrade to SharePoint 2019.**

**Q6** On page 71 of RFP (EDRMS Response Matrix Spreadsheet), the Purchaser’s have requested that the proposed solution is a Certified Microsoft SharePoint Add-in. It is not common for Microsoft to certify Add-ins, can the Purchaser’s please describe their expectation in this regard?

**A6** **Joint Response: The City is looking for any certifications or collaboration with Microsoft that indicates that there is a high probability that the solution was correctly designed to work with Microsoft SharePoint and that it will continue to work with future versions. The Notes box can be used to describe any level of collaboration that has occurred.**

**Q7** In the event that a Proponent can offer multiple technical solutions that meet the Purchaser’s requirements. Will the Purchaser’s allow Proponents to submit up to two separate bids?

**A7** **Joint Response: Proponents are allowed to submit up to two (2) separate Proposals. Please clearly distinguish each Proposal with an identifier. i.e. Option 1 and Option 2**

- Q8** Are bids from international corporations acceptable?
- A8** **Joint Response: Proposals will be accepted from international corporations however Proponents must be aware and be able to meet the Legislative requirements.**
- Q9** Does the software UI need to be readable in French as well as English?
- A9** **Joint Response: Neither the City nor the RDN require a French UI.**
- Q10** In Section 4.13 (p 20), the Purchasers have outlined a Discovery Phase to be completed before the project is formally awarded “to allow the Preferred Proponent to develop a revised Proposal” Given that pricing is a heavily weighted (25% of the available points) in determining a Preferred Proponent, will the Purchasers permit the Preferred Proponent to increase their proposed pricing at this stage of selection? If so what limits will be placed on an increase in pricing?
- A10** **Joint Response: The pricing is weighted at 25% due to budget limitations for both Purchasers. It is expected that Proponents will be able to price Phase 1 from the information provided in the RFP and subsequent Addenda. If this information changes during the Discovery Phase the Purchasers would accept the change but only in accordance with the rates provided in the original Proposal. Purchasers would not accept a wholesale change to the proposed rates.**
- Q11** On pages 22 of the RFP the Purchaser’s (specifically City of Nanaimo) has stated that “At the time of the EDRMS implementation all shared drive content at the City will be classified according to the RCRS.” Can the City please provide Proponents with additional detail as to how the City intends to classify content, from a technical perspective (eg. separate indices, system metadata, folder structures, etc.)?
- A11** **City Response: Records will be organized into a folder structure in a shared drive environment that mirrors the City’s RCRS.**
- Q12** Appendix B – Mandatory Technical Requirements (p66), specifically “Must have workflow capability”. Can the Purchasers please confirm that all “workflow capabilities” are captured in Appendix C1 - EDRMS Response Matrix Spreadsheet.
- A12** **City Response: All the workflow capabilities that are known and will be used as evaluation criteria are listed in the spreadsheet.**
- RDN Response: Workflow capabilities are vast, and all capabilities can’t be listed before having a solution. Hence, the RFP states some features which both purchasers feel important. If an applicant feels additional features are needed to make it better product, they can include those in their proposal with relevant details.**

- Q13** Appendix C1 - EDRMS Response Matrix Spreadsheet, please provide any specific functional requirements for the Tempest and SAP integrations.
- A13** **City Response: Tempest and SAP are common BC Municipal applications that store and access record information that are currently stored within each system, but would be ideally stored in an EDRMS. If the proposed software is able to provide that linking capability please explain in the notes.**
- Q14** Appendix C1 - EDRMS Response Matrix Spreadsheet, please provide the Purchasers expectations for providing “test environment for user performance evaluation”.
- A14** **Joint Response: Whether on premise or in the cloud, a test environment should be provided free of charge. This environment would be used for testing new functionality, usability and user experience.**
- Q15** Appendix C1 - EDRMS Response Matrix Spreadsheet, can the Purchasers please provide more information on the requirement “Capability to support document archival from NTFS File Shares”?
- A15** **City Response: Q15: The City is looking for a Windows compatible solution for building back-up, restore, permissions and maintenance plans.**  
**RDN Response: We would need the ability to import files from our existing NTFS file shares into the new system.**
- Q16** Are either of the Purchasers planning to deploy SharePoint 2016, 2019, Online or Office 365 in 2020? If so what version of SharePoint is being planned for each of the Purchaser’s?
- A16** **City Response: The City of Nanaimo has now fully upgraded to SharePoint 2019 on premise, but could be using SharePoint Online in 3-6 years. The City is currently using Office 2016 on-premise and does not have a planned date to upgrade.**  
**RDN Response: The RDN is currently using SharePoint 2016. The RDN is planning to upgrade to SharePoint 2019.**  
**Office365- this decision is pending for the RDN. We can’t confirm it at this stage.**
- Q17** Appendix C1 - EDRMS Response Matrix Spreadsheet, regarding the requirement "Allow for configuration of records classification system elements, such as scope notes or description, title, primary and secondary classifications, and retention and disposition relationships." can the Purchasers please provide a clarifying description of “primary and secondary classifications”?
- A17** **City Response: Per the City of Nanaimo RCRS, which is custom made and broad functional classification system and retention schedule:**

**Primary:** Each 'primary' is a related group of business functions or activities identified by a two or three letter classification code and a title (e.g., FIN and Finance). The functions or activities collected under the primary may have specific affiliation (e.g., Education and Training or Fire) or broad affiliation (e.g., Communication or Governance).

**Secondary:** Within each primary there are a number of 'secondaries'. Every secondary will have a title and a classification code which consists of the primary classification code, a dash and a two-digit number (e.g., FIN-02). Each secondary includes additional notes and information regarding how to arrange content, event triggers, retention, destruction, legal citations, and notes.

**RDN Response:** The records classification and retention schedule are a functionally based classification schedule that provides a hierarchical framework for the organization and description of records. The structure is based on the content of the document and applies to all records. The primary classification of a record is based on the function and sub-function to which it relates, and the secondary classification of a record is the activity occurring within the function and subfunction.

**Q18** Kindly confirm whether the City and RDN would consider SharePoint as your EDRMS solution.

**A18** **Joint Response: All proposed solutions including SharePoint will be considered against the evaluation criteria.**

### **Amended Section and or Information**

The following Sections are hereby Amended

#### **Proposal Checklist**

#### **Add Appendix G – Pricing Forms**

#### **Appendix A - Proponent's Submission Form, Section 3. Non-binding Price Estimates**

##### **From:**

The Proponent has submitted its prices in accordance with the instructions in the RFP and in the Pricing Form set out in Appendix F.

##### **To:**

**The Proponent has submitted its prices in accordance with the instructions in the RFP and in the Pricing Form set out in Appendix F and Appendix G.**

#### **Appendix C - Evaluated Criteria, Section 4.8.7 Pricing, Item a.**

##### **From:**

Complete and submit Appendix F.



**To:**  
**Complete and submit Appendix F and Appendix G.**

**Proponent:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Note:** All forms that require a signature must be signed by a person authorized to legally bind the Proponents to statements made in response to this RFP.

**End of Addendum 1**