



REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL No.2466

Electronic Document and Records Management System (EDRMS)

Addendum No. 2

December 19, 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

Q19 Do you have a budget? If yes, can you disclose it?

A19 **Joint Response: Both Purchasers have a budget however, will not disclose the value.**

Q20 Section 5.1 mentions a RM review performed by a consultant. Are we able to have a copy of that report? Could we also have copies of any relevant Records documents also mentioned in that section?

A20 **City Response: A copy of the report prepared by Oldenburger Consulting was presented to the Committee of the Whole on October 23, 2017, and is available on the City's website at:**

<https://pub-nanaimo.escribemeetings.com/FileStream.ashx?DocumentId=8283>.

The records management policies are in the final stages of revision and the City is not prepared to release until finalized. The City of Nanaimo Records Classification and Retention Schedule (RCRS) is included with this Addendum. (Addendum 2 Attachment 2_City of Nanaimo RCRS 2019-12-04 – draft) Please note that the RCRS is a draft in the final stages of development. This document is still being checked for consistent formatting and cross-reference accuracy.

Q21 Page 23, outcome #1 states “full data migration from network drives and active physical files....for all five City departments”. How much information is being referenced here? (i.e. how many drives? How much disk space? How many electronic files? How many physical files? Is there an electronic listing of these files for import? If yes, in what format? Do you expect this work to be fully done by the consultant or some by City staff?)

A21 **City Response: See Addendum 1 – Question 1.**

Q22 Page 24, outcome #4 states the “ability to replace the majority of group and personal network drives”. What constitutes a “majority”? How much information is being referenced here? (i.e. how many drives? How much disk space? How many electronic files? How many physical files? Is there an electronic listing of these files for import? If yes, in what format? Do you expect this work to be fully done by the consultant or some by City staff?)

A22 **City Response: See Addendum 1 - Question 1.**

Q23 Page 24, outcome #6 references the ability to “measure compliance using reports”. What is envisioned here? What compliance is being referenced?

A23 **City Response: The City requires the ability to monitor the volume ingested into the EDRMS on a daily, weekly, and monthly basis in order to ensure that the system is being utilized appropriately and all content created is being saved according to the City’s policies.**

Q24 Page 24, outcome #9 states “technical support and helpdesk access”. What parameters are expected here?

A24 **City Response: The City requires technical support and helpdesk access at the minimum of the City’s business hours of 8:00am to 5:00pm PST.**

RDN Response: EDRMS solution provider should offer technical support for the provided solution. They should offer access to helpdesk with defined SLA (Service level agreement) mentioning response time based on criticality of the request.

Q25 Page 26, outcome #3 states the “ability to replace the majority of group and personal network drives”. What constitutes a “majority”? How much information is being referenced here? (i.e. how many drives? How much disk space? How many electronic files? How many physical files? Is there an electronic listing of these files for import? If yes, in what format? Do you expect this work to be fully done by the consultant or some by RDN staff?)

A25 **RDN Response: See Addendum 1 - Question 2.**

Q26 Page 26, outcome #5 references the ability to “measure compliance using reports”. What is envisioned here? What compliance is being referenced?

A26 **RDN Response: The RDN requires the ability to monitor the volume ingested into the EDRMS on a daily, weekly, and monthly basis in order to ensure that the system is being utilized appropriately and all content created is being saved according to the RDN’s policies.**

- Q27** In reviewing the RFP submission requirements, it is unclear whether proponent should submit a single proposal that includes both the City and the Regional District or to be of separate proposals. Can you please clarify this?
- A27** **Joint Response: If proposing to both Purchasers, Proponents are able to submit one package and include the pricing tables for both Purchasers.**
- Q28** Workflow: Regarding the workflow component, is it standardized on a cross-platform workflow engine, or is each organization using its own workflow capabilities?
- A28** **Joint Response: The City and the RDN are not currently using a standardized workflow engine. The proposed system should have the ability to run workflows like disposition approval.**
- Q29** Clearance Letter: Can Out-of-Province corporations provide an equivalence to a “WorkSafeBC Clearance Letter”? (Ref: Item 3.5, point b.)
- A29** **Joint Response: Equivalency to WorkSafeBC will not be accepted, however, the WorkSafeBC Clearance Letter will only be required from the Successful Proponent and is not required at the time of Proposal submission. The requirement is due to the belief that the Successful Proponent will be working on site.**
- Q30** Fiscal year: When is the City’s and RDN’s fiscal year? (From which date?).
- A30** **City Response: The City is on a calendar year-end January 1st to December 31st.**
RDN Response: The RDN is on a calendar year-end January 1st to December 31st.
- Q31** Purchaser’s Records Classification Retention Schedule: Can you provide Purchaser’s Records Classification Retention Schedule documentation please?
- A31** **City Response: See Addendum 2 - Question 20.**
RDN Response: The RDN RCRS is in draft stage and is included with this Addendum. (Addendum 2 Attachment 3_RDN RCRS Draft) Please note that the RCRS of the RDN is in preliminary draft stage and some modifications are expected.
- Q32** Volume metrics:
- What is the current volume metrics for SharePoint 2010 of the two organisations?
 - What is the current total drives volume to be transferred from both parties?
- A32** **City Response: The City of Nanaimo is now fully switched to SharePoint 2019. Data in SharePoint is approximately 150GB. See Addendum 1 – Question 1 for minimum estimates for data storage.**

RDN Response: The RDN is using SharePoint 2016 and aiming to switch to SharePoint 2019 by May 2020.

Following is an approximate volume of current files (after retention schedule is applied, the numbers should reduce). Please note that, these numbers are changing every day.

- **The data migration from network shares will be done by the RDN resources. But the EDRMS solution should have an easy to use data import utility.**
- **Electronic Files SharePoint- 825 GB of Data in internal SharePoint, 440000 documents.**
- **Emails- 1.4 TB in email**
- **File Share- 1698 GB**
- **Once retention schedule is applied, the RDN internal resources will clear up these electronic files and prepare an electronic listing.**
- **See Addendum 1-Question 2 for projected estimate of required data storage.**

Q33 For clarification: We presume “consultant” is a single-person supplier, not a legally incorporated proponent company. Is this correct? (There is no definition in the Definitions List)

A33 **Joint Response: The Consultant is the Successful Proponent entering into the Discovery Phase of the project.**

Q34 Signature component: Do either of the purchasers already use a Digital Signature Utility?

A34 **Joint Response: Neither the City nor the RDN use a Digital Signature Utility.**

Q35 For requirement “Integrate with Sharepoint 2010 and 2016 on-premise and future versions of Sharepoint (either on-premise or off-premise)”

- Which SharePoint version is deployed at the City?
 - Are there any plans to migrate to SharePoint Online (Office 365)? If not, are there any plans to migrate to other version of on-prem SharePoint?
 - What’s the timeline of the migration?
- Which SharePoint version is deployed at the RDN?
 - Are there any plans to migrate to SharePoint Online (Office 365)? If not, are there any plans to migrate to other version of on-prem SharePoint?
 - What’s the timeline of the migration?

A35 **City Response: See Addendum 1 - Question 16.**

RDN Response: See Addendum 1- Question 5 and Question 16.

Q36 For requirement “Allow retention schedule changes to be batch updated on applicable records and containers”

- Do you expect retention schedule changes to be applied to new records and containers only? Or, records and containers on an existing retention schedule?

A36 **Joint Response: The City and the RDN expects the retention schedule changes to be applied to both new records/containers as well as records/containers on an existing retention schedule.**

Q37 For requirement “Capability to support Email, Calendar, and Task List archival from MS Outlook or MS Exchange 2010 or later”

- What version of Outlook is running at the City?
 - Are there plans to upgrade to Outlook Office 365? If not, are there plans to upgrade to Outlook 2016 or higher?
 - What’s the timeline of the upgrade?
- What version of Outlook is running at the RDN?
 - Are there plans to upgrade to Outlook Office 365? If not, are there plans to upgrade to Outlook 2016 or higher?
 - What’s the timeline of the upgrade?
- What version of Exchange is deployed at the City?
 - Are there plan to migrate to Exchange Online? If not, are there plans to upgrade to Exchange 2016 or higher?
 - What’s the timeline of the upgrade or migration?
- What version of Exchange is deployed at the RDN?
 - Are there plan to migrate to Exchange Online? If not, are there plans to upgrade to Exchange 2016 or higher?
 - What’s the timeline of the upgrade or migration?

A37 **City Response: The City of Nanaimo is currently running Outlook 2016 on Exchange 2013. We do not have a scheduled year for future upgrades.**

RDN Response: The RDN currently use Outlook 2016 and Outlook Office 365. The RDN plans to upgrade to latest version as and when released by Microsoft. The RDN currently use Exchange 2013 with a vision to upgrade to Exchange 2016/2019 by 2020.

Q38 City, how much data (in TB) do you expect the new EDRMS solution will be managing?

- By the end of Phase 1
- By the end of Phase 2

A38 **See Addendum 1 – Question 1**

Q39 RDN, how much data (in TB) do you expect the new EDRMS solution will be managing?

- By the end of Phase 1
- By the end of Phase 2

A39 The RDN expects 500GB by the end of phase 1 and 1TB by the end of phase 2.

Q40 Physical records

- a) Can you please provide us some statistics on how many boxes and folders there are (by location if possible), and in generally, how many folders are in boxes?
- b) Which providers are you using for offsite record storage?
- c) What metadata is captured for the boxes? Folders?
- d) Are there different types of boxes and folders?
- e) How do the users search for the boxes and folders today?
- f) Is there any circulation process now (checkouts / checkins)?
- g) Please describe your current physical item disposition process.

A40 City Response: Physical record keeping is not in scope for Phase 1 or Phase 2 of implementation, although considerations will be made for platforms supporting features of physical record keeping. We do not have a provider for offsite record storage; we store records in our own facilities. The types of boxes and folders may differ between departments. Circulation processes as well as disposition processes may also differ between departments.

RDN Response:

a. Statistics

- i. In terms of records that are currently held under the control of records management (which are inactive), we currently have an estimated: 200 Legal size Bankers Boxes and 800 Shannon Files split between storage in the RDN building vault and an offsite storage unit. We do not know the number of physical files/boxes that would be held outside of the control of the Records Management team, but we can estimate there are over 10,000 manila folders exist within the RDN building.
- ii. An average box will contain roughly 10 – 25 folders.
- iii. Please note that the RDN plans to target new, active records to enter into the ECM on an ongoing forward basis when the system is ready and not to backtrack to older inactive files.

b. Currently we do not use any offsite records storage providers. However, this is subject to change in the future as we plan to transition to an offsite records storage facility.

c. Metadata

Information we record include the:

- Primary number (record series),
- File number (if applicable),
- File names,
- Year of the file (the end date),
- Disposition Type (Destroy, Permanent, Archive)

- **Active (How many years the file is active)**
- **Semi Active (How many years the file is semi-active)**
- d. **Box Types:**
 - i. **At present we collect standard legal-size bankers boxes, shannon files, manila folders, expandable folders and in some cases 3 ring binders.**
 - ii. ****However, it should be noted that in the future, it may be decided that all documents handed over to records management will be stored within legal size bankers boxes.**
- e. **Search:**
 - i. **The user would manually search through our “Authorization for Destruction” (non-permanent files) or “Box List” (permanent files) forms based on the end year of the files in question which would reveal the location of the file or box.**
- f. **Circulation Process:**
 - i. **There is no circulation system in place at present. However, it is on the agenda for the future as we upgrade up our physical records based procedures.**
- g. **Disposition Process:**
 - i. **The current disposition process is done manually and consists of the following steps:**
 - ii. **All required physical signatures are obtained on the corresponding “Authorization for Destruction” forms; after which, said forms are then stored physically in the appropriate folder as well as scanned and uploaded to the shared drive.**
 - iii. **A destruction is then scheduled with a shredding company for all boxes/documents due for destruction from the previous year. The list of documents due for destruction can be accessed by reviewing the physical “To be Destroyed” folder (or the electronic versions) which contains all “Authorization for Destruction” forms with the required destroy date.**
 - iv. **On the day of destruction, Certificate of Destructions are received from the shredding company and stored physically in a corresponding folder. However, the new process coming will involve scanning and uploading these documents to the shared drive**

Q41 It would be great if all the Appendix documents to this RFP could be supplied as separate documents. But especially the price pages - appendix E & F & G.

A41 **Joint Response: Excel spreadsheets for Appendix F and Appendix G are included in this Addendum. (Addendum 2 Attachment 1_2466 - EDRMS Pricing Forms Rev0)**

Q42 Regarding pages 23 and 27 of RFP 2466, specifically the “Position / Usage and Responsibilities” table. Former Employees is not listed in the Current User Account types list directly above. Can the Purchasers please clarify if this was a mistake or provide the current number of users associated with this position?

A42 **Joint Response: The City and the RDN know that some vendors charge the audit of records created by former employees and we would like to understand charges in this RFP process. There are documents created by a significant number of former employees. The goal is to start tracking former employees once documents are ingested in the EDRMS. It is not the City’s or the RDN’s preference to license based on former employees.**

Q43 On pages 25 and 29 of RFP 2466, the Purchasers have specified that “The Successful Proponent will be responsible for assisting the [City/RDN] in the completion of a PIA.” What are the Purchasers’ expectations for vendors regarding the completion of a PIA? What is the anticipated level of effort for vendors?

A43 **Joint Response: The vendor assistance for a PIA would be for technical information. It would be about storage methods and data protections. If the information is readily available then it would just be answering a couple of questions. The purpose of the PIA is to determine whether the proposed solution meets the City’s and the RDN’s requirements under the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FOIPPA). For reference, the City and the RDN uses a template that is very similar to the BC Provincial Government PIA template ‘General PIA for Other Public Bodies’ found at the following link: <https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/governments/services-for-government/information-management-technology/privacy/privacy-impact-assessments#templates>**
Proponents are encouraged to review the aforementioned template and ensure that they are able to meet the requirements of FOIPPA.

Q44 Appendix B – Mandatory Technical Requirements (p66), specifically “Ability to access metadata from structured records (i.e. dates, author)”. For the purpose of our response, can the Purchasers please further define “structured records”?

A44 **City Response: The City desires the ability to define and retrieve records by associated metadata.**

RDN Response: This was meant to be more for records in general (MS Word, Emails, Excel, etc.) and not just structured data (such as a database). RDN would like the system to be able to access certain metadata from an uploaded record such as the creation date, and the author.

- Q45** Appendix C1 - EDRMS Response Matrix Spreadsheet, specifically "The platform must have an API, using common or non-proprietary language (e.g Java, .NET), to allow for integration with other LDB systems". Can the Purchasers please clarify what is meant by "LDB systems"?
- A45** **Joint Response: The term "LDB Systems" is a typo. It should be LOB or Line of Business systems.**
- Q46** Appendix C1 - EDRMS Response Matrix Spreadsheet, specifically "Ability, where appropriate, to automatically classify newly added documents to the repository". What is the Purchasers' criteria for "where appropriate"?
- A46** **Joint Response: At the discretion of the City and the RDN, the EDRMS will have the ability to classify and apply metadata to the documents based on rules and templates.**
- Q47** Appendix C1 - EDRMS Response Matrix Spreadsheet, specifically "Support the creation of case files with standardized sub-folders through the use of templates". Can the purchasers please elaborate on the usage of templates and provide an example or specific use case?
- A47** **Joint Response: Based on different cases, a pre-defined folder structure with associated files/forms for each new file can be generated. A use case example could include FOI Requests. If a new FOI Request file is opened, a template with a pre-defined folder structure (e.g. correspondence, original documents, redacted documents, etc.), as well as pre-defined files and templates (e.g. time tracking sheets, letter templates, etc.) could be automatically generated.**
- Q48** From the requirements matrix / spreadsheet:
1. Row 7 (Certified Microsoft Sharepoint Add-On)
 - a. Is it the City and Region's intentions to implement the EDRMS as a SharePoint-based solution, and therefore any system that is not an add-on to SharePoint will not be considered, or will be a considerable disadvantage in the evaluation process?
 - b. Or are you more saying that IF the solution is SharePoint-based, then you're asking if that Add-on is a "certified" add-on?
 2. Row 8 (Integrate with Sharepoint 2010 and 2016 on-premise and future versions of Sharepoint (either on-premise or off-premise))
 - a. Similar questions to above – are you asking (if the solution is SharePoint based) whether that add-on works with those versions of SharePoint?
 - b. Or whether or not it's SharePoint-based solution, does the system integrate with those versions of SharePoint?
 3. Row 9 (Integration with SharePoint Online and Office 365 (i.e. must allow for virtual hosting and Cloud IaaS hosting environments))
 - a. The points on row 9 aren't necessarily related (I don't think)

- b. The integration with SharePoint Online is a similar point to row 8.
 - c. Integration with Office 365 – could be interpreted a few different ways depending on how Office 365 is deployed.
 - d. And the “i.e.” part – that seems to relate to the solution itself being able to be implemented on virtual hosting and / or IaaS, which isn’t necessarily related to the first two points.
 - e. Just looking for some clarification.
4. Row 45 (Ability to access metadata from structured records (i.e. dates, author))
- a. Please could you provide more details around this point? Perhaps examples etc?

A48 Joint Response: Please see Addendum 1 – Questions 6, 16, 18 and Addendum 2 – Question 44.

City Response: The ability to integrate with Office 365 is for future proofing as we are currently on Office 2016.

Q49 The RFP has information about both the City of Nanaimo (the “City”) and the Regional District of Nanaimo (the “RDN”) and includes information (e.g. user counts) for a current state and a “next phase”:

- a. To confirm, are you requesting separate response submission packages for the City and RDN?
- b. Should responses address the current state, the next phase, or both?
- c. Other than user counts, can you please detail the differences between the requirements for the City and the RDN?

A49 Joint Response:

- a. **See answer to Addendum 2 – Question 27.**
- b. **Response should address Phase 1 and Phase 2, as outlined in Section 5.3 of the RFP. Section 5.2 Current State has been included in order to provide context to the Proponents.**
- c. **Section 5.3 of the RFP outlines the City’s Scope of Work and Requirements and Section 6.2 of the RFP outlines the RDN’s Scope of Work and Requirements.**

Q50 The implementation of software solutions can vary widely depending on project budget. Our firm has successfully delivered projects across various budget ranges. To help us best meet the goals of your solicitation, can you please approximate the anticipated budget range for *each* project (i.e. the City and RDN)? For example, is the *anticipated* budget range for each project:

- a. Less than \$75,000
- b. \$75,000 – \$100,000
- c. \$100,000 – \$150,000
- d. \$150,000 - \$200,000
- e. \$200,000 - \$350,000
- f. \$350,000+

A50 Joint Response: See answer to Addendum 2 – Question 19.

Q51 What qualifications are you looking for in an implementation partner?

A51 Joint Response: Complementary qualifications will be appropriately considered. Section 4.8.1 of Appendix C requires the Proponent to describe capabilities and experience to deliver the proposed EDRMS solution.

Q52 Remote project delivery typically enables firms to reduce project duration and costs. Most of the project *could* be delivered 100% remotely however, sometimes it is useful to be onsite during discovery meetings, training, etc. Considering the potential effect on project duration, resource availability, and cost on a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 represents "100% onsite project delivery" and 5 represents "100% remote project delivery", what are your requirements on this continuum?

A52 Joint Response: All project strategies will be considered. The City and the RDN would prefer some onsite training and project delivery assistance. Proponents are welcome to provide multiple costings between onsite and offsite delivery methods.

Q53 Regarding the Enterprise Content Management RFI that was conducted in January 2019:

- a. Can you please provide a list of vendors that provided responses to the RFI?
- b. Did any of the respondents provide product demos as part of or after the RFI process and if so, which vendors?
- c. The RFI had references to SharePoint such as "Integrate with SharePoint 2010 and 2016 on-premise and future versions of SharePoint (either on-premise or off-premise)" and "Integration with SharePoint Online and Office 365 (i.e. must allow for virtual hosting and Cloud IaaS hosting environments)" and a "Certified Microsoft SharePoint Add-On" however these were omitted from this RFP; does this mean that SharePoint and SharePoint Online are no longer up for consideration for this solution?

A53 Joint Response:

- a. **The RFI process was solely to gather information to prepare the RFP. The City and the RDN do not believe that providing the list of vendors from the RFI has any bearing on the RFP.**
- b. **The RFI process also gave way to demonstrations of technology such as, cloud-based software, on premise software and SharePoint solutions. The City is open to all solutions that meet the requirements as stated in the RFP.**
- c. **See Addendum 1 – Question 16.**

Q54 The RFP indicates that "The City engaged a consultant to conduct a content management review, assist in drafting a records management policy suite and RCRS"; can you please provide a copy of the artifacts developed by the consultant as part of the response to vendor questions?

A54 City Response: See Addendum 2 – Question 20.

Q55 On a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 represents “An on-premises solution housed in your facility, managed and maintained by you” and 5 represents “A cloud-based solution managed by you”, what best represents the desired solution on this continuum?

A55 Joint Response: See Addendum 1 – Question 4.

Q56 How many users should we account for as it relates to product pricing, implementation services scoping, etc. for the City and the RDN respectively?

A56 City Response: A list of User types is included in Section 5.3 of the RFP, and a further breakdown is provided in Addendum 1 – Question 1.

RDN Response: A list of User types is included in Section 6.2 of the RFP, and a further breakdown is provided in Addendum 1 – Question 2.

Q57 Given what you know about SharePoint/O365, including any as-needed 3rd-party add-ons, on a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 represents “Will not meet our requirements” and 5 represents “We believe SharePoint or O365 is the best platform for our needs”, what represents your view on the continuum?

A57 City Response: The City has not scheduled a migration to Office365 so we are not looking for that integration in the short term. In terms of SharePoint and/or add-ins for EDRMS see Addendum 1 – Question 18.

RDN Response: See Addendum 1 – Question 4, Question 18 and Addendum 2- Question 48.

Q58 Regarding the requirement stated in the RFP as “the supply of an off the shelf and in use product (not a custom as built solution for this project)”

- a. Given what you know about SharePoint, does SharePoint/O365 plus a Records Management Add-on such as [Gimmel](#) or [RecordPoint](#) satisfy this requirement?
- b. On a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 represents an all-in COTS solution with minimal configuration and 5 represents a platform-based solution such as SharePoint/O365 requiring professional services, customization and third-party products, what is acceptable with respect to the solution you are looking for on this continuum?

A58 Joint Response: The City and the RDN are looking for a system that meets a high percentage of business needs out of the box and additional functionality can be configured with training by internal staff. The City or the RDN is not looking for a unique customized solution. All project strategies will be considered.

Q59 Regarding your Records Management requirements:

- a. Can you please provide a copy of the City's Records Classification Retention Schedule ("RCRS") as part of the response to questions?
- b. How are Physical Records currently managed?
- c. Can you please provide details about the configuration of Physical Records (e.g. # of locations, cabinets, containers, folders, documents, etc.)?

A59 City Response: See Addendum 2 - Questions 20 and 40.

RDN Response: See Addendum 2- Questions 31, 32 and 40.

Q60 The EDRMS Response Matrix Spreadsheet includes a requirement stated as "Capability to support document archival from SharePoint 2010 or later"; regarding your experience with SharePoint and/or O365:

- a. Are you still on SharePoint 2010 and if so, do you have plans to move to a newer version?
 - i. If yes, what version (e.g. SP2019 or O365) and when?
- b. What versions are you currently licensed for (e.g. SharePoint 2019, SharePoint Online G3, etc.)?
- c. Do you have the requisite licensing for the number of anticipated users of the solution being contemplated in this solicitation?
- d. What is the current breadth of usage in terms of number of:
 - i. Departments
 - ii. Users
 - iii. Site Collections
- e. For what workloads are you currently using SharePoint/O365 (e.g. collaboration, document management)? **The breadth of use of SP extends to all features of the platform and all users of the organization.**
- f. What, if any, problems or dissatisfaction have you experienced with SharePoint/O365? N/A
- g. Do you already own any SharePoint-related products (e.g. ShareGate, etc.) and if so, which ones? N/A
- h. On a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 represents "None" and 5 represents "Expert", can you please indicate what SharePoint/O365 skills you currently have in house in terms of: N/A
 - i. Infrastructure, Administration and Maintenance
 - ii. Information Architecture Design and Implementation
 - iii. Content Owner/Authorship
 - iv. PowerShell and C# Development

A60 City Response: The City of Nanaimo has now fully transitioned to SharePoint 2019 on premise. We do not have any scheduled plans to move to O365. SharePoint 2019 is currently used as an Intranet and collaboration sites for various departments and

projects. The number of potential users is approximately 800, but only a subset use SharePoint on a regular basis. There are approximately 30 site collections with differing levels of active use. We do use SharePoint related products. The IT skillset for basic SharePoint 2019 support is good, with limited experience with SharePoint development.

RDN Response: The RDN is currently using SharePoint 2016 with an aim to upgrade to SharePoint 2019 by May 2020. We do not have any scheduled plans to move to O365. SharePoint 2016 is currently used as an intranet and collaboration site for different departments and projects. The number of potential users is approximately 500, and all SharePoint collections are used on a regular basis. There are approximately 27 site collections with differing levels of active use. We do use SharePoint related products. The IT skillset for basic SharePoint 2019 support is good, with limited experience with SharePoint development.

Q61 Regarding the requirement stated as “ability to replace the majority of group and personal network drives with the EDRMS”, if the migration of documents from network drives to the new solution is within the scope of the project:

- a. How many documents need to be migrated?
- b. How many folders exist on in the network drives that need to be migrated?
- c. What is the total size in GB/TB of the content to be migrated?

Note: this information can be determined by right-clicking on the parent folder and selecting "Properties".

A61 City Response: See Addendum 1 – Question 1.

RDN Response: See Addendum 1 Question 2; Addendum 2 Question 32.

Q62 Regarding the requirement stated as " Meet ISO 15489:2016-Information and Documentation - Records Management, CGSB 72.34 2017 Electronic Records as Documentary Evidence and CGSB 72-11-93 Microfilm and Electronic Images as Documentary Evidence Standards"; if the solution proposed has the following certifications/accreditations: MoReq, ISO 15489, ISO 16175, Sarbanes-Oxley, VERS, ANSI, IS40, HIPAA, NARA, FIPS, 21 CFR 11, etc.

- a. Does this satisfy your requirements for the solution?

A62 Joint Response: Proposals should outline how their products will meet our legislated requirements and desired standards (as listed in the response matrix).

Q63 Regarding the requirement stated as “Allow for metadata to be extracted (OCR) from scanned paper documents”; if Document Capture/Scanning software is part of this procurement, please answer the following:

- a. If you desire to leverage an existing document capture software:

- i. What capture software do you currently use?
 - ii. Is this software able to release scanned documents and metadata to SharePoint/O365?
- b. What is the current scanning volume in terms of Documents per year?
- c. Are you currently using server-based scanning products to achieve the required throughput?

A63 City Response:

- a. **The City uses Abbyy, which scans to folder location**
- b. **Current scanning volume is unknown**
- c. **Yes**

RDN Response:

- a. **The RDN uses Aquaforest Autobahn and it can release files to SharePoint.**
- b. **Current scanning volumes are unknown**
- c. **Yes**

Q64 Regarding the requirement stated as “Must have a workflow capability”:

- a. Is the required workflows capability centered on records management (e.g. disposition policies) or does it include process workflows to automate line of business functions?
- b. Can we assume that the workflows are very simple in nature (e.g. document approval, record disposition)?

A64 Joint Response: See Addendum 1 – Question 12.

Q65 Workflow integration with other systems. Can you please give some other examples of types of other systems you workflow to integrate with?

A65 Joint Response: Workflow capabilities are desired for future proofing integrations with other systems. Possible systems would include agenda management, property taxation and financial management.

Q66 Integration with ARCGIS. What do you envision for this integration? What information are you trying to capture? For which department?

A66 City Response: The data in GIS is considered the most authoritative location for spatial information and the City’s desire is to allow records maintenance between the EDRMS and GIS.

RDN Response: The RDN uses ArcGIS software (ArcMap and ArcPro) to export the following file types - .pdf, .jpg, .tiff, .dbf. GIS team also create excel files from the extracted .dbf file.

GIS team receive request to capture data from ArcGIS tool for following departments- CAO, Legislative Services, Employee Health Safety and Wellness, Accounting Services,

Information Technologies Innovation & Development, Intergovernmental Relations, Strategic Initiatives, Current Planning, Long Range Planning & Energy and Sustainability, Building and Bylaw Services, Recreation Services, Parks Services, Wastewater Services, Water Services, Engineering Services, Solid Waste, Transit Operations, Emergency Services.

Q67 Which solutions did you review during your RFI process?

A67 City Response: See Addendum 2 – Question 53.

Q68 Workflow processes triggered directly from applications. Can you give an example of a WF you might want to trigger from another application.

A68 Joint Response: See Addendum 1 – Question 12 and Addendum 2 – Question 65.

Q69 Do you have a time line (dates) for Phase 1 to be complete and Phase 2 to be completed.

A69 City Response: Phase 1 is scheduled to be complete December 2020 and Phase 2 is scheduled to complete end of 2022.

RDN Response: Please refer to Section 6.0 Page 28 of the posted RFP. Detailed breakdown will be decided in implementation/planning stage.

Q70 Have you allotted budget of >\$100,000

A70 Joint Response: See Addendum 2 – Question 19.

Q71 It states that a proponent cannot make any changes to any of the forms. Did you want us to complete them in their original PDF format, or do you have a Word format you can send so we can fill them out in Word and attach them to our response.

A71 Joint Response: Pricing forms in excel format are included in this Addendum.

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.

/attachments, published under separate cover
Addendum 2 Attachment 1_2466 - EDRMS Pricing Forms Rev0
Addendum 2 Attachment 2_City of Nanaimo RCRS 2019-12-04 – draft
Addendum 2 Attachment 3_RDN RCRS Draft

End of Addendum 2