



DATE: April 16, 2019

TO: Prospective Respondents

FROM: Terri Lessard, Purchasing Agent

RE: Addendum #1, RFP # TL040519, IBM FileNet Upgrade Consulting Services

All Respondents are hereby advised of the following amendments to the Request for Proposal document(s) which are made an integral part of the bid documents. Respondents are required to acknowledge receipt of this addendum in their proposal response, as well as include a signed copy of this addendum with their RFP response.

THE INQUIRY PERIOD FOR THIS RFP IS NOW CLOSED

Item # 1: Responses to Inquiries

Below are responses to inquiries submitted by potential Respondents

- Q1. Has there been a budget established for this project, and if so what is said budget?
- A1. A budgetary estimate is not available. The University encourages respondents to submit proposals containing the most advantageous pricing possible.
- Q2. What is the anticipated timeline for completion of deliverables in the Statement of Work, Schedule 5, Page 2? Item III, A. Line items 1-8?
- A2. While there is no deadline for the completion of this project, it is the University's expectation that it will be completed in a reasonable time. Respondents' work breakdown should include a timeline based on tasks performed.
- Q3. If a bidder has previously submitted schedules 3 & 4 must they be filled out again or may the required forms submitted with RFP # TL121218 be re submitted with this bid, RFP # TL040519?
- A3. If a respondent has previously submitted affidavits that were signed with one year of April 24, 2019, those affidavits can be submitted with the response.
- Q4. Knowledge Transfer – In the Statement of Work Section III A, Deliverable number 8 states that the vendor has responsibility for “Knowledge Transfer of the upgrade, installation, and configuration including steps and explanations”. However, in Section IV, UConn Responsibilities the SOW states that the University will “Create documentation based on vendor knowledge transfer information”. In what form do you expect the vendor to provide Knowledge Transfer to the University? Will the University be shadowing the vendor throughout the project? Is a formal knowledge transfer session with UConn staff anticipated? The

University Business Services

Procurement Services

3 DISCOVERY DRIVE, UNIT 6076

STORRS, CT 06269-6076

PHONE 860.486.2619

FAX 860.486.5051

www.procurement.uconn.edu

Deliverable description seems to imply that the vendor will also have responsibility for some level of documentation. Is that correct?

A4. The University does not expect the vendor to create documentation.

UConn envisions the knowledge transfer sessions to include some shadowing (webEx sessions, conference calls, etc.), conversations that articulate procedures performed and issues resolved, and possible Skype sessions through which UConn staff and the vendor can see and discuss the processes, procedures, etc. performed.

After completion of the project, a formal review will be conducted which will include a summary of tasks performed, and confirmation that any documentation created by UConn staff is complete and correct. The format and extent of this final knowledge transfer review will be determined by UConn and the vendor.

UConn staff will create formal documentation and will ask the vendor to review it for accuracy and to make sure all steps and procedures are correct.

If the vendor has documentation for procedures and other pertinent information, it is the University's expectation that it will be shared with UConn.

Q5. In several places in the SOW the University speaks to their expectations for vendor activities and deliverables. We would like some clarification on how these points will be evaluated in proposal responses and measured during project delivery. Specifically, can you detail what UConn means by "function as expected" with enough detail that it is understood by someone that has never used the system before?

A5. Folder names and structure should be the same after the upgrades and migrations
Document entry templates should work the same after the upgrades and migrations
Document search templates should work the same after the upgrades and migrations
Security settings should be the same (for all objects) after the upgrades and migrations:

- Object Store
- Document Classes
- Folders
- Entry templates
- Search templates
- Teamspaces

Default security should be the same (for all classes such as parent Document class, Stored Search class, etc.

The expectation is that the upgrades and migrations should not break the core functionality of the system. If it does break the system, it is expected that the vendor will fix anything broken.

Is there a particular matrix, checklist or list that specifies what constitutes functioning as expected? If so, can please provide a copy of this matrix, list or checklist?

There is not a current test checklist. This is something that UConn staff will create for the various levels of testing to be performed by UConn

University Business Services

Procurement Services

3 DISCOVERY DRIVE, UNIT 6076
STORRS, CT 06269-6076
PHONE 860.486.2619
FAX 860.486.5051
www.procurement.uconn.edu

RFP examples include:

A. In Section IV, Assumptions you state, “It is the expectation of this engagement that all systems function as expected, and that configurations, security, and functionality remain intact.” Are you asking that the to-be, upgraded system performs as it previously did prior to upgrading?

Yes. The expectation is that, after the upgrade the core functionality of FileNet, ICN, Datacap, etc. will work.

For example, documents will be added to the FileNet repository with the existing custom document entry templates, searches will work using the existing custom search templates, and all other FileNet functionality will work as it did prior to the upgrade. Another example is, Datacap scanning, verification, and export to FileNet will work as it did prior to the upgrade.

UConn expects the existing security model be maintained after upgrade and migration to Linux. For example, John Doe will be able to add documents to the specific folder and document class for his business area.

The University expects that configurations such as SSO in WebSphere be implemented in the upgraded version of WebSphere. Also, the FileNet WebSphere configuration should follow IBM support guidelines. For example, ICN installed in its own WebSphere instance is a supported configuration vs. co-location of ICN with other applications.

B. Similarly, in Section IV, Vendor Responsibilities, these statements are made:

- i. Verify all systems function as expected - [see above](#)
- ii. Verify data model, security, and configurations are intact and function as expected – [see above](#)
- iii. Verify document entry templates and search templates function as expected [see above](#)
- iv. Verify the Datacap applications’ compatibility with the upgraded version and function as expected (owing to deprecated actions)

The University expects core functionality of each application to work (with the exception of issues pertaining to deprecated actions) after the Datacap upgrade. For example, scanning documents, verification, and export to FileNet will work after the Datacap upgrade.

UConn realizes there are deprecated actions currently used in some of the Datacap applications. UConn staff will be responsible for replacing deprecated actions with supported actions. UConn staff are unsure if there are any requirements to upgrade Datacap applications (after the Datacap software upgrade) from 9.0 to the 9.1 platform. The University will rely on the experience and expertise of the vendor to advise, communicate, and perform any required steps to make sure the applications will work following the upgrade.

With many system upgrades there are certain actions that may be deprecated and application functions which may perform differently post upgrade. Some of these changes may not be noticeable until the upgrade is being performed. We understand that this is a fixed price, milestone-based project.

However, would the University be open to change orders upon discovery that additional effort may be required on behalf of the vendor to make these changes?

It is understandable that issues may arise that would warrant additional work from the vendor. A Change Order would be written and pricing negotiated for the completion of any additional work.

Q6. In Section IV of the SOW under UConn Responsibilities, letter L states, “Discuss (with the vendor) implementation of the Navigator Integration with Microsoft Office plug-in” and letter K states, “Identify and discuss required custom application changes due to deprecated APIs and functions”, and in Appendix J – Datacap Applications, you state, “It should be noted that detailed discussions will occur as needed during the engagement.” Can you elaborate on what these discussions imply? Is the expectation that after the various upgrades and migration that the UConn systems operate as they had prior to the upgrades?

Or, might discussions trigger the need for the University or the vendor to perform additional configurations and/or customizations? If it is the latter case – for which details would remain largely unknown until actually upgrading the system - would the University be open to change orders for additional effort if it is required on behalf of the vendor?

A6. The University understands there are some significant changes in the new versions of software. UConn staff have completed some research but there are knowledge gaps. UConn will rely on the expertise and experience of the vendor to provide information on needed application modifications for new APIs, actions, etc. to make sure University applications work. Additionally, the vendor will be engaged in a discussion about the implementation of the Navigator Integration plug-in. UConn staff will rely on vendor expertise and experience to determine the feasibility of an implementation of this feature. If these discussions trigger opportunities for additional work, and it is sanctioned by University leadership, a Change Order would be written and pricing negotiated for completion of the additional effort.

Q7. In section IV (Assumptions), the vendor responsibility with respect to Datacap is defined as “Verify the Datacap applications” compatibility with the upgraded version and function as expected (owing to deprecated actions).” Given that not all of the Datacap actions used by UConn are known at the time of estimation, will an analysis of the functionality be done after the upgrade in Development, and then an estimate of effort change order request be allowed?

A7. Yes. If discussions reveal the need for additional work from the vendor and University leadership approves the effort, a Change Order will be written and pricing negotiated for the completion of the work.

Q8. Will the vendor be responsible for making Datacap application changes required to convert the Datacap clients from TMweb to Datacap Navigator?

A8. Conversion of the Datacap Applications from TMWeb to Datacap Navigator is out of the scope of this RFP.

However, UConn is currently learning Datacap Navigator and is unsure of the effort required to

perform this conversion. UConn staff will discuss with the vendor to determine the scope of effort and based on that, will determine if a Change Order will be created, pricing negotiated, and the work performed by the vendor.

Q9. Will the University be responsible for making any changes required for custom applications (with vendor advice and input)?

A9. Yes.

Q10. Can you tell us what percentage of searches in FileNet were created under Workplace XT and what percentage of search were created under the current version of Content Navigator? Are there any custom applications that have embedded searches or that call searches?

A10. The University has been converting the WorkplaceXT searches to ICN searches. Most are converted at this point.

There are no custom applications that have search templates embedded in them however there is a .Net application that will retrieve documents based on metadata (property definitions).

Q11. In Appendix I you state that there are approximately 150 search templates in each environment. Are these the same search templates across all environments? Do all search templates work in the current IBM Content Navigator interface? If not, how many (or what percentage) would need to be converted?

A11. Search templates are converted. UConn has not removed the WorkplaceXT templates yet. However, there is no expectation that the vendor will convert these.

It is expected that the ICN search templates will be migrated to the new Linux environment.

Q12. In Appendix I you list 96 entry templates in each environment. Are these the same entry templates across all environments? Have all entry templates been converted to and are running under the current version IBM Content Navigator? If not, how many (or what percentage) would need to be converted?

A12. There is no expectation that the vendor will convert the University document entry templates.

Q13. Are any of the responses to the questions from the previous RFP (TL121218) applicable to this RFP? Can you please document and confirm which answers are still applicable to the current RFP in the attached Addendum 2 to RFP TL121218 and if the answers are no longer applicable or have changed, please adjust or change your answers?

A13. While the scope of the RFP # TL121218 is similar to the scope of this RFP, please note these are separate solicitations and therefore any content contained in any documents other than the documents specific to this RFP are not applicable nor should they be formally considered. Only the requirements, specifications, terms, and conditions of this RFP shall be the basis for proposal development and submission

Q14. As a number of the answers to these vendor questions will impact vendor estimations and project proposal responses will the University permit follow-on questions subsequent to this round of Q&A?

A14. It is the University's hope that inquiries posed here are answered sufficiently. If it is absolutely necessary, subsequent technical questions may be posed by the 4:00 p.m. on Wednesday April 17, 2019. An addendum will be posted by 4:00 p.m. on Thursday April 18, 2019 or a revised schedule will be published.

BIDDER NOTE: This addendum must be completed, signed and submitted with your proposal response to be considered for award. If you have already submitted a proposal, please complete the addendum and submit same in a sealed envelope, clearly marked with the RFP number, response date, and return address. This will be accepted as part of your proposal response, PROVIDING IT IS RECEIVED BY UCONN PROCUREMENT BEFORE THE TIME AND DATE SPECIFIED IN THE ORIGINAL RFP DOCUMENT, OR AS AMENDED BY THIS DOCUMENT.

Name: _____

Title: _____

Company: _____

Date: _____