

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII	AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION	PAGE 1 of 34
1. AMENDMENT NO. 1	3. REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) NO. <u>17-0109</u> Dated <u>SEPTEMBER, 2016</u> Provide a Document Imaging and Management System for the University of Hawaii System, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii	
2. EFFECTIVE DATE October 12, 2016		
4. ISSUED BY Director, Office of Procurement and Real Property Management 1400 Lower Campus Road, Room 15 Honolulu Hawaii 96822 BUYER <u>K. Hisashima</u>	5. CONTRACTOR (NAME AND ADDRESS)	
6. The RFP referenced above is amended as set forth in block 7. The hour and date for receipt of offers <input type="checkbox"/> is extended <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> is not extended. Offerors must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation by one of the following methods: (a) by signing and returning a copy of this amendment; (b) by acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) by separate letter or facsimile which references: the solicitation and amendment numbers. Failure of your acknowledgment to be received by the Director, Office of Procurement and Real Property Management, prior to the hour and date specified may result in a rejection of your offer. If, by virtue of this amendment, you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by submittal of replacement page(s) in a sealed envelope, provided such envelope makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the specified hour and date when proposals are due.		

7. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT

The questions and University responses pertaining to this RFP are attached hereto and shall be incorporated into the RFP.

EXCEPT AS PROVIDED HEREIN, ALL TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE DOCUMENT REFERENCED IN BLOCK 3 UNLESS HERETOFORE AMENDED, REMAIN UNCHANGED.

8. THE OFFEROR IS REQUIRED TO SIGN THIS DOCUMENT AND RETURN TO DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF PROCUREMENT AND REAL PROPERTY MANAGEMENT.

9. NAME OF OFFEROR	11. UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII
BY _____ / _____ (authorized signature) DATE	BY  /10/12/16 DATE
10. NAME & TITLE OF SIGNER (TYPE OR PRINT)	12. NAME & TITLE OF SIGNER (TYPE OR PRINT) Duff Zwald, Director, Office of Procurement and Real Property Management

RFP No. 17-0109
Questions and University Responses

1. Is the University looking to obtain services to continue to expand the Perceptive System or is the University looking to migrate to a new ECM system?

University Response:

The University is looking to implement an ECM system that will either expand the Perceptive System or migrate the Perceptive Noliq installations to the awarded offeror's solution.

2. Could you please help me with the following questions:

- a. Whether companies from Outside USA can apply for this? (like, from India or Canada)

University Response:

Yes, however, Offerors must comply with ALL provisions of this RFP such as, but not limited to, Section 2.5 - Minimum Qualifications of Offeror, Section 3 - Proposal Requirements, Section 3.4 - Minimum Qualification Matrix (Appendix C), Section 5 - Special Provisions.

- b. Whether we need to come over there for meetings?

University Response:

The three top offerors will have the option to present their solution via web, Refer to Section 4.2, 4.2.2. The offeror can present on-site; however, the offeror shall be responsible for all travel, lodging and transportation costs and will be restricted to the time requirements as outlined in Section 4.2.2.

Any meetings and costs deemed necessary by the offeror that is associated with this RFP shall be noted in Appendix J, Cost Proposal. Also Refer to Section 2.4.4 regarding on-site training.

- c. Can we perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside USA? (like, from India or Canada)

University Response:

Offerors shall be evaluated based on Section 3.7, Customer Support and Section 4, Criteria to Evaluate Proposals. Support for any tasks performed outside the USA will be the responsibility of the offeror, shall meet the requirements set forth in the RFP and will be evaluated accordingly.

- d. Can we submit the proposals via email?????

University Response:

Proposals may not be submitted via email. Refer to Section 1.6, SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS.

3. Will you entertain a cloud-based document imaging and management system?

University Response:

Although the University specifies in Section 2.3.4 - Security, "All documents, scans and related metadata will remain on local systems." The University will consider a cloud based system providing the following conditions are met:

1. All requirements of the RFP have been satisfied,
2. The offeror can demonstrate sufficient controls and security,
 - a. Access, process, procedures, protocols and guarantees,
3. The Offeror shall fully describe its liability under any data loss or breach or suspected breach, to include, but not be limited to, proposed indemnification of the University against losses or damages resulting from any data loss or breach, or suspected breach,
4. The Offeror shall describe procedures regarding backup and recovery,
5. The Offer shall describe its disposition procedures of backed up data for both regular and archived data including security measures,
 - i. The University shall at all times retain ownership of any and all data and metadata,
6. The Offeror shall describe its procedures for addressing outages and slowdowns and estimated resolution times.

4. Ref. Section 2.3.3, Page 15, **Requirement bullet 4 states** that "documents must be Scanned utilizing OCR technology, capable of full text search for word(s) or phrase(s), and the ability to edit, highlight and redact text".

Is university planning to OCR and capture full-text for all the documents or some of the document types that will be stored in the document management system?

University Response:

The document management system shall be able to OCR and capture text for any document if a department chooses to utilize the feature.

5. Ref. Section 2.3.11, Page 18, **Migration/Conversion of existing document imaging systems**

If any of the currently used document management systems store documents and meta-data in proprietary format, does University have any support in place with appropriate product offeror to provide a tool to extract documents and data from their product?

University Response:

With regard to 2.4.3 Options 2 & 3 NoliWeb migration for UH Manoa and UH West Oahu - No, the bidder is responsible for establishing/proving their ability to perform this service.

6. Reference Section 2.4.2, Page 19, **System Environment**
Can you provide metrics and/or estimated daily transaction for the following:

- Number of paper documents to be scanned
- Number of users who would only search, retrieve and view documents
- Number of users who would be processing documents through workflow (Workflow users)

University Response:

There are no estimates at this time. Refer to Section 2.2, Introduction/Background of the RFP. The campus locations, faculty and staff count should be used as the basis for your solution.

7. Could provide a copy of the referenced document on Section 5.1 Scope: "The Providing of Document Imaging and Management System, University of Hawai'i, Honolulu, Hawai'i shall be in accordance with the terms and conditions of RFP No. 17-0109 and the General Provisions dated September 2013, included by reference. Copies of the General Provisions are available at the Office of Procurement and Real Property Management, University of Hawai'i, 1400 Lower Campus Road, Room 15, Honolulu, Hawai'i 96822 or the General Provisions may be viewed at: <http://www.fmo.hawaii.edu/procure/doc/GP0913.pdf>"

The link is giving us a "Not Found" error.

University Response:

The General Provisions can be found at <http://www.hawaii.edu/oprpm/>, Click on "General Provisions for Goods and Services", or you may directly link to the General Provisions at: <http://www.hawaii.edu/oprpm/docs/GP0913.pdf>

Paragraph 5.1, Scope, shall be replaced with the following:

5.1 SCOPE

The Providing of Document Imaging and Management System, University of Hawai'i, Honolulu, Hawai'i shall be in accordance with the terms and conditions of RFP No. 17-0109 and the General Provisions dated September 2013, included by reference. Copies of the General Provisions are available at the Office of Procurement and Real Property Management, University of Hawai'i, 1400 Lower Campus Road, Room 15, Honolulu, Hawai'i 96822 or the General Provisions may be viewed at: <http://www.hawaii.edu/oprpm/docs/GP0913.pdf>.

8. Can the University please provide the RFP Document or the Appendices in Word format?

University Response:

The RFP is not available in word format.

9. What are the number of users who will be using the solution at any given time?

University Response:

Refer to Section 2.2, Introduction/Background of the RFP. The campus locations, faculty and staff count should be used as the basis for your solution.

10. What licensing type are you interested in? Concurrent or named user?

University Response:

The University is interested in Enterprise Licensing where there is no limit to user seats.

11. What's the LDAP standard (AD Sync, SSO, In-Line)?

University Response:

The UH authentication integration standard is SSO using CASv5 with the CAS2 Protocol or Shibboleth Idp v3.2.1.

12. What is the number of pages scanned per year approximately?

University Response:

Unknown at this time. Refer to Section 2.2, Introduction/Background of the RFP. The campus locations, faculty and staff count should be used as the basis for your solution.

13. Will the University require Scan Stations as part of this project, if so please quantify?

University Response:

It will be up to the respective campuses or departments whether scan stations will be required. The solution shall be able to support, at a minimum, scanners as described in Section 2.3.1. Each campus or department will be responsible to supply scanning hardware.

14. Can barcodes be used on the forms to uniquely identify a document type?

University Response:

Barcodes can be used; however, using this feature will be considered as part of the evaluation for ease of use and compatibility, Section 2.3.3.

15. Number of workflows that are required to be designed in the new solution?

University Response:

The number of workflows that will be required is unknown at this time. Option 1, Section 2.4.3 will give the University a base budgetary cost for one simple workflow. Pricing for any designed workflow will entail requirements, analysis and other costs. Each workflow will be priced on a case by case basis. Pricing for Options 2 & 3 are required as part of this RFP.

16. Any representation of current workflows? Will you be able to provide flowcharts of current workflows that are expected to be replicated into the new solution?

University Response:

See Attachments. UHWO and UH Manoa. (For Options 2 & 3)

17. Are there any requirements for audit trail of workflow activities?

University Response:

Yes, Refer Section 2.3.4, bullet 9

18. How many users outside the organization will need to participate in the workflow?

University Response:

It is not known at this time if this is a requirement. It will be dependent on the requirements set forth by a campus or department and University security policies.

19. Are there any retention policies or file plans for the documents? If so, please provide details.

University Response:

Yes, refer to Section 2.3.6.

20. Volumes of documents from current systems that need to be migrated?

University Response:

It is unknown at this time. Refer to Section 2.3.11.

21. Name the systems that support web service integration currently?

University Response:

NolijWeb utilizes a web front-end

22. Do you currently have an e-signature solution in place at the University? If yes, please provide details? If no how many licensing are you looking to purchase as part of this implementation?

University Response:

There is no e-signature solution currently in place at the University. Approvals shall be incorporated within workflow design; however, the proposed system shall allow electronic signatures as part of the workflow. Refer to Section 2.3.3, last bullet.

23. Can you provide some Banner Student Information System Form samples that will need to be utilized into the new solution?

University Response:

Not at this time. Refer to Section 2.3.5.

24. What reports types are needed on a weekly, monthly, quarterly and/or yearly frequency?

University Response:

Frequency is unknown at this time. Refer to Section 2.3.3.

25. How many document types are there for each department?

University Response:

It is unknown at this time.

26. Any architecture diagram that represents the current system?

University Response:

There is no current ECM system at this time.

27. You require migration/conversion of data, and you list a number of products, can you please tell us which ones you have implemented and require migration/conversion to/from? (please provide product full name and version)

- a. Docushare
- b. Noilij
- c. Documentum
- d. DocuXplorer
- e. Sharepoint

University Response:

These products have been implemented independently by various departments throughout the University. The full name and versions are not available at this time and if conversion is required, the offeror and product should have the ability to allow for conversion of existing documents. Refer to Section 2.3.2.

28. What are the number of users that will require training on the new system?

- a. Admin (base implementation)
- b. End-user (Base implementation)
- c. Advanced Admin (Option 1)
- d. End-user (Option 1, 2, and 3)

University Response:

Admin (Base Implementation) - for ECM System Administration - Up to 4
End User (Base Implementation) - Train the trainer - Up to 8
Advanced Administration - (Option 1) - Up to 4
End User (Option 1, 2, 3) - Train the trainer - Up to 4 each

29. Is there a budget allocated to this project, if so how much:

- a. <\$100K
- b. up to \$200K
- c. Up to \$300K
- d. Up to \$400K
- e. >\$400K

University Response:

No.

30. Does the University require conversion of paper to digital? If so please provide details:

- a. Size of paper?
- b. Quantity to be digitizes?
- c. Number of index fields that need to be captured?
- d. Will they need to be converted on-site or can they be converted off-site?

University Response:

Regarding size of paper, refer to Section 2.3.1. The number of index fields need to be determined; however, the proposed application must be able to accomplish this - Section 2.3.2. The quantity of documents to be digitized will be determined by the campus or department and they will be responsible to convert the documents at their chosen location.

31. Do you currently use a capturing software? If so please provide details, product name, number of licenses, etc...?

University Response:

UH does not currently sanction a systemwide capturing software. The capturing software must support hardware as described in section 2.3.1. NolijWeb, used by UH Manoa and UH West Oahu, includes a custom feeder that parses PDF's and automatically imports and indexes them into Nolij - Refer to 2.4.3 Options 2 & 3.

32. **Section 2.2**, School/Department/Division offices; Is this a single department and group of users, or three separate departments?

University Response:

These could be separate departments; however, there may be several departments within a School.

33. **Section 2.2**, What is the current degree of interaction and reliance between the following systems? BANNER, DIMS, Enrollment Management, and RDBMS's.

University Response:

**Banner - Oracle 11g
DIMS - TBD
Enrollment Management - Oracle, SQL Server**

34. **Section 2.2**, Is there a single RDBMS supporting this infrastructure, or multiple, separate RDBMSs.

University Response:

Multiple - Oracle, MySQL, SQL Server

35. **Section 2.2**, What are the current RDBMSs being used for these documented systems.

University Response:

Oracle, MySQL, SQL Server

36. **Section 2.2**, Are there any other RDBMSs currently in use by the University?

University Response:

There may be; however, for the purposes of this RFP, the RDBMSs used and identified are for System Applications

37. **Section 2.2**, Are all the students and faculty on only the 10 campuses, or also the 7 education centers?

University Response:

There are all on the 10 campuses including the 7 education centers.

38. **Section 2.2**, Does the provided Imaging system need to support all 17 sites or only the 10 campuses?

University Response:

The system needs to support all 17 sites.

39. **Section 2.3.1**, Scan speed of up to 100 PPM. Is this per station? What is the expected document capture throughput per minute across the all campuses? Is this a requirement for consideration?

University Response:

The scan speed of up to 100 PPM is per station. At this time, the volume throughput across all campuses is not known. The proposed system should be able to support all locations scanning at various times and speeds. If there are limitations to the proposed system, that should be disclosed in the response.

40. **Section 2.3.1**, Is there an expected response time at the maximum throughput rate between the time documents are processed for scanning until a document is ready for secure viewing by a user?

University Response:

Refer to Section 2.4.2. Response times should be consistent with industry standards and mutually agreed upon with the University.

41. **Section 2.3.1**, Are there any benchmark numbers to follow?

University Response:

Not at this time.

42. **Section 2.3.2 Index and Import**, What are the external sources of documents that need capture and import? ex: Hardcopy, electronic forms, web-forms, etc. Allow for conversion of existing documents stored in other imaging DBs, ex: DocuXplorer.

University Response:

All of the above. Hardcopy, electronic forms, web forms, etc.

43. **Section 2.3.2 Index and Import**, Is this to be considered a concurrent project, or a separate phased project considered as a 'Back File Conversion' process? Should it be considered as part of the initial scope and PS quote? If yes, we need to know the scope of migration (DBs, # of documents, document types, etc.).

University Response:

The proposed system shall be able to accept images stored in various databases and be able to accomplish a migration path from these databases to the the proposed system.

44. **Section 2.3.3 Ease of use and compatibility**, Bullet #6: Provide Real Time interface and allow changes to be seen immediately; Is the expectation that captured documents metadata will be used to update the University's DBs?

University Response:

The document management system may be required to update the University's DB's to indicate that a specific document was indexed/received. The document management system shall also provide the use of custom forms to display as well as update fields in the host DB's via bi-directional communication.

45. **Section 2.3.3 Ease of use and compatibility**, Bullet #6: Provide Real Time interface and allow changes to be seen immediately, Example of Real Time Interface. Is this limited to database lookups? Bullet #7: API library for integration into the U of H systems.

University Response:

Example of Real Time Interface: a custom form to query and display Admissions data elements from Banner. The form shall also be able to send coding updates back to Banner. The proposed system should have an API library to integrate into the University's various systems or the offeror must demonstrate and have the resources to be able to develop any required APIs.

46. **Section 2.3.3 Ease of use and compatibility**, Bullet #6: Provide Real Time interface and allow changes to be seen immediately, Define level of integration.

University Response:

See responses to #44 and #45

47. **Section 2.3.3 Ease of use and compatibility**, Bullet #6: Provide Real Time interface and allow changes to be seen immediately, Use of Open DBs for Reports: What types of reports are expected to be generated? Section 2.3.4

University Response:

Some of the reports are, but not limited to: Response times, volume (i.e. number of documents), volume by office, size of scan, file types and view types. The offeror should be able to describe the benefits of these metrics.

48. **Section 2.3.3 Ease of use and compatibility**, Bullet #6: Provide Real Time interface and allow changes to be seen immediately, Do CAS and Shib pass authentication through a single source such as LDAP to emulate Single Sign On?

University Response:

Yes, LDAP using a 389DS open source server.

49. **Section 2.3.3 Ease of use and compatibility**, Bullet #6: Provide Real Time interface and allow changes to be seen immediately, Are electronic signatures required?

University Response:

Not at this time, however, if the proposed system has this capability or to interface with an e-signature application, it should be noted in the proposal response. Refer to Section 2.3.3 last bullet.

50. **Section 2.3.3 Ease of use and compatibility**, Bullet #6: Provide Real Time interface and allow changes to be seen immediately, With regards to automatic logoff capability, is there a standard duration of inactivity or policy that we will need to meet?

University Response:

The proposed system should be able to configure the logoff timeframe.

51. **Section 2.3.5**, The system shall be able to integrate content into existing Banner forms or to integrate additional workflow into Banner forms, Please provide definition/clarification of Banner Forms requested.

University Response:

If Banner utilizes DIMS, the forms generated within and external to Banner need to be incorporated into the workflow engine of the proposed system. There may be occasion for content to be integrated into a Banner form as part of the workflow process.

52. **Section 2.3.6**, Retention: What is meant by "Retention by Group"?

University Response:

Group could be a school, department or office.

53. **Section 2.3.6**, What is meant by "Retention with Hold capacity"?

University Response:

There may be instances where retention parameters for certain records need to be overridden. For example, a retention period may have passed; however, due to circumstances such as legal litigation, certain records need to be isolated and retained beyond their retention date. The proposed system shall have this capability.

54. **Section 2.3.11**, The University currently has 5 repositories being utilized. Are all 5 currently on M&S?

University Response:

These systems were purchased by various departments throughout the University system. Assuming M&S means maintenance and support, it is unknown at this time.

55. **Section 2.3.11**, If additional modules or services from the other 5 repositories are required from existing offeror(s) for exporting of images, would the University be responsible for those charges?

University Response:

Yes. The price will be determined by the Scope. Refer to Section 2.4.5.

56. **Section 2.3.11**, Can the University estimate the approximate number of images in the 5 repositories?

University Response:

Not at this time.

57. **2.4.3 Implementation Services**, Why are they listed as three different options? Must the provider address all three?

University Response:

The provider must respond to all three. Option 1 is to give a University a base budget number for a simple workflow for departments that are interested in implementing workflow. The final cost will be determined by the complexity of the desired workflow. Options 2 and 3 has detailed information to migrate UH Manoa's and UH West Oahu's current Perceptive Software's Nolij system to the awarded offeror's system.

58. **Section 2.6.1**, What types of system performance require reporting?

University Response:

Some of the reports are, but not limited to: Response times, volume (i.e. number of documents), volume by office, size of scan, file types and view types. The offeror should be able to describe the benefits of these metrics.

59. **Section 2.6.2**, Encryption of file transmissions is typically managed via the network infrastructure. Is this something the University is currently doing or capable of doing?

University Response:

It is expected that the application will be able to accommodate encryption of file transmissions.

60. **Appendix J**, Given that the requested workflows are highly customized and will require in-depth analysis, can the University provide a detailed example(s) of the workflows for quoting purposes? If not, at what point will department interviews and walkthroughs take place for exact solution & quoting purposes?

University Response:

The provider must respond to all three. Option 1 is to give a University a base budget number for a simple workflow for departments that are interested in implementing workflow. The final cost will be determined by the complexity of the desired workflow. Options 2 and 3 has detailed information to migrate UH Manoa's and UH West Oahu's current Perceptive Software's Nolij system to the awarded offeror's system. Pricing for Options 1, 2 and 3 shall include required interviews and walkthroughs.

61. **General**, Since Offerors will not have responses to their questions until October 12th will an extension to the due date be granted to allow time to incorporate the new information into the proposal?

University Response:

Proposals are due by 2:30 p.m., H.S.T, October 20, 2016. Refer to Section 1.6, SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS.

62. **General**, Will University provide an executable RFP so that Offerors can complete the required forms electronically? The RFP document is password protected.

University Response:

The RFP is not available in an executable form fillable format.

63. How many end user licenses are needed and is it expected that all faculty and staff members will require access? From the information available in the RFP it seems like UH is asking for 10,5000 concurrent licenses?

University Response:

The University is interested in Enterprise Licensing where there is no limit to user seats.

64. If a Java Application Server is required, will UH supply the software (IBM WebSphere) or do we need to include it in licensing costs?

University Response:

The offeror will need to include it in licensing costs. If the offeror will not absorb any cost, it must be disclosed in the Cost Proposal, Appendix J.

65. What is the expected document Ingestion Volume (annual or per day) going forward? Ingestion is the combination of all document input whether from paper scanning, emails, fax, file uploads or electronic forms. The day forward ingestion volume is distinctly different from any documents needing to be migrated or converted from existing systems such as DocuXplorer and Perceptive (UH Manoa and UH O'ahu)

University Response:

It is not known at this time since the University does not have an existing system and supporting data. The University is relying on the experience and expertise of the offeror to be able to determine ingestion volume based on the locations and end user count.

66. What is the existing total document size (in terms of documents and pages) in all repositories ; including DocuXplorer and Perceptive (UH Manoa and UH O'ahu)? This is important in order to size the system.

University Response:

It is not known at this time since the University does not have an existing system and supporting data. The University is relying on the experience and expertise of the offeror to be able to determine volume based on the number of locations and end user count in order to size their proposed system.

67. Can the system be hosted, cloud based or hybrid?

University Response:

Although the University specifies in Section 2.3.4 - Security, "All documents, scans and related metadata will remain on local systems." The University will consider a cloud based system providing the following conditions are met:

- 1. All requirements of the RFP have been satisfied,**
- 2. The offeror can demonstrate sufficient controls and security,**
 - a. Access, process, procedures, protocols and guarantees,**
- 3. The Offeror shall fully describe its liability under any data loss or breach or suspected breach, to include, but not be limited to, proposed indemnification of the University against losses or damages resulting from any data loss or breach, or suspected breach,**
- 4. The Offeror shall describe procedures regarding backup and recovery,**
- 5. The Offer shall describe its disposition procedures of backed up data for both regular and archived data including security measures,**
 - i. The University shall at all times retain ownership of any and all data and metadata,**
- 6. The Offeror shall describe its procedures for addressing outages and slowdowns and estimated resolution times.**

68. Record Retention - Does UH have an existing Records File Plan, Disposition Schedule and records Security schema?

University Response:

The University is currently working on inventorying departmental records, disposition schedules and reviewing existing policies. Retention of records vary by department. The proposed system should be flexible enough to accommodate varying degrees of retention parameters. Refer to Section 2.3.6.

69. Clarification on Cost proposal - The One time fee for Implementation and Training seems to suggest a Fixed Price bid. Are there other options available ?

University Response:

For items outlined in Appendix J, Cost Proposal, the prices shall be fixed; however, there are other services that will be required and will be priced on a case by case basis with the awarded offeror. Refer to Sections 2.3.11 and 2.4.5.

70. Is the expectation that Implementation Services include creation of all 5 environments (Development, Test, Training, Staging and Production)

University Response:

Yes. Refer to Section 2.4.3 - Implementation Services

71. Please define UH security standards per 2.6.1.

University Response:

Refer to Section 2.3.4 - Security.

72. Is UH experienced in using Agile project methodology with offerors?

University Response:

Only recently with our Quali Student Curriculum Management system.

73. Will remote access be available for installation, configuration and project related tasks?

University Response:

Yes, it is expected that the contractor will have direct access.

74. Section 2.2.1, What version of Shibboleth is in use today?

University Response:

The UH authentication integration standard is SSO using CASv5 with the CAS2 Protocol or Shibboleth Idp v3.2.1.

75. Section 2.2.1, What version of CAS is in use today?

University Response:

The UH authentication integration standard is SSO using CASv5 with the CAS2 Protocol or Shibboleth Idp v3.2.1.

76. Section 2.2.4, Although section 2.2.3 (Enterprise Systems Environment) references Windows Server and Microsoft SQL Server, Microsoft technologies are omitted from section 2.2.4 (Enterprise Application Development Environment). To what extent is the Microsoft Windows/.NET platform supported from an enterprise application standpoint? Are you open to solutions where some (but not all) of the components might run on this platform?

University Response:

Yes

77. Section 2.2.5, Please elaborate on the APIs or interfaces available for integration with the University's implementation of the Banner Student Information System.

University Response:

The proposed system should have an API library to integrate into the University's various systems or the offeror must demonstrate and have the resources to be able to develop any required APIs.

78. Section 2.2.5, Please elaborate on the APIs or interfaces available for integration with the University's implementation of the Kual Financial System (KFS).

University Response:

Refer to University Response, question # 77

79. Section 2.2.5, Please elaborate on the APIs or interfaces available for integration with the University's implementation of PeopleSoft Human Resources.

University Response:

Refer to University Response, question # 77

80. Section 2.2.5, Please elaborate on the APIs or interfaces available for integration with the University's implementation of the Kual Coeus (MyGrant) System.

University Response:

Refer to University Response, question # 77

81. Section 2.2.5, Please elaborate on the APIs or interfaces available for integration with the University's implementation of the Sakai (Laulima) System.

University Response:

Refer to University Response, question # 77

82. Section 2.2.5, Please elaborate on the APIs or interfaces available for integration with the University's implementation of the AssetWorks (AIM) System.

University Response:

Refer to University Response, question # 77

83. Section 2.2.5, Does the University have a rough estimate of the number of additional internal applications for which integration might be needed in the future? Are there any standards relative to integration that exist for these systems (e.g. you can assume that integration could be accomplished via SOAP/REST web services or database access)?

University Response:

It is not known at this time. Additional internal applications for which integration is required will be determined on a case by case basis based on need and budget.

84. Section 2.2.6, Please clarify what is meant by the following sentence: “The document imaging and management platform shall have the ability to export as well as restrict indexed documents from the system in the original format.” Are you referring to the ability to restrict access to documents and the export function – but if export is enabled, allow for export in the original format?

University Response:

Exporting shall be configurable to permit either original and/or redacted/annotated versions.

85. Section 2.3.1, As part of the effort, are you looking for the offeror to determine scanning needs and recommend specific document scanning hardware, or does the University already have appropriate scanning hardware to support for the solution?

University Response:

Some departments possess scanning equipment; however, the makes and models are varied, which may or may not be compatible with the proposed system. Other departments do not have scanning equipment and will have to procure scanning hardware. In either situation, the University will look to the offeror to recommend or validate hardware compatibility as described in section 2.3.1.

86. Section 2.3.1, Does the University use multifunction peripherals (MFPs) – devices which serve as printers but which can also be used to scan and/or fax documents? If so, what offeror(s) of devices are currently in use throughout the University system?

University Response:

Yes, the predominant devices used as MFPs or MFDs (multifunctional devices) are Xerox.

87. Section 2.3.1, By “local technical support” are you referring to a local offeror who would provision the scanners and provide ongoing maintenance and support?

University Response:

By local technical support, the University is looking to the offeror to provide local support to assist with issues regarding their proposed system and scanning hardware.

88. Section 2.3.2, With regards to requested support for easy conversion for documents stored in existing imaging systems (e.g. DocuXplorer): do you anticipate that a one-time conversion would ultimately be done from each of these existing systems to the selected enterprise-level ECM system? Or, are you looking for the ability to perform periodic or ad-hoc conversions as needs require?

University Response:

A one-time conversion

89. Section 2.3.2, With regards to importing externally generated electronic documents: are there any automated feeds of such documents into any current imaging systems currently in scope for this project? If the answer is yes, please provide the following information for each such feed:

1. How are documents provided (e.g. SFTP, web services, other)?
2. How often are documents imported?
3. Into which current Imaging system are the documents imported?
4. Is any automated document recognition or processing (e.g. OCR, barcodes, forms recognition) done on the documents after they are retrieved but prior to being loaded into the destination imaging system?
5. Approximately how many documents per month are imported via this process?

University Response:

With regard to Nolij:

NolijWeb includes a custom feeder for Admissions documents:

1. **PDF files are placed into local network shares.**
2. **Daily**
3. **Nolij**
4. **PDF's may contain documents from multiple applicants. Custom feeder parses them into individual PDF files and uses OCR to read identifying information and translate into folder index values (Banner PIDM's). XML file is also generated providing indexing data such as destination folder, workflow step, and custom document label.**
5. **Number of documents varies greatly through the year.**

90. Section 2.3.3, Many document scanning solutions run solely on the Microsoft Windows platform. Are you open to a solution which would require Windows-based workstations for document scanning, with the understanding that most other components of the solution could be accessed through a supported web browser on any of the listed operating systems?

University Response:

Yes, all proposals will be considered as part of the evaluation for ease of use and compatibility, Section 2.3.3.

91. Section 2.3.3, With regards to stated support for technical troubleshooting, workflow enhancements, end-user training and system upgrades: how long would this period of support last? Should this be estimated across the three years (as indicated in Appendix J)?

University Response:

Yes, Section 2.4.1, Maintenance Fees

92. Section 2.3.3, Can you elaborate on a possible use cases that would drive the use of electronic signatures as part of the solution?

University Response:

There may be a situation where a student needs to verify a document. In such a case, the offeror shall be able to demonstrate how this will be accomplished. Refer to Section 2.3.3, last bullet.

93. Section 2.3.4, Will students be using the system? We see them listed as a security role in this section, but section 2.4.1 implies access by only faculty and staff.

University Response:

Only faculty, staff and maybe others described as roles will be using the system.

94. Section 2.3.4, Can you elaborate on possible use cases for “on the fly” redaction (with the ability for certain users to remove the redaction)? Are there use cases for which permanent redaction would be necessary as well?

University Response:

There are situations where redaction of specific types of information may only apply to certain security roles whereas a higher level role such as a supervisor may need to see the entire document. Yes, there may be cases where permanent redaction may be necessary.

95. Section 2.3.5, Please describe the Banner Student Information System forms referenced in this section. Are you indicating that you would like to have certain activities within Banner initiate a workflow in the ECM system? Likewise, would there be a need to notify Banner after said workflows were completed?

University Response:

Yes, there may be a future requirement where Banner will initiate a workflow in the ECM system. All the requirements will be determined if and when the situation arises.

96. Section 2.3.11, Numerous existing imaging systems are listed in this section; for the purposes of estimation, is it assumed that the only migrations in scope for this proposal are the Nolij systems referenced in options 2 and 3?

University Response:

Yes.

97. Section 2.4.3, Regarding bullet point #3: Are you looking for the offeror to recommend the hardware, with the understanding that the University will be purchasing the recommended hardware? Will the University be responsible for installing the base hardware (e.g. racks, networking, etc.) in the University’s data center?

University Response:

The University will be providing the hardware. Keep in mind the University utilizes VMware technology so the proposed solution must be compatible.

98. Section 2.4.3, Realizing that separate implementation plans have been requested for Options 1, 2 and 3, is the University planning to pick just one of these three options for the agreed-upon project, or is there a possibility that two or more of the options might be chosen?

University Response:

All options will be chosen.

99. Section 2.4.3 Option 1, Realizing that Option 1 pertains to a to-be-determined business process/department, do you have any examples of the kinds of forms you would want to be represented in this system?

University Response:

Not at this time.

100. Section 2.4.3 Option 2, For the Admissions workflow, do the 35 automated routing procedures include the 20 integration points with Banner? Could you provide one example each of a typical integration point and a query that would need to be done with Banner?

University Response:

The routing procedures may include one or more integration points with Banner. An example of a routing procedure would be to check the SARADAP and SARCHKL tables to see if an application fee has been collected and residency coded before moving an applicant to the next workflow step.

101. Section 2.4.3 Option 2, For the purposes of scoping migration:

1. How many documents are in your system?
2. What types of files (e.g. TIFF, PDF, Office docs) are stored?
3. Are you expecting any metadata cleanup or content (e.g. TIFF to PDF) transformation during the conversion?
4. With regards to the current document taxonomy: how many classes/types of documents exist in your Nolij system? On average, how many properties/attributes exist per document class/type?
5. Does the current Nolij system use any of the following features: annotations; foldering; document versioning; compound documents?
6. Does your Nolij system utilize existing LDAP groups/users for security purposes?

University Response:

1. **Over 830,000 documents.**
2. **Document type include but may not be limited to: BMP, DOC, HTM, JPG, JPEG, MSG, PDF, PNG, RTF, TIF, TXT, XLS, XLXS, DOCX, PPTX, TIFF**
3. **Document transformation is not required.**
4. **See response to #2 for types of files. As for indexing labels there are currently 267 custom labels that can be assigned (a file may only be indexed to 1 custom label at a time).**
5. **Annotations and sub-folders.**
6. **Role security is defined within Nolij.**

102. Section 2.4.3 Option 3, Option 3 appears to be very similar to Option 2, with the exception of the inclusion of two new departments: IT and Advising. Can you elaborate on the extent to which these departments participate in the process, in comparison to the Option 2 solution (which excludes these processes)?

University Response:

Scan/Store/Retrieve functionality only for the IT and Advising departments

103. Section 2.4.3, Option 3, For the purposes of scoping migration:

1. How many documents are in your system?
2. What types of files (e.g. TIFF, PDF, Office docs) are stored?
3. Are you expecting any metadata cleanup or content (e.g. TIFF to PDF) transformation during the conversion?
4. With regards to the current document taxonomy: how many classes/types of documents exist in your Nolij system? On average, how many properties/attributes exist per document class/type?
5. Does the current Nolij system use any of the following features: annotations; foldering; document versioning; compound documents?
6. Does your Nolij system utilize existing LDAP groups/users for security purposes?

University Response:

1. **Over 115,000 documents.**
2. **Document type include but may not be limited to: TIF, PDF, XLS, HTM, JPG, BMP, TIFF, DOC, PNG, JPEG, TXT, XLSX, DOCX**
3. **Document transformation is not required.**
4. **See response to #2 for types of files. As for indexing labels there are currently 251 custom labels that can be assigned (a file may only be indexed to 1 custom label at a time).**
5. **Annotations and sub-folders.**
6. **Role security is defined within Nolij.**

104. Section 2.4.3 Options 2 and 3, Is your intention to migrate these two existing solutions to the new platform, with each campus continuing to use its own migrated solution independently? Or, is the idea that one of these two options would be migrated to the new platform, and then used as a “solution template” for rollout to other campuses in the future?

University Response:

The existing solutions are customized to their respective offices. The intention is to perform independent migrations.

105. Section 2.4.4, Approximately how many users would require training for each of the following training categories listed?

1. Administrator Training for the base implementation
2. End-User Training (train-the-trainer) for base
3. Advanced Administrator training (for Option 1)
4. End-User Training (train-the-trainer) for options 1-3

University Response:

Admin (Base Implementation) - for ECM System Administration - Up to 4
End User (Base Implementation) - Train the trainer - Up to 8
Advanced Administration - (Option 1) - Up to 4
End User (Option 1, 2, 3) - Train the trainer - Up to 4 each

106. 2.2.2, Banner FGAC
Client-Server / Oracle RDBS (11.2)

Have you, or do you plan to implement a browser-based interface for Banner?

University Response:

There is no browser based interface for Banner at this time; however, if required, the University will expect the offeror to develop this interface.

107. 2.2.3, Enterprise System Environment

Do you have a preference of SQL Server or Oracle for the underlying DBMS of the content repository?

University Response:

Oracle.

108. 2.2.6, Export documents in their original format

Does this requirement refer to paper documents that are captured as part of the baseline solution? Documents that are migrated? Documents that have been captured into the repository and are being exported for email or other purposes?

University Response:

Solution shall be able to export both original and annotated/redacted versions

109. 2.2.6, Allow for conversion of existing documents stored in other imaging databases to be imported easily
ex: DocuXplorer

Is this a requirement of the capture system or is it a migration requirement?

University Response:

It is a migration requirement

110. 2.2.6, bullet 6: real time interface

You state that real-time interfaces to the SIS system are required. How accessible are the databases and are real-time updates allowed to tables? What is the preferred method for this?

University Response:

Refer to Section 2.3.3, bullet 6

111. 2.2.6, The system shall be multi-platform capable...Windows, Linux, MAC end user environments

Does this requirement imply that all components of the system, including the capture environment, must be deployable on all platforms?

University Response:

Refer to Section 2.3.3, bullet 1

112. 2.2.6, The servers run on RHEL

Does this requirement imply that all server components of the system, including the capture environment, must be deployable on Linux?

University Response:

Refer to Section 2.3.3, bullet 2

113. 2.2.6, The system shall allow secure client web-based access that is compatible with major internet browsers

Does this requirement imply that Windows-based document capture clients are undesirable?

University Response:

Refer to Section 2.3.3, bullet 3

114. 2.2.6, The system shall provide real time access to UofH systems and applications...

Will all UofH systems and applications permit direct real-time update from the ECM system?

University Response:

Refer to Section 2.3.3 bullet 6

115. 2.2.6, All document, scans, and metadata will remain on local systems

Please provide additional detail on this requirement as it relates to the document capture system.

University Response:

Refer to Section 2.3.4, bullet 8

116. 2.2.6, Audit Trails

What level of audit trail are you expecting relative to the capture system?

University Response:

Refer to Section 2.3.4 bullet 9

117. 2.2.6, The solution shall provide redactions on the fly...

Does this requirement apply to the capture system or the ECM system?

University Response:

The ECM

118. 2.3.5, Notifications; Forms, bullet 5: utilize Banner SIS forms

What is UH's expectation regarding how these forms are "utilized"? Several of the options refer to converting the forms; is the expectation that the forms are converted to Banner SIS forms (and if so, from what?) or to DIMS forms from Banner? (Option 1 indicates that customized forms will reside within "the application" and be accessed from a web browser. Does the application refer to Banner or the new workflow? Understand that the forms will need to capture Banner data, but where are the forms expected to be created and reside?)

University Response:

It means the system shall be able to utilize Banner forms as part of a new workflow.

119. 2.3.5, Notifications; Forms, bullet 7: integrate with existing workflows

Does this bullet mean that we would be "image enabling" the legacy apps identified?

University Response:

No, it means the system shall be able to integrate with existing workflows and utilize legacy app forms as part of a new workflow.

120. 2.3.6, Versioning in Retention Management

To clarify, are you looking for versioning in retention management? Retention management of docs including versions? Or is retention mentioned here as part of records management?

University Response:

Retention as part of records management.

121. 2.3.7, Data encryption

Please explain what you mean by emergency access.

University Response:

Under certain emergency situations it may become necessary for the University to release personal information to protect the health or safety of the student or other students; however, there needs to be a clear protocol and approval process in order to properly implement this exception. The system shall be able to implement an audited, multi-tiered level process for access and disclosure of student information for these types of situations.

122. 2.3.7, Data encryption

Given the FERPA requirement, will UofH provide test data that is compliant with this requirement for use by developers?

University Response:

Yes.

123. 2.3.7, Audit Controls

Please provide additional detail on this requirement as it relates to the document capture system.

University Response:

If there is an exception to the general consent requirement regarding a student's file, the system shall be able to record into the student's file what and to whom information was disclosed. Refer to Section 2.3.4, bullet 9

124. 2.3.7, Integrity Controls

Please provide additional detail on this requirement as it relates to the document capture system.

University Response:

The system shall be able to guard against improper information modification or destruction. Refer to Section 2.3.4, bullet 9

125. 2.4.1, License Fees

Please confirm concurrent license request is for 10,500.

University Response:

The University is interested in Enterprise Licensing where there is no limit to user seats. If there are limitations to the user base, it shall be disclosed by the offeror.

126. 2.4.1, License Fees, bullet 7: record retention rules

Does UH have a records retention plan?

University Response:

Yes. Retention plans vary by school, department and office.

127. 2.4.1, License Fees, Option#2 Page 10

What is meant by multi-person PDF forms?

University Response:

Multi-person PDF: a single multi-page PDF contains documents (e.g. admissions applications) for more than one individual. The solution must be able to parse and separate these into individual PDF's.

128. General Question

Does UH anticipate the need to OCR and extract detailed course information from transcripts?

University Response:

There may be that requirement, but cannot be confirmed at this time.

129. General Question

Will document scanning and indexing be distributed or take place at a central location?

University Response:

It will be distributed.

130. General Question

How many users will be accessing the capture workflow environment?

University Response:

Section 2.2 Introduction/Background - 10,500 users.

131. General Question

How many users will be accessing the capture workflow environment?

University Response:

Section 2.2 Introduction/Background - 10,500 users.

132. General Question

What is the approximate number of pages to be captured per year, and during a peak day?

University Response:

Unknown at this time. Refer to a user base of 10,500.

133. In regard to Section 2.3.3, what OS are your VMware environments running? Will the University of Hawaii support a Windows OS?

University Response:

Red Hat Linux and Windows Server.

134. In regard to Section 2.3.5, could you please give an example of how you would like the system to integrate with Kualii and Banner to allow our team to give more accurate pricing?

University Response:

Section 2.3.5 is part of Section 2.3 Overview of the Scope of Work and outlines the proposed system requirements. Kualii and Banner integration may come in at a future date. offerors should limit themselves to Section 2.4 Statement of Work and Appendix J.

135. Please identify all systems from which image migration is required. For each provide:

- a. System name and offeror.
- b. The version number current installed and latest version anticipated to be installed.
- c. The image format for the stored files and the export format options.
- d. The index export file type (e.g. CSV).
- e. The type of database(s) used by the system.
- f. The Operating Systems that each runs on.
- g. The approximate volume of images to be converted.
- h. By what means will the images and data files be provided to the contractor.

University Response:

- a. **Perceptive Nolib (Lexmark)**
- b. **Refer to 2.4.3 Options 2 & 3**
- c. **Refer to questions 101 & 103**
- d. **The manner of export for the migration shall be established by the contractor**
- e. **Oracle and Microsoft SQL Server**
- f. **Windows Server**
- g. **Refer to questions 101 & 103**
- h. **It is expected that the contractor will have direct access**

136. Regarding real time Interface with UH systems to the document image management system (DIMS) please confirm that the systems to be integrated are those listed in section 2.2.5. and for each system:

- a. Is there an interface available to the UH?
- b. What documentation is available?
- c. Please define for each system what information is expected to be updated to the DIMS so that we can understand the requirement more clearly.
- d. Please confirm that data will flow to the DIMS from the UH systems and not the reverse.

University Response:

Interfaces for DIMS and existing applications need to be developed. Information and requirements for interfacing with UH systems need to be identified and documented. Data flow may be bi-directional depending on requirements. Refer to Section 2.4.5.

137. Please confirm that the UH will provide the required servers and operating systems?

- a. Will they be centralized for all campuses?
- b. If not, how many installations will be needed?
- c. Where will the servers be located?
- d. What is the network bandwidth between servers and users?

University Response:

The servers and operating systems will be centrally located in the ITC data center on the Manoa campus. The network bandwidth is 1Gbps.

138. Regarding Security section 2.3.4, in what format will the DIMS obtain data from the CAS and Shib?

- a. Please provide a sample record with field definitions.
- b. Please provide the security levels (e.g. matrix of groups and permissions) that will need to be accommodated.

University Response:

Upon successful authentication the returned attributes include: uhUuid (unique person identifier), username, email, full name, role, organization, primary campus, phone, office location and additional information.

Security levels will be determined by the respective groups.

139. Regarding Workflow section 2.3.5.

- a. What is meant by “be able to utilize Banner Student Information System”?
- b. Please provide an example of: “The system shall be able to integrate content into existing Banner forms or to integrate additional workflow into Banner forms.”
- c. What is meant by “The system shall be able to integrate with existing UH workflows”. Please provide descriptive examples.

University Response:

The system should be able to utilize Banner Student Information System forms into a workflow. The system should also be able to integrate content information from other sources into Banner forms. The University utilizes RICE as the workflow engine for other applications. The system should be able to integrate with RICE for workflows.

140. Please explain what is meant by the Options. Does this mean phases?

University Response:

It means separate projects.

141. Regarding Option 1, please describe what is meant by “integration” in point #4.

University Response:

The proposed system will be able to use databases associated with the University’s System applications such as Banner and PeopleSoft.

142. University of Hawai’i mentions a number of Departments that will benefit from document imaging and workflow. Is it the University’s intention to roll out the solution simultaneously or in a phased approach across these Departments? If phased, please describe the desired priorities, locations and associated user counts for each phase. Also, please indicate what you would like us to include in the initial phase base pricing for licensing, implementation and installation services.

University Response:

Refer to Section 2.4 Statement of Work.

143. Will the solution be implemented on all 10 UH campuses and seven (7) education centers? If the answer is “yes”, does University of Hawai’i want the selected offeror to perform 100% of the implementation services?

University Response:

Initially, the University wants the selected offeror to perform implementation services as outlined in the RFP. All other services outside of the RFP will be determined and priced accordingly with the selected offeror.

144. 2.2.2, 2.2.3, 2.2.4 – Will the Banner Identification Management team have responsibility over defining and approving group privileges & roles for DIMS? What role will IT Services have pertaining to DIMS?

University Response:

Yes, the Banner team will have responsibility of defining privileges and roles within their Group. Other Groups who may utilize the system will have the same function. IT Services will have overall Admin responsibility for the system.

145. 2.2.5 – Could you please describe the desired functionality of the DIMS when integrated with UH’s primary applications?

University Response:

The desired functionality is to utilize DIMS to digitize paper documents or provide a repository for existing digitized documents. The DIMS workflow function would also be utilized if needed.

146. 2.2.6 – Reference is made to “...conversion of paper documents into electronic files...”. Does University of Hawai‘i intend to convert paper backfiles to the new document management solution? If so, can you please provide metrics (e.g., volumes) for this conversion and whether you would like the offeror to potentially provide these services?

University Response:

Yes. Details are not available at this time and as described in 2.3.11, services will be determined on a case by case basis. Costs will be determined at that time.

147. 2.3.2, 2.3.11, 2.4 -- University of Hawai‘i mentions conversion from existing imaging databases. Can UH provide details on the number of documents, format, size, etc., for each repository from which you expect to convert documents and whether you would like the offeror to potentially assist with these electronic conversions?

University Response:

Details are not available at this time and as described in 2.3.11, services will be determined on a case by case basis. Costs will be determined at that time.

148. 2.3.3, Bullet #3 – Does University of Hawai‘i only want web-based access?

University Response:

Yes

149. 2.3.4 & 2.3.8 – We confirm that all data will remain on local systems, but would like to know if the University of Hawai‘i prefers software to be installed on premises or as a cloud-based solution?

University Response:

Although the University specifies in Section 2.3.4 - Security, “All documents, scans and related metadata will remain on local systems.” The University will consider a cloud based system providing the following conditions are met:

1. All requirements of the RFP have been satisfied,
2. The offeror can demonstrate sufficient controls and security,
 - a. Access, process, procedures, protocols and guarantees,
3. The Offeror shall fully describe its liability under any data loss or breach or suspected breach, to include, but not be limited to, proposed indemnification of the University against losses or damages resulting from any data loss or breach, or suspected breach,
4. The Offeror shall describe procedures regarding backup and recovery,
5. The Offer shall describe its disposition procedures of backed up data for both regular and archived data including security measures,
 - i. The University shall at all times retain ownership of any and all data and metadata,
6. The Offeror shall describe its procedures for addressing outages and slowdowns and estimated resolution times.

150. 2.4.3, Option 1 – Please clarify what the 40 workflow steps and the 8 automated web workflow steps are.

University Response:

A step is a task that when completed, progressively triggers the next in series until all successive tasks have been completed. Automated steps are electronic triggers that automatically prompts a staff member for action.

151. 2.4.3, Option 2 & 3 – How many different Noli workflow are there in UH Mānoa & UH West O’ahu? How many Noli workflow forms are there UH Mānoa & UH West O’ahu?

University Response:

**UH Mānoa: 1 workflow, 6 forms
UH West O’ahu: 1 workflow, 8 forms**

152. 2.4.3, Options 1, 2 & 3 – Are these optional services or does UH want all of these options as part of the implementation services?

University Response:

Option 1 will be used for budgetary purposes for future engagements outside of this RFP. Options 2 and 3 will be part of the implementation services.

153. 2.4.5 – How many people will be trained as administrators? How many trainers will be trained?

University Response:

**Admin (Base Implementation) - for ECM System Administration - Up to 4
End User (Base Implementation) - Train the trainer - Up to 8
Advanced Administration - (Option 1) - Up to 4
End User (Option 1, 2, 3) - Train the trainer - Up to 4 each**

154. 3.9.5 – Can the demonstration be conducted on premises or is it a requirement to be remote?

University Response:

The three top offerors will have the option to present their solution via web, Refer to Section 4.2, 4.2.2. The offeror can present on-site; however, the offeror will be responsible for all travel, lodging and transportation costs and will be restricted to the time requirements as outlined in Section 4.2.2.

155. Appendix 1 Project Implementation Plan – Is it a requirement that we use this form or can we provide our own version of a plan in the RFP response?

University Response:

You may use your own version of a plan; however, it must have, at a minimum, all the elements noted in the header of the Project Implementation Plan in Appendix I.



