Enterprise Content Management

Request for Proposal: Questions & Responses

April 4, 2014

1. **What do you consider to be the top three critical success factors for this project? At the end of project delivery, how will we know that we've jointly delivered success to your constituents?**

   The goal is to deliver a comprehensive governance plan which protects the agency's electronic and hard-copy information in an efficient, cost-effective, and defensible manner. To be successful, governance plan must be accepted by Senior State Bar Directors and managed in a consistent manner across the agency. Plan must be economically viable, easy to monitor and minimize the associated risks involved. Specific deliverables will be itemized in the contract award process.

2. **What qualifications are you looking for in a partner? For example, we have four Microsoft Gold Competencies in Application Development, Business Intelligence, Application Integration and Content and Collaboration (i.e. SharePoint); will the proposal scoring take our credentials into account?**

   There are no minimum qualifications for certifications for this RFP. General qualifications and experience will be reviewed and scored in Evaluation Category C, worth 45% of the total points awarded (see section III.D.1. in posted RFP for score-weighting). Specific Microsoft Certifications will be more important in the Phase Two (implementation phase) RFP to follow.

3. **Does the existing Document Retention Policy cover the State Bar of California's higher level intentions, definitions, and requirements relating to Records and Information or does it just include Record Retention Schedules that comprise records, content types, retention periods and other guidelines? Can you provide a copy of the Document Retention Policy developed in 2008 to provide context around this RFP?**

   The Document Retention study done in 2008 was never adopted and implemented as policy. The results of the report can be shared with the vendor upon contract award.

4. **Have regulatory citations applicable to State Bar been identified? If not, are you asking that the vendor provide legal advice as a part of Phase 1?**

   We are seeking guidance for laws and regulations governing document retention requirements, but not legal advice. Citations were previously noted in the draft retention

schedule tables but we expect the subject to be revisited due to the age of the report and verified as part of this new ECM project.

5. **How many functional areas (divisions and departments) exist? Are retention schedules currently being used by these functional areas and when were they developed?**

   There are 10 major functional areas with a managing Senior Executive for each. The volume of records for each area varies by complexity, employee count and whether it is within the main programs areas: Regulation & Discipline, Access to Justice, Education, and the Business Platform. See posted Attachment B: <u>Document Summary by Senior Executive Area</u> for details. Retention schedules were suggested in the 2008 report but are not observed nor enforced agency wide.

6. **Are you interested in recommendations for an information governance committee as part of this RFP?**

   Yes.

7. **Does State Bar have formal roles for records and information management, including a records manager and senior advisor or champion?**

   The State Bar has existing positions for librarian/archivist as well as records coordinators and other staff liaisons within the major functional areas. New roles needed as a result of a formal ECM policy implementation will need to be defined within the ECM governance scope. Management of the ECM project will be from the Risk Management area with major support from IT operations. We expect the Senior Directors will champion or delegate as program is defined.

8. **Are you interested in an assessment of State Bar's existing ECM and Records and Information Management roles and responsibilities in order to identify any gaps and determine if the roles are sufficient to reach the desired level of maturity of the next 2 to 3 years?**

   Yes, all roles, gaps and other deficiencies should be addressed.

9. **What of the following content sources does the plan need to address: documents currently on file shares, documents currently in OpenText/Hummingbird , Email, paper documents, non-document content such as web pages/blogs/wikis, content in other systems?**

   All of the above, plus any others identified during the discovery phase.

10. **Can you provide information on why the ITAG project (described in DM History #3) recommendations were not formally adopted?**

No, but the changes in the State Bar's strategic plan, changes in technology architecture, and senior staff turnover prompt a fresh reevaluation of the 2008 recommendations.

11. What Knowledge Lake solutions are you integrating with SharePoint?

We are integrating KnowledgeLake Document Imaging, Capture, and Unify products.

12. DM History #8 describes the plan to use SharePoint to manage content for the entire organization. Is the plan to use SharePoint for collaboration (WIP) content and controlled records?

Yes, for both.

13. Are you interested in governance plans for both records and collaboration repositories as part of this RFP?

No, the focus is on a governance plan for records only, not collaborative work-spaces.

14. Please clarify submission Requirements #6 additional information for the completion of this question: Are you interested in a project plan that addresses the areas under the Performance section and the governance questions under Submission Requirement 6 or are you interested in an implementation plan for migrating content from a legacy system to a new system?

The actual implementation plan for the migrating of content is planned for Phase Two of this project and need not be included in your submission. This initial phase should focus on the governance issues we need to address before we prepare for the Sharepoint development and content migration itself.

15. Are you interested in including metadata recommendations (in addition to taxonomy) in this RFP?

Desirable, but not required.

16. Does a disposition and destruction process currently exist for paper and/or electronic information?

No formal agency-wide process, no.

17. Does an inventory of your physical records exist?

We only maintain inventories of the documents stored offsite (within the GRM and Iron Mountains reporting systems).

18. Retained records are a subset of your information. Are you interested in having a more comprehensive RIM and ECM assessment conducted that encompasses your

policies and practices around managing, controlling, and capturing active records and information?

Desirable, but not required.

19. **At which office will the work for this project be conducted? San Francisco or Los Angeles?**

    The primary project management will be out of the San Francisco offices, though some field interviews and discovery may need to occur in our LA offices during the project. Video-conferencing may be employed to reduce travel expenses were feasible.

20. **What are State Bar's current annual licensing fees for KnowledgeLake? How many seats are included in those fees and from what period?**

    The KnowledgeLake implementation is new and consists of 600 licensed seats. The license fees are not within the scope of this RFP.

21. **Would State Bar consider the possibility for vendor to replace KnowledgeLake licenses with more sophisticated SharePoint extension for advance capture which mutually agreeable to State Bar of CA policy and compliance?**

    Not at this time, no.

22. **Implementation decisions related to the design and development of software solutions can vary widely depending on project budget. What is the anticipated budget range for Phase 1 (discovery/planning) and for Phase 2 (implementation), if known?**

    There is no set, defined budget parameters for this project.Its importance in managing agency risk is acknowledged and while the competitive bidding process is important to observe as a public agency, the actual funding for the policy and implementation plans will not hinder the deployment.

23. **Does the scope of this project include the delivery of actual Information Architecture (IA) artifacts (e.g. taxonomies, a file plan, etc.) or a plan and guidance about how those artifacts could be developed and/or obtained (e.g. should we expect to deliver a taxonomy and file plan in Phase 1 or just a plan/consulting for how to develop a taxonomy, file plan, etc.)?**

    The focus of Phase One is policy and planning, not specific IA artifacts.

24. **Would you prefer that our proposal include a *Proof of Concept* or pilot for the solution or just representative demos of what the solution might look like?**

    Not in this phase, no. Solution demos and Proof-of-Concepts are anticipated to be part of the Phase Two (implementation phase) RFP to follow.

25. **Do you have document classes configured in OpenText (Hummingbird) and do you anticipate that the document classes currently implemented in OpenText represent reusable artifacts for the new implementation (e.g. from a design and potentially export/import perspective)?**

   Proposals should not plan to reuse existing DM document classes for the governance plan per se, but reevaluate based on the current needs and discovery phase of plan development.

26. **Does the scope include the development of a training and/or adoption plan for Administrators, End Users, etc. and how many of each?**

   It is expected that a small number of meetings may be needed during the plan development, including a presentation to the Senior Executive team. Primary contact will be with a small group of participants from the Offices of Finance, Information Technology, General Counsel and Risk Management. Actual administrator and end-user staff training will be addressed in Phase Two of the ECM roll-out and included in a separate bid offering.

27. **Is it acceptable for vendors to team up provided one is designated as the prime?**

   Subcontractors are allowed, though it is unlikely that the governance portion would need to be a joint effort. It is conceivable that the Phase One (governance) and Phase Two (implementation) contracts be awarded to separate organizations due to the differing skill-sets involved.

28. **Will preference be given to local firms?**

   Local firms are desirable only to the extent that it minimizes travel expenses, but there are no formal scoring criteria assigned to location other than projected cost.

29. **Will Certified Small Businesses receive any special consideration in this procurement?**

   There are no formal scoring criteria for a Small Business Certification. We hope to achieve the proper right-sizing through the award process to maximize the efficiencies of a vendor with both the experience and comfort level for clients similar to our agency.

30. **Can financials be submitted upon short-list for interview or award?**

   No, financials need to be provided with the initial proposals. If an NDA needs to be executed in advance, please provide. The need to perform a round one scoring to determine the finalists is based solely on the number of proposals received.

31. **Our typical delivery model is predominantly remote, with onsite services performed at project inception, discovery, requirements development and training. Are you open to such a delivery model, or is the preference to have predominantly onsite delivery?**

This approach would be acceptable. Please indicate in your proposal which portions are onsite.

32. What SharePoint skills do you currently have in house in terms of SharePoint Administration, Maintenance, Content Owner/Authorship, and Development?

Limited skills in-house, but currently seeking FT Information Architect staff position.

33. Are there any specific compliance requirements (e.g. DOD 5015.2) for the end solution?

Not that we are currently aware of.

34. The RFP lists various other systems such as Sustain and the Court Case Management System. Is development of an Integration Plan within the scope of this project and if so, what level of integration is anticipated (e.g., links to these applications from the solution, document storage for documents generated by these applications, search for documents that reside in these applications, surfacing of information/dashboards showing data from these systems, full integration of data and functionality)?

These issues to be addressed in the Plan Implementation RFP (Phase Two).

35. Is a plan for back-file conversion of paper documents in scope for this engagement? Is a workflow strategy and planning within the scope of this solicitation? Has a content migration strategy been considered to date (e.g. Migrate all content at once, Department by department, Go-forward only, other)?

All of the above to be addressed in the Implementation Plan RFP (Phase Two).

36. What is the target completion date for Phase 1 and Phase 2?

The anticipated bid award date is May 13. The target completion date for Phase One is no later than the end of 2014. Phase Two timing is undetermined.

37. Can proposals be submitted via email provided that they are confirmed received prior to the deadline?

Four hard-copies must be provided for the evaluation team. Large financials may be provided via email directly to andrew.conover@calbar.ca.gov if preferred.