



***GARLAND INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT***

**PURCHASING DEPARTMENT  
501 SOUTH JUPITER ROAD  
Garland, Texas 75042**

**May 10, 2019**

**ADDENDUM #1, RFP # 43-19**

**ENTERPRISE CONTENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM**

This addendum forms a part of the solicitation documents, modifies the original document as listed below, and is hereby made part of any pursuant award. Acknowledge receipt of this is addendum by returning the completed and signed form with the solicitation response. Failure to submit the addenda will be used as an evaluated factor.

**THE DATE AND TIME FOR SUBMITTAL OF RESPONSES IS CHANGED AS FOLLOWS:**

**FROM: Tuesday, May 21, 2019, 10:30 a.m., CST  
TO: Thursday, May 30, 2019, 10:30 a.m., CST**

**Questions and Responses are on pages following**

*Mark A Booker*  
Mark A. Booker  
Director of Purchasing

\_\_\_\_\_  
Company Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Address

\_\_\_\_\_  
City State Zip

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Title

#	Question	Response
1	Can you provide me a number of how many licenses would be needed?	Refer to page 69, #7, RFP Pricing Sheet
2	What is the estimated cost of the Enterprise Content Management System (ECM) project?	The cost will be dependent on the vendor responses and quantity and type of licenses proposed.
3	Has the Department allocated funding for the Enterprise Content Management System (ECM) yet? If so, through which source (budget, CIP, state/federal grant etc)?	Budget
4	How is the Department currently meeting this need?	The District does not have an Enterprise Content Management System.
5	Which vendor provides the incumbent Enterprise Content Management System (ECM)?	The District does not have an Enterprise Content Management System.
6	Who is the technical contact/project manager of the Enterprise Content Management System (ECM)?	Executive Director of Student Services
7	Would it be possible to name the three greatest challenges the Department is having with the current solution?	The District does not have an Enterprise Content Management System.
8	Which other systems will have to integrate or interface with the Enterprise Content Management System (ECM), and will the State provide incumbent vendors for each system?	Refer to page 16, 4.6 of the RFP Section, Goals
9	Which operating platform is desired for the Enterprise Content Management System (ECM)?	Refer to page 16, RFP Section 7, Technology Overview and page 17, RFP Section 8, Technical and Functional Minimum Requirements (Mandatory)
10	What is the number of users anticipated for the Enterprise Content Management System (ECM)?	Refer to page 50, RFP Section Implementation Requirements
11	Section 8.50 More clarification on "Seamless Integration" 1-way, 2-way?	2-way integration to both execute searches using data from the source business system and upload/scan documents and to ECM using data from the source business system as metadata.
12	Section 9.13 Does user require Google integration/Does user need to be able to save Gmail through interface seamlessly or could forward Gmail to monitored inbox a solution?	Specify existing Google integration. Offer alternatives including forwarding to monitored inbox.
13	Section 9.40 No point value for request	Value of 3.
14	Section 9.47 Could you please provide additional detail for 508 AA?	508 Level AA is a published standard.
15	Section 9.50 Could you please provide clarification on "Library Function"	We believe this is a question regarding 9.51. Library functions reference common ECM capabilities to checkout a document (lock for changes by other users) then checkin assigning a new version and add comments about the new version.
16	Section 9.67 Could you provide a real-life scenario?	Attaching receipts to an expense report eform. This question infers the scan-to-eform capability does not require multiple steps (e.g. scan to desktop then upload).

#	Question	Response
17	Section 9.84 Cannot transfer the task to someone who can't complete it. If not the objective, please clarify	It is not clear to GISD to which question this question refers.
18	Section 9.92 Could you please provide clarification on "Rendezvous Function"	Rendezvous refers to a workflow function which remains suspended waiting for the arrival of data; data may rendezvous via scanning, completion of an eform, database trigger (e.g. data from a business system), etc. Presumption of business rule control of rendezvous state changes and/or notifications.
19	Section 9.104 No point value for request	Value of 5.
20	Section 9.105 99% Sure we support. Request a real-life scenario to be sure	Autocategorization engine will analyze document content and assign a document type to it; user has the ability to override if incorrect.
21	Section 9.114 What information do you need to appear in the Digital Destruction Certification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Date</li> <li>• Approval Authorization(s)</li> <li>• Listing of content destroyed</li> <li>• Record series</li> <li>• Retention rule</li> </ul> <p>Citation (optional)</p>
22	Section 9.115 Please provide more clarification	Event-based dispositions are triggered by a future data event (state change) such as "last date of employment". This question requests reporting on event-based rules by either records category or disposition rules.
23	Section 9.119 Could you please provide a copy of the LTDP Guidelines for GISD or other supporting guidelines?	<p>Discussion from TX State Archives:  <a href="https://www.tsl.texas.gov/slrn/blog/tag/digital-preservation/">https://www.tsl.texas.gov/slrn/blog/tag/digital-preservation/</a></p> <p>The requirement seeks to understand whether the vendor ECM solution has defined methods for ensuring the protection of content which has a life greater than 9 years.</p>
24	Can you explain the business scenario/requirements around Suspended/on-hold eForms. This functionality is mentioned in the scenario but not in Section 9, "Functional requirements".	See Section 9.123 1.d.i. The buyer has a 5-day SLA to complete the task. However, if the task requires additional information it is put on hold and SLA is suspended until the information is received – effectively a rendezvous step
25	Workflow will allow for attaching digital objects to a workflow transaction. Is a "Digital Object" any electronic file? (9.87)	Yes
26	Please give us your definition / purpose of Long Term Digital Preservation: i.e. off site storage, transfer to another format - PDF/A, etc. (9.118)	By identifying content as requiring LTDP, as requested in this requirement, GISD will be able to apply the appropriate level of preservation required.
27	What are the record states? We are familiar with declaring records and completing them. (9.109)	Change of the state of a record from non-record to record.

#	Question	Response
28	Are you ok with a Java-based solution? We are asking because IIS is listed as the preferred application server, (11.37)	Java is acceptable, but not preferred.
29	Can you share the list of vendors that are responding to this proposal?	The Garland ISD does not have a list of vendors that are responding to this proposal.
30	Due to the complex nature of this opportunity and the importance of providing a complete, thorough and accurate response, an extension is requested.	Garland ISD extends the proposal due date to Thursday, May 30, 2019, 10:30 a.m. CST.
31	Do you have a preference as to a cloud-based solution or on-premise based solution?	Cloud-based solution is preferred.
32	How many environments do you require? (Dev, Test, QA, Production)	The four listed are acceptable.
33	An electronic signature is a process that assures that a document was signed by the party whose name appears on the form, most times by having them re-authenticate with their password as a part of the approval process. It is not a legal document that would be submissible in court. A digital signature locks the document down and encrypts it to guarantee that no one has modified the document after it has been signed and is submissible in court. Is the intent to provide a simple electronic workflow signature with re-authentication?	Primarily, yes, a logged in user would be able to submit approval actions (approve, deny). However, electronic signature will also be needed for those transactions which required a formal (digital) signing ceremony.
34	Do you have a preference in operating system environment?	GISD's environment is diverse (Windows, iOS, OS X, Chrome). All operating systems need to be supported.
35	How many total users (View Only, Approvers,) will access the system?	GISD is unsure how many total users will access the application, but we have approximately 7,500 employees which could potentially access in read-only mode.
36	How many approvers will access the system?	GISD is unsure how many total users will be approvers, but we assume no more than 200 (we anticipate less).
37	How many users will need to scan documents?	It is not known for certain. Each facility will require ad-hoc scanning to the Cumulative Student Folder -- at least 200 users. Additional scanning will be required for workflows and eforms. For the purposes of pricing, use 300 ad-hoc scanning users.

#	Question	Response
38	In the past year, has GISD engaged with any firm in regards to ECM solutions and Services, including face to face meetings and or remote sessions with any GISD employees? If so, who, and will that firm be allowed to participate?	GISD has many departments and schools that may have had discussions with a supplier which provided ECM solutions. The details of the RFP and the requirements would not have been available at the time of the meeting and subsequently not shared with the supplier. Those suppliers may submit a response. The Human Resources Department is currently using laser fiche for their needs and may have had discussions with the firm regarding their current software solution.
39	Are there any specific solutions that GISD has investigated in the past year? If so, which ones?	See response to question 38
40	Has a consultant already presented an estimated budget, and if so, has that been discussed with the board?	Yes, it has been discussed with the Board and the budget includes hardware, software, services, training, on-going services and staffing
41	If GISD used a consultant to help prepare this RFP, is the consultant allowed to be a respondent?	IMERGE Consulting was used to help prepare the RFP and budget. IMERGE does not sell hardware, software, nor programming services. IMERGE does not accept kickbacks (finder's fees). IMERGE is a vendor neutral, unbiased consultancy advising the District to find the best solution/partner at an appropriate cost. IMERGE Consulting is not allowed to respond to this request.
42	In regards to Student information, when a student transfers from one school to another, does GISD want that information to follow the student to that location?	Yes, although "location" is more a consideration of access rights to student data than transfer of student record from location to location. As you would expect, a student may attend multiple facilities (e.g. Garland North HS and Garland Technical Center).
43	The RFP has several tables within the response covering requirements and pricing, could the district provide excel versions (If already existing) to respondents?	The District will provide the tables as a Word document.
44	Is it a requirement that the software vendor is a Skyward Integration Partner?	No
45	There are alternative system architectures that have proven to be more flexible than the one described in the First Use Case. Is this specific hierarchical/cascading structure a system architecture requirement?	If the vendor's architecture is capable of replicating the hierarchy as defined without adding administrative overhead (defining searches, etc.), then describe it to satisfy the requirement. If Vendor believes their architecture offers a more flexible result, explain it in Section 9.122.

#	Question	Response
46	<p>Reading through the RFP, the document type hierarchies described in use cases indicate a requirement for a specific type of system/database architecture that appears to align/limit options for the district to Filebound, an offering from Upland Software, listed as a Skyward as the only Integration Partner. There are alternative architectures that have proven to be more flexible because documents are not limited to a specific hierarchical/cascading structure, allowing the data/documents to be retrieved or presented in a multitude of ways including a folder structure if desired. While the architecture described will work, the alternative is much more flexible and can be configured to present the data in a way that matches a business case providing a more user-friendly solution with a higher/faster user adoption rate. Is it a requirement that the software vendor is a Skyward Integration Partner and that the solution is architected as described and if not, is Garland ISD open to removing this minimum requirement allowing for an alternative solution that can be integrated with Skyward without custom development?</p>	<p>If the vendor's architecture is capable of replicating the hierarchy as defined without adding administrative overhead (defining searches, etc.), then describe it to satisfy the requirement. If Vendor believes their architecture offers a more flexible result, explain it in Section 9.122.</p> <p>GISD is open to vendor approaches to Skyward integration.</p> <p>Upland Software is not a preferred vendor.</p>