



ADDENDUM #1
Information Technology
Information Technology Service Management (ITSM) Platform
RFP # 7474-23

June 9, 2023

The attached addendum supersedes the original Information and Specifications regarding RFP # 7474-23 where it adds to, deletes from, clarifies or otherwise modifies. All other conditions and any previous addendums shall remain unchanged.

Please note: BIDS will only be accepted electronically by emailing purchasing@bouldercounty.org.

1. Question: What is the budget for this project?

ANSWER: The budget has not been set as this RFP is exploration for a potential budget request. The approved budget amount cannot be shared once defined.

2. Question: What is the current ITSM solution being used today?

ANSWER: Ivanti Cherwell Service Management is used for ITSM, PPM, and some HR Service management.

3. Question: How many admins do you have supporting the current solution, and how many do you plan to staff with the new solution?

ANSWER: 2 / 2.

4. Question: How many staff users?

ANSWER: ~160.

5. Question: How many end users?

ANSWER: ~3000.

6. Question: Current solution?

ANSWER: See Question #2.

7. Question: Did any vendor influence this RFP?

ANSWER: No.

8. Question: Do you have a range for the budget? Under 100K, between 100K and 250K, over 250K?

ANSWER: See Question #1.

9. Question: Please provide an estimated count for the system users for the following roles (Estimated count of users – For System License quote)

- a. Project Users – Who will be creating/updating/closing the Project/Program/Portfolio tasks.
- b. Business Stakeholders – Who will need “read only” access to system data and reports.
- c. Self Service Users – Who will be submitting the Project Intake request form
- d. Fulfillers – Who will be working and closing Incident/Change/Problem tickets

ANSWER: a. 60 Project/Portfolio managers, 440 task contributors.

b. See Question #5.

c. Apx 150 could initiate project requests.

d. See Question #4.

10. Question: Would Boulder County consider granting 2 weeks of extension for the RFP Response submission due date to be (07/04/2023)

ANSWER: Extensions for this RFP will not be permitted at this time. Submittals remain due on June 20, 2023.

11. Question: Please confirm if the system implementation team members can be located outside of the US (Offshore team) to include application developers and QA testers roles. They would have access to only Non-PROD instance. (Solution Implementation and support team)

ANSWER: Yes, for the vendor. We would not need this for our own admin.

12. Question: Data Migration

- a. What is the current system being used for ITSM and IT Project work from which data needs to be migrated to new application?
- b. Is data migration needed for open tickets or closed tickets or both?

ANSWER:

- a. **Ivanti Cherwell Service Management is the current system. Data migration is not part of requirements. If we can do CSV imports, we can manage any data migration on our own that might be needed.**
- b. **See response to a.**

13. Question: Please provide a rough count of total number of integrations currently in place or will be required in future (System Integrations)

ANSWER: 4 currently, two additional known for the future, but undetermined for future potential.

14. Question: Does the county have a pricing template that they would like us to respond to?

ANSWER: No. Please see RFP, page 8.

15. Question: What's the current Identity and Access management application in place for Boulder County?

ANSWER: Active Directory and Azure Active Directory

16. Question: What is the budget for this work?

ANSWER: See Question #1.

17. Question: What is the current solution the county is leveraging for ITSM?

ANSWER: See Question #2.

18. Question: What are your main pain points and challenges with the current ITSM solution?

ANSWER: Current pain points/challenges: 1) Lack of a modernized solution that requires minimal customizations 2) Limited functionality in terms of reporting, searching and metrics capabilities; 3) Absence of a mobile platform for ITSM

19. Question: What is the current solution the county is leveraging for PPM?

ANSWER: See Question #2.

20. Question: What are your main pain points and challenges with the current PPM solution?

ANSWER: Current pain points: 1) lack of a centralized/one stop shop solution where project and portfolio information (scope, schedule, budget, resources, risks, issues, requirements and priorities, change control, etc.) can be accessed, reviewed, and analyzed by stakeholders; 2) lack of out of the box/customizable reporting; 3) lack of two-way API integrations

21. Question: Prior to releasing the RFP, have you engaged with other vendors in demos or received pricing? If so, who have you reviewed thus far?

ANSWER: Yes. Over time, at trade shows and as part of a discovery phase to learn more about ITSM, we had demos from Ivanti, ServiceNow, and many others over several years.

22. Question: Will Boulder county consider tools which do not provide multi-language support or is this a hard requirement?

ANSWER: This is a hard requirement. We will not consider tools which do not provide multi-language support.

23. Question: In your current solution, what departments are leveraging the service management platform outside of IT? Is there a desire to incorporate non-IT groups? If so, who are those groups?

ANSWER: The current ITSM platform is utilized by many non-IT groups across the county.

24. Question: You ask for vendors to complete a Sustainability Questionnaire, but it was not included in the RFP. Can you please make this available or tell vendors where we can locate this?

ANSWER: Please disregard. The Sustainability Questionnaire is no longer required.

25. Question: Is Boulder County currently leveraging any tools such as SCCM, InTune, or Jamf for endpoint or asset management?

ANSWER: Yes.

26. Question: Boulder County mentions wanting to integrate with tools such as Oracle ERP, Office 365, DocuSign, FileNet, and UKG Dimensions. Can you elaborate on or provide example use cases for these integrations?

ANSWER: Oracle: Project financials; O365: Teams, Outlook; DocuSign: routing documents; UKG: timekeeping.

27. Question: For licensing purposes, we have a named user license model. Can you provide us with the total number of technicians that need the ability to fulfill requests? If applicable, please include non-IT staff who are also fulfilling requests.

ANSWER: ~160.

28. Question: What tool or technology is the County currently using to support its ITSM processes?

ANSWER: See Question #2.

29. Question: How many internal users will use the system?

ANSWER: See Question #5.

30. Question: Will the tool primarily be used on a laptop/desktop, or will the County expect robust mobile capabilities for use on a cell-phone sized device?

ANSWER: Both.

31. Question: What third party systems (if any) would the County expect to integrate with this tool?

ANSWER: See Question #26.

32. Question: What project management methodologies/frameworks are being used in the county (i.e., waterfall vs agile/iterative)

ANSWER: Primarily waterfall; however, we also have some teams that use agile. There is a possibility for more teams to move toward agile project management in the future.

33. Question: Are there particular budget/price point boundaries to consider?

ANSWER: See Question #1.

34. Question: Is there a requirement to migrate historical data into the new solution? If so, what is the approximate size of the data to be migrated?

ANSWER: See Question #12.

35. Question: Does the system need to support other languages besides English? If so, which languages?

ANSWER: See Question #22.

36. Question: Will the State please confirm if bidders can rely on subcontractor relevant experience and references to meet the minimum qualifications?

ANSWER: Yes.

37. Question: Exhibit A: Boulder County Data and Cyber Security Requirements - Exhibit A lists seven types of data and associated security requirements. Our assumption is that the only type of data that the vendor might possibly need to access for this project is PII. Please confirm that this assumption is valid

ANSWER: The vendor might have access to any of the seven types of data and are bound by the associated security requirements that are listed in Exhibit A.

38. Question: RFP #7474-23 / Submittal Section - The last item on page 13 is an open-ended question asking Vendor to indicate which of three confidentiality levels is applicable to its line-item pricing. However the requirement calls for a yes/no answer. Should vendors ignore the yes/no instruction add its answer below the table?

ANSWER: The question is asking if those categories apply to your line-item pricing information.

39. Question: RFP #7474-23 / Proposer Checklist - The RFP asks vendors to follow the response outline provided. However, the checklist includes several items that were not called out in the outline. Should the vender just add sections where applicable for the following?

- i. Relevant experience of key personnel
- ii. Compliance to T&Cs

ANSWER: Yes.

40. Question: RFP #7474-23 / Proposer Checklist - The checklist includes a requirement for a Sustainability Questionnaire. Is this a document that will be provided?

ANSWER: Please disregard – See Question #24.

41. Question: Attachment A, rows 18/54 - How many total users are expected? How many of these are technicians?

ANSWER: See Questions #4 and #5.

42. Question: Attachment A, row 135 - Do you want any integrations for CMDB? What device management systems are you currently using (e.g., Jamf, MECM, InTune, etc).

ANSWER: Desktop Central and Netreo.

43. Question: Are there any required integrations beyond LDAP/AD/CMDB?

ANSWER: Yes; Exchange, TEAMS through API calls.

44. Question: What is your current ITSM system?

ANSWER: See Question #2.

45. Question: What is your current PPM system?

ANSWER: See Question #2.

46. Question: Attachment A, rows 113-126 - What is your current Knowledge Management system? Is there a requirement to transfer content? If so, is the content available in XML/Word formats?

ANSWER: Ivanti Cherwell contains our current Knowledge Management system. See Question #12 as it relates to transfer. The content format is HTML.

47. Question: Are your ITSM processes currently well-defined and implemented in your ITSM system?

ANSWER: Yes.

48. Question: Two related proposals were released on the same day – RFP 7474-23 for Information Technology Service Management (ITSM) Platform and RFP 7475-23 for Information Technology Project Portfolio Management (PPM) Platform. Can the vendor submit a combined response if the functionality for both would be delivered in one solution?

ANSWER: Yes – please indicate upon submission that this is responsive to both RFPs.

49. Question: What data is expected to be migrated?

ANSWER: See Question #12.

50. Question: From a level of engagement perspective for your ServiceNow technical team, would you rather leverage a or b below?

- a. An implementation where all the configuration is done by the vendor and then the vendor documents what was done and provides a formal handoff to the client ServiceNow admin team so that they can support in the future post go-live.
- b. An implementation where your ServiceNow admin resources are actively involved in the ServiceNow project configuration working with the vendor implementation team to provide direction and coaching, and auditing of their work. This typically required at least 75% of a ServiceNow Admin resource during the implementation timeline but provides on the job training and experience.

ANSWER: We would prefer an implementation where vendor admin resources are actively involved throughout the implementation and knowledge transfer to Boulder County employees/admin is provided.

51. Question: What systems used today are expected to be integrated with ServiceNow beyond Azure AD?

ANSWER: See Question #26.

52. Question: What discovery tools are used today and, in the future, to populate the CMDB (Licensing, asset data, ITOM service craft connectors)

ANSWER: Desktop Central and Netreo.

53. Question: Is a phased approach in consideration for implementation and if so, is there a “must have” list of capabilities for Phase 1?

ANSWER: No, a phased approach is not in consideration.

54. Question: Upon finalization of the contracts, when will the work ideally begin? When is the work to be completed and potential Go Live Date?

ANSWER: The schedule has not been set as this RFP is exploration for a potential ITSM. If we move forward with a new ITSM, after contracting, we would ideally begin work in Q2 of 2024, with a potential go live date Q4 2024 and project completion in Q1 or Q2 2025.

55. Question: Will a demonstration or Proof of Concept be needed after the submission of RFP?

ANSWER: See RFP, page 14.

56. Question: What is the incumbent ITSM software?

ANSWER: See Question #2.

57. Question: When is the incumbent ITSM software contract up?

ANSWER: Current arrangement is an annual renewal every August.

58. Question: Is there a target go live date?

ANSWER: See Question #54.

59. Question: Can you share a target decision date?

ANSWER: Q4 2023.

60. Question: How many agent licenses will Boulder County need?

ANSWER: See Question #4.

61. Question: How many assets are you looking to manage in your ITSM platform?

ANSWER: ~3500 IT assets.

62. Question: Are you looking to manage Software licenses as well? If so, for how many employees?

ANSWER: Not at this time.

63. Question: Are there any additional integrations required outside of Oracle ERP, Office 365, DocuSign, FileNet, and UKG Dimensions?

ANSWER: Azure Active Directory, Microsoft Exchange, Microsoft Teams, Desktop Central and Netreo.

64. Question: Can you describe the use case for integrating with Oracle ERP, FileNet, and UKG Dimension? How do you intend to integrate these tools with an ITSM solution?

ANSWER: See Question #26.

65. Question: Would the team be open to a technical discovery call in order for us to provide a tailored demonstration of how we would solve for the RFP requirements?

ANSWER: See RFP, page 14.

66. Question: Is compliance to the following mandatory: ADA, CJIS, COPPA, or FTI?

ANSWER: See Question #37.

67. Question: What is the contract/term length for this RFP?

ANSWER: 5 years.

68. Question: How many licenses will be needed for ITSM for Fulfillers (people who will be working on tickets)?

ANSWER: See Question #4.

69. Question: How many licenses will be needed for ITSM Stakeholders (people who will need to approve and comment on tickets, but not work them)?

ANSWER: See Question #9b.

70. Question: How many licenses will be needed for Project Management?

ANSWER: See Question #9a.

71. Question: How many integrations and to what tools/systems are required for this solution (page 6, Functional Requirements)?

ANSWER: 6; Active Directory, Azure AD, MS Exchange, MS Teams, Desktop Central, Netro, with potential for more in the future.

72. Question: CJIS was mentioned in the main RFP document (page 9). Will this solution require integration with CJIS data?

ANSWER: No.

73. Question: What are the county retention schedules (line 68 of Attachment A)?

ANSWER: In General, our policy is 7-year retentions. There are law enforcement, personnel, and financial records that are exceptions to this general rule.

74. Question: Could you confirm the number of ITSM Fulfillers across all processes (Incident, Change, Problem, CMDB etc.).

ANSWER: See Question #4.

75. Question: How many “end users” will need access to your Self-Service Portal for ITSM Incidents, Requests, and Knowledge?

ANSWER: See Question #5.

76. Question: Is there any specific interfaces that is expected to be ready for the initial deployment (mobile applications, self-service portals)? And if so, could you please elaborate on the details?

ANSWER: All Technician and Customer facing interfaces are expected to be 100% operational at go live.

77. Question: Could you please confirm if the RFP 7474-23 includes the Project and portfolio management module, or if this is specifically for ITSM?

ANSWER: Project and Portfolio Management is included in this RFP as an additional module if available in your proposal / product.

78. Question: ITSM usually includes the configuration of a Service Catalog, with multiple forms where user can request services. Each request form (catalog item) is configured separately. Is there any expectation in terms of the number of catalog items this initial implementation should include?

ANSWER: We currently use ~300 catalog items.

79. Question: Does Boulder County expect Organizational Change Management as well as ITSM Fulfiller training as part of this ITSM platform implementation?

ANSWER: Yes.

80. Question: Where will be pulling in your user data from? LDAP, Active Directory or other?

ANSWER: Active Directory (LDAP) or Azure Active Directory.

81. Question: Will there be a need for SMS or Notify integrations?

ANSWER: No.

82. Question: Are you using any reporting tools today? E.g. PowerBI, or Custom tool?

ANSWER: Yes, PowerBI.

83. Question: CMDB discovery: Please confirm the number of servers, cloud PaaS resources, containers and end-user computing devices. Are all end user computing devices fully integrated in your corporate network?

ANSWER: ~4000; yes, all end-user computing devices are fully integrated in the corporate network.

84. Question: CMDB: Which 3rd party discovery tools need to be integrated?

ANSWER: See Question #52.

85. Question: What is the intended start date?

ANSWER: See Question #54.

86. Question: What is the intended period of performance?

ANSWER: We expect the environment up 24/365 on a 5-year contract with annual renewal. For implementation, please see Question #54.

87. Question: What is the current system being used for ITSM?

ANSWER: See Question #12.

88. Question: Will there be a required data migration or will this be a fresh start on the new system? If data migration, how many records and what types?

ANSWER: See Question #12.

89. Question: What other systems will be integrated with the ITSM solution? Will those systems be one or two-way integrations?

ANSWER: See Question 26; the majority of integrations would be one-way.

90. Question: What will be the authentication method for users?

ANSWER: Azure SAML Single Sign On.

91. Question: Do you have a service/request catalog in the current systems? If so, how many items are in it?

ANSWER: See Question #78.

92. Question: Are you doing "onboarding" in the current system? If so, can you share some details about that process?

ANSWER: The Onboarding process is handled in another system and work items are fulfilled in the ITSM solution.

93. Question: Is asset management in scope? If so, hardware and software? Are there integrations to support these assets?

ANSWER: Asset Management is listed is a requirement. See Question #52, #61, #62 and #83.

94. Question: Do you have a knowledge base and if so, will it need to be migrated? Please share some details about how many articles.

ANSWER: The county has an existing knowledge database. Migrating content is not a requirement of this RFP.

95. Question: Do you have a CMDB today? If so, how is data populated?

ANSWER: Yes; data is populated manually.

96. Question: How many people will be using this system (working in it, not requesting tickets)?

ANSWER: See Question #4.

97. Question: How many people will be using this system for PPM?

ANSWER: See Question #9.

98. Question: How many end users do you currently support?

ANSWER: See Question #5.

99. Question: Can you share who is bidding on these two implementations?

ANSWER: No.

100. Question: Is there a budget established and set aside for these projects?

ANSWER: See Question #1.

101. Question: If so, how much budget is allocated for each project?

ANSWER: See Question #1.

102. Question: What are the current challenges and what are long term goals for the new platform? What does your company or organization hope to improve?

ANSWER: See Question #18.

103. Question: What is the selection process and timeline? E.g. Down-selection, orals, contract negotiation?

ANSWER: Selection process is outlined in RFP on page 14. Vendor selection is anticipated in Q4 2023.

104. Question: What is the project timeline? What are the target dates to start and complete (go-live) both implementations?

ANSWER: See Question #54.

105. Question: Will there be an opportunity to present?

ANSWER: See RFP, page 14.

106. Question: Is it Boulder County's expectation that the ITSM and PPM implementations be completed in a single continuous delivery?

ANSWER: Combined ITSM/PPM as well as separate application deployment are being considered.

107. Question: Are there any data migrations from Boulder County's current ITSM and PPM solutions expected?

ANSWER: See Question #12.

108. Question: These external systems were in the questionnaires by name:

- a. Oracle ERP
- b. Office 365
- c. DocuSign
- d. File Net
- e. UKG Dimensions
- f. 3rd party discovery tools

How many of these external systems are expected to be included in the implementation, and what's the primary functionality you are looking for each integration? Are there any additional systems to be aware of?

Note: SSO and AD/LDAP type integrations are typical and accounted for.

ANSWER: See Question #26.

109. Question: Once implemented, is the County looking for ongoing services (Managed Services Program) to continue with ongoing enhancements, backlog reduction and bi-annual updates to ServiceNow ITSM and SPM (PPM)?

ANSWER: We are expecting an ITSM solution that is managed as a multi-tenant cloud software as a service (SaaS) configuration including regularly scheduled feature and functionality enhancements, server maintenance (OS currency, security patching, etc.)

110. Question: If so, what is the preference on the duration of a Managed Services program?

ANSWER: For the life of the contract plus optional renewals.

111. Question: Which core components (Incident, Change, Problem, Service Catalog, Reporting, etc)? Is there a requirement for Performance Analytics and Dashboards?

ANSWER: See Attachment A.

112. Question: What types of reports? What will you report on? Who will view reports?

ANSWER: We will report on all data available from the ITSM. We will want tabular and real-time drillable dashboards. Some examples of reports could include mean time to perform, status, SLAs, stale tickets, etc. People who will view/use/run the reports would be all technical users of the ITSM, and there will be high-level visibility for leadership outside of IT.

113. Question: What type of dashboards? Who will use the dashboards?

ANSWER: See Question #112.

114. Question: What type of data will be imported into instance?

ANSWER: See Question #12.

115. Question: What type of Catalog Items will be required? How many Catalog Items?

ANSWER: All current (~300) service offerings. See Question #78.

116. Question: Who will be the users of the ITSM solution? How many end users? How many fulfillers?

ANSWER: See Question #4 and #5.

117. Question: What type of HR Services are required? Do we need to consider an HR Solution outside of ITSM?

ANSWER: HR tickets are currently processed in current ITSM for personnel action notices, on-board, off-board, pay issues, etc. It is our intention to continue this configuration with a replacement ITSM. Onboard and offboard processes are not handled in ITSM; however, the onboard and offboard technical tickets are processed through the ITSM.

118. Question: What languages need to be supported? Do you have the ability to do translations?

ANSWER: See Question #22.

119. Question: What type of reports are required? How many subscribers?

ANSWER: See Question #112.

120. Question: What is meant by "response time"? Is this referring to platform performance or response SLAs for support?

ANSWER: One context is uptime and availability on our user volume; the other being vendor response time to service requests.

121. Question: What levels of support are required?

ANSWER: Implementation, post-implementation, and product support. Our expectation is there will be a contractual definition of SLA that will include escalations based on severity.

122. Question: What other applications need to be integrated with the solution? What are the requirements for those integrations?

ANSWER: See Question #26.

123. Question: Is there an existing KB that needs to be imported into the system or will it be created from scratch? Is there existing content?

ANSWER: See Question #94.

124. Question: Is there an existing CMDB?

ANSWER: Yes.

125. Question: Are there Discovery tools already in place that need to be integrated?

ANSWER: See Question #42.

126. Question: Does Asset Management need to be considered as part of this solution?

ANSWER: See Question #93.

127. Question: What type of training is required?

ANSWER: Administrator, Technician, Stakeholder, and End User are all under consideration.

128. Question: What business issues are currently in the way of you accomplishing your top business objective(s)? Business issue being timebound and measureable challenges that have to be solved to achieve the organization's objectives

ANSWER: See Question #18.

129. Question: What future projects and/or initiatives are dependent on/ awaiting the completion of this engagement?

ANSWER: None.

130. Question: What capability does the County currently not have that you are looking to have at the end of this engagement?

ANSWER: See RFP, page 6.

131. Question: Is there a prevailing event/initiative/etc. that triggered the creation and release of this solicitation?

ANSWER: No.

132. Question: What obstacles, if any, is the County experiencing that led to the creation of this solicitation?

ANSWER: See Question #18

133. Question: Has a budget for this contract been determined? If so, what is it?

ANSWER: See Question #1.

134. Question: Will this be a net new contract or will it replace an existing contract? If so, which contract will it be replacing?

ANSWER: New contract to replace the existing Ivanti contract.

135. Question: Is this a single-award or multiple-award RFP? (i.e., will the County award only to one vendor, or will awards to multiple vendors be considered)?

ANSWER: Our intention is a single-award RFP.

136. Question: How many employees does the County have?

ANSWER: See Question #5.

137. Question: How many IT employees does the County have?

ANSWER: ~70

138. Question: How many employees will need to work on tickets within the solution (i.e., how many fulfillers)?

ANSWER: See Question #4.

139. Question: How many employees will need to be able to work on projects within the solution?

ANSWER: See Question #9.

140. Question: What tool (or tools) aside from Cherwell is the County currently using to meet the ITSM needs outlined in the RFP?

ANSWER: We use Snipe for asset management, Excel for external tracking, PowerBI for reporting, and various project management tools.

141. Question: What tool (or tools) aside from Cherwell is the County currently using to meet the ESM (specifically non-IT) needs outlined in the RFP?

ANSWER: See Question #140. In addition, Netro, Microsoft Forms, and Power Automate.

142. Question: Could the County please describe what it envisions as the MVP for the first Go-Live? (i.e., what processes/capabilities must be in play for the first Go-Live? Incident Mgt, Change Mgt, Project Management, etc.)

ANSWER: The County expects full functionality at go-live.

143. Question: What, if any data is the County looking to migrate from it's existing toolset(s) into the new platform?

ANSWER: See Question #12.

144. Question: When is the County looking to be live on the new solution?

ANSWER: See Question #54.

145. Question: What is driving the target Go-Live date? (e.g., upcoming subscription renewal)

ANSWER: This is an attempt to be realistic about the time it will take to modify processes, work with contracting, training, unexpected delays, etc for a roll-out for the size of our organization.

146. Question: How many Cherwell licenses does the County currently have?

ANSWER: 40 Concurrent licenses.

147. Question: Does the County have CSM or CSMe licenses?

ANSWER: CSM.

148. Question: Does the County have perpetual or subscription CSM licenses?

ANSWER: Subscription.

149. Question: How many Cherwell Asset Management licenses, if any, does the County have?

ANSWER: 0.

150. Question: What platform and content version of Cherwell Service Management is the County currently on?

ANSWER: 10.1.4.

151. Question: What are your top 3 challenges/issues with the current Cherwell platform?

ANSWER: See Question #18.

152. Question: Please describe the makeup of the County's project team that will staff this engagement. Do you have Business Analysts that will be assigned? A Project Manager? Etc.

ANSWER: IT Management (hardware, software, security, training, PMO, data) are committed to this project. The direct team does include a BA, a PM, a application admin, service desk manager and IT enterprise manager.

153. Question: What internal resources will be available for User Acceptance testing? How available/not will these resources be?

ANSWER: Our implementation plan will ensure availability of necessary testing resources internal via IT and with the other super user groups in the County.

154. Question: Following ITSM and IT Project, what other areas are on the County's roadmap for possible implementation into the new ESM platform?

ANSWER: In the RFP where we mention "Enterprise Service Management" we are referring to a service management system that users from the entire Boulder County Enterprise could utilize. We did not intend to mean the initialism of ESM that includes ITSM and PPM. At this time, ESM is out of scope for the current requisition. An ESM may be considered; however, the full suite of ESM is not currently necessary.

155. Question: What does the County look for in a long-term strategic partnership? What makes a great partner for the County specifically?

ANSWER: Integrity, security, responsivity, visionary product roadmaps.

156. Question: Will the County consider adding an additional evaluation factor for "vendor diversity" such as for woman-owned or minority-owned small businesses?

ANSWER: Our policy does not allow the use of evaluation points for women or minority-owned businesses at this time.

157. Question: Can the County please provide more detail on the "Add on Features" evaluation criteria? What specifically will the County evaluate for that criteria? Product roadmaps? Ancillary services?

ANSWER: The potential for Add on Features would vary from system to system, as in, what other potential features does a system provide that we may not currently use, but could see benefit to using either immediately or in the future.

158. Question: Please describe all the features/business objects currently in use in the Cherwell platform?

ANSWER: Primary business objects are change Request, Configuration Items, Customer Objects (such as Identity), HR Case, Incident, IT Project, Knowledge Article, Problem, Service, SLAs. Features include but not limited to RestAPI, LDAP, SAML, O365, etc

159. Question: Does the County have any custom Business Objects?

ANSWER: Yes.

160. Question: Does the County leverage any mApps?

ANSWER: Yes.

161. Question: How many resources will the County look to train as part of this engagement?

ANSWER: Depending on the platform, at a minimum the resources would be 160 users with an expectation that County IT will distribute end-user training materials.

162. Question: Does the County have documented business processes in place?

ANSWER: Yes.

163. Question: Does the County have a documented Service Catalog in place?

ANSWER: Yes.

164. Question: Does the County have any specific pain points or issues with the current Service Catalog?

ANSWER: No.

165. Question: What systems does County intent to integrate with? Please list the use case (data pull, ticket sync, etc) and if it is one-way or bi-directional for each of the systems. (Attachment A – Row 7)

ANSWER: See Question #26.

166. Question: What overarching County strategic initiative is this engagement in support of? (Attachment A – Row 7)

ANSWER: Equity & Justice and Organizational & Financial Stewardship.

167. Question: What has the County tasked as its #1 business objective for 2023? Business objective being something an agency/organization needs to accomplish to maintain or grow their business (profits/mission). (Attachment A – Row 9)

ANSWER: We're a public sector service provider; we do not have profits.

168. Question: What roadblocks or challenges is the County experiencing with Enterprise Service Delivery? (Attachment A – Row 10)

ANSWER: See Question #18.

169. Question: Could the County please describe the level of maturity the County has with ITIL practices? (Attachment A – Row 10)

ANSWER: Boulder County uses ITIL practices to a reasonable extent for the majority of IT functional areas and seeks to continue deepening its adoption of ITIL practices through this ITSM procurement and associated process improvements.

170. Question: What business units outside of IT is the County looking to have in the solution? (Attachment A – Row 16)

ANSWER: See Question #23.

171. Question: What are non-IT use cases that the County is looking to have in the solution? (Attachment A – Row 16)

ANSWER: HR Services, Finance Services, Department specific services, and others as needed.

172. Question: What tool (or tools) is the County currently using to meet the HRSD needs outlined in the RFP? (Attachment A – Row 16)

ANSWER: See Question #2.

173. Question: Does the County currently have knowledge articles? If so, what system are they in? What format (if known)? How many? (Attachment A – Row 113)

ANSWER: See Question #46.

174. Question: Does the County currently have a CMDB? (Attachment A – Row 127)

ANSWER: Yes.

175. Question: Does the County currently use any discovery tools to discover CIs on it's networks? If so, what tool(s)? (Attachment A – Row 127)

ANSWER: See Question #42.

176. Question: What current system(s), if any, does the County use for Project Management? (Attachment A – Row 146)

ANSWER: See Question #2.

177. Question: Does the County expect to implement time cards through the system or integrate time cards in a current system? If current system, what is that system? (Attachment A – Row 146)

ANSWER: Time cards will continue to be processed through County HRIS system(s). Currently we use UKG WorkForceCentral and will migrate to UKG Dimensions in January of 2024. There is a long-term goal to marry ticket time to timecard time in the future.

178. Question: Is the County staff centralized, dispersed through multiple locations or remote? If multiple locations and/or remote, please provide breakdown by percentage. (Attachment A – Row 190)

ANSWER: County staff are dispersed throughout multiple locations and remote in 21 unique departments. We are unable to provide a breakdown by percentage due to each department's unique requirements.

179. Question: Kindly describe what are all the 3rd party API's needs to be integrated within the system? Will you provide all the API informations such as API documentation, API key's etc...Are we need to suggest the API providers based on your requirement?

ANSWER: See Question #26.

180. Question: Kindly describe what are all the services will be covered in this SaaS platform. Who are all the end users of this application?

ANSWER: Refer to page 6 of the RFP, and see Question #4, #5, and #9.

181. Question: Kindly share a detailed specification for the following sections - Project and portfolio management, workflow, and time tracking. Any possibility to have a meeting with your team to discuss the requirements for better scope understanding? Is there any design wire frames available, software requirement specification document(SRS) or functional specification document?

ANSWER: Boulder County currently manages a mix of technology related projects primarily through its IT PMO; however, several projects are also overseen by other departments and offices across the county. Currently, there is no centralized solution where project information (scope, schedule, budget, resources, risks, issues, change control, etc.) can be accessed, reviewed, and analyzed by stakeholders. The current solution consists of various excel-based

toolsets, disparate templates (Microsoft Project, Word, etc.), Microsoft Teams, document repositories using SharePoint folder hierarchies, and other tools aimed at portfolio management. We request a tool that supports workflow management (generates individual task lists, reports status, routes action notifications, supports approvals, etc.). Within that tool, users should be able to track time in the system, or through integrations that will aid in informing scheduling of future similar projects.

There will be no meetings with vendors prior to the 20 June submittal. Refer to vendor demo section of RFP on page 14.

There are no further design wire frames, software requirements, or functional specifications beyond what is included in the RFP.

182. Question: Any existing sample data's & paper based reports available to analyse and find the required charts & graphs.

ANSWER: No.

Submittal Instructions:

Submittals are due at the email box only, listed below, for time and date recording on or before **2:00 p.m. Mountain Time on June 20, 2023.**

Please note that email responses to this solicitation are limited to a maximum of 50MB capacity.

NO ZIP FILES OR LINKS TO EXTERNAL SITES WILL BE ACCEPTED. THIS INCLUDES GOOGLE DOCS AND SIMILAR SITES. ALL SUBMITTALS MUST BE RECEIVED AS AN ATTACHMENT (E.G. PDF, WORD, EXCEL).

Electronic submittals must be received in the email box listed below. Submittals sent to any other box will NOT be forwarded or accepted. This email box is only accessed on the due date of your questions or proposals. Please use the Delivery Receipt option to verify receipt of your email. It is the sole responsibility of the proposer to ensure their documents are received before the deadline specified above. Boulder County does not accept responsibility under any circumstance for delayed or failed email or mailed submittals.

Email purchasing@bouldercounty.org; identified as **RFP # 7474-23** in the subject line.

All proposals must be received and time and date recorded at the purchasing email by the above due date and time. Sole responsibility rests with the Offeror to see that their bid is received on time at the stated location(s). Any bid received after due date and time will be returned to the bidder. No exceptions will be made.

The Board of County Commissioners reserve the right to reject any and all bids, to waive any informalities or irregularities therein, and to accept the bid that, in the opinion of the Board, is in the best interest of the Board and of the County of Boulder, State of Colorado.



**RECEIPT OF LETTER
ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

June 9, 2023

Dear Vendor:

This is an acknowledgment of receipt of Addendum #1 for RFP #7474-23, Information Technology Service Management (ITSM) Platform.

In an effort to keep you informed, we would appreciate your acknowledgment of receipt of the preceding addendum. Please sign this acknowledgment and email it back to purchasing@bouldercounty.org as soon as possible. If you have any questions, or problems with transmittal, please call us at 303-441-3525. This is also an acknowledgement that the vendor understands that **BIDS will only be accepted electronically by emailing purchasing@bouldercounty.org.**

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter. This information is time and date sensitive; an immediate response is requested.

Sincerely,

Boulder County Purchasing

Signed by: _____ **Date:** _____

Name of Company _____

End of Document