

# Facility & Support Services

600 West Fourth Street  
Davenport, Iowa 52801  
(563) 326-8738 (Voice)

(563) 328-3245 Fax



~ Our Promise: Professional People, Solving Problems, High Performance

Addendum No. 6

Request #19177

Enterprise Content Management System and Implementation Services

Project #IT2015-1002

PreBid Vendor Conference questions/answers

*What are the current problems with Canon's imageWARE? Why is the county moving away from this solution?*

*The main reasons are that this is not a complete ECM solution, and currently this software is at its end of life.*

*Could the county prioritize the departments and agencies we are looking to bring over in phase I of the project. Which ones are slated for a future phase?*

*The primary conversion goal is imageWARE, and possible a handful of other smaller record sets that the county can "cut our teeth" on to learn the processes and workflows needed to convert existing digital data into the new solution. The county will seek assistance in creating a timeline/workflow for converting other files post-implementation.*

*What is the anticipated license breakdown?*

Total	System Administrator	Record Manager	Department Manager	Daily End User	Inquiry / Search Only
482	2	15	15	300	150

*Typically cloud based systems are not as open in terms of APIs. What are the expectations for the ECM system in relation to the county's cloud based systems listed on the interface page?*

*Our hope is to identify a flexible solution that is able to obtain index data based on fields on a computer screen. The hope is that the ECM solution isn't dependent upon direct connection into 3rd party/cloud based/custom applications.*

*In the requirements listing, there seems to be a great deal of discussion around records management with not much day to day content management from conception to disposal. Do you want the solution to be what the users maintain document through their life cycle or is this more for retention?*

*The hope is that an ECM can help us with ILM, but we currently don't have capabilities with ILM at this point and we are looking to a solution that could help us with this process. We are currently using file shares, discourage local C drive use but it is suspected that local storage is used. We are looking for ECM to be a better solution. We also are hoping for the solution to help with storage of documents in Exchange.*

*Are you expecting pricing in regards to the interfaces in this RFP response?*

*We are looking more for something that allows connectivity to these cloud based solutions, more than direct connections. We want an ECM solution to help us with life cycle management, and would like the ability to keep those systems free of documents, and kept in the ECM.*

*In the technical proposal section – item number 14 there is a requirement that the peer sites be within a 6 hour drive of Scott County. Is it a barrier if the chosen sites are outside of this range?*

*This is not a huge barrier. We ideally want to drive there and visit, but we recognize this isn't always possible and are open to other solutions.*

*Is Scott County's goal to use internal resources for the capture process? Do you have an order of magnitude for back filing and conversion as well as moving forward?*

*We don't have a good answer, we are learning the scope of this project and don't have a great response to this. We are looking to own the capture process so that we can expand and contract as needed.*

*We learned that the Scott County line item for this budget is approximately \$300,000. Is this solid or is there expansion room?*

*We see this as a range from \$200,000 to \$350,000 depending upon professional and conversion services.*

*Should we include "a la carte" pricing options as well?*

*Yes.*

*What are your estimates for number of concurrent users?*

*25 to 50 is probably a fair estimate. We have approximately 200 office workers, but a full county employee staff of just around 500. Ideally want to have enough licensing*

*so that all users can access the ECM, but we don't see more than the 25 to 50 needing concurrent access.*

*As far as future growth – do you see the number growing?*

*Probably not in the first few years, but it really depends on whether or not the content management solution supplants file share as our end users primary storage. If this happens, concurrent users could be up closer to a few hundred.*

*Is the county open to named users rather than concurrent users?*

*Yes. We are open to either solution.*

*Can the selected team be allowed to remote for the service engagement or do you require that all work be done onsite?*

*It may make sense for some services more than other for on-site versus remote, but there is no requirement for the county to have the vendor on-site.*

*Is VPN required or can it just be username and password?*

*We are hoping to be able to host this for use/search on the internet. So we would like to have an option for this to be open with no need for username/password to allow for citizens to search available records.*

*Is there a requirement to access the ECM on a mobile device?*

*Not at this point, but we have just recently implemented Drupal for our website, so if possible it would be helpful to partner with this platform for mobile access.*

*You mentioned a web portal or a citizen's engagement portal – is Drupal the site that we are refereeing to or are you looking for a brand new portal for users to request documents?*

*Either. If we can connect through Drupal that would be ideal, but if there are other options we are open to exploring those as well.*

*Are there any FOIA requirements?*

*Yes, we are always subject to FOIA which is why we want to give the public access direct connection to the ECM solution. Our goal is to provide the public access to those documents that are part of public domain to help eliminate FOIA needed requests*

*From the county's standpoint – what is the best judgement on timeline?*

*We are hoping to begin contract negotiations in early January 2016. Start the project in early 2016, then hope to have Canon conversion completed in 6 to 9 months, as well as some record sets moving towards the new ECM at that time. The county sees this as a calendar year 2016 project.*

*When talking about Drupal and public end users – is part of the process for end users to be able to submit new forms to the county.*

**No.**

*Is the county looking for encryption/security capabilities for specific document types?*

***Yes, we will be storing HIPPA, personnel records, financial records, etc. We will be looking to define security on a per record set basis.***

## Conference Vendor List:

	<b>Registered for PreBid</b>	<b>Attended PreBid</b>
4matix	x	
Alfresco	x	
AliTek	x	x
American Eagle.com	x	x
Cima Software Corporation	x	
Coexsys Consulting	x	
Databank	x	x
Devlin Consulting Group	x	
DLZP Group LLC	x	x
doc2efile	x	
Docfinity	x	x
Documentum		x
FutureNet Group, Inc.	x	
Hannon Hill	x	
ImageSoft	x	
Info-First	x	
MRC Information Technology	x	
Paper Free Tech	x	x
River City Data	x	x
Team Interger	x	x
The C2 Group	x	
Zia		x

\*\*Please note this listing may not be complete as some names/organizations were missed by County staff during introductions.