Purchasing Memorandum No. 2

DATE: February 4, 2026

PLEASE ADDRESS INQUIRIES TO:
Ashley Brown, *Contract Management Specialist Trainee 1*
Telephone Number: (518) 776-2168
E-Mail: purchase@ag.ny.gov

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL NO.: 25-007

TITLE: RFP 25-007 – Enterprise Content Management

BID DUE DATE: February 20, 2026

SUBJECT: Answers to Questions/Inquiries

TO: **ALL PROSPECTIVE BIDDERS**

In reference to the above Request for Proposal, the following questions/inquiries were submitted by prospective bidders. We are hereby providing answers to each question below:

1. QUESTION: Whether companies from outside the USA can apply for this? (like, from India or Canada)
   ANSWER: see Q3 below

2. QUESTION: Whether companies need to come to the USA for meetings?
   ANSWER: see Q3 below

3. QUESTION: Can companies perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside USA? (like, from India or Canada)
   ANSWER: Answers to questions 1-3 are included in segment 6.14 Location of Service (p 42) of the bid document. Copied here:

   6.14 Location of service
   All implementation activities under this contract must be onshore (within the United States) or nearshore (within North America). Offshore delivery of services is not permitted under this agreement. Remote work is allowed for certain technical, development, and support activities, provided that:
   • All remote work complies with OAG security and confidentiality requirements.
   • In-person presence is required for key activities such as project kickoff, critical design workshops, and any sessions explicitly required by OAG.
   • Meetings and communications will occur via OAG-approved channels (email and Microsoft Teams) unless otherwise agreed.

Additional OAG offices across New York State may be designated for specific tasks as needed during the engagement.

Please note: All tasks must be completed within the United States

4. QUESTION: Can companies submit the proposals via email?
   ANSWER: Yes, please see page 1 of the RFP Bid Package for submission instructions.

5. QUESTION: Whether there will be a pre-proposal conference for this solicitation in order to discuss further and ask questions live before submitting formal questions via email?
   ANSWER: Not planned at this time

6. QUESTION: Would the agency consider a three-week extension to the due date to allow for more competition?
   ANSWER: No, but please note the due date has been extended to February 20, 2026.

7. QUESTION: We are unable to open the PDF files embedded in excel file titled: rfp-25-007-enterprise-content-management-oag-current-environment-and-requirement-traceability, can the OAG upload them separately.
   ANSWER: Please see, https://ag.ny.gov/resources/government-organizations/contract-procurement-opportunities/request-proposals, the documents have been uploaded separately under RFP 25-007 – Enterprise Content Management

8. QUESTION: Can you please provide some details around your business goals and objectives to implement your AG Enterprise Content and Records Management (ECM) Modernization project?
   ANSWER: This is described in pages 5-7 of the bid document.

9. QUESTION: Can you share details around your desired outcomes, results, and success factors with this initiative?
   ANSWER: Specific target metrics will be discussed in the analysis and planning stage.

10. QUESTION: What project planning and management methodology approach do you follow at your organization? Do you prefer agile vs waterfall?
    ANSWER: Open to either, though projects have typically been managed in either a full waterfall or a hybrid approach. The need for broad agreement on the architecture design across a large variety of stakeholders will make pure Agile difficult.

11. QUESTION: Do you have any preferred approach with requirements gathering at organization level or are you open to us recommending approach?
    ANSWER: We are open to the contractor's recommendation of an approach. However, a significant amount of requirements has already been captured earlier in the project, so the contractor will need to review the existing documentation first and identify which requirements still need to be elicited.

12. QUESTION: Do you currently have any report generation tools/technologies or platforms, like BI, others?

ANSWER: We have Oracle Analytics Cloud and Power BI. Power BI is preferred for new reports.

13. QUESTION: Do you have a tentation timeline that you would like to achieve to complete this engagement?
ANSWER: The agreement term for awards resulting from this RFP will be **60 months (5 years)**. This extended term is intended to provide sufficient time to implement the core fully and extended ECM functionality, including all planned waves, optional tasks, and post-implementation support activities.

14. QUESTION: Do you have any Integration layer at your enterprise level, if yes, can you provide details of your integration service layer?
ANSWER: We don't have an API gateway finalized. All internal integrations are over REST API's

15. QUESTION: Are there any pending licensing or maintenance agreement deadlines that are driving the project schedule?
ANSWER: Nothing pending at this time.

16. QUESTION: Can you provide details around your current ECM portfolio?
ANSWER: See section 1.3 "Current Environment" on pp 6-7 of the bid document.
Current repository types and volumes are detailed in the "Current Environment and Requirements Traceability" attachment and copied here:

Solution	Volume/Storage
Network File Shares	152.75M files / 199 TB
FileNet	IBM FileNet P8 5.2.1, over 2 TB of documents stored.
CHAR410/CHAR500 (PDF storage)	250 GB (Approx)
SharePoint	1.2 million files/25.53 TB
OneDrive	6.4 million files/ 22.2TB
User C / Local drives not synced to network	~ 11.7 TB
OAG Own Cloud	24 TB of data in OAGCloud

17. QUESTION: Do you have any existing ECM tools and products or in house applications?
ANSWER: See section 1.3 "Current Environment" on pp 6-7 of the bid document.
Current repository types and volumes are detailed in the "Current Environment and Requirements Traceability" attachment and copied here:

Solution	Volume/Storage
Network File Shares	152.75M files / 199 TB
FileNet	IBM FileNet P8 5.2.1, over 2 TB of documents stored.
CHAR410/CHAR500 (PDF storage)	250 GB (Approx)
SharePoint	1.2 million files/25.53 TB
OneDrive	6.4 million files/ 22.2TB
User C / Local drives not synced to network	~ 11.7 TB
OAG Own Cloud	24 TB of data in OAGCloud

18. QUESTION: can you provide details on your Operating System and Version?
    ANSWER: A majority of staff are on Windows 11 workstations and that is preferred OS. We have a few Mac, Windows 10 devices. Hosting is mostly RHEL8, some Oracle Linux 8 servers. Windows Server 2019 or higher are available as needed.

19. QUESTION: Provide details with your choice of Database System (e.g. DB2, Oracle, etc.) and Version?
    ANSWER: Oracle 19c or higher

20. QUESTION: Is database on remote server?
    ANSWER: Yes, remote server hosted on-prem

21. QUESTION: Describe your current data/file ingestion solution and how it is used.
    ANSWER: OAG's current ingestion solution supports multiple intake channels, including manual scanning of paper documents, web-based submissions, e-mails, and bulk uploads via secure SSL connections, and storage on network shares. Files submitted through the web app are stored in Filenet, which serves as one of the content repositories. Once ingested, documents are integrated into evaluation workflows, notice letter generation, and standardized entry templates that initiate common business processes. Additionally, a significant portion of content is created directly by knowledge workers during day-to-day operations, ensuring that both externally submitted and internally generated documents are consistently captured and managed.

22. QUESTION: Do you require paper document scanning?
    ANSWER: Yes, this is to be part of the second stage of implementation and may require procurement of additional tools beyond what we currently have. See RTM in the "Current Environment and Requirements Traceability" attachment, and p.19 of the bid document.

23. QUESTION: Do you have a backlog of paper already in storage which need to be scanned? How much?

ANSWER: Volumes are still under assessment. The contractor should design and implement the paper-scanning/document-processing solution and train OAG staff in its use. OAG staff will then perform the majority of the scanning once the solution has been stabilized and adopted.

24. QUESTION: Describe the features you use in your data/file ingestion solution.
ANSWER: OAG's current ingestion solution supports multiple intake channels, including manual scanning of paper documents, web-based submissions, e-mails, and bulk uploads via secure SSL connections, and storage on network shares. Files submitted through the web app are stored in Filenet, which serves as one of the content repositories. Once ingested, documents are integrated into evaluation workflows, notice letter generation, and standardized entry templates that initiate common business processes. Additionally, a significant portion of content is created directly by knowledge workers during day-to-day operations, ensuring that both externally submitted and internally generated documents are consistently captured and managed.

25. QUESTION: Describe any additional features needed in your data/file ingestion solution.
ANSWER: See RTM in the "Current Environment and Requirements Traceability" attachment

26. QUESTION: Describe any pain points with your data/file ingestion solution.
ANSWER: Our current ingestion process faces several challenges. FileNet, previously the central repository, is out of service, leading to fragmented storage across network shares and web applications. SharePoint is underutilized as a content management platform, resulting in poor metadata and search capabilities. Network shares further exacerbate the issue by lacking collaboration features and robust search, making document retrieval and workflow integration cumbersome. These limitations hinder efficiency, increase compliance risks, and create barriers to scaling a unified ingestion strategy.

27. QUESTION: Do you have files in other storage media which need to be considered? (E.g., tape, CDs, etc.)
    a. How many of each storage media are there? (E.g., number of tapes, number of CDs, etc.)
    b. How are files being uploaded today? Who owns the tape/CD reader devices?
    ANSWER: Tape and CD content will not be ingested in this project. All files will be ingested from existing electronic files that are online and available.

28. QUESTION: Are you currently uploading files into a CSPs cloud storage?
    ANSWER: Other than the usage of SharePoint that is mentioned in the RFP, no other significant Cloud Service Provider's (CSP) storage is being used.

29. QUESTION: Are there any mainframe files stored in the native formats (EBCDIC)?
    ANSWER: No

30. QUESTION: Do you use a third party to assist with scanning paper documents into scanned files? E.g., KOFAX
    ANSWER: IBM Capture Professional, Kofax Total Agility

31. QUESTION: Does the data contain and PHI/PII information?
    ANSWER: Yes, some of the data does.

32. QUESTION: What are the security and compliance requirements for the system?
    ANSWER: Security and applicable compliance requirements are documented in the "Current Environment and Requirements Traceability."

33. QUESTION: Describe your data ingestion business requirements?
    ANSWER: Kindly refer to the attached RTM in the RFP bid

34. QUESTION: What are the file requirements for the tagging and categorization?
    ANSWER: Eliciting the requirements will be part of the deliverables for this project. A first sketch is on "Document type" tab (bottom table) of the "Current Environment and Requirements Traceability" attachment.

35. QUESTION: How are files being tagged today?
    ANSWER: There is very little formal / consistent tagging of files today. Classification is currently driven by folder hierarchy.

36. QUESTION: How will the data be used after migration?
    ANSWER: Content will be used in support of daily operations, most of it internally to OAG and some outward facing (partner agencies, general public).

37. QUESTION: Types of documents (E.g., contracts, identity documents, US Government or tax documents, lending, procurement, invoices, receipts, purchase order, manuals, etc.)
    ANSWER: See worksheet "Document Types" tab in the "Current Environment and Requirements Traceability" attachment

38. QUESTION: What is your document/file quality review requirement? (E.g. HITL)
    a. E.g., scanning quality assessment score threshold triggering a HITL review such as: all documents <80% quality score requires manual review.
    ANSWER: We are looking to the vendor to help develop these quality assurance levels<Refer Kofax>

39. QUESTION: Provide details with your existing content:
    a. Total Number of documents
    b. Average number of pages per document
    c. Number of new documents loaded monthly or weekly or daily
    d. Number of pages digitized (scanned) and loaded monthly"
    ANSWER: See section 1.3 "Current Environment" on pp 6-7 of the bid document.
    Current repository types and volumes are detailed in the "Current Environment and Requirements Traceability" attachment and copied here:

Solution	Volume/Storage
Network File Shares	152.75M files / 199 TB
FileNet	IBM FileNet P8 5.2.1, over 2 TB of documents stored.

CHAR410/CHAR500 (PDF storage)	250 GB (Approx)
SharePoint	1.2 million files/25.53 TB
OneDrive	6.4 million files/ 22.2TB
User C / Local drives not synced to network	~ 11.7 TB
OAG Own Cloud	24 TB of data in OAGCloud

40. QUESTION: Describe your current Content Management solution and how it is used.
    ANSWER: See section 1.3 "Current Environment" on pp 6-7 of the bid document.
    Current repository types and volumes are detailed in the "Current Environment and Requirements Traceability" attachment and copied here:

Solution	Volume/Storage
Network File Shares	152.75M files / 199 TB
FileNet	IBM FileNet P8 5.2.1, over 2 TB of documents stored.
CHAR410/CHAR500 (PDF storage)	250 GB (Approx)
SharePoint	1.2 million files/25.53 TB
OneDrive	6.4 million files/ 22.2TB
User C / Local drives not synced to network	~ 11.7 TB
OAG Own Cloud	24 TB of data in OAGCloud

41. QUESTION: Do you have a Content Management system today and if so, which one?
    ANSWER: See section 1.3 "Current Environment" on pp 6-7 of the bid document.
    Current repository types and volumes are detailed in the "Current Environment and Requirements Traceability" attachment and copied here:

Solution	Volume/Storage
Network File Shares	152.75M files / 199 TB

FileNet	IBM FileNet P8 5.2.1, over 2 TB of documents stored.
CHAR410/CHAR500 (PDF storage)	250 GB (Approx)
SharePoint	1.2 million files/25.53 TB
OneDrive	6.4 million files/ 22.2TB
User C / Local drives not synced to network	~ 11.7 TB
OAG Own Cloud	24 TB of data in OAGCloud

42. QUESTION: Who manages your content management solution?
    ANSWER: We do not currently use SharePoint as an ECM solution.

43. QUESTION: Describe the features you use in your content management solution.
    ANSWER: We don't use ECM capabilities in SharePoint. Limited ECM features in FileNet. Just has metadata defined on top of file storage for search and retrieval. See segment 1.3 Current Environment of the RFP bid document:
    While the use of SharePoint and OneDrive has been made available to all staff across the agency, its adoption remains very immature. A majority of users lack practice in and understanding of the capabilities SharePoint offers, such as version control or co-authoring of documents. Most of the agency's documents are stored in other repositories. Folder structures vary significantly between functional units, and there is very little use of metadata. Enterprise-wide standards or conventions governing content organization and labeling have yet to be established. Record retention policies are documented, but their implementation remains manual and uneven.

44. QUESTION: Describe any additional features needed in your content management solution.
    ANSWER: See RTM in the "Current Environment and Requirements Traceability" attachment

45. QUESTION: Describe any pain points with your content management solution.
    ANSWER: Multiple repositories that don't communicate well. No unified architecture for storage and search. Content is siloed. Search is time consuming and may miss content, risking compliance issues. No version control or effective collaboration on shared documents. Many duplicates or outdated copies. Large quantities of paper content is difficult to index and search.

46. QUESTION: Where are the files, documents, images, etc. stored today? (E.g., on-prem, CSP, tape, CDs, etc.)
    ANSWER: Tape and CD content will not be ingested in this project. All files will be ingested from existing electronic files that are online and available. See section 1.3 "Current Environment" on pp 6-7 of the bid document. Current repository types and volumes are detailed in the "Current Environment and Requirements Traceability" attachment and copied here:

Solution	Volume/Storage
Network File Shares	152.75M files / 199 TB
FileNet	IBM FileNet P8 5.2.1, over 2 TB of documents stored.
CHAR410/CHAR500 (PDF storage)	250 GB (Approx)
SharePoint	1.2 million files/25.53 TB
OneDrive	6.4 million files/ 22.2TB
User C / Local drives not synced to network	~ 11.7 TB
OAG Own Cloud	24 TB of data in OAGCloud

47. QUESTION: Describe any workflow processes.
    ANSWER: Manually driven workflows via email for approval and editing of documents

48. QUESTION: What are the security and compliance requirements for your content management solution?
    ANSWER: Security and applicable compliance requirements are documented in the "Current Environment and Requirements Traceability."

49. QUESTION: Describe your content management business requirements?
    ANSWER: See RTM in the "Current Environment and Requirements Traceability" attachment

50. QUESTION: What are the file requirements for the tagging and categorization?
    ANSWER: Eliciting the requirements will be part of the deliverables for this project. A first sketch is on "Document type" tab (bottom table) of the "Current Environment and Requirements Traceability" attachment.

51. QUESTION: How are files being tagged today?
    ANSWER: There is very little formal / consistent tagging of files today. Classification is currently driven by folder hierarchy.

52. QUESTION: Describe your reporting requirements.
    ANSWER: The responsibility of the vendor is to train our staff in creating and using reporting in the ECM and to create the first 20 reports. Please refer to FR-288 in the attached RTM spreadsheet "requirements list".

53. QUESTION: What is your data lifecycle plan? E.g.,
    a. Files 0-30 days old: stored in standard storage with the data accessed regularly.
    b. Files 31-60 days old: stored in Nearline storage with the data accessed for at least 30 days.

c. Files 61–90 days old: stored in Coldline storage with the data accessed for at least 90 days.
d. Files >60 days old Archive storage with the data accessed for at least 365 days.

ANSWER: Please note that different bureaus will have different regulatory requirements so there will be multiple lifecycle plans. A typical case might go through multiple stages over several years with documents ingested and/or created during each. All case files would be in active use while the case is open, which often lasts for several years. They would be retained but infrequently used for several years once closed. Example cycle: complaint intake > review > investigation > litigation > appeal > follow up on compliance with court decisions [e.g. settlement distribution]. <For ECM data needs to be kept in real-time>

54. QUESTION: What would you like to do with the data after it is digitized and/or placed into the data warehouse/content management system?
ANSWER: Content will be used in support of daily operations, most of it internally to OAG and some outward facing (partner agencies, general public).

55. QUESTION: Can you provide some description on your deployment cycle? How long of a QA and SIT do you normally follow?
ANSWER: We primarily follow a standard waterfall approach for major releases, supplemented by rapid application development techniques where feasible. Testing is mostly manual, with test scripts created and validated as releases demand. Recently, we have started introducing test automation using Selenium IDE to improve efficiency. The availability of the test team for this project is limited, so please include tools and resources within the project plan.

56. QUESTION: Do you want us to provide a post implementation service for 1 year or 3 years or more?
ANSWER: The agreement term for awards resulting from this RFP will be 60 months (5 years). This extended term is intended to provide sufficient time to implement the core fully and extended ECM functionality, including all planned waves, optional tasks, and post-implementation support activities.

57. QUESTION: "Can you share details around bureau content from Network File Shares (NFS) and existing SharePoint (as appropriate) repositories?
a.   Size of these repositories.
b. Type of contents in these repositories
c. Are these repositories on premise system within NYS and does NYS have direct access to these contents
d. What is the total file sizes of these repositories?
e. What are the single file size (average)?"
ANSWER: See section 1.3 "Current Environment" on pp 6-7 of the bid document. Current repository types and volumes are detailed in the "Current Environment and Requirements Traceability" attachment and copied   here:

Solution	Volume/Storage
Network File Shares	152.75M files / 199 TB

FileNet	IBM FileNet P8 5.2.1, over 2 TB of documents stored.
CHAR410/CHAR500 (PDF storage)	250 GB (Approx)
SharePoint	1.2 million files/25.53 TB
OneDrive	6.4 million files/ 22.2TB
User C / Local drives not synced to network	~ 11.7 TB
OAG Own Cloud	24 TB of data in OAGCloud

58. QUESTION: Would it be possible to hold a pre-proposal conference where potential respondents could ask questions and get answers virtually via a call?
ANSWER: Not planned at this time

59. QUESTION: Would it be possible to extend the due date to allow for answers to questions to be furnished and incorporated into respondents' proposals?
ANSWER: Yes, the due date for proposals is now February 20, 2026.

60. QUESTION: Do you expect this to be a product offering (COTS), or can it be a solution that we build specifically for the OAG requirements?
ANSWER: We are looking for services to help us design, build, configure and roll out our implementation of SharePoint as an ECM solution.

61. QUESTION: Who is the incumbent vendor currently providing similar services?
ANSWER: There is none

62. QUESTION: Is the incumbent vendor allowed to participate in this RFP?
ANSWER: N/A

63. QUESTION: What are the current limitations and challenges that you are facing?
ANSWER: See bid document, section 1 Overview.

64. QUESTION: What are the expectations and timeline for ongoing support and maintenance after the system is implemented?
ANSWER: See bid document section 6.4 CONTRACT AWARD PERIOD: The agreement term for awards resulting from this RFP will be 60 months (5 years). This extended term is intended to provide sufficient time to implement the core fully and extended ECM functionality, including all planned waves, optional tasks, and post-implementation support activities.

65. QUESTION: Please confirm whether decommissioning of legacy systems is within the contractor's scope or if the contractor's responsibility is limited to content migration only.
ANSWER: Decommissioning is not in the contractor's scope. The scope is as described in the bid document.

66. QUESTION: Please confirm whether the awarded contractor may directly procure third-party tools required to fill functional gaps, or whether OAG will retain responsibility for all licensing and procurement activities.
ANSWER: The latter, but with the contractor's advice and guidance in defining requirements and assessing the available options on the market.

67. QUESTION: Please confirm whether licenses for Purview Records Management, SharePoint Premium/Syntex, SharePoint Embedded, and Power Automate Premium are already in place or should be assumed as part of the implementation cost.
ANSWER: Most are in place now, and any additional needed for the project are OAG's direct responsibility and should not be included in the implementation cost estimates for this RFP.

68. QUESTION: Please confirm whether automated records retention enforcement is expected to be mandatory for all applicable content or used in an advisory/monitoring capacity.
ANSWER: No documents are to be automatically destroyed; retention schedules are to alert and monitor only.

69. QUESTION: Please confirm whether enterprise search is expected to include legacy repositories during the migration period or be limited to SharePoint Online content only.
ANSWER: The latter. We don't intend to retrofit enterprise search to fileshares, which hold the majority of documents at present.

70. QUESTION: Please confirm whether OAG can provide estimated migration volumes, including total data size (TB), number of repositories, and number of files, to support accurate scheduling and pricing.
ANSWER: See section 1.3 "Current Environment" on pp 6-7 of the bid document. Current repository types and volumes are detailed in the "Current Environment and Requirements Traceability" attachment and copied here:

Solution	Volume/Storage
Network File Shares	152.75M files / 199 TB
FileNet	IBM FileNet P8 5.2.1, over 2 TB of documents stored.
CHAR410/CHAR500 (PDF storage)	250 GB (Approx)
SharePoint	1.2 million files/25.53 TB
OneDrive	6.4 million files/ 22.2TB
User C / Local drives not synced to network	~ 11.7 TB
OAG Own Cloud	24 TB of data in OAGCloud

Please note, not all are expected to migrate. ROT cleanup as part of the project will eliminate an unknown amount. The contractor is expected to complete the full Vanguard migration and then 20% of the total content in phase 1. Please see question 124 for the volume estimates.

71. QUESTION: Please confirm whether bureau teams will be responsible for validating data readiness prior to migration or whether remediation of data quality issues is within contractor scope.
    ANSWER: Both – bureaus will be responsible for validation, but we are looking to the contractor to plan and guide this effort and assist in remediation.

72. QUESTION: Please confirm whether pricing adjustments will be permitted if actual migration volumes materially exceed initial estimates.
    ANSWER: There will be a change order process for us to address these types of issues as they arise. However, you should refer to the table in question 72 to assist you with your estimation. Rates for any changes must be included as part of the proposal.

73. QUESTION: Please confirm whether innovative or AI-enabled approaches (e.g., intelligent classification, enhanced search, automation) will be positively weighted in the technical evaluation.
    ANSWER: Accompanied by the appropriate safeguards for privacy and quality, innovation and AI are not only welcome but expected as part of the proposed solution. The proposals should clearly lay out the proposed approach.

74. QUESTION: Please confirm what criteria will be used to determine readiness for transition of implementation leadership from the contractor to OAG IT staff.
    ANSWER:
    - Completion of Implementation Waves: All planned waves of deployment must be successfully completed.
    - Capability of OAG IT and Training Staff: Designated OAG IT and Training staff (including Division representatives) should demonstrate confidence and readiness to assume leadership responsibilities.
    - Knowledge Transfer: Sufficient knowledge transfer and documentation must be provided by the contractor to ensure continuity.
    - Training Coverage: While full agency-wide training is not required at this stage, key staff responsible for ongoing support and operations must be trained and prepared.

75. QUESTION: What is the anticipated project go-live date and tenure?
    ANSWER: The term "go-live" as stated in the question is somewhat ambiguous. If "go-live" refers to the point at which the first bureau is onboarded, we anticipate that occurring within approximately the first three months following contract award.
    The overall implementation is expected to proceed in waves, unless the selected contractor proposes an alternative methodology in their submission. At this time, we cannot provide specific dates because the contract execution timeline remains uncertain.

76. QUESTION: Do you accept offshore resources?
    ANSWER: Refer response in question # 3

77. QUESTION: What is the approved budget or range allocated for this project?

ANSWER: The OAG is seeking competitive pricing from all prospective bidders to award the best value for this scope of work. The allocated budget will not be disclosed at this time.

78. QUESTION: If OAG is okay to negotiate on the proposed deviations if any.
    ANSWER: There will be a change order process for OAG to address timeline issues as they arise. However, you should refer to the table in question 72 to assist you with your estimation. Rates for any changes must be included as part of the proposal.

79. QUESTION: RFP 25-007 - Enterprise Content Management - Bid Package - Revised:
    2.1 MINIMUM BIDDER QUALIFICATIONS (Page 7) - Hope it is okay to share examples of similar implementation from the commercial entity as well.
    ANSWER: This is acceptable, the OAG will accept private and public sector experience. Experience with organizations of similar size and complexity is required.

80. QUESTION: RFP 25-007 - Enterprise Content Management - Bid Package - Revised:
    2.1.1 Contractor Experience (Page 8) - If OAG is okay to consider Vendor who has MSFT 'Solutions Partner' designation as higher (equivalent) partner.
    ANSWER: Yes, that is acceptable as long as the minimal qualifications outlined in the bid document are met.

81. QUESTION: RFP 25-007 - Enterprise Content Management - Bid Package - Revised:
    2.1.2 Staff Experience (Page 8) - If it is okay to share similar qualified staff resumes if the proposed staff is not available post 6 months duration.
    ANSWER: Bidders should share resumes of staff who will be available for the project. If unsure, sharing resumes of additional (backup) staff would be helpful in case a substitution is needed. OAG will prefer project teams who can commit to minimum turnover.

82. QUESTION: RFP 25-007 - Enterprise Content Management - Bid Package - Revised:
    4.2.6 ATTACHMENT D - ADMINISTRATIVE FORMS (Page 33 & 34) - Hope these listed administrative forms only need to be completed and submitted with the proposal:
    •   Procurement Lobbying Forms
    •   Vendor Responsibility Questionnaire
    •   Form A – Awarded Contractor Disclosure Form
    •   ST-220-CA – Awarded Contractor Certification
    •   NYS Office of the State Comptroller Substitute W-9 Form
    ANSWER: Only the administrative forms listed in Section 4.2.6 of the RFP must be submitted with the proposal.

83. QUESTION: RFP 25-007 - Enterprise Content Management - Bid Package - Revised:
    4.2.6 ATTACHMENT D - ADMINISTRATIVE FORMS (Page 34) - What is meant by 'SIGNED ADDENDA (IF ANY, EX. Purchasing Memorandum - Questions & Answers)'?
    ANSWER: This document, Purchasing Memorandum II, is currently the only addenda that must be signed and returned with the bidder's proposal to confirm receipt of the questions and answers. Should additional addenda need to be signed and returned they will be posted to the OAG website here: https://ag.ny.gov/resources/government-organizations/contract-procurement-opportunities/request-proposals

84. QUESTION: ATTACHMENTS (page 52) - What is meant by this form ST220 TD – Awarded Contractor Certification is sent to NYS DTF?
ANSWER: NYS DTF stands for New York State Department of Taxation and Finance. Please refer to ST-220-TD for instructions about where and how to send the document.

85. QUESTION: We understood the system needs integration with other tools. Please provide the list of such external tools and purpose of integration.
ANSWER: See "Existing Systems" tab in the "Current Environment and Requirements Traceability" attachment. Additional tools will be recommended by the selected vendor during the design phase

86. QUESTION: We understood tool will support English language, do you need any other language support if yes, please provide list of languages.
ANSWER: No

87. QUESTION: Is creating APIs for all external systems under scope or are API already available?
ANSWER: API creation is in scope where out-of-the-box (OOTB) capabilities are insufficient. We expect well-documented REST APIs and adapters to integrate both internal and external systems with the ECM product. In areas where stable APIs already exist, the solution should leverage and harden those rather than rebuild them.

88. QUESTION: RFP 25-007 - Enterprise Content Management - OAG Current Environment and Requirement Traceability Matrix (Requirements List tab) FR-305 - Which kind of security monitoring we are looking for, please elaborate.
ANSWER: We are not specifically looking for vulnerability scanning tools like Tenable and Qualys. Instead, our focus is on detecting anomalous and/or malicious activity. The system should offer native security monitoring and alerting capabilities, with options for seamless integration with third-party tools such as Splunk and CrowdStrike.

89. QUESTION: RFP 25-007 - Enterprise Content Management - OAG Current Environment and Requirement Traceability Matrix (Requirements List tab) FR-279 - What maximum file size are you looking for?
ANSWER: File size varies, but should be able to handle video file sizes up to 2 GB

90. QUESTION: RFP 25-007 - Enterprise Content Management - OAG Current Environment and Requirement Traceability Matrix (Requirements List tab) FR-262 - Please elaborate on this, generally encryption is applied at system level not at repository level.
ANSWER: Our expectation is the vendor will utilize sensitivity labels to enforce additional encryption on an as needed basis

91. QUESTION: RFP 25-007 - Enterprise Content Management - OAG Current Environment and Requirement Traceability Matrix (Requirements List tab) FR-218 - Do we need desktop applications to access content in addition to web based applications? If yes, please list all features which are required in native desktop.
ANSWER: No

92. QUESTION: RFP 25-007 - Enterprise Content Management - OAG Current Environment and Requirement Traceability Matrix (Requirements List tab) FR-208 - Please elaborate which capabilities are required in mobile app.
    ANSWER: To clarify the requirement: the solution should utilize native product mobile applications for iOS and Android. Workflow monitoring and user interactions identified during the design phase should be supported, enabling users to perform necessary functions even when not physically connected to the OAG network. Custom mobile app development is not in scope.

93. QUESTION: RFP 25-007 - Enterprise Content Management - OAG Current Environment and Requirement Traceability Matrix (Requirements List tab) FR-020.1 - As external access is required, we assume it's required only for the file link or of a certain page or an item in the SharePoint.
    ANSWER: External Access will likely be limited to a subset of content and not the entire SharePoint environment.

94. QUESTION: RFP 25-007 - Enterprise Content Management - OAG Current Environment and Requirement Traceability Matrix (Requirements List tab) FR-016 - Is there any external ransomware tool used by NYS now?
    ANSWER: We are not specifically looking for vulnerability scanning tools like Tenable and Qualys. Instead, our focus is on detecting anomalous and/or malicious activity. The system should offer native security monitoring and alerting capabilities, with options for seamless integration with third-party tools such as Splunk and CrowdStrike.

95. QUESTION: RFP 25-007 - Enterprise Content Management - OAG Current Environment and Requirement Traceability Matrix (Requirements List tab) FR-049 - Does this attestation required to be done as a part of the process for each document process flow?
    ANSWER: The extent to which attestation will be used will be defined during the design phase.

96. QUESTION: RFP 25-007 - Enterprise Content Management - OAG Current Environment and Requirement Traceability Matrix (Requirements List tab) FR-129 - When doing bulk import of the systems, do we also have done a cleanup for the files needed to be migrated ex- some might be archived, not used or all data needed to be migrated and then cleanup will happen?
    ANSWER: Vendor will only be responsible for migrating files during the Vangaurd.

97. QUESTION: RFP 25-007 - Enterprise Content Management - OAG Current Environment and Requirement Traceability Matrix (Requirements List tab) FR-135 - Are we looking here for the APIs available as a part of the tool ex- (APIs available from FileNet, etx) or any custom APIs also to be built to provide this integration?
    ANSWER: API creation is in scope where out-of-the-box (OOTB) capabilities are insufficient. We expect well-documented REST APIs and adapters to integrate both internal and external systems with the ECM product. In areas where stable APIs already exist, the solution should leverage and harden those rather than rebuild them.

98. QUESTION: RFP 25-007 - Enterprise Content Management - OAG Current Environment and Requirement Traceability Matrix (Requirements List tab) FR-134 - Can you please explain this, do you want retention policy to be overridden and what features are expected from the user?
    ANSWER: Our expectation is that the system will allow for one off exceptions in retention polices that are easily executed by users with appropriate permissions. All such exceptions must be tracked and auditable.

99. QUESTION: What are the strategic goals and primary pain points that you are looking to solve? Has OAG already identified a target operating model or "North Star" for the ideal future-state of the organization and / or for this initiative? Are there key, overarching content management principles that you would like to see present on 'go live'?
ANSWER: This is described in pages 5-7 of the bid document. For pain-points Refer # 45

100. QUESTION: Are there executive stakeholders for this initiative, and a business division that it is being 'run out of'? Are there others whom you consider to be key stakeholders who will participate in the evaluation and / or ultimate decision-making process?
ANSWER: This project has both an executive sponsor and an executive level steering committee.

101. QUESTION: Is OAG fully committed to utilizing the Microsoft SharePoint Online Government Cloud (GCC) platform, or open to other systems?
ANSWER: Fully committed with add-ons as identified during either phase 1 or phase 2 of this engagement. Core capabilities must be developed using the Sharepoint Online GCC platform and as indicated third-party add-on solutions may be proposed to address any functionality or usability gaps. Entirely separate/alternative ECM platforms/environments will NOT be considered.

102. QUESTION: Has OAG considered the data and metadata contained within their document population, and options available for contracts intelligence and ongoing contract lifecycle management?
ANSWER: Will be determined during the discovery phase

103. QUESTION: RFP Section 2.3.1 ECM Implementation (PDF pg. 10) - Has OAG explored Legal specific Content Management Systems such as iManage? If you have, and decided not to use them, are you able to share why that is? If not, would a market landscape overview be valuable in preparation for this project?
ANSWER: We have already completed a market scan of products. We are committed to Microsoft products with potential for add-ons as identified and needed. Please see question 101 for a complete answer.

104. QUESTION: Requirements List Tab of RFP 25-007 - Enterprise Content Management - OAG Current Environment and Requirement Traceability Matrix – Rows 225-228 - Is the expectation that Microsoft Purview will need to be implemented as the DLP solution as part of this initiative?
ANSWER: Purview, Information Rights Management, Insider Risk Management, and any other capabilities within our G5 licensing level which need to be configured to meet our requirements are in-scope]

105. QUESTION: Requirements List Tab of RFP 25-007 - Enterprise Content Management - OAG Current Environment and Requirement Traceability Matrix – Row 188 - Is the expectation that Microsoft Purview will need to be implemented as the Litigation Hold solution as a part of this initiative?
ANSWER: We are currently using Purview, but we are open to other solutions.

106. QUESTION: Requirements List Tab of RFP 25-007 - Enterprise Content Management - OAG Current Environment and Requirement Traceability Matrix – Row 53 - Is the expectation that Microsoft Purview will need to be implemented as the Records Retention solution as a part of this initiative?
ANSWER: We are currently using Purview, but we are open to other solutions.

107. QUESTION: We understand that a 'remote / virtual – first' meeting and delivery approach to the project is expected with the exception of key onsite meetings. Can you please confirm this, and the appropriate offices for in-person meetings (e.g., 1 Empire State Plaza, The Capitol, Albany, NY 12224)?
ANSWER: 10 British American Blvd, Latham, NY 12110

108. QUESTION: RFP §1.4; §2.3; §2.3.1.1 (Pre-Vanguard) The RFP indicates that the ECM solution will support "meaningful and secure integration with existing and future systems" and will serve as a "headless content repository" for application modernization. - Can OAG clarify whether Stage 1 (Core ECM) includes the implementation of any specific system integrations beyond Microsoft Entra ID and Microsoft 365 services, or whether Stage 1 is limited to defining and validating integration patterns and architecture, with actual system integrations deferred to later waves or Stage 2?
ANSWER: Refer to section 2.3.1.1 in the RFP bid document

109. QUESTION: RFP §1.4; §2.4 (Technical Design Deliverables) The RFP notes that the ECM platform will be used as a backend "headless" content repository for application modernization initiatives. - Can OAG clarify whether any specific application use cases are expected to leverage SharePoint Embedded or headless access during Stage 1, or whether Stage 1 is expected to focus on enabling the capability rather than integrating a specific application?
ANSWER: Stage 1 will include ensuring that SPOL can be used as a headless ECM via connectors or REST calls.

110. QUESTION: RFP §2.3.1; §2.3.1.1; Stage 1 description The RFP indicates that approximately 20% of total content is anticipated to be migrated during the first year, with migration scaling over time. - Can OAG provide estimated content volumes (number of files and/or storage size) for the Vanguard bureau and initial Wave 1A bureaus to help bidders size migration tooling, validation, and resource requirements appropriately?
ANSWER: 20% of 3.7 TB for network drives and 160gb from our own cloud.

111. QUESTION: RFP §2.3.1.1 (Migration); §2.4 Deliverables The migration requirements reference migration of files, revisions, metadata, and security details, as well as validation and rollback capabilities. - Can OAG clarify whether full fidelity migration (including versions and permissions) is required for all repositories in Stage 1, or whether fidelity expectations may vary by repository or bureau?
ANSWER: It is expected that 20% of the migration will be completed the first year. Please see page 12 for more information. Please see page 12 of the RFP. The contractor is expected to complete the full Vanguard migration and then 20% of the total content in phase 1. Please see question 124 for the volume estimates.

112. QUESTION: RFP §1.3; §2.3; RTM (Document Types) The RFP notes that records retention policies are documented but currently implemented manually and unevenly. - Can OAG clarify whether existing retention schedules and file plans are considered final and authoritative for implementation in Microsoft Purview, or whether refinement and rationalization of retention policies is expected as part of Stage 1?
ANSWER: Will be determined during the design phase

113. QUESTION: RFP §2.3.1.1 (Testing) The RFP indicates that testing and QA results will be validated by an OAG-appointed third party. - Can OAG clarify how this third-party validation will be coordinated (timing, review cycles, acceptance criteria) and whether bidders should include schedule contingency for this activity?
ANSWER: IV&V activity will be determined & scheduled during the design phase

114. QUESTION: RFP 2.1.2 (Staff Experience) The RFP indicates that proposers should name multiple technical leads. - Can OAG clarify if proposers need to name 5 technical leads or would a different resource strategy be appropriate?
ANSWER: Awarded Contractor staff whose resumes are submitted to demonstrate qualification must be available to work on the project for at least 6 months post the due date for Bidder responses to this RFP. Any later substitution of Awarded Contractor team members will be subject to OAG's review to ensure continued adherence to the standards outlined in Section 2.1.2. We welcome alternative suggestions that are equal or better than the roles defined in that section.

115. QUESTION: RFP §1.2(g); §2.3; §2.4 (Content Intelligence) The RFP references responsible integration of AI and intelligent document processing capabilities. - Can OAG clarify whether Stage 1 expectations for SharePoint Premium / Syntex include:
    a. Implementation of specific document models for defined document types; or
    b. Establishment of the platform capability, governance, and pilot use cases, with broader model development deferred to later waves or Stage 2?
ANSWER: Will likely be B, if SharePoint syntex is selected as the document processing model

116. QUESTION: RFP §2.3; §2.4 (Records Management Deliverables) The RFP requires configuration of records retention, disposition workflows, and compliance reporting. - Can OAG clarify:
    a. Whether records disposition approvals are expected to follow a centralized enterprise workflow or bureau-specific workflows; and
    b. Whether OAG anticipates legal or records officer review as part of automated disposition during Stage 1?
ANSWER: Both will be decided in the discovery & design phase

117. QUESTION: Page 8, bullet for Functional Lead or Solution Analyst: Mentions "experience with automated workflows and monitoring using Power Automate". Are other tools acceptable?
ANSWER: Yes

118. QUESTION: OAG Current Environment and Requirements Traceability Matrix, Records Mgmt Policies tab: unable to open "Record Retention Quick Guidance pdf" due to an error; perhaps do not need because can open the Record Retention Policy pdf.
ANSWER: Please see, https://ag.ny.gov/resources/government-organizations/contract-procurement-opportunities/request-proposals, the documents have been uploaded separately under RFP 25-007 – Enterprise Content Management.

119. QUESTION: OAG Current Environment and Requirements Traceability Matrix – Requirements Tab: FR-130 Error Notification – Will any form of "real-time notification" suffice? Must it be an email or SMS notification? What about adding to a daily notification digest or "notification to users containing a list of items that need attention"?
ANSWER: Key functions will be decided during the design & discovery phase

120. QUESTION: Enterprise Content Management – Bid Package, section 2.3 Scope of Work, page 10 last paragraph, 2nd sentence says "In addition, the Awarded Contractor will be expected work closely with the existing consultants engaged for this project on knowledge acquisition and ongoing project tasks ...". What

roles and responsibilities do the existing consultants have? How many consultants are there? Are they all from the same consulting firm?
ANSWER: Yes, they are all from the same consulting firm and currently have 4 dedicated resources for the project.

121. QUESTION: Will there be an extension of the Bid Due Date and Time (top of first page in Bid Package)?
ANSWER: Yes, the due date for proposals is now February 20, 2026.

122. QUESTION: What is the total number of users and amount of data included in the project?
ANSWER: Approximately 2200 users. See section 1.3 "Current Environment" on pp 6-7 of the bid document. Current repository types and volumes are detailed in the "Current Environment and Requirements Traceability" attachment and copied here:

Solution	Volume/Storage
Network File Shares	152.75M files / 199 TB
FileNet	IBM FileNet P8 5.2.1, over 2 TB of documents stored.
CHAR410/CHAR500 (PDF storage)	250 GB (Approx)
SharePoint	1.2 million files/25.53 TB
OneDrive	6.4 million files/ 22.2TB
User C / Local drives not synced to network	~ 11.7 TB
OAG Own Cloud	24 TB of data in OAGCloud

Please note, not all are expected to migrate. ROT cleanup as part of the project will eliminate an unknown amount.

123. QUESTION: What is the number of users and amount of data in scope for the Vanguard phase?
ANSWER: Vanguard will consist of a single bureau out of a total of 80. Bureau currently has 27 users. The total amount of storage on the network drive is 3.7 TB, and the OAG cloud provides 159.98 GB. Please note that these are approximate figures as of January 2026.

124. QUESTION: Page 7 - 1.4 Objectives - Paragraph 1   With ~230+ TB of identified data, please confirm whether Stage 1 success is measured by platform readiness and pilot adoption rather than percentage of total data migrated.
ANSWER: Stage 1 success will include successful platform adoption by pilot and wave 1 bureaus, plus the successful validation of the migration framework, not the total volume migrated.

125. QUESTION: Page 7 - 1.4 Objectives - Paragraph 2   Please clarify whether the stated "~20% of total content migrated in Year 1" is a contractual acceptance requirement or an indicative planning assumption dependent on bureau readiness and ROT outcomes.
ANSWER: It would be a planning assumption

126. QUESTION: Page 10 - 2.3 Scope of Work – Applications - Entire Section   Please provide an inventory of custom applications to be built or modernized using SPFx, Power Apps, and Power Automate, including quantity and complexity. Are these intended to replace legacy apps or net-new solutions?
ANSWER: These applications will be developed as part of a separate initiative. There may be some power automate work necessary to facilitate ECM functionality.

127. QUESTION: Page 10 - 2.3 Scope of Work – Applications - Entire Section   How many applications are expected to leverage SharePoint Embedded as a headless repository during Stage 1?
ANSWER: All applications will be built against SharePoint online. The exact integrations will be determined in the design phase.

128. QUESTION: Page 12 - 2.3.1.1.A ECM Core Implementation – Stage 1 - Paragraph 2   Based on Attachment E ("Current Repositories Document"), which repositories are in scope for Stage 1 migrations versus explicitly deferred to Stage 2 (≈199 TB network shares, 25.53 TB SharePoint, 22.2 TB OneDrive, 24 TB OAG Cloud)?
ANSWER: Rollout of the content will be done by bureau, with each of the bureaus owning content in several of the legacy repositories. All repositories will be in scope for both stages. Please see page 12 of the RFP. The contractor is expected to complete the full Vanguard migration and then 20% of the total content in phase 1. Please see question 124 for the volume estimates

129. QUESTION: Page 12 - 2.3.1.1.A ECM Core Implementation – Stage 1 - Paragraph 2   Please confirm whether user local drives (~11.7 TB not centrally synced) are explicitly excluded from Stage 1 unless centrally collected by OAG.
ANSWER: Please see the table in section 2.3.1.1 Pre-Vanguard and Vanguard, stating: Awarded Contractor will lead ECM implementation, which includes adoption and content
Migration as defined in the solicitation

130. QUESTION: Page 12 - 2.3.1 ECM Implementation – Waves - Paragraph 1   Please confirm which bureau groups and proposed waves (Pilot, Waves 2–4) are included in the Stage 1 fixed fee versus deferred to Stage 2.
ANSWER: All bureaus will be included in the Stage 1 waves for core functionality. Refer# 128 for proposed waves and the transition of workload from vendor to OAG from early waves to later ones (see p.11 of bid document). Proposed breakdown of bureau into waves is in <attachment>.

131. QUESTION: Page 12 - 2.3.1 ECM Implementation – Waves - Paragraph 2   For the BIT pilot (Wave 1), please confirm expected success criteria (content migrated, users onboarded, governance validated, performance benchmarks).
ANSWER:
- Content Migration: Successful migration of the bureau's designated content to the ECM platform with full fidelity (including metadata and permissions).

- User Onboarding: Key bureau users trained and actively using the new ECM solution for daily operations.
- Governance Validation: Implementation and validation of governance standards, including taxonomy, security model, and records management configurations.
- Performance Benchmarks: System performance meets agreed-upon benchmarks for search, access, and workflow execution as defined during the design phase.
- Platform Readiness: The solution is production-ready and supports ongoing bureau operations without requiring major rework before subsequent waves.

132. QUESTION: Page 13 - Pre-Vanguard – Governance - Entire Section   Are Microsoft Purview retention labels, records declarations, and legal holds expected to be fully configured in Stage 1 or incrementally applied per wave?
ANSWER: After defining enterprise-wide rules, additional refinements and variations by bureau would be defined and applied incrementally by wave. All initially identified rules, policies, labels etc. Must be completed as part of Stage 1.

133. QUESTION: Page 14 - Pre-Vanguard – Security Model - Entire Section   Is bureau-level delegated security administration required in Stage 1 or planned for later waves?
ANSWER: It is required, as it would go hand in hand with establishing governance and access rights, which are essential to this project.

134. QUESTION: Page 14–15 - Acceptance & Deliverables - Entire Section   Given the scale of data and waves, please clarify whether Stage 1 acceptance is based on design and pilot outcomes rather than full-volume migration completion.
ANSWER: Please see page 12 of the RFP. The contractor is expected to complete the full Vanguard migration and then 20% of the total content in stage 1. Please see question 124 for the volume estimates.

135. QUESTION: Page 9–10 - 2.3 Scope of Work – Migration - Multiple   For repositories that support versioning (e.g., SharePoint Online, OneDrive, and applicable cloud platforms), please confirm whether historical file versions are in scope for migration or if only the latest versions are required. Additionally, should version retention limits be defined globally or configurable per bureau?
ANSWER: Refer # 111 for scope, Expect per Bureau flexibility

136. QUESTION: Page 9–10 - 2.3 Scope of Work – Migration - Multiple   What is OAG's acceptable downtime window during migration cutover per bureau, and are after-hours or weekend cutovers required or preferred?
ANSWER: Yes, off -hours or weekend cutovers are preferred

137. QUESTION: Page 9–10 - 2.3 Scope of Work – Migration - Multiple   Please clarify expected migration validation thresholds (e.g., 99% vs. 99.9%), rollback expectations, and whether parallel access to legacy systems is required post-migration for any stabilization period.
ANSWER: SLA will be defined in the planning/discovery phase. Access to legacy system is required post-migration for validation.

138. QUESTION: General – Current Environment
Has OAG conducted any ROT analysis? If not, should ROT discovery and cleanup be included in Stage 1 scope or treated as business-led?
ANSWER: ROT discovery & clean-up will be conducted during phase 1 but would be business-led in conjunction with the contractor.

139. QUESTION: General – Integrations
Which listed systems (NYMatters, Dynamics CRM 2011, Homegrown Apps, Adobe, HotDocs) are required to integrate with ECM in Stage 1 versus future stages?
ANSWER: None are required in Stage 1 but will be required in future stages. We don't need to build integrations with specific applications for stage 1. However, we want to be able to build/expose/extend reusable API's that provide flexibility to integrate ECM/Sharepoint with current or future applications

140. QUESTION: General – Migration Tooling
Does OAG have preferred or existing licenses for migration tools (e.g., ShareGate, AvePoint), or should these costs be included in the Stage 1 proposal?
ANSWER: Most are in place now, and any additional items needed for the project are OAG's direct responsibility and should not be included in the implementation cost estimates for this RFP.

141. QUESTION: General – Migration Depth
What percentage of current repositories is considered active versus archival and eligible for cold storage rather than migration to SharePoint Online?
ANSWER: Will be determined during the discovery phase

142. QUESTION: General – Wave 3A Transition
The RFP states OAG IT will lead Wave 3A with contractor support (~80 hours/month). What is the expected duration of this support phase, and how is "readiness" of OAG staff defined?
ANSWER: The solution is production-ready and supports ongoing bureau operations without requiring major rework before subsequent waves.

143. QUESTION: General – Complexity Assessment
Can OAG provide bureau complexity tiers (low/medium/high) based on content volume, workflows, and security requirements?
ANSWER: Bureau groupings were sketched (see attachment) based on our initial assessment of common complexity and functional needs. A finer assessment will be done in the discovery phase.

144. QUESTION: Page 17 - 6.5 Contract Rates – Stage 2
Please confirm Stage 2 (Deliverable 11) is intended for execution of large-scale and high-complexity repositories (FileNet, Access, imaging, additional bureau waves) and is not implicitly required within Stage 1 fixed fee.
ANSWER: That is correct

145. QUESTION: Page 17 - 6.5 Contract Rates – Stage 2
Please clarify the trigger for initiating Stage 2 activities (e.g., post-Vanguard, post-Wave 1, or parallel execution), and whether Stage 2 may begin prior to Stage 1 acceptance.
ANSWER:

- Stage 2 deliverables will be accepted based on successful completion and validation of the following: Requirements and Design: Stage 2 requirements confirmed and documented; design and SDLC plan approved by OAG.
- Extended Functionality: Procurement and configuration of additional capabilities (e.g., physical records management, imaging, email records management) completed as agreed.
- Integration and Migration: All in-scope repositories migrated with full fidelity (metadata, permissions) and integrations functioning as designed.
- Knowledge Transfer: OAG staff trained and documentation delivered to enable independent operation.
- Headless Repository Setup: SharePoint Embedded configured and validated for application development use cases.
- Performance and Governance: System meets defined performance benchmarks and governance standards established during design.

146. QUESTION: Page 9–10 - 2.3 Scope of Work – FileNet
For IBM FileNet P8 (~2 TB), does Stage 2 include metadata mapping, document class redesign, security model translation, workflow modernization, or only content migration?
ANSWER: All the activities highlighted will be covered in Stage 1. It would include metadata mapping and document class redesign. We would be seeking to simplify the document class design versus what is in FileNet currently.

147. QUESTION: Page 9–10 - 2.3 Scope of Work – Access Databases
For CHAR410/CHAR500 (~250 GB) and other Access-based systems, is application replacement (Power Apps / Dataverse) expected, or only document extraction and storage in SharePoint?
ANSWER: Replacing of access database is out of scope and will be carried out in a different project. CHAR410/CHAR500 are not based on Access - They are built on Oracle WebCenter Content - And we would not be directly migrating documents from them. Both these systems transfer their documents to FileNet when evaluations are completed.

148. QUESTION: Page 9–10 - 2.3 Scope of Work – Physical Records & Imaging
For physical records management and imaging referenced in Stage 2, does scope include scanning services or only ECM configuration for physical records tracking? If scanning is in scope, can OAG provide estimated volumes (boxes or linear feet)?
ANSWER: Volumes are still under assessment. The contractor should design and implement the paper-scanning/document-processing solution and train OAG staff in its use. OAG staff will then perform the majority of the scanning once the solution has been stabilized and adopted.

149. QUESTION: Page 9–10 - 2.3 Scope of Work – OAG Cloud / NextCloud
Should the 24 TB OAG Cloud (NextCloud) data be fully migrated, selectively migrated, or retained as a parallel system during Stage 2?
ANSWER: Selectively migrated (approximately 25-50% of the current state), and to be determined in the discovery phase. Please see page 12 of the RFP. The contractor is expected to complete the full Vanguard migration and then 20% of the total content in phase 1. Please see question 124 for the volume estimates.

150. QUESTION: Page 9–10 - 2.3 Scope of Work – Video & Media

For Vimeo, Total Webcasting, Adobe Creative assets, and other media-heavy systems, are video migration, streaming optimization, and media governance included in Stage 2?

ANSWER: Refer to section 2.3.1.1 in bid document for detailed approach. Any remaining ECM features that are not covered during Stage-1 will be addressed in Stage-2 implementation as Extended ECM feature rollout.

151. QUESTION: Page 9–10 - 2.3 Scope of Work – Application Integrations
For homegrown Java/.NET apps, NYMatters, Recruitment Management (Oracle APEX), and Dynamics CRM 2011, does Stage 2 include API-level integration and refactoring, or only storage-level integration with ECM?
ANSWER: Storage level integration with ECM

152. QUESTION: Page 16 - 6.3 Contract Quantities
Does OAG anticipate consuming the full 20% Stage 2 allocation, or will additional funding be needed if complexity exceeds the cap?
ANSWER: The OAG anticipates that the 20% allocation will be more than sufficient for Stage 2, as needed, services. Any additional scope will require a second procurement.

153. QUESTION: Page 17 - 6.5 Contract Rates – Authorization
Will all Stage 2 activities be executed via separately authorized task orders with defined scope, assumptions, and acceptance criteria?
ANSWER: The Stage 2 scope is outlined on page 22 as well as section 2.3B. The OAG will release purchase orders to authorize deliverables.

154. QUESTION: Page 9–10 - 2.3 Scope of Work – Tooling
For FileNet, Access, and NextCloud migrations, will specialized migration tools and licenses be provided by OAG or funded separately outside Stage 2 hourly rates?
ANSWER: Most are in place now, and any additional items needed for the project are OAG's direct responsibility and should not be included in the implementation cost estimates for this RFP.

155. QUESTION: Page 14–15, 22–23 - Acceptance – Stage 2
Please clarify acceptance criteria for Stage 2 deliverables involving legacy remediation, application modernization, and complex integrations, including validation timelines.
ANSWER:
Stage 2 deliverables will be accepted based on successful completion and validation of the following: Requirements and Design: Stage 2 requirements confirmed and documented; design and SDLC plan approved by OAG.

- Extended Functionality: Procurement and configuration of additional capabilities (e.g., physical records management, imaging, email records management) completed as agreed.
- Integration and Migration: All in-scope repositories migrated with full fidelity (metadata, permissions) and integrations functioning as designed.
- Knowledge Transfer: OAG staff trained and documentation delivered to enable independent operation.
- Headless Repository Setup: SharePoint Embedded configured and validated for application development use cases.
- Performance and Governance: System meets defined performance benchmarks and governance standards established during design.

156. QUESTION: Page 6 - Current Environment - 1.3
Can OAG confirm the total estimated data volume (TB), file counts, and file types across all in-scope legacy systems to support migration sizing and tooling assumptions?
ANSWER: See section 1.3 "Current Environment" on pp 6-7 of the bid document. Current repository types and volumes are detailed in the "Current Environment and Requirements Traceability" attachment and copied here:

Solution	Volume/Storage
Network File Shares	152.75M files / 199 TB
FileNet	IBM FileNet P8 5.2.1, over 2 TB of documents stored.
CHAR410/CHAR500 (PDF storage)	250 GB (Approx)
SharePoint	1.2 million files/25.53 TB
OneDrive	6.4 million files/ 22.2TB
User C / Local drives not synced to network	~ 11.7 TB
OAG Own Cloud	24 TB of data in OAGCloud

Please note, not all are expected to migrate.

157. QUESTION: Page 6 - Current Environment - 1.3
What are the "Other Repositories" currently being used by the team?
ANSWER: See section 1.3 "Current Environment" on pp 6-7 of the bid document. Current repository types and volumes are detailed in the "Current Environment and Requirements Traceability" attachment and copied here:

Solution	Volume/Storage
Network File Shares	152.75M files / 199 TB
FileNet	IBM FileNet P8 5.2.1, over 2 TB of documents stored.
CHAR410/CHAR500 (PDF storage)	250 GB (Approx)
SharePoint	1.2 million files/25.53 TB
OneDrive	6.4 million files/ 22.2TB
User C / Local drives not synced to network	~ 11.7 TB

OAG Own Cloud	24 TB of data in OAGCloud

Please note, not all are expected to migrate.

158. QUESTION: Page 6 - Current Environment - 1.3
Are there any bureaus currently using SharePoint Online in production for records management that should be considered "early adopters" for Vanguard or Wave 1 planning?
ANSWER: Currently no Bureau utilizing all the capabilities of SharePoint online for records management. To be determined during the discovery phase.

159. QUESTION: Page 7 – Objectives - 1.4
Will the OAG Microsoft GCC tenant be dedicated solely to OAG, and are there any known tenant-level restrictions (e.g., preview features disabled) bidders should plan around?
ANSWER: No restrictions

160. QUESTION: Page 7 – Objectives - 1.4
"The RFP states "Measurable objectives should be defined as part of this engagement, with an initial target of 30% reduction in document retrieval times, 60% meaningful adoption of the solution across the agency, and 25% improvement in demonstrable compliance with digital records management requirements.""
What is the current baseline for these metrics? What is an ideal target end state?"
ANSWER: Baseline to be established during the discovery phase. These targets are intended as initial goals and may be refined during planning to reflect bureau-specific needs and operational realities.

161. QUESTION: Page 11 - Two Stage ECM Implementation - 2.3.1.1
What criteria will OAG use to determine readiness to transition Wave leadership from the Contractor to OAG teams (Wave 3 and more Waves)?
ANSWER:
- Content Migration: Successful migration of the bureau's designated content to the ECM platform with full fidelity (including metadata and permissions).
- User Onboarding: Key bureau users trained and actively using the new ECM solution for daily operations.
- Governance Validation: Implementation and validation of governance standards, including taxonomy, security model, and records management configurations.
- Performance Benchmarks: System performance meets agreed-upon benchmarks for search, access, and workflow execution as defined during the design phase.
- Platform Readiness: The solution is production-ready and supports ongoing bureau operations without requiring major rework before subsequent waves.

162. QUESTION: Page 11 - Two-Stage ECM Implementation - 2.3.1.1
Does OAG expect multiple bureaus within a single wave to go live simultaneously, or may bureaus within the same wave be deployed on a rolling basis?
ANSWER: Not necessary to go-live simultaneously, can vary based on complexities.

163. QUESTION: Page 11 - Two-Stage ECM Implementation - 2.3.1.1
"Please confirm whether OAG has target or desired date ranges for the following Stage 1 and Stage 2 milestones, or if these are expected to be finalized during project initiation:
    a. Completion of Pre-Vanguard Analysis and Design
    b. Vanguard go-live
    c. Wave 1 go-live and subsequent Waves"
ANSWER: Baseline to be established during the discovery phase. These targets are intended as initial goals and may be refined during planning to reflect bureau-specific needs and operational realities.

164. QUESTION: Page 11 - Two-Stage ECM Implementation - 2.3.1.1
Does OAG anticipate that Stage 1 (Core ECM) will be completed within a specific timeframe (e.g., 12–18 months), or should bidders treat Stage 1 duration as flexible and wave-driven?
ANSWER: Baseline to be established during the discovery phase. These targets are intended as initial goals and may be refined during planning to reflect bureau-specific needs and operational realities.

165. QUESTION: Page 11 - Two-Stage ECM Implementation - 2.3.1.1
Please clarify whether OAG anticipates initiating Stage 2 Extended ECM:
    a. Immediately following completion of Stage 1, or
    b. At a later date subject to funding and prioritization decisions.
ANSWER: Baseline to be established during the discovery phase. These targets are intended as initial goals and may be refined during planning to reflect bureau-specific needs and operational realities.

166. QUESTION: Page 13 - Pre-Vanguard Analysis and Design - Section 2.3.1.1.A.i
Please confirm whether OAG or the Contractor is responsible for procuring and funding Microsoft licenses required for the ECM solution, including but not limited to:
    a. SharePoint Online GCC
    b. Microsoft Purview (Records Management)
    c. Microsoft 365
    d. SharePoint Premium / Syntex
    e. SharePoint Embedded"
ANSWER: Most are in place now, and any additional needed for the project are OAG's direct responsibility and should not be included in the implementation cost estimates for this RFP.

167. QUESTION: Page 13 - Pre-Vanguard Analysis and Design - Section 2.3.1.1.A.i
Where additional Microsoft licenses are required to support new functionality introduced by the ECM implementation, please clarify whether:
    a. OAG will procure licenses directly through its existing Microsoft agreement, or
    b. The Contractor is expected to recommend quantities only, with no financial responsibility.
ANSWER: Most are in place now, and any additional needed for the project are OAG's direct responsibility and should not be included in the implementation cost estimates for this RFP.

168. QUESTION: Page 14 - Pre Vanguard- Analysis and Design - 2.3.1.1.A.i
The RFP references ~10 waves with 8–10 bureaus each. Should bidders price assuming exactly 10 waves, or treat this as a planning estimate subject to change?

ANSWER: The contractor may recommend alternative approaches, provided that all required work is fully addressed and completed. Any modifications to the agreed scope will follow the established change management process to ensure proper handling of changes that may arise."

169. QUESTION: Page 14 - Pre Vanguard- Analysis and Design - 2.3.1.1.A.i
    Does OAG currently utilize Azure AD Groups for organizational system access?
    ANSWER: Yes

170. QUESTION: Page 14 - Pre Vanguard- Analysis and Design - 2.3.1.1   Does OAG have a target cadence for waves (e.g., number of waves per year), or should bidders propose wave timing and overlap based on delivery efficiency?
    ANSWER: Baseline to be established during the discovery phase. These targets are intended as initial goals and may be refined during planning to reflect bureau-specific needs and operational realities.

171. QUESTION: Page 15 - Training and Knowledge Transfer - 2.3.1.1.A.i
    Please clarify whether training is expected to be repeated for each wave, or whether OAG anticipates a train-the-trainer model for later waves.
    ANSWER:
    - Train OAG IT staff and key project participants during early phases to ensure technical readiness.
    - Provide wave-specific training for designated bureau representatives and trainers in each wave.
    - Enable a train-the-trainer model so these representatives can cascade knowledge within their bureaus, reducing the need for full-scale training for every user.

172. QUESTION: Page 16 – Migration - 2.3.1.1.A.i
    Will OAG provide bureau-level content complexity indicators (e.g., litigation holds, retention exceptions, external sharing) to support differentiated migration effort estimates?
    ANSWER: OAG records file plan would be shared with the awarded vendor

173. QUESTION: Page 17 - Vanguard Implementation Testing - 2.3.1.1.A.ii
    What is the expected scope and authority of the third-party QA team validating testing results (advisory vs. approval authority)?
    ANSWER: Third-party QA team will be validating the QA work by the vendor

174. QUESTION: Page 17 - Vanguard Deployment - 2.3.1.1.A.ii
    Is Vanguard expected to be treated as a production-grade implementation that remains in steady-state use, or may Vanguard configurations be materially refactored prior to Wave 1A?
    ANSWER:
    The expectation is that Vanguard should be production-ready and remain in steady-state use, not a temporary or disposable setup. That said, if there are developments/enhancements which should be applied retroactively as waves progress, then this should be presented and discussed with the project team for sponsor review.

175. QUESTION: Page 23 - SharePoint Configuration and Customization - 2.4.2

Please confirm the estimated number of users expected to require Power Platform access (e.g., Power Apps or Power Automate), and whether OAG anticipates the need for Power Apps Premium licensing for any user populations.
ANSWER: Based on the discovery phase, Vendor can advice & suggest on products and licensing required for OAG.

176. QUESTION: Page 23 - SharePoint Configuration and Customization - 2.4.2
Please confirm whether Power Platform licensing (e.g., Power Apps, Power Automate premium connectors) is:
    a. Already included within OAG's Microsoft GCC licensing, or
    b. Expected to be identified, recommended, and budgeted separately as part of this engagement."
ANSWER: Vendor would be responsible for recommending, but the financial liability will be with OAG.

177. QUESTION: Page 23 - SharePoint Configuration and Customization - 2.4.2
If SharePoint Embedded or headless repository capabilities are implemented to support application modernization, please clarify whether the associated Microsoft consumption-based licensing costs will be:
    a. Funded and managed directly by OAG, or
    b. Expected to be included in Contractor cost estimates
ANSWER: Most are in place now, and any additional needed for the project are OAG's direct responsibility and should not be included in the implementation cost estimates for this RFP.

178. QUESTION: Implementation and Go-Live Deliverables - 2.4
Please clarify whether OAG anticipates a formal go-live readiness review (security, records, operations) prior to approving each wave's production deployment.
ANSWER: Yes

179. QUESTION: Page 58 - Appendix A – Standard Clauses for New York State Contracts - 21 (Reciprocity and Sanctions Provisions)
Please confirm that the reciprocity and sanctions provision is triggered solely by a contractor's principal place of business, and not by the presence of satellite offices, registered offices, or personnel located in the identified jurisdictions.
ANSWER: Answering this question would require OAG to provide legal advice interpreting one or more contractual provisions. OAG recommends that Bidders consult legal counsel, as OAG cannot provide legal advice to third parties.

180. QUESTION: Page 58 - Appendix A – Standard Clauses for New York State Contracts - 21 (Reciprocity and Sanctions Provisions)
Would the State consider waiving the application of Section 21 (Reciprocity and Sanctions Provisions) for this procurement?
ANSWER: No, the state is unable to waive Section 21.

181. QUESTION: Page 58 - Appendix A – Standard Clauses for New York State Contracts - 21 (Reciprocity and Sanctions Provisions)
If a Contractor is later determined to be non-compliant with Section 21 due to changes in state reciprocity laws, please confirm whether such determination would:
    a. -require immediate contract termination, or

b.   permit remediation or transition."

ANSWER: Answering this question would require OAG to provide legal advice interpreting one or more contractual provisions. OAG recommends that Bidders consult legal counsel, as OAG cannot provide legal advice to third parties.

182. QUESTION: Page 73-74 - Appendix B – General Specifications - 56 (Indemnification)

In circumstances involving comparative or shared negligence between OAG and the Contractor, please confirm whether the Contractor's indemnification obligation is limited proportionally to the extent of the Contractor's negligence.

ANSWER: Answering this question would require OAG to provide legal advice interpreting one or more contractual provisions. OAG recommends that Bidders consult legal counsel, as OAG cannot provide legal advice to third parties.

183. QUESTION: Page 73-74 - Appendix B – General Specifications - 56 (Indemnification)

Please confirm whether the indemnification carve-out for OAG's negligence applies equally to acts, omissions, or policy decisions made by OAG personnel that materially contribute to a third-party claim.

ANSWER: Answering this question would require OAG to provide legal advice interpreting one or more contractual provisions. OAG recommends that Bidders consult legal counsel, as OAG cannot provide legal advice to third parties.

184. QUESTION: Page 73-74 - Appendix B – General Specifications 56 (Indemnification)

Please clarify whether the Contractor is expected to indemnify OAG for claims arising from the acts or omissions of third-party technology providers (e.g., Microsoft SharePoint Online GCC), where such providers are:
a.   Not subcontractors of the Contractor, and
b.   Not under the Contractor's operational control."

ANSWER: Paragraph 56 does not exclude the claims described in the question. OAG recommends that Bidders consult legal counsel, as OAG cannot provide legal advice to third parties.

185. QUESTION: Page 73-74 - Appendix B – General Specifications - 56 (Indemnification)

Please confirm whether claims arising from platform-level service outages, security vulnerabilities, or defects in Microsoft-provided services are excluded from Contractor indemnification, absent Contractor negligence in configuration or implementation.

ANSWER: Paragraph 56 does not exclude the claims described in the question. OAG recommends that Bidders consult legal counsel, as OAG cannot provide legal advice to third parties.

186. QUESTION: Page 73-74 - Appendix B – General Specifications - 56 (Indemnification)

Please clarify whether the Contractor's duty to defend includes the obligation to defend claims that are later determined to fall outside the scope of indemnification, or only those claims ultimately determined to be indemnifiable.

ANSWER: The obligation to defend and indemnify arises when a claim is asserted. OAG recommends that Bidders consult legal counsel, as OAG cannot provide legal advice to third parties.

187. QUESTION: Page 73-74 - Appendix B – General Specifications - 56 (Indemnification)

Please confirm whether the Contractor retains the right to control the defense and settlement of an indemnified claim, subject to OAG's participation where a significant public interest is identified.

ANSWER: Answering this question would require OAG to provide legal advice interpreting one or more contractual provisions. OAG recommends that Bidders consult legal counsel, as OAG cannot provide legal advice to third parties.

188. QUESTION: Page 73-74 - Appendix B – General Specifications - 57 (Indemnification Relating to Infringement)
Please confirm that intellectual property infringement claims are governed exclusively by Section 57 and are not intended to be duplicated or expanded under Section 56.
ANSWER: Paragraph 57 makes clear that, in addition to paragraph 56, it "also" provides for separate indemnification for intellectual property infringement claims. OAG recommends that Bidders consult legal counsel, as OAG cannot provide legal advice to third parties.

189. QUESTION: Page 73-74 - Appendix B – General Specifications - 56 (Indemnification)
Please confirm whether the Contractor's indemnification obligations survive contract termination and, if so, whether survival is limited to claims arising from services performed during the contract term.
ANSWER: Answering this question would require OAG to provide legal advice interpreting one or more contractual provisions. OAG recommends that Bidders consult legal counsel, as OAG cannot provide legal advice to third parties.

190. QUESTION: Page 73-74 - Appendix B – General Specifications - 56 (Indemnification)
Please clarify whether the Contractor is required to provide indemnification for claims arising from OAG-directed configurations or design decisions, where the Contractor implemented such decisions at OAG's instruction.
ANSWER: Answering this question would require OAG to provide legal advice interpreting one or more contractual provisions. OAG recommends that Bidders consult legal counsel, as OAG cannot provide legal advice to third parties.

191. QUESTION: Page 73-74 - Appendix B – General Specifications - 56 (Indemnification)
Please confirm whether regulatory fines or penalties imposed by third parties are intended to be treated as indemnifiable losses, or whether indemnification is limited to third-party civil claims.
ANSWER: Paragraph 56 covers all losses incurred by OAG and is not limited as suggested in the question. OAG recommends that Bidders consult legal counsel, as OAG cannot provide legal advice to third parties.

192. QUESTION: Page 73-74 - Appendix B – General Specifications - 56 (Indemnification) / 57 (Indemnification Relating to Infringement)
Please confirm the anticipated number and categories of third parties that will be involved in delivering or validating the ECM solution (e.g., Microsoft as the platform provider, OAG-appointed independent QA or validation vendors, and any OAG-approved third-party software providers), and clarify whether any such third parties will be considered subcontractors of the Contractor for purposes of indemnification under Sections 56 and 57.
ANSWER: Answering this question would require OAG to provide legal advice interpreting one or more contractual provisions. OAG recommends that Bidders consult legal counsel, as OAG cannot provide legal advice to third parties.

193. QUESTION: Page 74 - Appendix B – General Specifications - 58 (Limitation of Liability)
Please confirm whether the limitation of liability in Section 58 applies on a per-claim basis or in the aggregate across all claims arising under the Contract.

ANSWER: Answering this question would require OAG to provide legal advice interpreting one or more contractual provisions. OAG recommends that Bidders consult legal counsel, as OAG cannot provide legal advice to third parties.

194. QUESTION: Page 74 - Appendix B – General Specifications - 58 (Limitation of Liability)
Please confirm that the limitation of liability in Section 58 does not apply to indemnification obligations under Section 56, except to the extent a claim falls outside the scope of indemnification.
ANSWER: Answering this question would require OAG to provide legal advice interpreting one or more contractual provisions. OAG recommends that Bidders consult legal counsel, as OAG cannot provide legal advice to third parties.

195. QUESTION: Per sec 2.3 (Scope of Work), Pg #9-11 - Does OAG anticipate a budgetary range or not-to-exceed threshold for Stage 2 Extended ECM functionality?
ANSWER: The total deliverable cost for Stage 2 (deliverable 11) is the not to exceed threshold. Deliverable 11 will be automatically calculated at 20% of the total cost of deliverables 1-10 and billed at actual usage.

196. QUESTION: Per Sec 2.4 (Deliverables) Pg #21-23 - Is SharePoint Embedded required as part of Stage 1 implementation, or intended solely for future application development initiatives? SharePoint Embedded became generally available in May 2024 whereas the RFP indicates in the Staff Experience Section 2.1.2 that proponents must have "at least 2 years of experience with SharePoint Embedded". Given that SharePoint Embedded has not been out for 2 years yet, will familiarity with SharePoint Embedded and deep SharePoint experience satisfy this requirement?
ANSWER: Yes

197. QUESTION: Per Section 1.3, Pg #2–3 - Are legacy systems included in the migration scope expected to be fully decommissioned, or must they coexist with the new ECM platform?
ANSWER: Decommissioning is not in the contractor's scope. The scope is as described in the bid document.

198. QUESTION: Do we need to send to send Form A via email or to the address given in the form via postal, please confirm.
ANSWER: Proposal Submissions must be received by OAG prior to the bid due date and time AND submitted via e-mail to purchase@ag.ny.gov with the subject line "Proposal for RFP 25-007 - Enterprise Content Management from [insert name of bidder or organization]".

199. QUESTION: As per Section 2.1.2, Pg #8 (Staff Experience) of the RFP, is it mandatory to propose all eleven (11) resources listed, or may a single individual fulfill multiple roles (e.g., covering two to three roles)?
ANSWER: The vendor has flexibility to staff as needed so long as all requirements are met. It is unlikely that limited individuals will be able to possess the appropriate skills or the timeliness required to fulfill all obligations, however, this will be the responsibility of the selected vendor.

200. QUESTION: Per Section 2.1.2, Pg #8 (Staff Experience) - Are proposers permitted to add additional roles, remove, or modify roles based on the requirements outlined in the RFP?
ANSWER: The vendor has flexibility to staff as needed so long as all requirements are met. It is unlikely that limited individuals will be able to possess the appropriate skills or the timeliness required to fulfill all obligations, however, this will be the responsibility of the selected vendor

201. QUESTION: Did any contractor or vendor assist with the development of the existing SharePoint implementation or this solicitation, or provide you with an initial evaluation, estimates, or any other analysis related to this procurement? If so:
    a. Please provide the name of all contractors and vendors
    b. Are these contractors and/or vendors eligible to bid on this project?
    ANSWER:
    a. DynTek Services Inc. DBA Artiq and TekStream Solutions LLC
    b. No, downstream prohibition will be enforced.

202. QUESTION: On a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 represents a vendor proximal to you in New York and 5 represents a vendor in another state such as California, what is your preference for vendor proximity for this project? In other words, please rate your preference for local vendors.
    ANSWER: Vendor will be evaluated and selected based on the ability to meet the requirements, regardless of the location within North America region

203. QUESTION: Per section 7.1, Pg #42, (Participation Opportunities for M/WMBEs) –
    a. Does the RFP include any mandatory M/WBE or SDVOB participation goals or minimum percentage requirements for this procurement, or is participation encouraged on a best-efforts basis only?
    b. Will a proposer be deemed non-responsive or disqualified if they are neither a certified M/WBE nor able to commit to M/WBE or SDVOB subcontracting at the time of proposal submission?
    c. If M/WBE or SDVOB participation is not mandatory, what level of documentation (if any) is expected from proposers to demonstrate outreach, intent, or best-efforts compliance?
    ANSWER:
    a. No, this RFP does not include any mandatory M/WBE or SDVOB participation goals or minimum percentage requirements for this procurement, participation is encouraged on a best-efforts basis only.
    b. No, a proposer will not be deemed non-responsive or disqualified if they are neither a certified M/WBE nor able to commit to M/WBE or SDVOB subcontracting at the time of proposal submission.
    c. None

204. QUESTION: Per Section 2.3.1.1, Pg #12-20 (Two-Stage ECM Implementation – Stage 1, Core ECM Features): Are all RTM requirements marked as "High Priority = 5" expected to be fully implemented during the Vanguard phase, or may certain high-priority items be deferred to Wave 1 or later phases?
    ANSWER: Required as listed in the RTM

205. QUESTION: As referenced in Section 2.3, Pg #9-11 (Scope of Work) and Attachment F (RTM): Are there any ECM or Records Management capabilities that have already been partially implemented or configured within OAG that the Awarded Contractor is expected to reuse or enhance rather than reimplement?
    ANSWER: No, Enterprise records management currently exist

206. QUESTION: Per Section 2.3.1.1, Pg #12-20 (Records Management and Retention Configuration): Are there specific repositories containing regulated, investigative, or legal-hold content that require specialized migration handling or sequencing?
    ANSWER: Yes, all content should be subject to records management

207. QUESTION: As referenced in Section 2.3.1.1, Pg #12-20 - Vanguard Phase – ROT Cleanup: Is the Awarded Contractor expected to actively execute ROT remediation, or provide advisory guidance only with final execution performed by OAG?
ANSWER: ROT discovery & clean-up will be conducted during phase 1 but would be business-led in conjunction with the contractor.

208. QUESTION: Per Section 2.3.1.1 (Waves Planning and Bureau Grouping): Does OAG have a predefined bureau rollout sequence, or is the Awarded Contractor expected to propose Wave groupings based on bureau complexity and similarity?
ANSWER: RTM provides proposed strategy of the rollout, but OAG will be open to consider vendor recommendations.

209. QUESTION: As outlined in Section 2.3.1.1, Wave 3A (OAG-led Execution): What is the anticipated readiness level of OAG IT staff to assume primary responsibility for Wave 3 and subsequent implementations?
ANSWER:
   - Completion of Implementation Waves: All planned waves of deployment must be successfully completed.
   - Capability of OAG IT and Training Staff: Designated OAG IT and Training staff (including Division representatives) should demonstrate confidence and readiness to assume leadership responsibilities.
   - Knowledge Transfer: Sufficient knowledge transfer and documentation must be provided by the contractor to ensure continuity.
   - Training Coverage: While full agency-wide training is not required at this stage, key staff responsible for ongoing support and operations must be trained and prepared.

210. QUESTION: Per Section 2.3.1.1, Wave 3A – Post-deliverable Support: Is the estimated 80 hours per month of contractor support a fixed expectation, or may it be adjusted based on OAG's operational needs?
ANSWER: The solution is production-ready and supports ongoing bureau operations without requiring major rework before subsequent waves.

211. QUESTION: As referenced in Section 2.3.1.1 (Records Management File Plan): Are OAG's records retention schedules and file plans finalized and approved, or is the Awarded Contractor expected to assist in refining or validating them?
ANSWER: Will be determined during the design phase

212. QUESTION: Regarding requirements related to records retention and management indicated throughout the RFP:
   a. Is retention based on a "big bucket" approach or more granularly based on discrete document types?
   b. Approximately how many document/record types does the solution need to support?
ANSWER: Refer to RTM "Records retention policies" & "Document type" spreadsheet

213. QUESTION: Per Section 2.3, are there any existing third-party security, DLP, or classification tools that must be integrated into the ECM solution? Which system integrations (e.g., Entra ID, line-of-business applications) are mandatory for Stage 1, versus acceptable for later phases?

ANSWER: Purview, Information Rights Management, Insider Risk Management, and any other capabilities within our G5 licensing level which need to be configured to meet our requirements are in-scope]

214. QUESTION: Per Section 2.4 (Scope Fixed-Cost Deliverables): Which deliverables are considered strictly fixed-price, and which may allow flexibility based on refined scope or assumptions?
ANSWER: Contracts resulting from this RFP will be written as Fixed Price Deliverables 1-10 for the Core Implementation (Stage1). The optional portion of the work, Deliverable 11 - Optional Extended ECM Implementation (Stage 2), will be consumed as needed and billed hourly for actual usage.

215. QUESTION: Per Section 2.3 and Section 2.3.1.1 (Information Architecture and Governance): To what extent may bureau-specific content management conventions deviate from the enterprise-wide taxonomy, metadata model, and governance standards? Can OAG provide any existing taxonomy, records retention schedules, departmental site maps, or preferred hub/site topology? Confirm the role model (AAD groups, M365 groups, SharePoint groups) and integration expectations for Planner, Lists, Forms.
ANSWER: Some level of defined taxonomy is present within the OAG Bureau, but Vendors would be required to identify during the discovery phase

216. QUESTION: On a scale from 1 to 5 (1 = None, 5 = Expert), please indicate your in-house expertise for:
    a.   Infrastructure, Administration, and Maintenance
    b.   Information Architecture, Design, and Implementation
    c.   Content Ownership/Authorship
ANSWER: a) 4, b) 1, and c) 3

217. QUESTION: Are there existing SharePoint customizations or governance policies that must be preserved?
ANSWER: Minimal implementation subject to improvement

218. QUESTION: Per section 2.3.1.1 – Migration Approach, please confirm whether OAG has any existing preference or active subscription for migration tools (e.g., ShareGate, Quest, AvePoint, or others) that should be leveraged for content assessment and migration.
ANSWER: Vendor is required to provide recommendations & OAG will procure them as needed.

219. QUESTION: Per Sections 2.3 and 2.3.1.1 please share the target information architecture: hub/home site model, estimated number of departmental sites, need for cross-department hubs, and whether a home site/Viva Connections setup is expected.
ANSWER: Collaborating with OAG to propose a future content management architecture design is a core deliverable for this contract.

220. QUESTION: Section 1.1. indicates that the OAG is comprised of "Over 2,200 employees"; does this represent the anticipated number of users of the new ECM solution?
ANSWER: Yes

221. Regarding Workflow requirements indicated throughout the solicitation documents:
    a.   How many workflows are to be built as part of this solicitation?
    b.   Can we assume that the workflows are very simple in nature (e.g. document approval)?
    c.   Are the required workflows centered on document approval, or do they include process workflows to automate line of business functions?

d. If available, can you please provide an outline of the steps or flow diagrams that represent a typical workflow?

ANSWER: Refer to the workflow requirements in the RTM

222. QUESTION: Regarding Integration requirements indicated throughout the solicitation documents:
   a. Is actual integration in scope for this solicitation or is the intent to ensure that integration with existing systems is possible?
   b. If integration is in scope:
      i. Can you please provide the manufacturer and version of all systems for which integration is required?
      ii. Do these systems have APIs that can be used for integration?
   c. What level of integration is anticipated (e.g. hyperlinks only, document-level integration, unidirectional/read only, bidirectional data updates, functional integration)?

   ANSWER:
   a. Yes, some level will be done in stage 1
   b. Manufacturer & version information will be shared during the discovery phase
   c. Demonstrate/scope the level of integration in this phase, but the actual development will be carried out in a different project

223. QUESTION: Regarding the reference to "physical records management" in Section 2.4:
   a. How many physical documents need to be managed?
   b. Please provide a detailed description or diagram that illustrates the number of locations, rooms, cabinets, etc. where physical documents are stored.

   ANSWER: Volumes are still under assessment. The contractor should design and implement the paper scanning/document processing solution and train OAG staff in its use by using actual physical records. OAG staff will then perform the majority of the scanning once the solution has been stabilized and adopted.

224. QUESTION: Regarding the migration of Network File Shares (NFS):
   a. Can we assume that each Departmental File Share will be migrated to a corresponding Modern Team Site?
   b. How many Departments or sub-departmental Business Units will use the resulting solution?
   c. Approximately how many documents need to be migrated from network file shares?
   d. What is the total size in GB/TB of the network file share content to be migrated?

   Note: this information can be determined by right-clicking on the top-most parent folder and selecting "Properties".

   ANSWER:
   a. Yes
   b. Refer to RTM "User group"
   c. Please note vendor is only responsible for content in Wave 1 & 2
   d. Refer # 16 for migration & file volume

225. QUESTION: Regarding references in Section 1.3 to "manual scanning", "notice letter generation", and "standardized entry templates to initiate common processes":
   a. What software is currently used for document scanning and can this software release image directly to SharePoint Online?
   b. Can you please provide additional details and use cases for "notice letter generation"?

  c. Do "templates" in this context refer to Document Templates in SharePoint and if so, can we assume that the OAG will develop these document templates with assistance from the chosen vendor?

ANSWER:

  a. IBM capture is currently being used, it doesn't work with SharePoint. Currently used by only one Bureau

  b. Use cases will be discussed during the analysis & design phase

  c. No

226. QUESTION: Section 1.3 indicates that "Most of the agency's documents are stored in other repositories"; for each repository, please provide the following information:

  a. What is the repository software/platform and version?

  b. How is content and metadata stored in the repository (e.g. in SQL server or on the Windows file system)?

  c. Does the repository have a bulk export function that can export all of the documents and associate metadata to the windows file system (e.g. metadata in a CSV file)

  d. How many documents are in the repository?

  e. What is the total size in GB/TB of the content that needs to be migration from the repository?

  f. Approximately how many fields of metadata exist for each document in the repository?

ANSWER: Expectation is 20% of total content will be migrated during the wave 1 & 2. For details with regards to content volume, refer to the response in # 16. With regards to metadata there is minimal tagging and most of the Bureau's follow folder structure, while bulk of metadata definition and analysis will take place during the discovery phase.

227. QUESTION: The RFP mentions FileNet as a repository; please provide responses to the following questions related to FileNet specifically: Please note that FileNet is only a small portion (only one of 80+ bureaus) of the content that will be migrated in this phase; most documents are stored in unstructured repositories such as network drives, etc.

  a. Existing/Source Environment:

    i. What are the specifications of the existing server environment:

      1. RAM, CPU, and Disk utilization – **Average 30% RAM, 2% CPU, 2 TB disk**

      2. Operating System Manufacturer and Version – **RedHat 8**

      3. Database Manufacturer (e.g. SQL or Oracle) and Version – **Oracle Database 19c**

    ii. Do you have a utility that can be used to document the schema for all database tables utilized in the existing system, including the amount of content in each table? **Yes**

    iii. Are documents stored in the database or on the (Windows) file system? If so: Database

      1. How are documents on the file system related to the metadata in the database (e.g. using the file name)? **N/A**

    iv. Is the existing system backed up and on what frequency/rotation? **Yes, database snapshots, weekly**

    v. Are there any known issues or corruption with any of the documents or the database? - **No**

    vi. Will we have access to the existing server environment and frontend application for the purposes of discovery and analysis? - **Yes**

    vii. Assuming we have an NDA in place, can we get a copy of the FileNet database to do analysis, development, and testing of export and migration in our environment prior to

using it in your environment? – **We can't provide a copy of the entire database but we have a development environment that can be used to test.**

b. Content Analysis: (Section 2.3.1.1, pg #. 12–20)

  i. Are there any Compound Documents in the existing system (files that contain multiple and often different document types) and if so, can you please provide related details. – **No compound documents exist**

  ii. Are annotations/or redactions applied via overlay (i.e. imposed by the existing application's document viewer) or burned-in, resulting in a permanent change to the document? – **Annotation and redaction is not currently used**.

  iii. What types of documents are stored in the system (e.g. PDF, TIFF, Microsoft Office documents)? – **PDF documents, ITX Form Data (FileNet eForms)**

  iv. Does the system use any proprietary/non-standard file formats? – **ITX Form Data**

  v. Do any files stored in the system exceed 250 GB? - **No**

  vi. Are versions utilized and if so, are they directly accessible in the repository (e.g. not archived)? – **Yes, and yes**

  vii. How many versions, if applicable, need to be migrated to the new solution (e.g. only the last 3 versions)? – **This would be determined in the discovery phase**

  viii. How many documents, including all versions need to be migrated? – **This would be determined in the discovery phase**

  ix. Are you using folders or some other "container" to group documents and if so:

    1. How many folders/containers exist? – **At least 100,000 folders; they are used for each organization to hold its documents**.

    2. What meaning, security boundary, or organization of content do the folders/containers represent? – **The folders are for each registered organization in the system**

c. Taxonomy/Metadata Analysis

  i. How many distinct metadata/index fields are defined in the existing system? **– Approximately 200**

  ii. What is the average number of metadata/index fields per document? – **Approximately 15-20 in each document**

  iii. Has taxonomy/metadata been applied the same way, consistently, over time or are there significant differences in the taxonomy/metadata as the system has evolved and been used? – **Consistently, this was set up a long time ago and changed very little**

  iv. Has the corresponding taxonomy been implemented in the target SharePoint repository already? - **No**

d. Conversion and Processing:

  i. Do you require any pre-processing of documents or metadata during migration, for example:

  ii. Conversion to PDF/A - **No**

  iii. Renaming of documents - **Possibly**

  iv. Metadata cleanup, for example: - **Yes, possibly. Will be determined in discovery sessions.**

    1. Change 2-digit year fields to 4-digit years or remediation of invalid date formats

    2. Separating multi-valued metadata fields into discrete fields/columns in the new solution

  v. Combining individual document pages into a single document/file and if so: - **No**

1. How can these related files be identified programmatically (e.g. identical name with page # appended)?

vi. Is the metadata the same for all pages, associated only with the first page or does it need to be combined from all pages? Please indicate all that apply and provide details. – **Metadata is configured at the document class level, documents are stored as PDFs, not individual pages.**

ANSWER: Responses are in bold above

228. QUESTION: Does OAG prefer a centralized training delivery model, or a train-the-trainer approach led by bureau champions?
ANSWER: We would need our staff to be trained but would be more of train-the-trainer model.

229. QUESTION: What is the expected scope and format of end-user training (counts of site owners, content authors, general users; live/virtual/in-person/recorded; required deliverables: guides, recordings)?
ANSWER: Blend between virtual & in-person. Contractor should recommend the best approach based on their expertise, while still being cost efficient.

230. QUESTION: We typically conduct the majority of our solution delivery via virtual meetings using Microsoft Teams because this:
   a. Reduces the cost of the project in terms of both travel time and expenses
   b. Enables us to record the sessions for review by anyone who could not attend and/or for future reference
   c. Enables participants from multiple customer locations to participate independent of their location
   d. Enables us to have the most qualified resource on our team conduct the session, independent of location
   e. Will this way of conducting project delivery meet your requirements?
ANSWER: Yes

231. QUESTION: Who is the final decision authority for enterprise information architecture, metadata standards, and records governance decisions during and after implementation?
ANSWER: This project has both an executive sponsor and an executive level steering committee.

232. QUESTION: What governance body or role will adjudicate conflicts between bureau-specific requirements and enterprise ECM standards?
ANSWER: This project has both an executive sponsor and an executive level steering committee.

233. QUESTION: Please define what is meant by a 'headless content repository' in this RFP, including expected use cases and application interaction patterns.
ANSWER: Headless repository refers to having APIs that expose content for integration with OAG's custom applications, core case management systems, or other third-party applications to enable interaction through decoupled, API-driven patterns.

234. QUESTION: Is SharePoint Embedded a mandatory requirement for headless scenarios, or may proposers recommend alternative SharePoint Online patterns?
ANSWER: SharePoint Embedded is the recommended solution for headless ECM for the application integration, but it's not mandatory. Alternatives may be proposed if there's a strong justification for why

Embedded doesn't fit the environment as long as Sharepoint remains the core content repository or there is guaranteed content/records/search management possible using the unified Microsoft platform.

235. QUESTION: Which applications are currently planned to integrate with the ECM platform as headless consumers?
ANSWER: All AG custom-built and COTS applications requiring ECM capabilities are planned to integrate as headless consumers. However, the vendor is not responsible for integrating all apps—AG IT will collaborate with the vendor to integrate with our internal AG applications. We would require the vendor to assist OAG IT with a first two applications and ensure knowledge transfer.

236. QUESTION: What authentication and authorization patterns are required for application-level access to ECM content (e.g., Entra app registrations, managed identities)?
ANSWER: Entra SSO authentication passing user identity for internal OAG portals.

237. QUESTION: How should retention, legal hold, and disposition be enforced when content is accessed or modified via APIs rather than SharePoint UI?
ANSWER: The same retention policies, legal hold, and disposition rules apply to content accessed or modified via APIs as they do through the SharePoint UI. Enforcement is consistent across all access methods.

238. QUESTION: What level of bureau autonomy is permitted for creating or modifying metadata fields, content types, or taxonomies post-go-live?
ANSWER: We expect the contractor to collaborate with our governance group on defining the limits for acceptable changes post go live and the processes for enforcing.

239. QUESTION: What are the acceptance criteria for a successful content migration (e.g., metadata fidelity, permissions accuracy, error tolerance)?
ANSWER: Content Completion and accuracy. (file count validation), file integrity, metadata population, version history, access and permission model being tested, search, performance.

240. QUESTION: Who is responsible for validating and formally approving migrated content at the bureau level?
ANSWER: SME. Technical team, business owners/stakeholders.

241. QUESTION: What guardrails govern the use of AI/Syntex for classification, extraction, or retention labeling (e.g., human review requirements)?
ANSWER: These will be defined during the design phase in collaboration with the vendor & internal stakeholders

242. QUESTION: Are there defined performance benchmarks or SLAs for search, API access, and large file operations?
ANSWER: No performance benchmarks or SLAs have been established yet. These will be defined during the design phase in collaboration with the vendor, ensuring suggestions do not compromise user experience.

243. QUESTION: What formal exit criteria must be met to complete Vanguard and each Wave phase?
ANSWER:

- Content Migration: Successful migration of the bureau's designated content to the ECM platform with full fidelity (including metadata and permissions).
- User Onboarding: Key bureau users trained and actively using the new ECM solution for daily operations.
- Governance Validation: Implementation and validation of governance standards, including taxonomy, security model, and records management configurations.
- Performance Benchmarks: System performance meets agreed-upon benchmarks for search, access, and workflow execution as defined during the design phase.
- Platform Readiness: The solution is production-ready and supports ongoing bureau operations without requiring major rework

244. QUESTION: What is the expected post-go-live operational model, including support ownership, SLAs, and escalation paths?
ANSWER: SLA will be defined in the planning/discovery phase

245. QUESTION: What criteria will determine OAG readiness to lead Wave 3 and subsequent waves independently?
ANSWER: Refer response in question number 244

246. QUESTION: Does OAG have any existing estimates, reports, or historical metrics regarding document volume to be migrated (e.g., total document count, total storage size in GB/TB, average or maximum file size, or repository-level sizing by bureau), even if approximate?
ANSWER: Yes

247. QUESTION: Are there known differences in repository complexity across bureaus (e.g., depth of folder hierarchies, number of unique permission sets, prevalence of broken inheritance, or use of document versions)?
ANSWER: Will be determined during the design phase. Please note that vast majority of content exist in network shared drives, that do not support versioning

248. QUESTION: Is full version history required to be migrated for all repositories, or may version retention be limited based on records policy or bureau need?
ANSWER: Full version history may/will be required for certain bureaus.

249. QUESTION: Does OAG have insight into the predominant file types within legacy repositories (e.g., PDF, Word, email, images, multimedia), particularly where OCR, Syntex, or IDP processing may be required?
ANSWER: FileNet is almost exclusively PDFs with some other metadata-only document types (ITX Form Data); some network drives are used primarily for PDFs (REF) while others may have Office and other documents and file types, including large format images, etc.

250. QUESTION: Is OAG expecting significant ROT (Redundant, Obsolete, Trivial) cleanup prior to or during migration, and who has authority to approve deletions or exclusions under existing retention policies?
ANSWER: Duplicate question. See above. ROT discovery & clean-up will be conducted during phase 1 but would be business-led in conjunction with the contractor. Document owner would be the authority.

---

251. QUESTION: What are the acceptance criteria for a successful migration (e.g., allowable error rate, metadata fidelity requirements, permission accuracy thresholds), and who provides final sign-off?
ANSWER: Refer response in question number 244

252. QUESTION: Will source repositories remain active and editable during migration, or will content freezes or defined cutover windows be enforced?
ANSWER: Legacy repositories will be kept active in a "read-only" mode during and after migration for a given period for verification.

253. QUESTION: Are any high-volume or transactional workloads (e.g., case systems, intake portals, application-generated documents) expected to use SharePoint as a headless repository, and if so, what volumes or growth patterns are anticipated?
ANSWER: Yes. All AG custom-built applications (40+), COTS applications, the core case management system, and future systems requiring ECM capabilities—including OAG's core case matters management—are expected to use headless ECM functionality. Most of these are transactional systems. Volumes and growth patterns will be assessed during design.

254. QUESTION: Please confirm whether SharePoint Embedded is supported in the specific Microsoft 365 Government Cloud environment used by OAG (GCC vs GCC High), including any functional limitations, preview status, or unavailable Graph API capabilities compared to Commercial tenants.
ANSWER: SharePoint Embedded is not currently in use at OAG. Modern custom OAG apps leverage Microsoft Graph API for limited functionality, but not at an ECM level.

255. QUESTION: How will scope changes related to accelerated migration volume or additional bureau requirements be governed contractually?
ANSWER: There will be a change order process for us to address these types of issues as they arise. However, you should refer to the table in question 72 to assist you with your estimation. Rates for any changes must be included as part of the proposal.

256. QUESTION: Does OAG have documented estimates of current content volume (document counts, TB/GB by source, avg/max file sizes)?
ANSWER: Yes

257. QUESTION: Are there known differences in repository complexity across bureaus (hierarchy depth, permissions, inheritance, versioning)?
ANSWER: No significant differences in hierarchy, depth, permissions, inheritance or versioning

258. QUESTION: Is full document version history required or can version retention be limited?
ANSWER: For certain bureaus, full document version history may be required.

259. QUESTION: Will legacy repositories remain active during migration, or will freezes/cutovers be enforced?
ANSWER: Legacy repositories will be kept active in a "read-only" mode during and after migration for a given period for verification

260. QUESTION: Is OAG expecting ROT cleanup and who approves deletions/exclusions?
ANSWER: Yes. Business owners along with PMO team will work on exclusions

---

261. QUESTION: What are the acceptance criteria & sign-off thresholds for migration?
     ANSWER: Content Completion and accuracy. (file count validation), file integrity, metadata population, version history, access and permission model being tested, search, performance.

262. QUESTION: Which 2–3 applications are prioritized for Stage-1 integration and what API patterns apply?
     ANSWER: Stage-1 application priorities will be determined during the design phase. At this stage, the expected API pattern is basic CRUD operations via REST services, with proper security and logging controls.

263. QUESTION: Are high-volume or transactional workloads expected for headless use and what volumes apply?
     ANSWER: We anticipate a moderate to high transactional workload for headless content usage driven by application-level integrations rather than direct user interaction. Volumes are expected to grow incrementally year over year as additional business processes and applications adopt the platform. Architecture should support horizontal scaling without re-platforming.

264. QUESTION: Is SharePoint Embedded mandatory and is GCC support confirmed
     ANSWER: We are open to other options but would prefer Sharepoint Embedded.

265. QUESTION: What authentication/authorization patterns are required for app-level access?
     ANSWER: The solution must support modern, secure authentication and authorization patterns for all application-level access. Authentication shall be token-based, using OAuth 2.0 and OpenID Connect integrated with Azure Active Directory (Entra ID), and must support application identities such as app registrations and managed identities. Shared service accounts and embedded credentials are prohibited. Authorization must follow the principle of least privilege and implement role-based and scope-based access controls, allowing fine-grained authorization at the appropriate resource level with clear separation of read, write, and administrative privileges. All application-level access must be auditable, centrally managed, and subject to access lifecycle controls, including revocation and periodic review.

266. QUESTION: Will all workloads remain in GCC and is GCC High or CMK required?
     ANSWER: Workloads will remain in GCC. FR-357: The system should be deployable in a FedRAMP Moderate and CGIS compliant cloud environment if the solution is a SaaS or Cloud Only offering.

267. QUESTION: What performance SLAs/NFRs apply (search, API throughput, file ops, RPO/RTO)?
     ANSWER: No performance benchmarks or SLAs have been established yet. These will be defined during the design phase in collaboration with the vendor, ensuring suggestions do not compromise user experience.

268. QUESTION: Does OAG handle large media files and what are typical/max sizes?
     ANSWER: Yes. Size can vary but video files received aree anywhere from 300mb to 1gb

269. QUESTION: What is the preferred wave structure, concurrency, and exit/readiness criteria?
     ANSWER: Refer section 2.3.1.1 for information on stages & wave structure. The solution is production-ready and supports ongoing bureau operations without requiring major rework before subsequent waves.

270. QUESTION: How will scope changes in migration volume or bureau needs be contractually governed?

ANSWER: There will be a change order process for us to address these types of issues as they arise. However, you should refer to the table in question 72 to assist you with your estimation. Rates for any changes must be included as part of the proposal.

271. QUESTION: What privileged-access model should vendors assume (GDAP, PIM, etc.)?
ANSWER: The solution must support RBAC; PIM would be nice to have, but not required.

272. QUESTION: Given Microsoft's recent enhancements to the Solutions Partner program, does prior Gold Partner status satisfy 'Gold or higher' equivalency requirements coupled with case studies and references? OR
How does the RFP weigh historical Microsoft Gold Partner delivery against the updated Solutions Partner framework, which Microsoft designed to recognize proven expertise through dynamic metrics like customer success?
ANSWER: Our expectation is the partner will have a gold level certification or similar in the Microsoft Partner framework.

This Purchasing Memorandum is to be signed, submitted and made a part of your response. If you have any questions, do not hesitate to contact the person listed on top of this memorandum.

VENDOR: _____

ADDRESS: _____

SIGNATURE OF BIDDER: _____

DATE: _____