UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO SOLICITATION

TO: ALL VENDORS

FROM: Charles Johnson, Procurement Manager

SUBJECT: SOLICITATION NUMBER: USC-RFP-3236-CJ

DESCRIPTION: Data Governance Information System

DATE: December 15, 2017

This Amendment No. 1 modifies the Request for Proposals only in the manner and to the extent as stated herein.

Vendor Questions and Answers

Technical Proposal Portion of the Narrative subsection of Section III of the solicitation has been revised/modified

New clause (Authorized Agent) is added to Section II-A of the solicitation.

The PROTEST – CPO – MMO ADDRESS clause in Section II-B of the solicitation has been deleted and has been replaced with the PROTEST – CPO – ITMO ADDRESS clause

BIDDER SHALL ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF AMENDMENT NO. 1 IN THE SPACE PROVIDED BELOW AND RETURN IT WITH THEIR BID RESPONSE. FAILURE TO DO SO MAY SUBJECT BID TO REJECTION.

_____   _____

 Authorized Signature   Name of Offeror

_____

 Date

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS WERE RECEIVED FROM VENDOR A:

Question #1: Whether companies from Outside USA can apply for this? (like,from India or Canada)

ANSWER: Yes, companies outside the United States are welcome to respond to the solicitation.

Question # 2: Whether we need to come over there for meetings?

ANSWER: Your proposal should explain how your firm will accomplish all requirements in the RFP; it is on the offeror to make compelling case for how it would accomplish any work that might benefit from being on-site. The committee will evaluate accordingly

Question # 3: Can we perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside USA? (like, from India or Canada)

ANSWER: Your proposal should explain how your firm will accomplish all requirements in the RFP; it is on the offeror to make compelling case for how it would accomplish those requirements regardless of their location. The committee will evaluate accordingly. Please note that if state procurement provisions indicate to the contrary, state provisions will supersede.

Question # 4: Can we submit the proposals via email?

ANSWER: No, you cannot submit proposals by email. Please refer to the Submit A Paper Offer Or Modification clause in Section II-A of the solicitation.

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS WERE RECEIVED FROM VENDOR B:

Question # 1: What is the Budget allocated for the current Project?

ANSWER: There is not a fixed budget. See Sections II, III, IV, and V of the solicitation for guidance on formulating a response (proposal).

Question # 2: Are there any incumbents?

ANSWER: There are no incumbents. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time the University has sought to procure a Data Governance Information System.

Question # 3: Is it a single or multiple award?

ANSWER: This is a single award. Please refer to the Award To One Offeror clause in Section VI of the solicitation.

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS WERE RECEIVED FROM VENDOR C:

Question 1: * ******** can integrate with other applications that support Org Chart generation, but it cannot serve as the source system for Org Chart generation. Will this be automatic elimination?

ANSWER: Please refer to Section III of the solicitation for requirements. Minimum requirements are as stated.

Question # 2: Can the University provide an estimated number of users?

ANSWER: Please refer to the Cost Proposal portion of the Narrative subsection of Section III of the solicitation for content contributors and general users. General users (which may be considered those with ability to access some content) cannot be faithfully

estimated, as the intent is to expose some content to the public while restricting other content to a subset of University personnel.

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS WERE RECEIVED FROM VENDOR D:

Question # 1: To keep costs down, can some of the work be done remotely from our offices in the US?

ANSWER: Yes.

Question # 2: We offer a metadata solution and Data Governance services; will this do or are you only looking for a GRM type solution with services?

ANSWER: We are looking for a Data Governance Information System that meets the requirements stated in Section III of the solicitation.

Question # 3: What options does ServiceNow offer for integration (API, service broker, etc.)?

ANSWER: It is up to the RFP respondent (offeror) to determine through ServiceNow. Asking the question suggests no such relationship exists.

Question # 4: Do you have a data validation tool in place with your Data Warehouse?

ANSWER: Cognos platform; special reports are currently used to perform some validation; intent is to mature in this area.

Question # 5: For off-site or 3rd party hosting, what level of security certification, compliance regulations or audit standards do you require?

ANSWER: Please refer to State of South Carolina information technology guidelines to find out level of security certification, compliance regulations or audit standards for off-site or 3rd party hosting.

Question # 6: Will a bond be absolutely required, or can we instead show successful prior work to give you that confidence?

ANSWER: The intent and meaning of this question is not clear. The word bond appears only in the Qualification of Offer clause in Section V of the solicitation. Please re-read the Qualification of Offeror clause in Section V of the solicitation.

Question # 7: Our partner is an out of state minority vendor certified by the State, will this be sufficient certification?

ANSWER: If you referring to the Tax Credit for Subcontracting with Disadvantaged Small Business clause in Section II-A of the solicitation, then please refer your question regarding subcontractor certification to: Governor's Office of Small and Minority Business Assistance, Phone: (803) 734-0657, Fax: (803) 734-2498.

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS WERE RECEIVED FROM VENDOR E:

Question # 1: ***** has reviewed the RFP and believes our Information Value Management platform and associated services are an excellent fit for the University's requirements. As witnessed by our recognition in Gartner's Magic Quadrant for metadata management solutions and Forrester's Wave for data governance, stewardship, and discovery, ***** is the one of the leaders, if not the leading solution in the space. However, based on the rapid provisioning, deployment and maintenance/upgrade advantages of a multi-tenant solution hosted and maintained in a highly secure cloud environment (note the solution only stores metadata, not actual University data), ***** designed IVM from the ground up as a cloud-based, SaaS solution. ***** does not currently offer an on premises hosting option. Please clarify if this disqualifies ***** from consideration per the Installation/Hosting requirements of the RFP.

ANSWER: We apologize for the confusion. The Minimum Requirements indicated "on-premise hosting" as the first item, and the phrase includes "option." Our intent was to have the option to host on premise, but "SaaS only" model may also be considered by the evaluation committee for the RFP.

Question # 2: Will USC provide any additional contracts to sign upon award? Many terms are covered by the Solicitation, but there are some basic terms that are not (i.e. Grant of License). We could suggest those basic terms as part of our response; however, we are unclear on how to present them. Page 11 says we can provide additional terms and conditions, as long as they are marked "SAMPLE," but the "Offeror's Checklist" states that we should not include any standard contract forms or additional boilerplate contract clauses. Please clarify.

ANSWER: Right now, the University does not plan to provide any additional contracts for the successful offer (contractor) to sign upon award. If you wish to suggest some basic terms as part of your response (proposal), then you need to make sure that you clearly label the pages with suggested basic terms that are not (i.e. Grant of License) included in the solicitation. The Offeror's Checklist preceded the Legal Agreements Included With Bids Must Be Clearly Labelled "Sample" clause in Section II of the solicitation and hasn't been updated.

Question # 3: Page 13. 3rd Bullet: "In its technical proposal, Offeror must demonstrate prior successful experience with higher education institutions, and must include 3 named higher education institutional customers who are willing to serve as references, along with bid." Is this a hardline requirement for vendor selection, or is USC interested in a partnering program arrangement with a vendor aiming to break into the higher education market?

ANSWER: USC included this requirement to ensure offerors demonstrate prior experience in the higher education industry, which is notoriously complex and challenging. Absence of such demonstration may cause offeror's proposal to be deemed non-responsive and removed from further consideration.

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS WERE RECEIVED FROM VENDOR F:

Question # 1: Are there any existing data governance tools available with the university, which could be leveraged?

ANSWER: No.

Question # 2: Does the university have a preference for Data Governance tool to be implemented?

ANSWER: The RFP is objective and open and is requirements based. See RFP.

Question # 3: For Training - Is the university open for a mix of physical (onsite - classroom style) and virtual training model (offsite - online) by SMEs with the help of video conferencing tools?

ANSWER: The university is open to vendor proposals that meet stated requirements. It is the responsibility of the offeror to make clear how the requirements will be met successfully, and the committee will evaluate each proposal according to consistent criteria.

Question # 4: What are the current technologies used for data management (e.g.
1. Data security,
2. Data quality,
3. Data Integration,
4. MDM,
5. Reporting,
6. Visualization,
7. Data warehouse etc.)

This will help us in determining a DG solution that integrates well with softwares currently in place?

ANSWER: Preface to individual items: the university aims to mature its enterprise approach to data governance, including management and protection; the acquisition of a data governance information system may be seen as the second step in this process, with security being the first. All other areas, including those that may be covered by the individual items in this question, are considered less mature at this time. In some cases the university has not standardized its approach.

1. Data security technologies cannot all be named due to the volume and variety of tools, nor will the university make public its entire security strategy. Some technologies in use are described in various sections of the university's public website and sub-pages, located at http://sc.edu/about/offices_and_divisions/university_technology_services/security/

2. Data quality. USC uses various custom reports to monitor values in data elements; some reside in Cognos and others are maintained by functional units or IT units. This is considered an immature area.

3. Data integration. USC uses UC4 job chains to move data between systems, and uses various point solutions between certain systems. There are too many systems to list.

4. MDM. The university has no system supporting MDM at this time.

5. Reporting. The university does not have a true enterprise reporting platform and is looking to mature in this area. A data governance information system is seen as critical to the success of this maturation. USC currently uses Cognos for limited data warehouse, point solutions for ODS, and a wide variety of point solutions within systems as well as software like SAS, r, and Excel, that are used in various offices around the university system.

6. Visualization. The university does not have a visualization standard and is looking to mature in this area. A data governance information system is seen as critical to the success of this maturation and development of a data visualization strategy/solution that can be used enterprise wide and supported by the Division of Information Technology.

7. Data warehouse. USC has a limited data warehouse using Cognos. It currently contains large volumes of student and human resources data but does not currently include data from many domains and functional areas of the university. USC is looking to mature in this area.

Question # 5: Are there any other applications/systems apart from Ellucian Banner, PeopleSoft planned for future purposes? This will help us in determining applications to considered for DG Strategy?

ANSWER: Currently there are literally hundreds of systems and solutions in use across the USC system, with over 140 data integrations and interfaces from just the student information system. This illustrates the need for the university to govern and understand its data. Future major systems are unknown at this time and will likely go through an open RFP process as well.

Question # 6: Who are main users of the DG solution? Business users or IT team?

ANSWER: Initially the main users of the solution will include the office of the Chief Data Officer, the Office of Institutional Reporting, Assessment, and Analytics (OIRAA), and approximately 15 core functional areas such as Registrar, Admissions, Human Resources, and Finance. Those approximately 15 functional areas will be the primary content contributors initially, while the CDO office will administer the system and support the work of the functional areas. OIRAA will be partly a contributor and also will be the primary consumer/user of the content from functional areas. IT users will be stakeholders in the system, as the CDO office resides in the Division of IT, and the Data Warehouse team and Enterprise Applications teams are an extension of the Division of IT; the Information Security unit also resides in Division of IT.

In the long term, there are literally hundreds of organizational units across the university system that could potentially be contributors and users of the system content. The university is also responsible for supporting the development and administration of formal data management plans for thousands of sponsored awards conducted by principle investigators, who are generally faculty; in the long run USC will want to explore leveraging the solution currently being sought to aid with these plans and related requirements.

THE FOLLOWING QUESTION WAS RECEIVED FROM VENDOR G:

Question # 1: With regards to the 5 year not to exceed cost. Does this apply only to the scope of the RFP? If the scope expands there may be costs above the initial quote.

ANSWER: The 5 year not to exceed price applies to the Scope of Work for the RFP. While we may issue change order(s) to the contract that are within the Scope of Work for the RFP during the contract term that may increase the total spent against the contract, we are not allowed to expand the Scope of Work for the contract during the contract term.

THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL PORTION OF THE NARRATIVE SUBSECTION OF SECTION III OF THE SOLICITATION HAS BEEN REVISED/MODIFIED AND NOW READS AS FOLLOWS:

Technical Proposal
- In its technical proposal, Offeror must specify solution/software by exact product title(s), module(s)/component(s), and version(s), as well as the basis for pricing (enterprise license, tiered license, per user basis, etc.);
  - The modules included in the proposal must address all "must-have" functional requirements; offeror must state price for solutions as a package. If package content will include features and services not specified below as requirements, offeror may highlight such items as additional benefits
- In its technical proposal, Offeror must specify its practices for customers to acquire and deploy system upgrades and patches, including software maintenance agreements, security, and general installation procedures
- In its technical proposal, Offeror should provide guidance on implementation timeframe, describing typical timespan customers experience in deploying the product for initial use
- In its technical proposal, Offeror must state that it is willing to formally accept USC's Contract Addendum for External Data and Systems Service Providers (UNIV 1.52 Appendix 4, see http://www.sc.edu/about/offices_and_divisions/division_of_information_technology/chiefdataofficer/univ_152_appendix_4.docx) which will be attached to the purchase order for the successful bidder
- **In its technical proposal, Offeror must demonstrate prior successful experience in the higher education industry, and must include 3 named higher education institutional customers who are willing to serve as references, along with its bid. Failure of offeror to demonstrate prior successful experience in the higher education industry and include 3 named higher education institutional customers who are willing to serve as references may cause offeror's proposal to be deemed non-responsive and removed from further consideration.**

THE FOLLOWING NEW CLAUSE HAS BEEN ADDED TO SECTION II. INSTRUCTIONS TO OFFERORS – A. GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS:

AUTHORIZED AGENT (FEB 2015)
All authority regarding this procurement is vested solely with the responsible Procurement Officer. Unless specifically delegated in writing, the Procurement Officer is the only government official authorized to bind the government with regard to this procurement or the resulting contract. [02-2A007-1]

THE PROTEST – CPO – MMO ADDRESS clause in SECTION II. INSTRUCTIONS TO OFFERORS – B. SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS HAS BEEN DELETED AND HAS BEEN REPLACED WITH THE FOLLOWING PROTEST – CPO – ITMO ADDRESS CLAUSE:

PROTEST - CPO - ITMO ADDRESS (JUN 2006): Any protest must be addressed to the Chief Procurement Officer, Information Technology Management Office, and submitted in writing
 (a) by email to protest-itmo@itmo.sc.gov ,
 (b) by facsimile at 803-737-0102 , or
 (c) by post or delivery to 1201 Main Street, Suite 601, Columbia, SC 29201.
[02-2B120-1]