

<p>Guilford Technical Community College</p> <p>601 E. Main Street</p> <p>Jamestown, NC 27282</p>	ADDENDA 2
	IFB/RFQ NO. 99-MP24042
	Commodity: IT Service Management System
	Using Agency Name: GTCC
	Date: Monday, June 16, 2025

This addendum addresses the following:

Response to Vendor Questions:

Vendor Question	GTCC Response
Hosting Model - Is GTCC open to a cloud-only solution, or is there also consideration being given to on-premise or hybrid deployments?	GTCC is seeking a SaaS/cloud-hosted ITSM solution. The RFP terms and conditions are specifically structured for SaaS hosting. A hybrid configuration may be considered only if the primary solution is cloud-hosted and the hybrid components do not conflict with SaaS-specific terms, including hosting, data security, and support obligations. Fully on-premise solutions will not be accepted.
Security Certifications -The RFP references FedRAMP, SOC 2 Type 2, ISO 27001, etc. Can you confirm whether FedRAMP certification is strictly required, or if SOC 2 Type 2 and/or ISO 27001 would meet your compliance needs?	Confirmed with our Security Team that FedRAMP certification is not strictly required. SOC 2 Type 2 or ISO 27001 certifications are acceptable and would meet our compliance requirements.
Accessibility Compliance - For WCAG 2.1 and other accessibility standards, would GTCC accept a solution that leverages a third-party accessibility tool to achieve compliance, or is native platform accessibility preferred?	GTCC prefers solutions with native accessibility features that comply with WCAG 2.1 standards. While third-party accessibility tools may be considered, native compliance is strongly preferred to ensure consistent and reliable accessibility.
Project Management Tools - Is integrated project management functionality considered a mandatory requirement, or would you accept a solution that integrates with existing tools (e.g., Asana, MS Project, etc.) to fulfill that need?	Integrated project management functionality within the solution is a mandatory requirement. Solutions relying solely on integration with external tools will not meet this criterion.
Reference 2.1, Page Number 3: The RFP mentions the current ticketing system is "co-managed". Who are the parties that currently manage the ITSM system and will that construct continue with the new ITSM system?	Our current system is co-managed with the North Carolina Community College System (NCCCS), where GTCC functions as a client under their ITSM instance. This RFP seeks to transition away from that arrangement, moving to a solution where GTCC will have full control over its own ITSM instance independent of NCCCS.
Reference 3.4.1, Page Number 8: Will N-Able continue to be your long term monitoring solution? Can we propose alternative solutions?	This RFP is specifically for an ITSM system. Proposals that require replacing or moving away from N-Central do not meet the stated requirements.
Reference 5.2, Page Number 10: Are there any other priority integrations to be covered under this RFP besides N-Able, Active Directory and MS365?	For the purposes of evaluation and selection, the integrations with N-Able, Active Directory, and MS365 are the only required priorities under this RFP.

Reference 7.12, Page Number 19: Is it a requirement that vendor resources must be onsite throughout the lifecycle of planning, design, and implementation?	No, face-to-face meetings or onsite presence are not required for any phase of planning, design, or implementation.
Reference Attach.D, Page Number 39: We understand the quantity of 50 user licenses is provided solely for evaluation and pricing comparison purposes. Can you provide how many IT staff will be processing tickets in the new ITSM system?	The evaluation quantity of 50 user licenses was selected to encompass the entire IT department, potential non-user automated services, and additional licenses to explore Enterprise Service Management (ESM) capabilities with other departments. The IT department itself consists of approximately 30 users who will be actively processing tickets.
Reference Page N/A: What is your current ITSM platform?	We currently use ServiceNow as part of the North Carolina Community College System's managed instance.
Reference Page 44: What integrations are currently operating with the legacy solution? In addition to N-Central, Microsoft 365, or Active Directory, are there any other integration you may require?	For the purposes of evaluation and selection under this RFP, integrations with N-Central, Microsoft 365, and Active Directory are the only required priorities.
Reference Page 8: What data do you intend to migrate from the legacy system? (# of records, scope) or do you want vendors to recommend?	While not a strict requirement, we expect to migrate open incidents at a minimum (approximately 100–200 records). Migrating historical incidents and change records from a limited time period is also open for discussion. For the purposes of this RFP, we welcome vendor recommendations and options based on the capabilities of the proposed solution.
Reference Page 8: How do you obtain your Asset/CMDB data? Do you use online asset discovery tools? If yes, please describe or list. Also if yes, do you plan to retain your existing discovery tools or replace them? If you want to replace your discovery tool, how many assets do you have?	We currently use the Collection Agent as part of the CMDB module within ServiceNow. This will be discontinued with the transition to a new ITSM solution. Our preferred method for asset discovery is integration with N-Central. We currently manage approximately 6,000 assets.
Reference Page 39, Schedule D: Do you prefer to have concurrent, named licenses or a combination of both for your 50 users?	Due to work schedules and procurement considerations, we treat both concurrent and named licenses equally. The 50-user license count would be named licenses, with most users typically accessing the system concurrently.
Reference Page, 39 Schedule D: Do you plan to take all current practice areas live in the new platform at the initial GoLive? (ESM and HR, Facilities, etc).	Initially, only the IT department will go live on the new platform. Additional departments will be onboarded after a period during which we assess the solution's effectiveness and alignment with their needs.
Reference Page 6: The requirement, 3.3.1 ARCHITECTURE DIAGRAMS, talks about two required diagrams. However, the linked documentation and Visio template appear to refer to only one diagram. Can you please clarify if "Network Architecture and Technology Stack" refers to one diagram or two? If two, can you please provide more guidance on what is expected for the "Technology Stack" diagram?	<p>Vendors should follow the State's official guidance and example diagram provided in the following document, which integrates both Network Architecture and Technology Stack elements into a single diagram:</p> <p>https://it.nc.gov/documents/architecture-submission-guidance/download?attachment</p> <p>This integrated approach will be considered responsive to Section 3.3.1.</p>

Who are the incumbents for this Contract?	The current incumbent is ServiceNow, provided through the North Carolina Community College System's managed instance.
What is the approximate budget allocated or What is the annual spent for this Contract?	GTCC is not disclosing a budget range for the IT Service Management (ITSM) project at this time due to internal budget considerations. Vendors are encouraged to submit their most competitive pricing based on the full scope of work outlined in the RFP and any subsequent clarifications.
Software Demo Availability – Has a demo been developed for the software?	GTCC has not developed a formal demo script or predefined scenario at this stage. However, vendors should be prepared to provide a demonstration of their solution later in the evaluation process, focusing on how it meets the RFP requirements, including ITIL-aligned workflows, automation, ESM capabilities, and integration with N-Central. Additional guidance may be provided to shortlisted vendors before demos are scheduled.
Offshore Resource Utilization - can we utilize Offshore resources to provide the services?	You may perform tasks outside the U.S., but please review Section 7.1 (Vendor Utilization of Workers Outside of the U.S.) and Attachment F (Location of Workers Utilized by Vendor) for the specific requirements. GTCC will evaluate the use of non-U.S. resources based on potential risks, costs, and compliance factors.
Reference RFP Section 3.4/3.5, Page Number 7-8: How many agents/users will require login-based access to the ITSM system for the purposes of managing, updating, and resolving tickets?	The system is expected to support login-based access for 50 users.
Reference RFP Section 2.2, Page Number 4: Which ITSM tool or platform (if any) is currently in use, and is there a preferred tool or vendor for this procurement?	We are currently utilizing ServiceNow but remain open to proposals for the best-fit solution.
Reference RFP Section 6.2.2, Page Number 13: Is there a preferred engagement model for project execution among the following options? This will help us offer the most cost-efficient model: a. Fully onsite (most expensive) b. Fully remote onshore c. Blended (onshore + offshore) d. Fully remote offshore with overlapping US working hours (least expensive)	GTCC is open to various engagement models, including fully remote offshore with overlapping US working hours, assuming contractual provisions and security requirements can be met. Please review Section 7.1 (Vendor Utilization of Workers Outside of the U.S.) and Attachment F (Location of Workers Utilized by Vendor) for detailed requirements. GTCC will evaluate the use of non-U.S. resources based on potential risks, costs, and compliance factors.
Reference RFP Section Attachment D, Page Number 39: Can the agency share the estimated budget range allocated for this ITSM implementation and ongoing support?	GTCC is not disclosing a budget range for the IT Service Management (ITSM) project at this time due to internal budgetary considerations. Vendors are encouraged to submit their most competitive pricing based on the full scope of work outlined in the RFP and any clarifications provided through this addendum.

<p>Reference RFP Section 2.4, Page Number 4:</p> <p>What is the anticipated duration of required post-implementation support (e.g., 1 year, 3 years)? Is this support expected to be 24x7 or during business hours only?</p>	<p>Manufacturer support for the ITSM solution is expected for the full duration of the contract. Implementation support is limited to the agreed project hours and schedules and is not expected beyond project closure. Vendor SLAs will be reviewed during evaluation, but no specific support hours (e.g., 24x7 vs. business hours) are mandated for selection purposes.</p>
<p>Reference RFP Section 3.4/3.5, Page Number 7-8: The ITSM manufacturer typically includes standard support with license purchases. Would this be sufficient for the GTCC, or is dedicated manpower support preferred for faster resolution? This will help us estimate the annual support cost accordingly.</p>	<p>Standard ITSM manufacturer support included with license purchases is acceptable and preferred by GTCC.</p>
<p>Reference RFP Section 3.5.1, Page Number 8: Does GTCC prefer or expect AI-powered features such as automated routing, resolution suggestions, and workflow enhancements to be included in the proposed solution?</p>	<p>AI-powered features are considered a low priority overall. However, GTCC is interested in understanding how AI may be or is being used to assist support staff and end users. Automation and workflow capabilities, particularly for routing, remain a high priority within this RFP.</p>
<p>Reference RFP Section 3.1.5 – Enterprise Licensing, Page Number 5: The section on Enterprise Licensing is marked as "RESERVED. Can the agency please clarify whether enterprise licensing considerations are expected to be addressed in the vendor proposal or these existing enterprise licensing agreement (ELA) in place with any ITSM vendors, and if so, should vendors align their proposal accordingly? If no ELA exists, will the College consider proposals that include new licensing models?</p>	<p>Section 3.1.5 is marked "Reserved" because GTCC does not currently participate in any statewide or agency-specific enterprise licensing agreements (ELAs) for ITSM solutions. Vendors are not expected to align proposals with any existing ELAs. GTCC welcomes proposals featuring new or vendor-specific licensing models, provided they are cost-effective, scalable, and meet the College's requirements.</p>
<p>Reference RFP Section 2.4, Page 4: Is Guilford Technical Community College open to multi-year terms?</p>	<p>GTCC's standard contract term, as outlined in Section 2.4 of the RFP, is one (1) year with the option to renew for up to four (4) additional one-year periods at the College's sole discretion. While GTCC does not commit to a fixed multi-year contract, vendors are welcome to propose pricing or incentives that reflect multi-year terms, understanding that renewals are subject to performance, continued need, and available funding.</p>
<p>Reference RFP Section 2.6, Page 4: Can you define what you mean by Indefinite Quantity Contract?</p>	<p>As stated in Section 2.6 of the RFP, an "Indefinite Quantity Contract" means that GTCC does not guarantee any specific purchase volume under the resulting contract. The estimated quantity of 50 user licenses is provided solely for pricing evaluation purposes and does not represent a firm purchase commitment. Actual quantities purchased may increase or decrease throughout the contract term and any renewals, based on GTCC's needs and funding availability. This approach allows GTCC the flexibility to scale the solution as necessary without being bound to fixed quantities.</p>

Reference RFP Section 3.2.2, Page 5: Is FEDRAMP certified a requirement?	FedRAMP certification is not strictly required. SOC 2 Type 2 or ISO 27001 certifications are acceptable alternatives to meet the compliance requirements.
Reference RFP Section 3.3.4, Page 6: What integrations are required? Can you please list out?	The only required integrations are N-Central, Microsoft 365, and Active Directory. However, Section 3.3.4 also seeks to understand the available integration options through the system and its API capabilities.
Reference RFP Section 3.4.1, Page 8: Can you share specially what you mean by Inventory and Asset Mgmt with automated discovery? Is this a hard requirement?	We are seeking an ITSM solution that supports maintaining an inventory of assets such as workstations and servers. This includes functionality for device discovery or integration with N-Central for asset information, along with reporting capabilities. While this functionality is described in Section 5.2 under "substantial conformity with requirements," proposals lacking this feature will be evaluated accordingly and may be rated lower in the selection process.
Inventory and Asset Management: - How frequently do you require automated discovery and reporting of assets? - Are there specific types of assets or inventory items that require unique tracking or management?	Our focus is not on a comprehensive inventory management system but on tracking workstations and servers as they relate to incidents, problems, changes, and projects. There are no specific requirements regarding the frequency of automated discovery.
Project Management Tools: - What project management methodologies (e.g., Agile, Waterfall) do you currently use or plan to use? - What project management tools do you use? - Are there specific integrations required with existing project management tools?	We utilize both Agile and Waterfall methodologies depending on the project and department; however, Agile alone would sufficiently meet our needs. Currently, we use ServiceNow for project management, but we intend for the proposed ITSM solution to serve as our sole project management tool moving forward.
Change Management: - Can you describe your current change management process and any specific pain points? - What level of customization is required for change management workflows?	Our current change management process includes weekly approval and scheduling meetings. Key pain points are related to templating standard changes that do not require multiple approvals, managing multiple assignments on changes, and handling notifications. The change management workflows are expected to focus primarily on approval processes.
IT Maintenance Scheduling: - How do you currently handle scheduling for IT maintenance, and what improvements are you seeking? - Is there a preference for automated vs. manual scheduling, or a combination of both?	We require the ITSM solution to support change workflows, alerts, and notifications related to scheduled maintenance. For example, when a ticket is opened against a device under scheduled maintenance or a change, the assigned engineer should receive a notification before work begins. Additionally, users submitting requests should be notified of any scheduled maintenance or ongoing issues, potentially through a status page or similar mechanism.

<p>Integration with N-Central by N-Able:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Can you detail any specific integration challenges you've faced with N-Central in the past? - What are the primary benefits you seek from real-time asset/ticket sync and alert-based ticket generation? - Can you specify what is meant by deep integration? It will be helpful to specify use cases so we can scope a solution appropriately. 	<p>Most ITSM solutions "integrate" via simple email exchanges between systems. We seek a solution that offers an API or built-in partnership with N-Central to enable enhanced features such as hot-linking to assets and remote control, automatic creation/updating/closing of incidents based on N-Central alerts, and accurate user-device matching. Deep integration means an intentional, inherent, and seamless connection between the ITSM and N-Central systems.</p>
<p>Custom Workflows and Automation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What specific ITIL processes are a priority for automation? 	<p>Priorities include automatic tracking and updating of SLA status based on ticket handling, SLA timeout notifications, automatic problem escalations, user notifications, and resolution handling, among others.</p>
<p>Administrative Control:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What level of admin training or support do you require to maintain in-house control? 	<p>The level of administrative training and support required will depend on the proposed solution, including the quality of documentation and vendor support provided.</p>
<p>Permission Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How are roles and permissions currently managed, and what improvements are you seeking? - Can you describe your current SAML2 group sync setup with Microsoft Entra ID? 	<p>Currently, GTCC does not manage roles and permissions in the existing system. The goal is to regain autonomy over these controls and simplify the management process. The number of roles is expected to be limited. For authentication, we use SAML claims to share group information, which supports queue assignments.</p>
<p>Reporting and Dashboard Tools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What specific types of reports or dashboards are critical for your operational visibility? - Are there any existing reporting tools you plan to integrate with? 	<p>Critical reporting needs include monitoring the lifecycle of tickets, SLA compliance, assignment tracking, and trend analysis. Currently, there are no plans to integrate with any existing reporting tools.</p>
<p>Enterprise Service Management (ESM):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What non-IT departments are you planning to include in the ESM capabilities? - Are there specific workflows or processes in these departments that require customization? 	<p>All GTCC departments will be given the opportunity to utilize the ITSM solution if it meets their needs. However, defining required workflows or customizations for non-IT departments is beyond the scope of this implementation.</p>
<p>Service Data Access:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Can you describe your current challenges with centralized service data access? - Are there specific departments or teams that require unique data access configurations? 	<p>Certain departments, such as HR, require isolation of internal notes, updates, and documentation from other ITSM users to maintain privacy and security.</p>
<p>Ticket Creation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What are your current methods for ticket creation, and what improvements are you seeking? 	<p>We currently use email, web, and API for ticket creation. Lack of API ticket generation would be considered a significant limitation when evaluating overall ticket creation and workflow capabilities.</p>
<p>Mobile Interface:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What are the primary use cases for mobile access to the system? - Are there specific mobile devices or operating systems that need to be supported? 	<p>Mobile support is intended primarily for technicians to lookup, view, edit, and update incidents on the go. Support for both iOS and Android devices is expected to ensure broad accessibility.</p>

<p>ITIL-Aligned Workflows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Which ITIL processes are most critical to your operations? - How do you currently manage ticket assignment, escalation, and SLAs? 	<p>Incident lifecycle and problem management would be top priority. Incidents are assigned and escalated by a dispatcher with SLAs being handled by the system itself.</p>
<p>AI-Powered/Automation Features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What types of AI-powered or automation features are you most interested in for issue resolution? - How do you envision AI enhancing your current support processes? 	<p>AI is generally a low priority for GTCC at this time, but we are interested in how it is or may be used to assist support staff and end users. Automation and workflow features, especially in routing, are a high priority.</p>
<p>Email and Communications Integration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are there specific integration requirements or challenges with email integrations? 	<p>We adhere to DMARC, DKIM, and strict SPF guidelines. Therefore, we want to review and understand how emails are sent to and from the ITSM system. Some solutions integrate directly through a shared mailbox, while others send and receive emails on behalf of users.</p>
<p>Time-Tracking Features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How is time tracking currently managed, and what improvements are you seeking? - Are there specific reporting requirements for tracked time? 	<p>Time tracking is not currently managed, but we want to ensure this capability is included, as future operational changes may require it. We are seeking to understand and evaluate the time-tracking features offered by the proposed solution.</p>
<p>In section 3.2.2 b), the government is asking for 3rd party assessment report on recommended SaaS solution. Is this report required if our solution is FEDRAM running in GCC High environment?</p>	<p>A SOC 2 or ISO 27001 third-party assessment report is required. If your solution is FedRAMP authorized and running in a GCC High environment, please provide the appropriate FedRAMP authorization documentation.</p>
<p>In section 3.4.1, the government mentioned "Scalable, predictable licensing model with no per-feature or module surprise fees". Most large-scale models like ServiceNow have module-based fees to allow customers to pick functionality they need and not overpay for unnecessary fees. Is a tool like that not allowed since they only offer flexible license models?</p>	<p>The intent of the requirement is to avoid unexpected or hidden fees based on individual features or modules. While we recognize that some large-scale solutions like ServiceNow offer modular licensing, GTCC prefers a scalable and predictable licensing model without per-feature or per-module fees that could cause cost surprises. Therefore, solutions with such flexible but potentially complex licensing structures may not fully meet our requirements.</p>
<p>In section 3.4.1, the government is asking for "IT Maintenance Scheduling". Are you asking for IT ITSM tool to provide scheduling functionality to run jobs automatically for IT Maintenance of infrastructure?</p>	<p>The intent is for the ITSM solution to support change workflows, alerting, and notifications related to scheduled IT maintenance. For example, if a ticket is opened for a device involved in a scheduled maintenance or change, the assigned engineer should be notified prior to work commencing. Additionally, the system should be able to notify users—when they submit a request—of any scheduled maintenance or ongoing issues, potentially through a status page or similar mechanism. The focus is on communication and coordination around maintenance activities rather than automating the actual execution of maintenance jobs.</p>

<p>In section 3.4.1, the government is asking "Full in-house administrative control without vendor intervention". SaaS software provider allows full administrative control of the software without the underline infrastructure or application supporting it. Since SaaS solution are managed by a vendor providing the solution, is that still allowed?</p>	<p>Yes, the expectation is that GTCC will have full administrative control over the configuration and management of the SaaS application itself, within the boundaries and capabilities provided by the vendor's software. This means GTCC should be able to administer and customize its use independently, without needing to rely on the vendor or a third party for routine administrative tasks, even though the underlying infrastructure and platform are managed by the SaaS provider.</p>
<p>In section 5.2, the government is talking about TCO and further looking for automation across IT ITSM platform. Can you please provide details on tools used for IT Service management (Hardware and Software Asset Management, Event Management, Server Platform and count, ...) so we can properly articulate our response.</p>	<p>In the context of this RFP, automation primarily refers to ITSM processes such as automated ticket handling, workflow-driven notifications, escalations, and scheduling activities like maintenance-related ticket generation. While we recognize the importance of tools for hardware and software asset management, event management, and server platform monitoring, the focus here is on how automation supports efficient IT service management workflows.</p>
<p>Reference Section 1.0, Page 4: When do you expect this RFQ to be awarded? / When is the expected award date?</p>	<p>As outlined in Section 1.0, GTCC will begin evaluating offers on June 27, 2025. However, this is a complex RFP requiring detailed review, possible finalist presentations, negotiations, and best and final offers. As such, a specific contract award date has not been established and is listed as TBD. Vendors should not assume award will be immediately following the offer evaluation start date.</p>
<p>Reference Section 6.3.1, Page 16: How long do you expect the proposal to be?</p>	<p>While there is no specific page limit imposed, Vendors are expected to exercise professional judgment in crafting a response. As noted in Sections 6.3.1 and 6.3.2, the proposal should follow the structure of the RFP precisely and include only the relevant, requested information. Excessively lengthy or overly promotional submissions are neither necessary nor encouraged and may detract from the clarity of your proposal. We are evaluating substance, not volume — so focus on providing direct, well-organized responses that demonstrate your solution's ability to meet GTCC's needs.</p>
<p>Reference Section 3.4, Page 9: Is there any software that the state preferences?</p>	<p>GTCC does not have a preferred software solution and is open to evaluating all proposals to determine the best-fit solution that aligns with the College's needs, priorities, and technical requirements.</p>

Reference General, Page N/A: Can you provide more details on the budget constraints or funding availability?	GTCC is not disclosing a specific budget range for the IT Service Management (ITSM) project at this time due to internal budgetary considerations. Vendors are encouraged to submit their most competitive pricing based on the full scope of work outlined in the RFP and any clarifications provided through this addendum.
Reference Section 3.4, Page 9: What are the existing infrastructures in place?	GTCC currently uses a cloud-based, co-managed instance of ServiceNow. The College supports approximately 6,000 devices, including a mix of servers, desktops, all-in-ones, laptops, printers, projectors, and other equipment. Devices operate on a variety of platforms including Windows, macOS, Linux, and some proprietary operating systems.
Reference General, Page N/A: Is there an incumbent? How much was their contract worth?	GTCC currently utilizes ServiceNow through the North Carolina Community College System (NCCCS) managed instance. As this arrangement is managed at the system level, GTCC does not have access to or knowledge of the specific contract value paid by NCCCS for ServiceNow.
Reference Attachment G, Page 45: Do commercial or government references carry different significance?	As outlined in Attachment G of the RFP, references from public sector, higher education, or similarly structured organizations are strongly preferred, given their alignment with GTCC's operational environment. While commercial references may be considered, those lacking relevance to the specified scope and use cases may carry less evaluative weight. Vendors are advised to review the RFP in detail and tailor their responses accordingly to maximize alignment with stated expectations.
Reference Section 16, Page 29; Attachment D, Page 40: Do you need a UAT/Sandbox?	A test, development, or sandbox environment is preferred to support User Acceptance Testing (UAT) and configuration validation; however, it is not a strict requirement.
Reference General, Page N/A: Upon Award-decision, what kind of feedback can bidders expect to get on proposal submission?	<p>As outlined in Section 5.4 of the RFP: <i>"After award of contract, the complete bid file will be available to any interested persons, with the exception of trade secrets, test information, or other proprietary information as protected by statute and rule."</i> Any proprietary or confidential information must be clearly marked in accordance with N.C.G.S. §132-1.2 at the time of submission.</p> <p>Vendors seeking feedback or access to procurement records must submit a written request under the North Carolina Public Records Law.</p>

<p>Reference Section 2.6, Page 5; Attachment D, Page 40: The RFP notes an estimated quantity of 50 user licenses for evaluation purposes. Can you clarify if these 50 users are all expected to be full-access technicians/administrators, or does this estimate include end-users or users with view-only/limited access?</p>	<p>The estimate of 50 user licenses refers to users with elevated access. Approximately 45 users will require technician-level access, with configurable, limited privileges based on their assigned group, area, department, or team. An additional 5 users may require administrator-level access. Separately, the system should support between 1,000 to 2,000 end-users who can submit tickets or service requests. These end-users should only have access to view and manage their own requests or affiliated items.</p>
<p>Reference Section 3.4, Page 9: The requirement for "Deep integration with N-Central by N-Able" is noted. Can the agency provide more specifics on the required integration points, such as the version of N-Central in use and which specific APIs are available for real-time asset/ticket synchronization?</p>	<p>Most ITSM solutions offer only basic integrations, such as email-based communication between systems. GTCC is seeking a more advanced solution that includes API-based or native integration with N-Central. Desired functionality includes, but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hot-linking to assets for direct access and potential remote control • Automatic creation, update, and closure of incidents based on N-Central alerts • Matching users to their known or assigned devices within the system <p>By "deep integration," we mean an intentional and inherent connection between the ITSM solution and N-Central—not a workaround or surface-level interface.</p> <p>GTCC generally maintains the latest version of N-Central. For reference, vendors may consult the following API documentation for integration capabilities:</p> <p>https://ncod2.n-able.com/api-explorer/ https://developer.n-able.com/n-central</p>
<p>Reference Section 3.3.6, Page 8: Regarding Data Migration, can the agency provide details on the source of the data to be migrated? Specifically, what is the name of the current ticketing system, and can you provide an estimated volume of historical data (e.g., number of tickets, assets, users, and knowledge base articles)?</p>	<p>The current ticketing system is ServiceNow, utilized within a co-managed instance under the North Carolina Community College System (NCCCS). While data migration is not a strict requirement, GTCC would prefer to migrate open incidents, estimated at approximately 100 to 200 records, at a minimum.</p> <p>Migration of historical incidents and changes within a limited time frame may also be considered and would be subject to further discussion. For the purposes of this RFP, GTCC welcomes vendor recommendations and migration options based on the capabilities of the proposed solution, including any available tools or services for data import from ServiceNow.</p>

Reference Section 3.4, Page 9; Attachment D, Page 41: The RFP mentions Enterprise Service Management (ESM) capabilities to expand beyond IT. Are there specific departments (e.g., HR, Facilities) identified as primary candidates for this expansion in the first 1-2 years of the contract?	The initial implementation will be limited to the ITS department. Once the system is fully implemented and we have assessed its alignment with institutional needs, we intend to explore onboarding additional departments. Human Resources is a likely candidate for future expansion, with other potential areas including eLearning, Finance, and Student Support Services. The timeline for expansion will depend on organizational readiness and the capabilities demonstrated by the selected solution.
Reference Section 7.11, Page 20: Will GTCC assign a dedicated Project Manager and key technical personnel to be available for the duration of the implementation project?	As outlined in Section 7.11, GTCC will assign a dedicated Agency Project Manager to serve as the single point of contact throughout the project. We expect your team to provide consistent key technical personnel for effective collaboration, as is standard practice in projects of this scope.
Reference Section 3.2.2, Page 6: For the required third-party security assessment (e.g., SOC 2 Type 2), how will the agency evaluate a report that is clean but contains specific vendor-noted exceptions or observations in the final opinion?	GTCC won't be able to make a determination until the specific exceptions or observations are reviewed. Evaluation will depend on the nature, severity, and relevance of those findings to the services being offered
Reference General, Page N/A: What is the level of effort? How many Key Personnel are required?	The overall level of effort is expected to be moderate. GTCC ITS anticipates that the selected solution can be implemented and deemed "successful" prior to the end of the fiscal year. The number of Key Personnel will depend on the vendor's implementation approach, but we expect the vendor to assign appropriate resources to ensure timely delivery, coordination, and support throughout the project lifecycle.
Reference Section 3.1.5, Page 6: Regarding Section 3.1.5, 'ENTERPRISE LICENSING - RESERVED', we request clarification on the term 'RESERVED'. Does this term imply that an enterprise licensing model is a specific requirement for this project, that it is an optional feature vendors may propose, or that this section does not apply to this RFP?	Section 3.1.5 was marked "Reserved" because GTCC does not currently participate in any statewide or agency-specific Enterprise Licensing Agreements (ELAs) relevant to ITSM solutions. Vendors are not expected to align with any existing ELA. However, GTCC welcomes proposals that include vendor-specific or new licensing models, so long as they are cost-effective, scalable, and aligned with the College's needs and requirements.
Reference Section 6.2.10, Page 15; Attachment E, Page 43: Section 6.2.10 and Attachment E state that a vendor must be registered with the NC Secretary of State to receive a contract award. To clarify the timing, does this mean the vendor's registration must be complete and active at the time of final selection, or can the registration process be completed after notification of selection but before the final contract is executed?	Vendors must have an active registration with the North Carolina Secretary of State prior to contract award. While registration is not required at the time of proposal submission, vendors are strongly encouraged to complete the process as early as possible to avoid any potential delays. Please note that contract award is contingent upon verification of an active and compliant registration. Early registration supports a smooth contracting process and ensures full compliance throughout the contract term.
Are you looking for an off-the-shelf software that is already developed, or are you open to getting a software developed / customized according to your requirements?	GTCC ITS is open to an already-developed solution.

<p>Please confirm that you are only looking to get a subscription of a cloud-based ITSM solution, offered as SaaS (Software as a Service) and not purchase one and host it yourself?</p>	<p>Yes, that is confirmed. GTCC is only seeking a subscription to a cloud-based ITSM solution offered as SaaS, not a self-hosted purchase.</p>
<p>How much disk space / file storage shall be required for attachments or knowledge base? It is important to know, as it affects the cost of the cloud.</p>	<p>Start with approximately 75GB, with the ability to scale as storage needs grow over time.</p>
<p>What is the current ticketing system being used, and how much historical data (in volume or records) needs to be migrated?</p>	<p>We currently use an instance of ServiceNow. While data migration is not a requirement, we would expect to migrate at least 100–200 open incidents. Limited historical incidents and changes may also be considered. We welcome vendor recommendations based on the proposed solution's capabilities.</p>
<p>Can you elaborate on what is meant by "co-managed ticketing system"? What aspects are co-managed and with whom?</p>	<p>Our current system is co-managed under the North Carolina Community College System (NCCCS), where GTCC operates as a client entity within their ITSM instance. This RFP seeks to transition GTCC to its own independent instance with full administrative control, separate from NCCCS.</p>
<p>Are there any existing scripts, APIs, or workflows currently integrated with N-Central that need to be preserved?</p>	<p>As of this writing, there are no known scripts, APIs, or workflows integrated with N-Central in the current ServiceNow system that would need to be preserved.</p>
<p>Will GTCC provide a testing environment or sandbox for Entra ID (Microsoft Entra ID / SAML2) to validate SSO integration?</p>	<p>Yes, GTCC can provide a testing environment or sandbox for Microsoft Entra ID (SAML2) to validate SSO integration.</p>
<p>Is GTCC open to using RESTful APIs for integration with other platforms, or are there specific protocols preferred or required?</p>	<p>Yes, GTCC ITS supports RESTful APIs and other protocols for integration with external platforms.</p>
<p>Can you clarify how PSA functionality is currently handled and what level of automation you expect in the new system?</p>	<p>The current ServiceNow implementation provides GTCC ITS with Centralized Ticket and Change Management capabilities. It also offers Time Tracking and Project Management features; however, due to co-managed environment limitations, GTCC has faced challenges implementing these fully. Automations are similarly constrained in the shared environment. GTCC ITS expects automation primarily through workflows—for example, guiding end-users through ticket submission questions to route the ticket to the correct ITS team, or routing software request tickets through necessary vetting and approval steps.</p>
<p>What non-IT departments (e.g., HR, Facilities) will initially use the ESM features? What are their anticipated use cases?</p>	<p>Initially, only ITS will go live with the ESM features. Additional departments will be onboarded once we are confident the solution meets their needs. HR is a prime example, with potential future expansion to areas such as eLearning, Finance, and Student Support Services.</p>
<p>Are there examples of current workflows that must be replicated, or will new workflows be defined during implementation?</p>	<p>Workflows are expected to be minimal and simple, if any. There are no existing examples to replicate at this time.</p>

Will the selected vendor be expected to conduct formal requirement gathering sessions or discovery workshops with GTCC stakeholders prior to configuration and implementation?	Yes, the selected vendor will be expected to conduct formal requirement gathering sessions or discovery workshops with GTCC stakeholders prior to configuration and implementation.
Is there a target go-live date or maximum implementation window (e.g., 3 months, 6 months) that GTCC expects the awarded vendor to meet?	GTCC ITS expects the solution to be implemented and marked "Successful" before the end of the fiscal year.
What features are required for "Project Management tools to support IT planning and execution"	We intend to use both Agile and Waterfall methodologies depending on the project and area, though Agile alone would meet our needs. Currently, we use ServiceNow for project management, and we expect this ITSM solution to serve as our sole project management tool moving forward.
What features are required for "Structured Change Management workflows?"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Templated standard changes that don't require multiple approvals • Ability to assign multiple individuals to changes, with notifications • Change management workflows centered around approval processes

By providing signature below, the vendor is indicating that they have reviewed the question(s) and answer(s) for IFB/RFQ No. 99-MP24042. ***This Addendum should be signed and returned with the IFB/RFQ package.***

Company

Printed Name

Signature

Date