THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) ADDENDUM

FAILURE TO RETURN THIS ADDENDUM IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE INSTRUCTIONS BELOW MAY SUBJECT YOUR PROPOSAL TO REJECTION

RFP Number: RFP073123AMW
Addendum Number: 01
Addendum Date: August 25, 2023
RFP Opening Date / Time: September 1, 2023 at 2:00 PM Eastern Time (ET)

Instructions: Return one properly executed copy of this addendum prior to the RFP Opening Date / Time specified above. This addendum may be included with your proposal, or it may be emailed separately to Alicia Waymack at awaymack@unc.edu.

A. Subsection (3) is hereby added to Section 3.1 (Method of Award) of the RFP as follows:

"3. The Intended Awardee must be registered with the North Carolina Secretary of State before a Contract can be awarded. Registration can be completed at the following website: https://www.sosnc.gov/Guides/launching_a_business."

B. Please see the following University responses to all questions received by the deadline to submit written questions of August 11, 2023 at 2:00 PM ET:

1. Question: Is there a current budget allocated for this project?

   Answer: The University will not disclose any budget information.

2. Question: Is the University looking for an off-the-shelf software solution or a custom-built solution?

   Answer: A custom-built solution may be considered if (a) it meets all of the University's needs as defined in the RFP, and (b) viable answers are provided to all of the platform-specific questions, including ongoing maintenance and management.

3. Question: Does a Supplier need to be registered as a vendor with the University prior to submitting a proposal?

   Answer: No, a Supplier does *not* need to be registered as a vendor *with the University* prior to submitting a proposal.

   However, a Supplier *must* be registered with the North Carolina electronic Vendor Portal (eVP), located at https://evp.nc.gov/, to submit a proposal.

   Furthermore, a Supplier does *not* have to be registered with the North Carolina Secretary of State to submit a proposal; however, they must be registered before a Contract can be awarded. Registration can be completed at the following website: https://www.sosnc.gov/Guides/launching_a_business.

4. Question: In addition to the price sheet provided in the RFP document, can vendors also submit supplemental pricing documents? We have a narrative format that we feel properly explains the license model and associated value proposition. We would like that to be included. (Reference Attachment A: Pricing)

   Answer: Yes, as long as Attachment A: Pricing is completed as provided. Only Attachment A: Pricing will be evaluated for annual and implementation costs.

5. Question: Can vendors provide a supplemental document listing optional products and services and their associated costs? (Reference Attachment A: Pricing)

   Answer: Yes. However, if "optional" products and services are required to meet the core functionality as defined in Section 5.1 (1) of the RFP, those products and services must be included in the base cost of the software in Attachment A: Pricing. Only Attachment A: Pricing will be evaluated for annual and implementation costs.

6. Question: What Chatbot technology is the University currently using? (Reference Attachment K: Questions to Supplier; Section J (Chatbot/Virtual Agent))

   Answer: ServiceNow's native chatbot, Virtual Agent.

7. Question: Does IT and the other in-scope Business Lines (Customer Service, Finance, Operations, Human Resources) currently have a chatbot for each department, or are you looking for just one chatbot for IT? (Reference Attachment K: Questions to Supplier; Section J (Chatbot/Virtual Agent))

   Answer: For this project specifically, the University currently has only one chatbot implemented. However, Supplier should detail in their proposal if their proposed platform has functionality for multiple departments (e.g., ITS, School of Medicine IT, etc.) to configure/manage their own chatbots, or their own conversations and chat queues.

8. Question: You mentioned the willingness to decouple from ITSM processes. Please elaborate on the specific areas that you are willing to decouple. (Reference Section 1.2 of the RFP)

   Answer: Our focus is on improving the customer experience; therefore, the University is open to any and all ITIL decoupling that helps achieve that goal.

9. Question: What is included in a DGOG review? (Reference Section 3.1 (1) (c) of the RFP)

   Answer: The University's Data Governance Oversight Group (DGOG) review considers the types of data to be used in the proposed system, maturity of data management practices of the third party provider, and how the proposed system supports the University's data management practices. The DGOG performs risk assessment based on appropriate and legal use of the data, and how the proposed system supports the University's requirements for security, accessibility, and data integrity.

10. Question: What is the current enterprise integrations solution? (Reference Attachment K: Questions to Supplier, Section D (Administration and Integrations))

    Answer: Reference the response to Question Number 20 below.

11. Question: What is the current volume of texting/SMS? Are you looking to bulk text or more of a 1:1 engagement? (Reference Attachment K: Questions to Supplier, Question F1)

    Answer: Our current platform does not provide texting/SMS capabilities. Question F1 in Attachment K: Questions to Supplier is primarily geared toward a 1:1 customer engagement.

12. Question: You mentioned the need for screen sharing capabilities – are you looking to take control of a desktop? (Reference Attachment K: Questions to Supplier, Question B6)

    Answer: Reference the response to Question Number 28 below.

13. Question: Can you provide a couple of examples of what colleges will be resolving for this provided example: *"For example, the Eshelman School of Pharmacy and the F&O Service Center teams have a significant volume of non-IT business processes in the platform."* (Reference Section 1.2 of the RFP)

Answer: A few examples of this include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Adding, modifying, or terminating an affiliate employee
- Purchase requests for goods and/or services
- Change requests to existing Purchase Orders
- Paying an invoice
- Requests for review of agreements (e.g., Data Use Agreements)

14. Question: On what type of cases do your student workers work? (Reference Section 1.2 of the RFP)

    Answer: This varies by department but could include any non-sensitive cases that a full-time employee would work on.

15. Question: What are the ~200 review/approve only users reviewing and approving? (Reference Section 1.2 of the RFP)

    Answer: Viewing reports and dashboards designed and maintained by other users, and in some cases approving certain Service Requests before other users work the ticket.

16. Question: Do you have Qualtrics or a survey tool you are currently using? (Reference Attachment H: Tech Environment Overview)

    Answer: Currently, the only surveys sent out via ServiceNow leverage the native ServiceNow options. The University also has access to Qualtrics and Microsoft Forms at an enterprise level.

17. Question: Of the 45,000 total count of students, staff, and faculty, how many of these are staff and faculty? (Reference Section 1.1 of the RFP)

    Answer: Roughly 13,000 – reference "BY THE NUMBERS" located at https://www.unc.edu/about/by-the-numbers/.

18. Question: Are you open to looking at alternatives to Microsoft Teams for comms, case updates, screen sharing, etc.? (Reference Attachment H: Tech Environment Overview)

    Answer: Yes, as long as it does not require purchasing another enterprise tool.

19. Question: What Business Intelligence (BI) platform is currently used? (Reference Attachment K: Questions to Supplier, Question G11)

    Answer: Most of our current ServiceNow reporting is done within the native ServiceNow reporting functionality. The University also has access to Tableau and Microsoft BI, so some groups export data and leverage those tools for their BI.

20. Question: What extract, transform, and load (ETL) tool is currently in use? Is it feasible for the University to switch ETL tools?

    Answer: The University uses several tools such as SAS, Cybermation, Informatica, and Ansible, depending on the context of your question. The University will not switch to a new ETL tool as part of this project.

21. Question: What is the current automated call distribution (ACD) tool? Does the University wish to retain the current ACD tool?

    Answer: Genesys Pure Cloud is our current ACD tool, but it is not currently integrated into our ServiceNow implementation. The University is open to changing ACD systems to ensure integration into the customer support tool and the best experience for our customers and agents.

22. Question: What asset management functions are included in this scope? The RFP lists both CMDB Lite and an integration to an external SCCM. Does the University wish to replace the SCCM tool or integrate with it? (Reference Attachment H: Tech Environment Overview)

    Answer: Asset management is not included in the base scope of this project and should only be included as growth potential. In an effort to focus on our core requirements of workflows and ticketing, we are not considering certain aspects of current functionality – namely, CMDB and Asset Management – to be in-scope for the initial implementation of our new customer support tool. Replacement of SCCM is not in scope for this project, but a customer support tool that can integrate with SCCM is preferred.

23. Question: How many tables of data is the institution looking to migrate to the new environment as part of this implementation? Roughly how many rows of each table are you expecting?

    Answer: The University does not plan to migrate any data from the current platform into the new one. It is our practice to begin with a fresh installation when moving to new support tools. Instead, we will work with the selected vendor to import data from our systems of records using automated refresh schedules.

24. Question: Are you looking to have a branded mobile app specific for the University or a mobile app provided generally by the software provider? (Reference Attachment K: Questions to Supplier, Question D4)

    Answer: The University is looking for an app experience provided by the vendor and/or a platform that is truly device-agnostic and can present a satisfactory experience to both customers and agents. We do not need a custom or freestanding mobile app.

25. Question: You mentioned the willingness to decouple from ITSM processes. Can you please elaborate on the specific areas that you are willing to decouple? (Reference Section 1.2 of the RFP)

    Answer: Reference the response to Question Number 8 above.

26. Question: What is included in a DGOG review? (Reference Section 3.1 (1) (c) of the RFP)

    Answer: Reference the response to Question Number 9 above.

27. Question: What is the current volume of texting/SMS? Are you looking to bulk text or more of a 1:1 engagement? (Reference Attachment K: Questions to Supplier, Question F1)

    Answer: Reference the response to Question Number 11 above.

28. Question: You mentioned the need for screen sharing capabilities – are you looking to take control of a desktop with remote desktop capabilities? What tool is being used for screen sharing? What tool is being used for remote desktop? How do you envision screen sharing and remote desktop functions working in the new solution? (Reference Attachment K: Questions to Supplier, Question B6)

    Answer: Currently most IT teams at the University use either Bomgar or Microsoft Teams for screen sharing and remote control of client machines. Our goal for screen sharing/remote control is to ensure the best customer and agent experience during a support request.

29. Question: Can you provide examples of non-IT business processes that the colleges will be resolving as described in the following statement: *"For example, the Eshelman School of Pharmacy and the F&O Service Center teams have a significant volume of non-IT business processes in the platform."* (Reference Section 1.2 of the RFP)

    Answer: Reference the response to Question Number 13 above.

30. Question: What type of cases do your student workers work on? (Reference Section 1.2 of the RFP)

    Answer: Reference the response to Question Number 14 above.

31. Question: What are the ~200 review/approve only users reviewing and approving? (Reference Section 1.2 of the RFP)

    Answer: Reference the response to Question Number 15 above.

32. Question: What survey tools, like Qualtrics, are currently in use? (Reference Attachment H: Tech Environment Overview)

    Answer: Reference the response to Question Number 16 above.

33. Question: How many of the 45,000 total count of students, staff, and faculty, are staff and faculty? (Reference Section 1.1 of the RFP)

    Answer: Reference the response to Question Number 17 above.

34. Question: Do you anticipate the contract being awarded by the end of the calendar year? (Reference Section 2.3 of the RFP)

    Answer: The University intends to award a contract as a result of this RFP by the end of calendar year 2023, but that is subject to change at the University's sole discretion.

35. Question: How many of the decentralized IT departments will the new solution serve at go-live? Are all departmental customized workflows and business processes expected to be available at go-live? (Reference Section 1.2 of the RFP)

    Answer: All units, departments, and groups currently using ServiceNow are in-scope for go-live. We currently have 250 assignments groups, but those don't always map neatly to departments and are often service-based.

    All current workflows are potentially in-scope for go-live. It may be determined, however, that (a) not all workflows make sense to recreate if their usage volume is too low, and (b) how a new tool approaches the concept of workflows allows us to decrease our number of workflows.

36. Question: How many of the current 250 service requests should be available at go-live? Is there a prioritized list of those requests? How would the University like to consolidate or simplify the quantity of service requests? (Reference Section 1.2 of the RFP)

    Answer: Reference the response to Question Number 35 above.

37. Question: The Scope of Work, Customer Support Tool section states that *"Phone system integration is not required at go-live but should be possible within the system."* However, the Scorecard contains an ACD system section worth three (3) points. How does the University plan to evaluate the ACD system integration if it is not part of the go-live plan? (Reference Section 5.1 (1) (d) of the RFP and Attachment L: RFP Response Scorecard, Section C9)

    Answer: While not a requirement, built-in ACD functionality or turn-key integration with an ACD system is a highly desirable capability for our new customer support tool since it would allow for a stronger customer and more seamless agent experience. We will evaluate ACD capabilities based on availability and ease of implementation.

An ACD system is not included in the initial go-live scope because we do not currently have integration between our two current providers (Genesis and ServiceNow). To keep our go-live timeline and scope manageable, we are not introducing this as a go-live or product requirement.

38. Question: Do you expect end users to be automatically created/registered via your identity provider (Just-in-Time Provisioning), or a self-registration process? What is your identity provider for SSO? Should any users that do not exist in your identity provider (i.e., guests) be able to create accounts, or are they limited to unauthenticated interactions? (Reference Attachment K: Questions to Supplier)

    Answer: The answer to this question is dependent upon the implementation method chosen for Single Sign On (SSO) with the customer support tool. Shibboleth is the most utilized SSO on campus, but Azure Active Directory is also making headway. The University would like to know which identity providers work with your product and details about what provisioning process(es) are supported by your product. No determination has been made for whether our implementation will be Just-in-Time Provisioning or a registration process.

    Guest user account requirements will be determined after a product has been selected, in consultation with the appropriate stakeholders.

39. Question: How are walk-in cases created currently? What type of terminals are being used, if any? (Reference Section 1.2 of the RFP)

    Answer: Currently customers check in via a website hosted by ServiceNow that is typically pulled up on a tablet in the lobby of a service location.

40. Question: Which Business Critical Integrations are considered "essential" for go-live? What tool is used by the University for integrations? For each integration, please specify expected data (entities/fields), directionality, frequency, and typical volume. (Reference Section 5.1 (1) (g) of the RFP)

    Answer: Business critical integrations are those that provide essential data feeds to the system and allow for secure authentication. We have multiple options for achieving similar outcomes (e.g., LDAP and Active Directory for people data), so it is not useful to line item those options. Methods that are used currently are not necessarily what will be used for the new tool. Finalists (as defined in the RFP) should expect rigorous dialogue during their demonstration to cover these details.

41. Question: What is meant by *“30 active service accounts”* in the API integrations section of Attachment H: Tech Environment Overview?

    Answer: These are service accounts for automation/integrations via the API (not tied to a specific user account).

42. Question: How many sites host *“Virtual Agent (Chatbot) and Live Chat”*? (Reference Section 1.2 of the RFP)

    Answer: Only one – currently our live chat and chatbot are only available on help.unc.edu.

43. Question: For Asset Management, what functions are desired in the new solution and what functions will be provided via integration? (Reference Attachment H: Tech Environment Overview)

    Answer: Reference the response to Question Number 22 above.

44. Question: Can you describe the governance structure between central IT and the decentralized units? When configuration for a department is needed, who performs that configuration work? (Reference Section 1.2 of the RFP)

Answer: Currently we have a ServiceNow Governance Committee which helps steer decisions made around the platform. The group consists of both central IT (ITS) and decentralized unit representatives. When configuration for a department is needed, ITS performs the configuration work.

45. Question: Attachment C appears to be a software-focused Master Agreement. Is there a Professional Services Agreement that an implementation partner should review?

    Answer: No. Attachment C includes the University's standard terms and conditions for procurement of IT products, software and services.

46. Question: Are you using ServiceNow discovery? How are you managing Asset and Inventory? How may total devices and type of devices do you have?

    Answer: We are not using ServiceNow discovery.

    Currently there are about 40,000 devices in the platform. The types of devices include desktop computing devices such as desktops, laptops, and monitors, as well as a significant number of data center devices. The hardware asset feature of ServiceNow is being used to manage these devices. The devices can be organized into several fields such as support group, status, device category, device assigned to, etc. The devices are manually uploaded / entered into the system. Also, if the device is found in SCCM, any additional attributes contained within SCCM will amend the ServiceNow entry.

    Also reference the response to Question Number 22 above.

47. Question: Are there any other tools like Flexera or other advanced Software Asset Management tools with ServiceNow? Are there any other integrations with other software and tools?

    Answer: The only current integration with asset management is SCCM. Also reference the response to Question Number 22 above.

    Reference Attachment H: Tech Environment Overview.

48. Question: As ServiceNow is integrated with multiple tools, is there a reporting tool or engine with which we would have to integrate?

    Answer: Integration with Tableau would be beneficial, but is not required. The University's preference is for robust reporting capabilities that are native to the selected platform.

49. Question: Any integrations that you currently have that you don't need?

    Answer: The University has a very limited list of current integrations, and we expect to continue to utilize all of them. We would only cease use of an integration if the new system can fully replace that functionality natively.

50. Question: Apart from integration with SCCM, do we need to integrate with any third-party systems like ERP, CRM, monitoring tools, etc.? Please specify.

    Answer: Reference Attachment H: Tech Environment Overview.

51. Question: Customer portal can be accessed by a guest. Is there a temporary authentication that is created for the same? Or is the expectation for access without authentication. Please advise on the current process. (Reference Section 5.1 (1) (c))

    Answer: Currently guest access is provided without authentication. Also reference the response to Question Number 38 above.

52. Question: How is the ServiceNow instance set up currently with regards to number and type of tenants? Are IT, Customer Service, Finance, Operations, and Human Resources separate tenants? (Reference Attachment H: Tech Environment Overview)

    Answer: The University currently works in one shared tenant.

53. Question: Is there a requirement for onsite resources for implementation or can it be remote? Can resources outside of the US be deployed for implementation and project management?

    Answer: Resources can be fully remote; no on-site consultation is required. Resources can be located outside of the United States but must be available to meet during standard business hours in the US Eastern Time Zone.

    Also reference Section 3.5 (Performance Outside the United States) of the RFP.

54. Question: Is Escrow of Code a mandatory clause or negotiable? (Reference Section 46 of Attachment C: University Terms and Conditions)

    Answer: Section 46 (Escrow of Code) of Attachment C: University Terms and Conditions is a negotiable clause, if applicable.

55. Question: What are the Service Catalog requirements? (Reference Attachment H: Tech Environment Overview)

    Answer: Broadly speaking, the Service Catalog should be flexible and adaptable to our decentralized environment. Service Catalog functionality should allow for both simple and complex automation, and the ability to group catalog items into customer-focused categories. The Service Catalog should be publicly accessible without authentication, although authentication can be required for submission. The Service Catalog should also be easily searchable.

56. Question: How many active directories does the University have? (Reference Attachment I: Workflow Examples)

    Answer: Only one that is in scope for this project.

57. Question: Will all configurations be in English, or will any additional languages be needed? (Reference Section 5.0 of the RFP)

    Answer: All configurations will be in English, but as a multi-lingual institution, any automated translation features would be beneficial and may be considered.

58. Question: Are incidents and tickets received by email? (Reference Attachment I: Workflow Examples)

    Answer: Currently no, but the University would like to re-evaluate this. It's our belief that customers should be able to request assistance using the channel that is most convenient and comfortable for them – including email.

59. Question: Is there a mobile app currently being used to create and manage ticketing? (Reference Section 1.2 of the RFP)

    Answer: The University recently gained access to ServiceNow's new, improved mobile app with our most recent upgrade.

60. Question: Is the chatbot used to gather requests? (Reference Section 1.2 of the RFP)

    Answer: No. Currently the chatbot is only conversation based with the ability to transfer to a live agent.

61. Question: What and how many software tools, reports, dashboards are currently in use? (Reference Section 5.0 of the RFP)

    Answer: Since every agent can create as many reports and dashboards as required, the number of custom reports and dashboards is in the hundreds. Some of these reports and dashboards serve a single agent while others are shared with the entire department / team. Multiple new reports and dashboards are being created and deleted / abandoned almost every week, if not every day. Currently we have 7,085 reports that have been run at least once, and 1,112 dashboards. The University expects that certain industry standard reports will be available at go-live, but we do not intend for the majority of the reports and dashboards currently in use to be copied over into the new tool. While our current numbers are high, we intend to start fresh with a small handful.

62. Question: How many users can manage the reports? Do you have on-demand reports? Automatic reports? Online reports? (Reference Section 5.0 of the RFP)

    Answer: All agents can create reports as needed from the available ServiceNow fields. Reports can be run on-demand or scheduled, and they can be accessed online within ServiceNow or sent as an email.

63. Question: Is an end user survey required? What and how many questions does the survey have? (Reference Section 5.0 of the RFP)

    Answer: The ability to send end user surveys – ideally in an automated fashion – is highly desired, but not required. The University prefers a built-in survey capability, but we would also be open to an integration with Qualtrics or Microsoft Forms (reference the response to Question Number 16 above).

    Our current functionality does not send a survey for all incidents/service requests – it selects mostly at random, but also ensures that users do not get more than one survey within a set period of time. The surveys we currently utilize have between 3-5 questions. The University is open to approaching this in new ways.

64. Question: What information do you want to find from the historical data? (Reference Section 5.0 of the RFP)

    Answer: The University will maintain its own historical data.

65. Question: What are the current approval processes in the published services? (Reference Section 5.0 of the RFP)

    Answer: Most current approvals are in the change module. There are a few specific use cases for approvals in service requests, which are very basic. An approval task is spawned to the assignment group, and once a member of that group approves it, the next step in the service request is initiated.

66. Question: How many of the CIS must be in the CMDB? What are growth expectations? (Reference Section 5.0 of the RFP)

    Answer: CMDB is out of scope for this project. While we currently utilize some functionality in ServiceNow (as listed in Attachment H) and take a "CMDB Lite" approach, it is not a requirement nor our intention to replace this in the new platform.

    Also reference the response to Question Number 22 above.

67. Question: What additional functionality do you want to see in the new tool? (Reference Section 5.0 of the RFP)

    Answer: Additional functionality outside of the core functionality as defined in Section 5.1 (1) of the RFP is not required, but may be considered after a platform has been selected.

68. Question: What are the most common issues you hare having in the current tool (availability, communication)? (Reference Section 5.0 of the RFP)

    Answer: Reference Section 1.0 of the RFP.

Execute Addendum:

Vendor Name: ____

Authorized Signature: ______________________ Date: ______________________

Name and Title: ____

Email Address: ____