ADDENDUM No. "1" to RFP No. B2014006

Records Management Application

Date of Addendum No. "1" Issued: July 1, 2014

Purpose of this Addendum is to:

❖ Provide written responses to questions raised during and after the prebid conference.

1) Can you advise what (if any) current database software is used in the current Windows-based RMA that you wish to replace?

 The database that the current RMA uses is Sybase Advantage, which is a SQL database.

2) Part of this project to replace the RMA will require transfer of all data to the new system.....correct? If the data on the 30,000 boxes and request and re-file history are not stored in a database, where is it stored?

Correct, the data will have to be transferred to the new system. See question #1 answer above for the database information.

3) Can you advise what software (and database) the current off-site vendor uses to manage the archived records that are transferred?
That would be the Iron Mountain systems Safekeeper Plus and Iron Mountain Connect. You may have to inquire from Iron Mountain for more information regarding the database.

4) Why is the current RMA (by Castle Group) being replaced? Is it a proprietary system custom designed for the AOSC?

It is not compatible with Windows 7. It is a proprietary system (originally called Assured Information Systems, later called Castle Group Records Management), and has been customized somewhat for the AOSC by the vendor.

5) Does the current RMA respect Records Retention schedules? Does the AOSC have a defined Records Retention Schedule for all record types?

The current RMA does have records retention schedule functionality, and the AOSC does have a defined retention schedule.

6) Integration to offsite storage company software **-** What vendor technical resources are available for this?

The current offsite vendor is Iron Mountain.

7) Converting data from AIS Castle Group RMS - What's the format and how do we get access to it?

CRMS runs off an "Advantage Database" and the company that develops that is Sybase.

8) Item 10 error message content criteria - Can you provide further clarification on what kind of "error" a user would encounter or what you would want to see in an error message?

It just has to be made obvious when a user is entering unacceptable data.

9) Item 2 Tree view – Is the same "tree view" required in the new RMA, or would you be open to more user-friendly, efficient display of items/file classification?

The same 'tree view' is not required, as long as all of the functions listed are included in the new RMA.

10) Item 3 every reference to "Search" in the Request category – Our solution has a separate search function as opposed to a different "search window" in each request screen. Is this ok?

That is acceptable, as long as all of the search types are included.

11) Item 4 every reference to "recalculate" in the Retention category – What exactly do you mean by "recalculate"? What is being recalculated and how?

We primarily recalculate when a retention code is changed or added.

12) Item 5 Transaction charges/codes/defaults – Can you please provide further analysis and use case?

The transaction function is used to allow the JRC to determine the usage rates of each department's requests, refiles, and storage, and to allow us the ability to charge costs back to the departments.

13) Item 6 Locations every reference to "Range" "Recalculate" (we don't do this) - What exactly do you mean by "recalculate"? What is being recalculated and how?

This would be used if we needed to change the internal shelving arrangement in the JRC.

14)Item 9 System Logs, Users Online/Reset – What is this needed for? You want users to see which other users are logged into the system and be able to send messages through the RMA?

This is a management function, used on occasion to determine who is logged in, or had logged in at any point. We do not currently send messages through the RMA.

15) Section 5: Vendor information: Do these items need to be answered in s specific format/ template form? Or it acceptable to submit TAB document/product literature that addressed everything listed here?

Your submission should be in two parts in compliance with the issued rfp: Requested copies of Proposal with bid form as the top sheet and Pricing should be submitted in a separate, sealed envelope.

16) Iron Mountain currently has an MPA in place with State of RI (#173), if awarded this RFP would the State of RI permit Iron Mountain to create an addendum and pricing schedule A to affiliate to the current MPA in place?

No, this is not an option. The Rhode Island Department of Administration and the Rhode Island Judiciary are separate entities that procure services/goods independently.