

ADDENDUM No. 1

RFP No. 26-38

IT Service Management System Replacement

Due: July 29, 2026 by 2:00 p.m. (local time)

The information contained herein shall take precedence over the original documents and all previous addenda (if any) and is appended thereto. **This Addendum includes fifty (50) pages.**

The Proposer is to acknowledge receipt of this Addendum No. 1, including all attachments in its Proposal by so indicating in the proposal that the addendum has been received. Proposals submitted without acknowledgement of receipt of this addendum may be considered non-conforming.

The following forms provided within the RFP Document should be included in submitted proposal:

- **Attachment B – City of Ann Arbor Non-Discrimination Declaration of Compliance**
- **Attachment C - City of Ann Arbor Living Wage Declaration of Compliance**
- **Attachment D - Vendor Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form of the RFP Document**

Proposals that fail to provide these completed forms listed above upon proposal opening may be rejected as non-responsive and may not be considered for award.

I. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

The following Questions have been received by the City. Responses are being provided in accordance with the terms of the RFP. Respondents are directed to take note in its review of the documents of the following questions and City responses as they affect work or details in other areas not specifically referenced here.

Question 1: Would the City consider proposals from firms that focus specifically on independent advisory services to support ITSM platform selection and procurement, without performing the subsequent system implementation?

Answer 1: No.

Question 2: Has the City considered, or would it consider, a separation between independent advisory/selection services and implementation services to help ensure objectivity in vendor evaluation and solution implementation?

Answer 2: No.

Question 3: Please confirm the approximate number of (a) IT service desk agents, (b) backend IT staff, and (c) City employees who will use the self-service portal so we can right-size licensing and hosting.

Answer 3: IT service desk agents – 32
Backend IT staff/system administrators – 2
City employees who will use the self-service portal - 894

Question 4: What volume of historical tickets, assets, and knowledge-base articles must be migrated from Cireson/SCSM, and is data mapping documentation available?

Answer 4: The City does not anticipate migrating historical incident, service request, change,

problem, or other ticket records from Cireson/System Center Service Manager (SCSM). Likewise, the City does not anticipate migrating historical knowledge base articles as part of the implementation.

The City does expect to migrate current IT asset information into the proposed solution. Vendors should describe their recommended approach for extracting, mapping, validating, and importing asset data. We currently have approximately 2,380 assets. Data mapping documentation is not currently available and will be developed collaboratively with the selected vendor during the implementation phase.

Question 5: Besides Active Directory, SCCM, and Intune, what additional integrations (e.g., Azure AD, M365, ERP, GIS) are mandatory for go-live?

Answer 5: The City has identified integration with Active Directory or Microsoft Entra ID, Microsoft Configuration Manager (SCCM/MECM) or Microsoft Intune as the primary integrations anticipated for the initial implementation.

At this time, the City has not identified additional mandatory integrations required for go-live. Vendors should describe their capabilities for integrating with other enterprise systems, including Microsoft 365, ERP, GIS, monitoring, and other business applications, where applicable.

The City recognizes that additional integrations may be implemented in future phases and invites vendors to recommend an implementation roadmap based on industry best practices, organizational priorities, and implementation risk.

Question 6: Does the City require the selected SaaS provider to hold specific security authorizations (e.g., FedRAMP Moderate, CJIS, SOC 2 Type II), and will third-party penetration test results suffice for security review?

Answer 6: No.

Question 7: Is the City open to a phased rollout (incident/service request first, CMDB/asset and change management later) or is full ITIL scope required at initial go-live?

Answer 7: The City expects the proposed solution to support all IT service management capabilities identified in the RFP. While the City anticipates that certain capabilities may be implemented in phases, the proposed implementation approach should ultimately deliver the full scope of functionality.

Vendors are encouraged to recommend an implementation roadmap and sequencing based on industry best practices, implementation risk, organizational readiness, and the successful adoption of the solution. The City will evaluate the proposed approach as part of the overall implementation methodology.

Question 8: How many licenses will your team need for your agents? We need the count of agents (such as service desk technicians and managers) who are working the lifecycle of a ticket and this count does not include end users submitting tickets and checking the status of tickets via a portal or those just simply doing an approval. If you can explain how many fixed or how many concurrent/floating licenses you would need to cover your agents working tickets, that would be really helpful in providing the correct pricing.

Answer 8: IT service desk agents – 32
Backend IT staff/system administrators – 2
City employees who will use the self-service portal - 894

Question 9: What integrations will be required for the implementation?

Answer 9: The following integrations are required as part of the initial implementation:

- Microsoft Entra ID – User authentication and identity management.
- Microsoft SCCM – Asset inventory and CMDB population.
- Microsoft Intune – Asset inventory and CMDB population.

The City is also open to vendor recommendations for additional discovery capabilities or tools that improve the accuracy and completeness of the CMDB and align with industry best practices. No other enterprise system integrations are required as part of this RFP.

Question 10: How many complex request management workflows do you have which include approvals?

Answer 10: We have 15 simple workflows and none of them have approvals configured in the system.

Question 11: What data would you like migrated from your legacy solution (open and/or closed tickets and requests, change management records, knowledge articles)? What is the volume of data to be migrated?

Answer 11: The City does not anticipate migrating historical incident, service request, problem, change, or other ticket records from the legacy solution. This includes both open and closed tickets and requests. The City also does not anticipate migrating historical knowledge base articles as part of the implementation.

The City does expect to migrate current IT asset data into the proposed solution. Vendors should describe their approach for extracting, mapping, validating, and importing asset information. We currently have approximately 2,380 assets.

Question 12: Please indicate which of these ITSM modules you would like within the scope of your initial ITSM implementation cost: incident management, request management, knowledge management, change management, problem management, asset management, knowledge management, user portal.

Answer 12: The City expects proposals to include implementation services for all core IT service management capabilities identified in the RFP, including, at a minimum:

- Incident Management
- Service Request Management
- Knowledge Management
- Change Management
- Problem Management
- Asset Management
- Configuration Management Database (CMDB)
- User Self-Service Portal

The City recognizes that a phased implementation may be appropriate and invites vendors to recommend an implementation approach and timeline based on industry best practices, organizational readiness, and implementation risk. Proposed implementation phases should be clearly identified in the vendor's response, with all requested capabilities included within the overall implementation scope and pricing.

Question 13: Asset management is a fairly broad topic. Please confirm the asset management capabilities/functionality you wish to include in the initial implementation.

Answer 13: The City expects the initial implementation to include core IT asset management

capabilities that support effective IT service management, including:

- A centralized inventory of IT assets (hardware and software, as applicable).
- Asset lifecycle management, including asset status and ownership.
- Association of assets with users, locations, and organizational units, where applicable.
- Integration between Asset Management and the CMDB, Incident Management, Change Management, and Service Request Management, as appropriate.
- The ability to search, report on, and maintain asset information.
- Standard reporting and dashboards for asset inventory and lifecycle status.

The City recognizes that advanced IT Asset Management capabilities (e.g., procurement, contract management, software license optimization, financial management, or depreciation tracking) may be available within vendor solutions. Vendors should identify any such capabilities and indicate whether they are included in the proposed implementation or recommended for a future phase.

Question 14: Do you wish to implement any of the following additional modules as a part of your initial implementation: facilities service management, HR service Management, financial management, onboarding/offboarding, etc?

Answer 14: No. The initial implementation is focused on IT service management. Additional enterprise service management modules are not within the scope of this RFP.

Question 15: Could the City elaborate on its need for consumable tracking, as it relates to Asset Management? For what types of assets will consumption need to be tracked?

Answer 15: The City's intent is to support the tracking and management of common IT consumable inventory used in day-to-day IT operations. Examples may include printer toner, cables, adapters, peripherals, batteries, and other similar IT-related supplies.

The City is not seeking a comprehensive warehouse or inventory management solution as part of this procurement. Vendors should describe the standard consumable tracking capabilities included with their solution and identify any assumptions or limitations associated with those capabilities.

Question 16: Do you expect to track software assets? If so, what type of software information would you like to track?

Answer 16: Yes. The City expects the solution to support the tracking of software assets as part of the overall IT asset management capabilities.

At a minimum, the City expects to be able to track information such as:

- Software title and publisher.
- Version and edition.
- License or subscription information, where applicable.
- Installation or assignment to devices and/or users.
- Asset ownership and lifecycle status.
- Associations with related hardware assets and configuration items (CIs), where appropriate.

The City recognizes that Software Asset Management (SAM) capabilities may be implemented in phases. Vendors should describe the native software asset management functionality included in their solution, including any capabilities related to software discovery, license management, compliance reporting, and

integration with endpoint management or software discovery tools.

Question 17: How many user licenses will the City require for a new ITSM platform? With our solution, licenses would be required for individuals who actively work on tickets, resolve incidents, fulfill requests, manage changes, administer the platform, etc.

Answer 17: IT service desk agents – 32
Backend IT staff/system administrators – 2
City employees who will use the self-service portal - 894

Question 18: For API integrations with other City systems, could the City provide more detail on which systems an integration would be required / preferred?

Answer 18: No additional API integrations with other City systems are required as part of this RFP. However, the City prefers a solution that provides robust API integration capabilities, as identified in the RFP, to support future integration needs. During implementation, the City may evaluate additional integrations based on business needs and the capabilities of the selected solution. Vendors are not expected to scope or price integrations beyond Microsoft Entra ID, Microsoft SCCM, and Microsoft Intune as part of their proposal.

Question 19: Is the City open to procurement through the MS Azure Marketplace?

Answer 19: No.

Question 20: Does the City have any preferred ITSM platforms that are being considered for this replacement effort?

Answer 20: No.

Question 21: Has the City established a budget or budgetary range for this project that can be shared with prospective vendors?

Answer 21: A project budget has not yet been established.

Question 22: Could the City provide additional details regarding the expected migration scope, such as:

- Approximate volume of records/tickets to be migrated
- Number of years of historical data to be retained and migrated
- Types of data that are expected to be included (tickets, assets, knowledge base articles, CMDB records, etc.)

Answer 22: The City's anticipated data migration scope is limited.

- Historical ITSM records: The City does not anticipate migrating historical transactional data, including incident, service request, change, problem, or other ticket records. As such, there is no requirement to migrate historical ticket data or retain a specified number of years of ITSM history within the new solution.
- Knowledge Base: The City does not anticipate migrating existing knowledge base articles as part of the initial implementation.
- Asset Data: The City does expect to migrate existing asset information into the new solution. Vendors should describe their approach to migrating and validating asset data as part of the implementation. We currently have approximately 2,380 assets.

Question 23: Should software licensing/subscription costs for the proposed ITSM solution be included as part of the fee proposal, or is the City planning to procure licenses separately?

Answer 23: Yes, software licensing/subscription costs should be included as part of the fee proposal.

Question 24: Is the City primarily seeking the most cost-effective ITSM solution that meets the stated requirements, or will greater consideration be given to solutions offering enhanced functionality, scalability, automation, and long-term value, even if associated costs are higher?

Answer 24: Proposals will be evaluated in accordance with the evaluation criteria and weighting identified in the RFP.

Question 25: Microsoft Ecosystem Integration

- The RFP references integration with Active Directory, SCCM, and Intune.
- Are there any additional Microsoft technologies or services that the City would like the proposed solution to integrate with?

Answer 25: The City has not identified any additional Microsoft technologies or services that are required to be integrated as part of this RFP. Vendors are encouraged to describe additional Microsoft ecosystem integration capabilities supported by their solution that may provide value to the City. During implementation, the City may evaluate additional integrations based on business needs and the capabilities of the selected solution.

Question 26: Are there any restrictions regarding the use of offshore personnel for implementation, migration, support, or other project activities?

Answer 26: It is preferred that the resources are located in the US but not required.

Question 27: Number of technician accounts required (technician accounts have access to ticket processing, report creation, knowledge approval, etc.)

Answer 27: IT service desk agents – 32
Backend IT staff/system administrators – 2
City employees who will use the self-service portal - 894

Question 28: Number of assets to be managed

Answer 28: We currently have approximately 2,380 assets.

Question 29: Number of online workflows to be migrated from current ITSM to new ITSM (Online workflows: incident workflows, service request workflows, IT change workflows, IT assets management workflows, etc.)

Answer 29: We have 15 simple workflows.

Question 30: Deployment mode: On-Premises or SaaS

Answer 30: No preference.

Question 31: What data needs to be migrated, such as process data, asset data, configuration data, etc.?

Answer 31: The City does not anticipate migrating historical incident, service request, change, problem, or other ticket records from Cireson/System Center Service Manager (SCSM). Likewise, the City does not anticipate migrating historical knowledge base articles as part of the implementation.

The City does expect to migrate current IT asset information into the proposed solution. Vendors should describe their recommended approach for extracting, mapping, validating, and importing asset data. We currently have approximately 2,380 assets. Data mapping documentation is not currently available and will be developed collaboratively with the selected vendor during the implementation phase.

Question 32: What is the size of the data to be migrated?

Answer 32: We currently have approximately 2,380 assets that will need to be migrated.

Question 33: How many automation tasks are to be migrated?

Answer 33: 15.

Question 34: How many automation tasks have integrations with other systems, such as automatic alarm-to-ticket conversion with the monitoring system, automatic asset data synchronization to the EAM system, etc.?

Answer 34: 0.

Question 35: The City's Active Directory mentioned is Windows Active Directory?

Answer 35: Yes.

Question 36: How many agents/ fulfillers will require access to the proposed solution? In Halo there is no cost for the number of end-users, only those working tickets, managing assets etc. This can be named, concurrent or a combination of both.

Answer 36: IT service desk agents – 32
Backend IT staff/system administrators – 2
City employees who will use the self-service portal - 894

Question 37: Does the City have a preferred format for the Fee Proposal, or should bidders use their own?

Answer 37: The City does not require a specific fee proposal format. Vendors may use their standard format, provided all requested pricing information identified in the RFP is included.

Question 38: Does the City have any data migration requirements? If so, what type and quantity of records? Are you open to following best practice and our recommendation on this?

Answer 38: The City does not anticipate migrating historical incident, service request, problem, change, or other ticket records from the legacy solution. This includes both open and closed tickets and requests. The City also does not anticipate migrating historical knowledge base articles as part of the implementation.

We currently have approximately 2,380 assets that will need to be migrated. We manage consumables outside of our system but want to import them into the new system. We are open to recommendations on our CMDB, either through discovery or migration.

Question 39: What documentation requirements does the City have for the project?

Answer 39: The City expects the selected vendor to provide standard project, technical, administrative, and end-user documentation necessary for the successful implementation and ongoing support of the solution.

Question 40: As mentioned in the RFP, the City is currently using the Cireson/System Center Service Manager (SCSM) platform. Could you please elaborate on the key challenges, limitations, or pain points you are experiencing with the current ITSM environment that you would like the new solution to address?

Answer 40: The City is seeking a modern, intuitive, and flexible ITSM solution that is easier to configure, administer, and maintain than the current environment. The City also seeks improved workflow automation, reporting, asset and CMDB management, integration capabilities, and support for IT service management best practices. Vendors should describe how their proposed solution addresses these objectives.

Question 41: Could you please confirm how many users will be responsible for creating, updating, assigning, and managing incidents and service requests in the ITSM solution? This information will help us determine the appropriate licensing cost.

Answer 41: IT service desk agents – 32

Backend IT staff/system administrators – 2
City employees who will use the self-service portal - 894

Question 42: Is there any preferred implementation model from project resource perspective? Remote, onsite, or a blend of both etc.? We will determine the cost accordingly.

Answer 42: Remote is preferred.

Question 43: The RFP provides the anticipated procurement schedule but does not specify the target implementation timeline. Could you please confirm the expected go-live date for the new ITSM solution?

Answer 43: The City has not established a target go-live date for the new ITSM solution. Vendors should propose a realistic implementation schedule based on their recommended methodology, project approach, and resource requirements. A phased implementation approach is acceptable.

Question 44: The RFP does not include a cost/pricing template or specify the required pricing period. Could you please confirm whether the City has a preferred pricing template or format for the Fee Proposal and how many years of pricing should be included?

Answer 44: The City does not have a preferred format.

Question 45: What is the estimated budget for this RFP?

Answer 45: A project budget has not yet been established.

Question 46: How many IT staff members (agent/technician licenses) are anticipated to use the system?

Answer 46: IT service desk agents – 32
Backend IT staff/system administrators – 2
City employees who will use the self-service portal - 894

Question 47: How many City employees are expected to use the self-service portal as end users?

Answer 47: IT service desk agents – 32
Backend IT staff/system administrators – 2
City employees who will use the self-service portal - 894

Question 48: What is the approximate annual volume of incidents and service requests currently processed through the existing ITSM system?

Answer 48: Approximately 15,000 to 20,000 per year.

Question 49: Is there an estimated budget range or not-to-exceed figure established for this engagement, including both software licensing and implementation services?

Answer 49: A project budget has not yet been established.

Question 50: Will the City require data migration from the existing Cireson/SCSM platform, and if so, what historical data (tickets, assets, configuration items) should vendors plan to include in scope?

Answer 50: The City does not anticipate migrating historical incident, service request, problem, change, or other ticket records from the legacy solution. This includes both open and closed tickets and requests. The City also does not anticipate migrating historical knowledge base articles as part of the implementation.

We currently have approximately 2,380 assets that will need to be migrated. We manage consumables outside of our system but want to import them into the new system. We are open to recommendations on our CMDB, either through discovery or migration.

Question 51: Please provide the estimated volume and types of data that must be migrated from the existing Cireson/SCSM platform, including incidents, service requests, assets, CMDB records, knowledge articles, attachments, historical records, and any applicable data retention requirements. Are there any other data sources that require migration?

Answer 51: The City does not anticipate migrating historical incident, service request, problem, change, or other ticket records from the legacy solution. This includes both open and closed tickets and requests. The City also does not anticipate migrating historical knowledge base articles as part of the implementation.

We currently have approximately 2,380 assets that will need to be migrated. We manage consumables outside of our system but want to import them into the new system. We are open to recommendations on our CMDB, either through discovery or migration.

Question 52: Does the City currently have a service catalog, knowledge base, CMDB, asset inventory, ticket taxonomy, categories, workflows, approval processes, or other existing ITSM configuration that must be migrated or recreated in the new solution?

Answer 52: Yes. The City currently has an existing ITSM configuration that includes a service catalog (approximately 12 catalog items), CMDB (approximately 700 configuration items), asset inventory (approximately 2,380 IT assets), incident, service request, and problem management processes, workflows (approximately 15), ticket categories, approval processes, SLAs, reporting, and a self-service portal. The City expects these existing capabilities to serve as the baseline for implementation. During implementation, the City will work with the selected vendor to determine which configurations should be migrated, recreated, refined, or redesigned to align with the capabilities of the proposed solution and industry best practices.

Question 53: What is the current ticket volume, including average monthly or annual incidents and service requests, and how many service catalog items are currently in use?

Answer 53: Approximately 15,000 to 20,000 per year.

Question 54: Can the City provide the expected number of users by role or user group, including administrators, IT fulfillers/service desk staff, approvers, knowledge owners, reporting users, and employee self-service users?

Answer 54: IT service desk agents – 32
Backend IT staff/system administrators – 2
City employees who will use the self-service portal - 894

Question 55: Does the City have existing ITIL processes, SLAs, ticket categories, escalation rules, approval workflows, or service management documentation that vendors should use as a baseline for the implementation?

Answer 55: The City has existing IT service management processes that will serve as a starting point for the implementation. The selected vendor will be expected to review the processes and recommend improvements based on ITIL best practices and the City's operational needs.

Question 56: Has the City established baseline performance metrics or target outcomes for the implementation, such as ticket deflection, first contact resolution, mean time to resolution, SLA compliance, employee satisfaction, backlog reduction, or operational efficiency improvements?

Answer 56: The City has not established formal baseline performance metrics or target outcomes at this time. The selected vendor will be expected to work with the City to define appropriate success measures and key performance indicators (KPIs) as part of the implementation.

- Question 57: Has the City identified a target implementation timeline, go-live date, go-live priorities, or mandated milestones that vendors should use for estimating effort, staffing, and project schedule?
- Answer 57: The City has not established a fixed implementation timeline or go-live date. Vendors should propose a realistic implementation schedule, key milestones, and staffing approach based on their recommended implementation methodology.
- Question 58: Does the City have an anticipated budget range or not-to-exceed amount for the ITSM replacement project? Should vendors assume the budget is inclusive of software licensing, implementation services, migration, integrations, training, and support?
- Answer 58: A project budget has not yet been established. Yes, vendors should assume the budget is inclusive.
- Question 59: Does the City have a required or preferred deliverables list for the ITSM replacement project, or should vendors propose recommended deliverables as part of their work plan?
- Answer 59: Vendors should propose recommended deliverables as part of their work plan.
- Question 60: Does the City have a required pricing template or preferred format for presenting software licensing, implementation services, migration, integrations, training, and ongoing support costs?
- Answer 60: No.
- Question 61: Are the integrations identified in the RFP, including Active Directory, SCCM, Intune, email, reporting/data access, and API capabilities, the complete list of required integrations for the initial implementation, or are there additional City systems that vendors should include in scope?
- Answer 61: The integrations identified in the RFP represent the City's anticipated requirements for the initial implementation. Vendors should describe their standard integration capabilities and may recommend additional integrations that would provide value. Additional integrations may be implemented in future phases.
- Question 62: Are there other systems intended for integration with the ITSM platform beyond those identified in the RFP, such as monitoring tools, procurement systems, HR systems, Microsoft Teams, ERP systems, cybersecurity tools, or other enterprise platforms?
- Answer 62: At this time, the City has not identified any additional required integrations beyond those identified in the RFP. Vendors may describe other standard integration capabilities and recommend additional integrations that would provide value. Additional integrations may be considered as part of future implementation phases.
- Question 63: Does the City currently have an enterprise integration platform or middleware solution already licensed and available for this project, such as MuleSoft or another tool? If so, should vendors assume its use for required integrations?
- Answer 63: No.
- Question 64: What employee support channels must be supported at launch, such as self-service portal, email, phone, chat, mobile, Microsoft Teams, Slack, or other channels?
- Answer 64: At a minimum, the City expects support for a self-service portal and email at launch. Vendors may describe additional supported channels and recommend an implementation approach based on industry best practices.

- Question 65: Please clarify the expected post-go-live support model. Should vendors assume the City will own ongoing platform administration, workflow/catalog configuration, release management, reporting, knowledge updates, and AI monitoring after implementation, or should vendors include optional ongoing support services?
- Answer 65: The City anticipates assuming responsibility for the ongoing administration and management of the solution following implementation. Vendors should include knowledge transfer as part of the implementation and may propose optional ongoing support services.
- Question 66: What are the City's expectations for post-go-live support, maintenance, support duration, and service levels?
- Answer 66: The City expects the selected vendor to provide standard post-go-live support and maintenance as part of the implementation. Vendors should describe their support approach, available service levels, and any optional ongoing support services.
- Question 67: Has the City developed a future-state operating model defining roles and responsibilities for IT fulfillers, approvers, service owners, knowledge owners, platform administrators, AI governance reviewers, and reporting users?
- Answer 67: The City has not developed a formal future-state operating model. The selected vendor will be expected to work collaboratively with the City to define roles, responsibilities, and governance appropriate for the proposed solution.
- Question 68: Can the City share any governance or guidance documents related to AI actions, human approval, auditability, data retention, PII handling, security controls, and role-based access?
- Answer 68: The City does not have formal AI governance documentation to share at this time. Vendors should describe how their solution supports security, auditability, role-based access, data protection, and responsible AI practices.
- Question 69: Does the City of Ann Arbor currently use Salesforce, ServiceNow, or other enterprise service management platforms? If so, please identify the platform, departments or business units using it, primary use cases, license footprint, and whether the existing platform is expected to be reused, integrated, replaced, or evaluated as part of this solicitation.
- Answer 69: The City is currently using Cireson/System Center Service Manager (SCSM) as its ITSM platform. This solicitation is limited to the replacement of the City's current ITSM solution. No additional enterprise service management platforms are included within the scope of this RFP.
- Question 70: Has the City conducted any market research, vendor demonstrations, or product evaluations for agentic ITSM or enterprise service management platforms to date? If so, please share any preferred capabilities, solution patterns, or platform preferences vendors should consider in their response.
- Answer 70: The City has not established a preferred solution or platform. Vendors should respond to the requirements and evaluation criteria outlined in the RFP.
- Question 71: The RFP requires vendors to provide a list of client references for similar projects but does not specify the required number. Could you please confirm the preferred number of client references to include in our proposal?
- Answer 71: The City requests that vendors provide at least three (3) client references for projects of similar size, scope, and complexity.
- Question 72: What is the current end-user count (total City employees) and IT staff/agent count who will use the system?
- Answer 72: IT service desk agents – 32
Backend IT staff/system administrators – 2

Question 73: What is current monthly/annual ticket volume (incidents + service requests) for sizing purposes?

Answer 73: Approximately 15,000 to 20,000 per year.

Question 74: Is a cloud/SaaS-hosted deployment acceptable/preferred, or does the City require on-premises or hybrid hosting?

Answer 74: No preference.

Question 75: What is the scope of data migration from Cireson/SCSM, how many years of historical tickets, and how many CMDB/CI records need to be migrated?

Answer 75: The City does not anticipate migrating historical incident, service request, problem, change, or other ticket records from the legacy solution. This includes both open and closed tickets and requests. The City also does not anticipate migrating historical knowledge base articles as part of the implementation.

We currently have approximately 2,380 assets that will need to be migrated. We manage consumables outside of our system but want to import them into the new system. We are open to recommendations on our CMDB, either through discovery or migration.

Question 76: What versions/environments are in use for Active Directory (on-prem AD vs. Azure AD/Entra ID), SCCM, and Intune, to confirm integration compatibility?

Answer 76: Windows 2016 domain and forest functional level. Running on Windows Server 2022. SCCM 2509.

Question 77: Are there additional systems (financial, HR, telephony, etc.) that will need to integrate with the ITSM platform beyond what is listed?

Answer 77: No.

Question 78: Are there specific security/compliance frameworks the solution must meet (e.g., SOC 2, StateRAMP, CJIS, State of Michigan data security standards)?

Answer 78: No.

Question 79: Is a native mobile app required, or is a responsive web portal sufficient?

Answer 79: Responsive web is sufficient.

Question 80: Are there ADA/WCAG accessibility requirements for the self-service portal?

Answer 80: Yes.

Question 81: What is the desired go-live date, and is there a target implementation duration (e.g., 4 months, 6 months)?

Answer 81: The City has not established a target go-live date or implementation duration. Vendors should propose a realistic implementation timeline, including key milestones and an anticipated go-live date.

Question 82: What is the anticipated initial contract term (period of performance), and are there renewal options?

Answer 82: The initial contract term and any renewal options will be negotiated with the selected vendor and reflected in the final agreement.

Question 83: Reservation of Rights item #6 states the City may select more than one consultant, is the City open to a multi-vendor award for this engagement, or is a single-vendor award expected?

Answer 83: Our preference is a single-vendor award.

Question 84: For “Past Involvement with Similar Projects,” does “similar” require public sector/municipal government experience specifically, or is private-sector ITSM implementation experience acceptable?

Answer 84: Private-sector ITSM implementation experience is acceptable.

Question 85: Does the 30-sheet (60-side) proposal limit include the cover letter, table of contents, and executive summary, or only the narrative body?

Answer 85: The 30-sheet (60-side) proposal limit applies to the narrative proposal. The cover letter, table of contents, and executive summary do not count toward the page limit.

Question 86: Are resumes required only for “key personnel,” or for every named individual, including subcontractor staff?

Answer 86: Resumes are required only for key personnel who will have significant roles in the implementation, including key subcontractor personnel, if applicable.

Question 87: Will interviews during the week of August 17, 2026 be held in person at City Hall, or is a virtual/video option acceptable?

Answer 87: Virtual/video is preferred.

Question 88: Is there an incumbent vendor currently supporting Cireson/SCSM who may be responding to this RFP?

Answer 88: No, not that we know of.

Question 89: Can the City provide any sample data extracts or record counts from the current Cireson/SCSM environment to help vendors scope the migration effort?

Answer 89: The City does not anticipate migrating historical incident, service request, problem, change, or other ticket records from the legacy solution. This includes both open and closed tickets and requests. The City also does not anticipate migrating historical knowledge base articles as part of the implementation.

We currently have approximately 2,380 assets that will need to be migrated. We manage consumables outside of our system but want to import them into the new system. We are open to recommendations on our CMDB, either through discovery or migration.

Question 90: Should fee proposals be structured as an annual SaaS subscription, or perpetual license + annual maintenance or is either acceptable?

Answer 90: The City expects proposals to be based on an annual SaaS subscription licensing model. Perpetual licensing is not requested as part of this RFP.

Question 91: Is there a target/not-to-exceed budget range the City can share to help vendors size an appropriately scoped proposal?

Answer 91: A project budget has not yet been established.

Question 92: Should implementation/professional services fees be itemized separately from ongoing license/subscription costs?

Answer 92: Yes, that would be preferred.

Question 93: Does the City want multi-year pricing options, such as 3-year or 5-year pricing, included in the fee proposal?

Answer 93: Vendors should provide pricing on an annual basis. Multi-year pricing options are acceptable but not required.

- Question 94: Is one (1) original + one (1) digital copy (USB) sufficient for the narrative proposal, or does the evaluation committee require additional printed copies?
- Answer 94: One (1) printed original and one digital copy on a USB drive is sufficient.
- Question 95: Please confirm two (2) copies are required for the separately sealed Fee Proposal envelope, is that correct?
- Answer 95: Correct.
- Question 96: Please reconfirm that electronic/email submission of the proposal is not accepted under any circumstance, given the size of the digital file.
- Answer 96: Proposals submitted late or via oral, telephonic, telegraphic, electronic mail or facsimile will not be considered or accepted.
- Question 97: If our firm is not incorporated in Michigan, is the Certificate of Authority required to be included with the proposal at submission, or only upon contract award?
- Answer 97: Only at contract award would be sufficient.
- Question 98: Are bid, performance, or payment bonds required for this engagement?
- Answer 98: No bonds are required.
- Question 99: Are insurance certificates required to be submitted with the proposal, or only prior to contract commencement, per Appendix A, Section 6?
- Answer 99: Only prior to contract commencement.
- Question 100: Is there a minimum small/disadvantaged/local business subcontracting participation goal for this RFP?
- Answer 100: No.
- Question 101: Section H states the City "will not entertain changes" to the Professional Services Agreement, can the City confirm whether there is any process for offerors to note exceptions/concerns for consideration during negotiation with the top-ranked firm, or is the agreement strictly non-negotiable as issued?
- Answer 101: Firms are welcome to propose changes to the Professional Services Agreement.
- Question 102: If required to attend interviews during the week of August 17, 2026, is remote/video attendance acceptable, or is in-person mandatory?
- Answer 102: Remote/video is preferred.
- Question 103: Can portions of a proposal, such as proprietary pricing methodology, be marked confidential, or does FOIA apply to the entire submission without exception upon request?
- Answer 103: Offerors are welcome to indicate that areas of their proposal submission are confidential or proprietary but should know that anything submitted will be subject to FOIA.
- Question 104: What ITSM platform are you currently using?
- Answer 104: Cireson.
- Question 105: Why are you replacing the current solution?
- Answer 105: Our current system is inflexible and does not meet our needs from an operational perspective.
- Question 106: What are the biggest pain points with the existing platform?
- Answer 106: The lack of flexibility to support our IT operations.

Question 107: How many years of historical tickets and asset data need to be migrated?

Answer 107: The City does not anticipate migrating historical incident, service request, problem, change, or other ticket records from the legacy solution. This includes both open and closed tickets and requests. The City also does not anticipate migrating historical knowledge base articles as part of the implementation.

We currently have approximately 2,380 assets that will need to be migrated. We manage consumables outside of our system but want to import them into the new system. We are open to recommendations on our CMDB, either through discovery or migration.

Question 108: Is migration of knowledge articles, workflows, and reports expected?

Answer 108: We have 15 workflows that we anticipate migrating. We will not migrate knowledge articles or reports.

Question 109: What existing integrations are currently in place?

Answer 109: The City has identified integration with Active Directory or Microsoft Entra ID, Microsoft Configuration Manager (SCCM/MECM) or Microsoft Intune as the primary integrations anticipated for the initial implementation. Vendors may recommend additional discovery capabilities or integration approaches that improve CMDB accuracy and align with industry best practices.

Question 110: How many:

Named IT agents?

Concurrent agents?

End users?

Departmental managers?

Answer 110: IT service desk agents – 32

Backend IT staff/system administrators – 2

City employees who will use the self-service portal - 894

Question 111: Will any non-IT departments use the platform now or in the future?

Answer 111: The initial implementation is focused on supporting the City's IT organization. Future use by other departments may be considered but is not within the scope of this RFP.

Question 112: Are there seasonal or temporary users?

Answer 112: Yes.

Question 113: How many IT teams will use the platform?

Answer 113: 1.

Question 114: What are the primary support groups?

Answer 114: The primary support groups are the City's Information Technology Services teams. Additional details will be provided to the selected vendor during implementation.

Question 115: Do you have multiple service desks?

Answer 115: No.

Question 116: Are there multiple physical locations?

Answer 116: No, not for the service desk.

Question 117: Is support provided 24/7?

Answer 117: The City's IT Service Desk is staffed during normal business hours. After-hours support is provided through an on-call service.

Question 118: Which ITIL processes are currently documented?

Answer 118: The City does not have formally documented ITIL processes at this time. The selected vendor will be expected to review the City's current ITSM environment and existing workflows as part of the implementation.

Question 119: Which processes are already mature?

Answer 119: The City has not formally assessed the maturity of its IT service management processes. The selected vendor will be expected to evaluate the current environment and recommend improvements as part of the implementation.

Question 120: Which processes are priorities for improvement?

Answer 120: The City's priorities include improving incident, request, asset, and CMDB management, as well as enhancing automation, reporting, and the overall user experience.

Question 121: Is the expectation to redesign processes or automate existing ones?

Answer 121: The City expects the selected vendor to evaluate current processes and recommend improvements based on industry best practices. The implementation should balance process optimization with automation where appropriate.

Question 122: Approximately how many:

Incidents per month?

Service requests per month?

Changes per month?

Answer 122: Approximately 15,000 to 20,000 per year.

Question 123: How many service catalog items currently exist?

Answer 123: 12

Question 124: Are there SLAs already defined?

Answer 124: Yes.

Question 125: Are there multiple escalation paths?

Answer 125: Yes. The City has multiple escalation paths that will be reviewed and refined with the selected vendor during implementation.

Question 126: Are approval workflows already documented?

Answer 126: We do not have approval workflows configured in the system, only simple workflows.

Question 127: Approximately how many managed assets?

Answer 127: We currently have approximately 2,380 assets.

Question 128: Types of assets?

Windows

Mac

Mobile

Network

Printers

Cloud resources

Answer 128: The City expects the solution to support common IT asset types, including Windows devices, Mac devices, mobile devices, network equipment, printers, and cloud resources.

Question 129: Are software licenses expected to be tracked?

Answer 129: Yes. The City expects the solution to support the tracking and management of software licenses as part of its software asset management capabilities.

Question 130: Is procurement lifecycle management required?

Answer 130: No. Procurement lifecycle management is not required as part of this RFP.

Question 131: What consumables are tracked?

Answer 131: The City's intent is to support the tracking and management of common IT consumable inventory used in day-to-day IT operations. Examples may include printer toner, cables, adapters, peripherals, batteries, and other similar IT-related supplies.

Question 132: Are barcode or QR code capabilities required?

Answer 132: No.

Question 133: Is there an existing CMDB?

Answer 133: Yes. The City currently maintains a Configuration Management Database (CMDB) within its existing ITSM solution containing approximately 700 configuration items (CIs) and manages approximately 2,380 IT assets. During implementation, the City expects to migrate and enhance the existing CMDB and asset data, including evaluating automated discovery capabilities and vendor recommendations to improve data quality, completeness, and alignment with industry best practices.

Question 134: What configuration item (CI) classes are expected?

Answer 134: The City anticipates common IT configuration item (CI) classes, including servers, workstations, network devices, software, cloud resources, and related IT assets. The final CI model will be developed with the selected vendor during implementation.

Question 135: What relationships need to be maintained?

Answer 135: The City expects the solution to support standard CMDB relationships between configuration items, assets, users, and services. The specific relationship model will be developed during implementation.

Question 136: How complete is the current asset inventory?

Answer 136: The City believes its current asset inventory is substantially complete; however, the selected vendor should expect to validate and refine the data as part of the implementation.

Question 137: Is discovery expected, or only synchronization from SCCM and Intune?

Answer 137: The City is open to vendor recommendations. Vendors should describe their recommended approach for asset discovery and/or synchronization with SCCM and Intune.

Question 138: Active Directory

On-prem AD?

Azure AD / Microsoft Entra ID?

Hybrid?

Answer 138: Hybrid.

Question 139: SCCM

Version?

Still actively used?

Answer 139: SCCM 2509 and is still used.

Question 140: Intune

What asset information is expected to synchronize?

One-way or bi-directional?

Answer 140: The City expects standard asset information to be available within the ITSM solution. Vendors should describe their recommended approach, including whether asset discovery or synchronization with Microsoft Intune is preferred, the asset information that would be synchronized, and whether a one-way or bi-directional integration is recommended.

Question 141: Are integrations needed with:

Microsoft 365

Teams

Exchange Online

Power BI

HR systems

ERP

Procurement

GIS

Phone systems

Remote support tools

Monitoring platforms

Answer 141: The City expects integration with the Microsoft ecosystem as identified in the RFP. Vendors should describe their capabilities and recommend any additional integrations that would provide value as part of the initial implementation or future phases.

Question 142: Which AI capabilities are considered most valuable?

Answer 142: The City is interested in AI capabilities that improve service delivery, operational efficiency, and the user experience. Vendors should describe their AI capabilities and recommend those that would provide the greatest value to the City.

Question 143: Is generative AI acceptable?

Answer 143: Yes. The City is open to generative AI capabilities, provided they meet the City's security, privacy, and governance requirements. Vendors should describe the capabilities and associated controls.

Question 144: Are there security restrictions regarding AI?

Answer 144: Yes. Any AI capabilities must comply with the City's applicable security, privacy, and governance requirements. Vendors should describe the controls and safeguards included with their solution.

Question 145: Are cloud-hosted AI services allowed?

Answer 145: Yes. Cloud-hosted AI services are acceptable, provided they comply with the City's security, privacy, and contractual requirements.

Question 146: Are there data residency requirements?

Answer 146: The City has no specific data residency requirements beyond those identified in the RFP and applicable contractual requirements.

Question 147: Is AI scoring part of the evaluation?

Answer 147: The evaluation criteria are identified in the RFP. AI capabilities will be evaluated in accordance with those criteria and the vendor's proposed solution.

Question 148: What executive dashboards currently exist?

Answer 148: The City currently utilizes operational reports and dashboards. Vendors are encouraged to describe executive dashboard capabilities that would provide

additional value.

Question 149: Which KPIs are most important?

Answer 149: The City currently utilizes IT service management KPIs and is interested in reviewing and refining them to better align with ITIL best practices. Vendors should describe their recommended KPI approach.

Question 150: Are there regulatory reporting requirements?

Answer 150: The City has not identified any specific regulatory reporting requirements as part of this RFP.

Question 151: Is Power BI integration desired?

Answer 151: The City has not identified Power BI integration as a requirement. Vendors may describe available Power BI integration capabilities and the value they would provide.

Question 152: Is SQL-level access required?

Answer 152: The City requires access to its data for reporting and integration purposes. Vendors should describe the available data access methods, including SQL access (if available), APIs, and other supported options.

Question 153: MFA requirements

Answer 153: We do MFA through Entra.

Question 154: SSO

Answer 154: Yes.

Question 155: SAML

Answer 155: Yes.

Question 156: OAuth

Answer 156: Yes.

Question 157: FedRAMP?

Answer 157: No.

Question 158: CJIS?

Answer 158: No.

Question 159: HIPAA?

Answer 159: No.

Question 160: PCI?

Answer 160: No.

Question 161: SOC 2 requirements

Answer 161: No.

Question 162: Data encryption

Answer 162: Preferred in transit and at rest.

Question 163: Audit logging

Answer 163: The City expects the solution to provide a comprehensive audit trail that records changes to system configuration and data, including who made the change and when it occurred.

Question 164: Retention requirements

Answer 164: The City has not established specific data retention requirements beyond those identified in the RFP and applicable contractual requirements.

Question 165: Is SaaS preferred?

Answer 165: No preference.

Question 166: Is on-premises acceptable?

Answer 166: No preference.

Question 167: Any cloud provider preference?

Answer 167: No preference.

Question 168: Data residency requirements?

Answer 168: The City has not established specific data residency requirements. Vendors should describe their data hosting locations and available options.

Question 169: Backup retention expectations?

Answer 169: The City has not established specific backup retention requirements. Vendors should describe their standard backup and recovery capabilities, including retention practices.

Question 170: Disaster recovery objectives (RTO/RPO)?

Answer 170: The City has not established specific RTO or RPO requirements. Vendors should describe their standard disaster recovery capabilities, including recovery time and recovery point objectives.

Question 171: Desired implementation timeline?

Answer 171: The City has not established a desired implementation timeline. Vendors should propose a realistic implementation schedule based on their recommended approach.

Question 172: Target go-live date?

Answer 172: The City has not established a target go-live date. Vendors should propose an anticipated go-live date as part of their implementation plan.

Question 173: Phased implementation or "big bang"?

Answer 173: The City is open to either a phased or full implementation. Vendors should recommend the approach they believe best supports a successful implementation.

Question 174: Internal project team size?

Answer 174: 8.

Question 175: Dedicated project manager?

Answer 175: Yes.

Question 176: Who owns configuration?

Answer 176: The City anticipates assuming responsibility for ongoing solution configuration and administration following implementation, with knowledge transfer provided by the selected vendor.

Question 177: Who owns testing?

Answer 177: Testing will be a collaborative effort between the City and the selected vendor, with the vendor leading test planning and the City performing user acceptance testing (UAT).

Question 178: Expected number of workshops?

Answer 178: The City has not established an expected number of workshops. Vendors should propose the workshops necessary to support a successful implementation.

Question 179: Administrator training?

Answer 179: Yes. The City expects the selected vendor to provide administrator training and knowledge transfer as part of the implementation.

Question 180: Service desk training?

Answer 180: Yes. The City expects the selected vendor to provide service desk training as part of the implementation.

Question 181: End-user training?

Answer 181: Yes. The City expects the selected vendor to provide appropriate end-user training and supporting documentation as part of the implementation.

Question 182: Recorded sessions?

Answer 182: Vendors should describe their approach to providing recorded training sessions and other training materials as part of the implementation.

Question 183: Train-the-trainer?

Answer 183: Yes. The City expects the selected vendor to include a train-the-trainer approach as part of the implementation and knowledge transfer.

Question 184: Number of administrators?

Answer 184: 2.

Question 185: Required support hours?

Answer 185: The City has not established required vendor support hours. Vendors should describe their standard support hours, service levels, and available support options.

Question 186: Required SLA?

Answer 186: The City has not established required service level agreements (SLAs). Vendors should describe their standard support SLAs and available service level options.

Question 187: Named technical account manager?

Answer 187: A named technical account manager is preferred but not required. Vendors should describe the account management services included with their offering.

Question 188: Customer success manager?

Answer 188: A customer success manager is preferred but not required. Vendors should describe the customer success services included with their offering.

Question 189: Upgrade assistance?

Answer 189: Yes. Vendors should describe their approach to solution upgrades, including any assistance provided and customer responsibilities.

Question 190: Configuration assistance?

Answer 190: Yes. Vendors should describe the configuration assistance available during implementation and any optional post-implementation configuration support services

Question 191: What level of low-code/no-code configuration is expected?

Answer 191: The City prefers a solution that supports low-code/no-code configuration for common administrative tasks and workflow changes. Vendors should describe the

capabilities of their platform.

Question 192: Are scripting capabilities acceptable?

Answer 192: Yes. Scripting capabilities are acceptable; however, the City prefers low-code/no-code configuration whenever practical.

Question 193: What level of internal administration experience exists?

Answer 193: The City has experience administering its current ITSM environment. The selected vendor should provide knowledge transfer and training to support ongoing administration of the new solution.

Question 194: Existing ticket count

Answer 194: We do not plan to migrate our existing tickets.

Question 195: Existing asset count

Answer 195: We currently have approximately 2,380 assets.

Question 196: Existing knowledge articles

Answer 196: We do not plan to migrate knowledge articles.

Question 197: Existing users

Answer 197: IT service desk agents – 32
Backend IT staff/system administrators – 2
City employees who will use the self-service portal - 894

Question 198: Existing workflows

Answer 198: 15.

Question 199: Existing reports

Answer 199: We do not intend to migrate existing reports.

Question 200: Historical data retention requirements

Answer 200: The City has no historical data retention requirements for the initial implementation. Vendors should describe the solution's data retention capabilities to support future needs.

Question 201: What are the evaluation criteria and weighting?

Answer 201: The evaluation criteria and associated weighting are identified in the RFP.

Question 202: Is functionality weighted higher than price?

Answer 202: The evaluation criteria and associated weighting are identified in the RFP.

Question 203: Will demonstrations be scored?

Answer 203: Yes.

Question 204: Will reference checks be performed?

Answer 204: Yes.

Question 205: Is there a preferred implementation timeline?

Answer 205: The City has not established a preferred implementation timeline. Vendors should propose a realistic implementation schedule based on their recommended approach.

Question 206: Are there incumbent vendors bidding?

Answer 206: Not that we are aware of.

Question 207: Will other City departments eventually use the platform?

Answer 207: The initial implementation is focused on the City's IT organization. Future use by other departments may be considered but is not within the scope of this RFP.

Question 208: Are Enterprise Service Management (HR, Facilities, Finance) capabilities part of the future roadmap?

Answer 208: The City has not established a roadmap for Enterprise Service Management beyond IT. Future expansion may be considered but is not within the scope of this RFP.

Question 209: Is expansion beyond IT expected within the contract term?

Answer 209: The City has not established plans to expand beyond IT during the initial contract term. Any future expansion would be at the City's discretion.

Question 210: What does success look like 12 months after implementation?

Answer 210: Success will be measured by a successfully implemented solution that improves the user experience, streamlines IT service management processes, and enables the City to effectively administer and support the platform.

Question 211: Which three outcomes are most important?

Answer 211: The City's highest priorities are:

1. A modern, intuitive user experience.
2. Simplified administration and configuration.
3. Improved IT service management capabilities that align with industry best practices.

Question 212: Which current challenges are considered highest priority?

Answer 212: The City's highest priorities are improving the user experience, simplifying administration and configuration, and enhancing IT service management capabilities through a modern, flexible solution.

Question 213: What would make this project a clear success for City leadership?

Answer 213: A successful project will deliver a modern, reliable ITSM solution that improves service delivery, enhances the user experience, and is easy for the City to administer and maintain.

Question 214: How many named users will require licenses?

Answer 214: IT service desk agents – 32
Backend IT staff/system administrators – 2
City employees who will use the self-service portal - 894

Question 215: How many IT agents/technicians require full administrative access?

Answer 215: IT service desk agents – 32
Backend IT staff/system administrators – 2
City employees who will use the self-service portal - 894

Question 216: Approximately how many annual incidents and service requests are processed?

Answer 216: Approximately 15,000 to 20,000 per year.

Question 217: How many historical tickets are expected to be migrated?

Answer 217: 0.

Question 218: What is the current version of Cireson you are using?

Answer 218: 11.6.2.

Question 219: How many existing service catalog items are in production?

Answer 219: 12.

Question 220: How many approval workflows currently exist?

Answer 220: We have 15 simple workflows and none of them have approvals configured in the system.

Question 221: How many assignment groups are in use today?

Answer 221: 6.

Question 222: Approximately how many hardware assets exist?

Answer 222: We currently have approximately 2,380 assets.

Question 223: How many software assets are tracked?

Answer 223: We are not currently tracking software assets but would like to.

Question 224: Is there an existing CMDB that is considered accurate?

Answer 224: The City has an existing CMDB that will serve as the foundation for the implementation. The selected vendor will be expected to assess the current CMDB and recommend improvements as appropriate.

Question 225: Is Active Directory on premises, Microsoft Entra ID, or hybrid?

Answer 225: Hybrid.

Question 226: Are there any additional systems requiring integration (HRIS, ERP, GIS, Finance, Procurement, etc.)?

Answer 226: No.

Question 227: What items are expected to migrate from the existing solution? Tickets, change requests, knowledge articles, assets, etc.

Answer 227: The City does not anticipate migrating historical incident, service request, change, problem, or other ticket records from Cireson/System Center Service Manager (SCSM). Likewise, the City does not anticipate migrating historical knowledge base articles as part of the implementation.

The City does expect to migrate current IT asset information into the proposed solution. Vendors should describe their recommended approach for extracting, mapping, validating, and importing asset data. We currently have approximately 2,380 assets.

Question 228: What historical period of tickets and change requests if they are required?

Answer 228: The City does not anticipate migrating historical incident, service request, change, problem, or other ticket records from Cireson/System Center Service Manager (SCSM). Likewise, the City does not anticipate migrating historical knowledge base articles as part of the implementation.

Question 229: Is it appropriate to migrate only open tickets?

Answer 229: We do not anticipate migrating any tickets from our current system.

Question 230: Please expand on this current pain point. Provide an illustrative example.

- The team finds the current system restrictive due to its rigid adherence to Microsoft's ITIL-based architecture.

Answer 230: The City's current ITSM environment has become difficult to adapt to evolving business and operational needs. Implementing new workflows, modifying forms,

or adjusting approval processes often requires significant customization and administrative effort. For example, introducing a new service request or modifying an existing workflow can require more effort and technical expertise than desired. The City is seeking a solution that provides greater flexibility and simplifies ongoing configuration and administration while supporting IT service management best practices.

Question 231: IT staff / agent count — How many IT technicians/agents will need licenses for the new system? This drives the platform sizing and annual cost significantly.

Answer 231: IT service desk agents – 32
Backend IT staff/system administrators – 2

Question 232: End-user count — Approximately how many city employees will access the self-service portal (the "customers" submitting requests)?

Answer 232: City employees who will use the self-service portal - 894

Question 233: Current system scale — What is the current ticket volume (monthly/annual) in Cireson/SCSM, and how many assets are currently in the CMDB? This helps us scope data migration effort.

Answer 233: Approximately 15,000 to 20,000 per year. We currently have approximately 2,380 assets.

Question 234: Implementation timeline — Is there a target go-live date, or is the City flexible on a phased approach?

Answer 234: The City has not established a target go-live date and is open to a phased implementation approach. Vendors should recommend an implementation strategy and timeline that best supports a successful deployment.

Question 235: Environment details — Is the current Cireson/SCCM system on-premises, cloud, or hybrid? This can affect migration strategy.

Answer 235: On-premises.

Question 236: Please confirm whether an out-of-state corporation is required to possess a Michigan Certificate of Authority at the time of proposal submission, or whether the successful offeror may obtain the Certificate prior to contract award.

Answer 236: Only at contract award would be sufficient.

Question 237: Please clarify the expected scope of data migration.

Answer 237: The City does not anticipate migrating historical incident, service request, change, problem, or other ticket records from Cireson/System Center Service Manager (SCSM). Likewise, the City does not anticipate migrating historical knowledge base articles as part of the implementation.

The City does expect to migrate current IT asset information into the proposed solution. Vendors should describe their recommended approach for extracting, mapping, validating, and importing asset data. We currently have approximately 2,380 assets. Data mapping documentation is not currently available and will be developed collaboratively with the selected vendor during the implementation phase.

Question 238: Are integrations beyond Active Directory, SCCM, and Microsoft Intune expected as part of this implementation? If so, please identify the additional systems that should be included in the proposed scope.

- Answer 238: The City has not identified additional required integrations beyond those identified in the RFP. Vendors may describe other integration capabilities and recommend additional integrations that would provide value.
- Question 239: Please provide the approximate number of hardware assets, software assets, mobile devices, consumable assets, and configuration items that will be managed within the new solution.
- Answer 239: The City currently manages approximately 2,380 hardware assets and around 700 configuration items. Software asset and consumable inventory counts have not been finalized and will be confirmed during implementation.
- Question 240: Please clarify the City's expectations for post-implementation support, including the anticipated support period, required hours of coverage, response/resolution service levels, and whether managed services should be included in the proposal.
- Answer 240: The City expects standard post-implementation support as part of the implementation. Vendors should describe their support approach, support hours, service levels, and any optional managed services available.
- Question 241: Please confirm whether the City has a preferred project start date, target production go-live date, or desired implementation completion date that offerors should consider when developing the proposed project schedule.
- Answer 241: The City has not established a preferred project start date, go-live date, or implementation completion date. Vendors should propose a realistic project schedule based on their recommended implementation approach.
- Question 242: Please clarify whether offerors should include software subscription/licensing costs as part of the Fee Proposal, or if the City intends to procure software licensing under a separate agreement or contract.
- Answer 242: Offerors should include all software subscription/licensing costs in their Fee Proposal.
- Question 243: Please provide the approximate number of end users, IT support staff, annual incident volume, annual service request volume, service catalog items, and knowledge articles currently managed within the existing ITSM environment.
- Answer 243: The City has approximately 894 employees who will use the self-service portal, 32 IT service desk agents, and 2 backend IT staff/system administrators. The City processes approximately 15,000–20,000 incidents and service requests annually, currently manages approximately 2,380 IT assets and 700 additional configuration items, and has 12 service catalog items. The City does not currently maintain a formal knowledge base.
- Question 244: Please clarify the intended evaluation process. Will fee proposals remain excluded from the initial technical evaluation, or may they be considered before completion of the technical scoring?
- Answer 244: The evaluation process is described in the RFP. Proposals will be evaluated in accordance with the procedures outlined in the RFP.
- Question 245: What is the current platform being used by the City of Ann Arbor for ITSM, Asset management, and Configuration Management Database (CMDB)?
- Answer 245: Cireson.
- Question 246: How many IT technicians/service desk analysts (L1 / L2 / L3) or system administrators currently have access to the existing ITSM platform with the ability to review, update, and resolve tickets?
- Answer 246: IT service desk agents – 32
Backend IT staff/system administrators – 2

- Question 247: What is the expected annual rate of growth or reduction in IT staff requiring access to the ITSM platform during the anticipated contract term?
- Answer 247: The City has not identified an expected growth or reduction in IT staff during the contract term. Vendors should assume staffing levels will remain relatively stable.
- Question 248: What is the total number of assets that need to be recorded/maintained in the system?
- Answer 248: We currently have approximately 2,380 assets.
- Question 249: What is the expected annual rate of growth or reduction in assets that need to be recorded/maintained in the asset management system?
- Answer 249: The City has not identified an expected annual growth or reduction in managed assets. Vendors should assume asset counts will remain relatively stable during the contract term.
- Question 250: Does the City of Ann Arbor require the migration of data and workflows from the current ITSM system to the new proposed ITSM system?
- If migration is required, please provide:
- Number of service request tickets.
 - Number of incident tickets.
 - Number of change request tickets.
 - Number of workflows.
 - Number of service catalog items.
- Answer 250: The City does not require the migration of historical incident, service request, or change request tickets. The City currently has approximately 15 workflows and 12 service catalog items. Existing workflows will be evaluated and redesigned as appropriate during implementation rather than migrated. CMDB and asset data are expected to be migrated to the new solution.
- Question 251: Will the City of Ann Arbor require any IT technicians to be provided by the service provider for:
- Manually create tickets
 - Ticket triage and help route tickets
 - Set ticket priority
 - Queue management
 - Service desk operations
 - Post implementation, and post training of City of Ann Arbor IT staff
- If yes, then will this be for the duration of the contract, or a predefined length of time? Whether support is expected only during transition/hypercare or throughout the contract term.
- Answer 251: No.
- Question 252: Is a cloud based ITSM platform acceptable to the City?
- Answer 252: Yes.
- Question 253: Can the City provide an estimate hours of the ongoing support and maintenance required, including the expected number of support hours per week after implementation?
- Answer 253: The City does not anticipate requiring ongoing administration or maintenance services from the vendor. Vendors should describe their standard product support services for questions, issue resolution, and technical assistance following implementation.

Question 254: The RFP requests that pricing information be submitted as part of the Fee Proposal; however, no specific pricing format or template has been provided. Does the City have a preferred pricing template for the Fee Proposal, or may vendors submit their own pricing format and cost structure?

Answer 254: The City does not require a specific pricing template. Vendors may use their standard pricing format, provided all requested pricing information identified in the RFP is included.

Question 255: Is City open to development, testing and any other work to be done in Secured offshore locations, for faster delivery and lower cost?

Answer 255: The City has no specific requirement regarding the location of development or testing resources. Vendors should describe their proposed delivery model and ensure it complies with the requirements of the RFP, including applicable security, privacy, and contractual requirements.

Question 256: While RFP specifies Physical submission of the printed proposal, can we send a copy by email, as backup?

Answer 256: Proposals submitted late or via oral, telephonic, telegraphic, electronic mail or facsimile will not be considered or accepted.

Question 257: We understand the current ITSM is based on Cireson/SCSM. Can the City provide details on the ITSM instance including native features of SCSM and any customizations done via Cireson (e.g., service manager portal)?

Answer 257: The City currently uses Cireson/System Center Service Manager (SCSM), including the Cireson Self-Service Portal and related customizations. Offerors should base their proposals on the requirements identified in the RFP rather than the City's current implementation. Additional details will be provided to the selected vendor during implementation.

Question 258: Do you use Tikit (Cireson's service desk software)?

Answer 258: No.

Question 259: We understand that the City intends to migrate to a modern platform that provides better ITSM, asset, and CMDB capabilities. Are there any other pertinent reasons for the migration?

Answer 259: In addition to improving ITSM, asset management, and CMDB capabilities, the City is seeking a modern, intuitive, and flexible solution that simplifies administration, improves the user experience, and better supports evolving business needs and ITIL best practices.

Question 260: Are there any other organizations that share the ITSM instance with the City?

Answer 260: No.

Question 261: Do you have a preferred ITSM tool?

Answer 261: No.

Question 262: Can the City provide the number of licenses (Fulfillers and Approvers)?

Answer 262: IT service desk agents – 32
Backend IT staff/system administrators – 2

Question 263: Please provide the monthly average ticket count for the following:

- Incidents
- Service Requests
- Change Requests
- Total knowledge article for end users
- Total knowledge article for fulfillers

Answer 263: The City processes approximately 15,000–20,000 incidents and service requests annually (approximately 1,250–1,670 per month combined). Separate incident, service request, and change request volumes are not available. The City does not currently maintain end-user or fulfiller knowledge articles.

Question 264: To assess automation requirements, can the City provide, at minimum, 3–6 months of incident, service request, and change request volume data, including ticket categorization and resolution statistics?

Answer 264: The City will not provide detailed historical ticket data as part of this procurement. Vendors should base their proposals on the information provided in the RFP and this addendum.

Question 265: What are the omnichannel sources used?

Answer 265: The City's primary support channels are the self-service portal and email.

Question 266: If telephone is a channel, is CTI integration currently in place?

Answer 266: No. The City does not currently have CTI integration in place.

Question 267: How many service catalog items are deployed in the current system? Also, what percent or count of those catalog items are complex (i.e., requests spanning multiple tasks, such as onboarding requests, system access requests, etc.)?

Answer 267: The City currently has 12 service catalog items. The City has not categorized service catalog items by complexity.

Question 268: Are there any external-facing portals other than the end user portal for the employees?

Answer 268: No, only the end user portal.

Question 269: Can the City provide the hardware asset volume (i.e., end user devices, servers, other devices, etc.)?

Answer 269: The City currently manages approximately 2,380 hardware assets. A detailed breakdown by asset type (e.g., end-user devices, servers, and other devices) is not available.

Question 270: Are software licenses also managed by the current system?

Answer 270: No. The City does not currently manage software licenses within its ITSM system but is interested in this capability.

Question 271: Are there any cloud assets? If so, how are they managed?

Answer 271: The City has not identified specific requirements for managing cloud assets as part of this procurement. Vendors may describe their capabilities for cloud asset management.

Question 272: Are there any IT asset catalog items available? If so, are they used to manage the asset life cycle processes (e.g., asset request, asset transfer, asset return, asset disposal, etc.)

Answer 272: The City has not identified specific requirements regarding the use of IT asset catalog items for asset lifecycle management. Vendors should describe their capabilities for supporting asset lifecycle processes, including asset requests, transfers, returns, and disposal.

Question 273: Can the City provide the CMDB units (CIs) volume?

Answer 273: The City currently manages approximately 2,380 IT assets and maintains approximately 700 configuration items (CIs) within its CMDB.

Question 274: Are there any other discovery tools that are integrated with CMDB apart from SCCM and Intune? Should the vendor integrate with these tools, or may other discovery tools be proposed?

Answer 274: The City has not identified any additional required discovery tool integrations beyond SCCM and Microsoft Intune. Vendors may recommend alternative discovery tools or approaches if they provide additional value.

Question 275: What are the event management/monitoring tools being used?

Answer 275: Solarwinds SEM. ManageEngine Operations Manager. Orion.

Question 276: Are the event management/monitoring tools integrated with Cireson/SCSM? If so, what is the average monthly event volume?

Answer 276: No.

Question 277: What are the third-party enterprise systems that are currently integrated with Cireson/SCSM other than AD?

Answer 277: The City has not identified any required third-party enterprise system integrations beyond those identified in the RFP. Vendors should base their proposals on the integration requirements described in the RFP.

Question 278: Are there any in-flight integrations? If so, what are they and do they need to be considered for this RFP?

Answer 278: The City is not aware of any in-flight integrations that need to be considered as part of this procurement.

Question 279: Are there custom applications integrated with Cireson/SCSM?

Answer 279: The City has not identified any custom application integrations that are required to be considered as part of this procurement. Vendors should base their proposals on the requirements identified in the RFP.

Question 280: How many custom reports and dashboards are developed for the City in Cireson/SCSM?

Answer 280: The City currently has approximately 10 custom reports and dashboards. Existing reports and dashboards will be evaluated during implementation and may be redesigned to leverage the capabilities of the proposed solution.

Question 281: Can the City specify high-level metrics or KPIs that need to be captured in the reports?

Answer 281: The City currently tracks IT service management metrics and views this implementation as an opportunity to review and align KPIs with ITIL best practices. Vendors should describe the standard reporting and KPI capabilities of their solution.

Question 282: Are all incidents, service requests, and changes required to be migrated from Cireson/SCSM or is the City requiring the migration of open tickets only?

Answer 282: The City does not require the migration of historical incident, service request, or change request tickets. Vendors may assume ticket migration is not required for the initial implementation.

Question 283: Can the City provide the types of automations configured in the current instance?

Answer 283: The City currently has approximately 15 workflows. Vendors should base their proposals on the requirements identified in the RFP rather than the City's current implementation.

- Question 284: Are there any AI capabilities already implemented, such as GenAI bots, Agentic AI, etc.? Please share the use cases of Gen AI and Agentic AI automations currently implemented within Cireson/SCSM and their associated volumes.
- Answer 284: No. The City does not currently have GenAI, agentic AI, or other AI capabilities implemented within its current ITSM solution.
- Question 285: What is the current AI adoption percentage?
- Answer 285: The City does not currently utilize AI capabilities within its ITSM solution.
- Question 286: When does the contract with the existing vendor expire?
- Answer 286: The expiration date of the City's current contract is not relevant to this procurement and will not be provided.
- Question 287: How many IT technicians should be licensed to use the system? Please confirm whether the City prefers named technician licensing or concurrent technician licensing.
- Answer 287: The City anticipates approximately 34 IT staff will require access to the system. The City has no preference for named or concurrent technician licensing. Vendors should propose the licensing model that best fits their solution.
- Question 288: Approximately how many nodes, endpoints, or assets should be managed within the ITSM/asset management system?
- Answer 288: The City currently manages approximately 2,380 IT assets and maintains approximately 700 configuration items (CIs) within its CMDB.
- Question 289: Does the City have a preferred deployment model: on-premises or cloud-hosted?
- Answer 289: No preference.
- Question 290: Does the City have a preferred license/subscription term: 1 year, 3 years, or perpetual?
- Answer 290: The City prefers an annual or three-year term. Perpetual licensing is not preferred.
- Question 291: What version of Cireson/SCSM is currently in use, and is it hosted on-premises or cloud?
- Answer 291: 11.6.2 and it is hosted on-premises.
- Question 292: What ticket volumes exist by year/month for incidents and service requests?
- Answer 292: The City processes approximately 15,000–20,000 incidents and service requests annually (approximately 1,250–1,670 per month combined). Separate incident and service request volumes are not available.
- Question 293: How many assignment groups, categories, request types, workflows, and notification rules exist today?
- Answer 293: The City currently has approximately 6 assignment groups and 15 workflows. Categories, request types, and notification rules will be reviewed and reevaluated during implementation to align with the capabilities and best practices of the selected solution.
- Question 294: What data must be migrated from Cireson/SCSM: open tickets, closed tickets, attachments, comments, work notes, approvals, audit history, assets, users, groups, knowledge articles, and configuration data?
- Answer 294: The City does not require migration of open tickets, closed tickets, attachments, comments, work notes, approvals, audit history, or knowledge articles. The City expects migration of current asset and CMDB/configuration data. Users and groups will be addressed through integration with the City's identity systems.

- Question 295: What historical period must be migrated? Full history, fixed number of years, open tickets only, or archive/search-only?
- Answer 295: The City does not require migration of historical ticket data. Vendors may assume historical incidents, service requests, and change requests will remain in the existing system for archival purposes. Only current asset and CMDB/configuration data are expected to be migrated.
- Question 296: What export formats or database/API access will the City provide for Cireson/SCSM?
- Answer 296: The City will work with the selected vendor to provide the access necessary to support the agreed-upon data migration approach. Specific export formats and access methods will be determined during implementation.
- Question 297: Is data cleansing, deduplication, normalization, and enrichment expected from the vendor?
- Answer 297: Yes. The City expects the selected vendor to recommend and perform appropriate data cleansing, deduplication, normalization, and enrichment activities as part of the implementation, where applicable.
- Question 298: How many IT fulfillers/agents, approvers, admins, and end-user requesters require access?
- Answer 298: IT service desk agents – 32
Backend IT staff/system administrators – 2
City employees who will use the self-service portal - 894
- Question 299: Should vendors include software subscription licensing in the fee proposal, or only implementation services?
- Answer 299: Vendors should include both software subscription/licensing and implementation services in their Fee Proposal, along with any other costs required to deliver the proposed solution.
- Question 300: Should pricing be fixed fee, time-and-materials, subscription plus services, or phased options?
- Answer 300: Vendors may propose their standard pricing model. The Fee Proposal should clearly identify all costs, including software subscription/licensing, implementation services, and any optional services or pricing alternatives.
- Question 301: Does the City prefer SaaS/cloud, on-premises, private cloud, or vendor-hosted deployment?
- Answer 301: No preference.
- Question 302: Are there specific security/compliance standards required, such as SOC 2, CJIS, HIPAA, FedRAMP, StateRAMP, ISO 27001, NIST, or City-specific policies?
- Answer 302: No.
- Question 303: Are there data residency requirements for City ITSM data?
- Answer 303: The City has not identified specific data residency requirements. Vendors should describe their data hosting locations and how they address applicable security, privacy, and regulatory requirements.
- Question 304: What RPO/RTO and backup retention requirements apply?
- Answer 304: The City has not established specific RPO, RTO, or backup retention requirements. Vendors should describe their standard disaster recovery capabilities, backup retention practices, and available service level options.

Question 305: Does “Active Directory” mean on-prem AD, Microsoft Entra ID, ADFS, LDAP, or hybrid?

Answer 305: Hybrid.

Question 306: Is SSO required? If yes, what protocol is preferred: SAML, OIDC, LDAP, or another method?

Answer 306: Yes, SAML.

Question 307: Is automated user provisioning/deprovisioning required, or only authentication/profile lookup?

Answer 307: The City has not identified a specific requirement. Vendors should describe their capabilities for automated user provisioning/deprovisioning, authentication, and profile synchronization, and recommend the approach that best meets the City's needs.

Question 308: What asset fields must be synchronized from SCCM and Intune into the CMDB?

Answer 308: The City has not identified a required list of asset fields. Vendors should recommend the asset attributes that should be synchronized from SCCM and Microsoft Intune to support an accurate and effective CMDB.

Question 309: Should SCCM/Intune integration be one-way into the ITSM platform or bidirectional?

Answer 309: The City has not identified a preferred integration approach. Vendors should recommend best practices for informing and maintaining the CMDB, including whether one-way or bidirectional synchronization is appropriate for their solution.

Question 310: Are macOS, mobile devices, printers, network devices, servers, and cloud assets in scope?

Answer 310: The City has not finalized the asset types that will be managed within the solution. Vendors should describe the asset types supported by their solution and recommend best practices based on the City's requirements.

Question 311: What CI classes are in scope for the initial CMDB?

Answer 311: The City has not defined the initial CMDB scope. Vendors should recommend the appropriate configuration item (CI) classes and CMDB design based on ITIL best practices and the City's requirements.

Question 312: Does the City expect CSDM alignment or a specific CMDB data model?

Answer 312: The City has not identified a required CMDB data model or CSDM alignment. Vendors should describe their recommended approach and any industry best practices supported by their solution.

Question 313: Should CMDB population rely only on SCCM/Intune, or should vendors propose discovery/scanning tools?

Answer 313: The City is open to vendor recommendations. Vendors should describe their recommended approach for populating and maintaining the CMDB, including the use of SCCM, Microsoft Intune, discovery/scanning tools, or a combination of these capabilities.

Question 314: What CI relationships are required at go-live?

Answer 314: The City has not defined required CI relationships for go-live. Vendors should recommend an appropriate set of CI relationships for the initial implementation based on ITIL best practices and the capabilities of their solution.

Question 315: Does asset management scope include only hardware and consumables, or also software licenses, contracts, warranties, procurement, and financial data?

Answer 315: The City expects the initial asset management scope to include hardware assets, consumables, and software licenses. Vendors should also describe their capabilities for managing contracts, warranties, procurement, financial data, and other asset lifecycle information, and recommend whether those capabilities should be included in the implementation.

Question 316: Does the City require barcode/stockroom/warehouse/receiving functionality?

Answer 316: No.

Question 317: How many service catalog items are required for go-live?

Answer 317: The City currently has 12 service catalog items. Vendors should assume these will serve as the initial baseline and recommend any additions or modifications based on the capabilities of the proposed solution and industry best practices.

Question 318: Will the City provide catalog item definitions, forms, approval flows, and fulfillment steps?

Answer 318: Yes. During implementation, the City will provide available documentation and work collaboratively with the selected vendor to review, refine, and implement service catalog items, forms, approval workflows, and fulfillment processes as appropriate.

Question 319: Are SLAs, priority matrix, major incident process, or on-call escalation required?

Answer 319: The City will review and refine its SLAs, priority matrix, major incident process, and on-call escalation procedures during implementation. Vendors should describe their capabilities and recommend best practices supported by their solution.

Question 320: Should requests submitted by email create generic requests, catalog items, or route to triage?

Answer 320: The City has not identified a preferred approach. Vendors should recommend best practices for handling email-submitted requests, including whether they should create generic requests, initiate catalog items, or route to a triage process.

Question 321: Does the City require standard/normal/emergency change models, CAB, change calendar, maintenance windows, or conflict detection?

Answer 321: The City will review and refine its change management processes during implementation. Vendors should describe their capabilities for supporting standard, normal, and emergency changes, CAB, change calendars, maintenance windows, and conflict detection, and recommend best practices based on their solution.

Question 322: Are existing knowledge articles available for migration? If yes, from where and in what format?

Answer 322: No.

Question 323: Is a knowledge approval/publishing workflow required?

Answer 323: The City does not currently maintain a knowledge base. During implementation, the City will evaluate knowledge management capabilities, including approval and publishing workflows, and vendors should describe their recommended approach and best practices.

Question 324: What specific KPIs, dashboards, and report formats are required at go-live?

Answer 324: The City has not defined specific KPIs, dashboards, or report formats for go-live. During implementation, the City will review and refine its reporting requirements and align KPIs with ITIL best practices. Vendors should describe the standard dashboards, reports, and KPI capabilities included with their solution.

- Question 325: Should data be exported to external BI tools or only reported within the ITSM platform?
- Answer 325: The City has not identified a preferred reporting approach. Vendors should describe the reporting capabilities available within their solution, as well as options for integrating with external business intelligence tools, and recommend best practices based on the City's needs.
- Question 326: Are AI-assisted solution suggestions and automated categorization/routing required for go-live, optional, or future phase?
- Answer 326: The City is interested in AI-assisted capabilities, including solution suggestions and automated categorization and routing. Vendors should identify which AI capabilities are available at go-live versus those recommended for future implementation phases.
- Question 327: Does the City have policies governing generative AI, data usage, model training, or AI explainability?
- Answer 327: The City has not identified specific policies governing generative AI, data usage, model training, or AI explainability for this procurement. Vendors should describe how their AI capabilities address security, privacy, transparency, and administrative controls.
- Question 328: Which routine service management tasks should be automated first?
- Answer 328: The City has not identified specific automation priorities. During implementation, the City will work with the selected vendor to identify and prioritize automation opportunities based on business value, efficiency, and ITIL best practices.
- Question 329: How many IT staff, system administrators, approvers, managers, and end users require training?
- Answer 329: The City anticipates training for approximately 32 IT service desk agents and 2 IT system administrators. Training needs for managers, approvers, and end users will be determined during implementation based on the capabilities of the selected solution and the City's change management approach.
- Question 330: Is training expected to be onsite, remote, hybrid, recorded, train-the-trainer, or role-based classroom sessions?
- Answer 330: The City has no preferred training delivery method. Vendors should describe their standard training approach, including onsite, remote, hybrid, recorded sessions, train-the-trainer, and role-based training options, and recommend the approach they believe will best support a successful implementation.
- Question 331: What documentation formats are expected: admin guide, runbook, configuration workbook, process design documents, training guides, test scripts?
- Answer 331: The City expects implementation documentation appropriate to support ongoing administration and operation of the solution. Vendors should describe the documentation they typically provide, including administrator guides, configuration documentation, process documentation, training materials, and operational runbooks.
- Question 332: What ongoing support hours, SLA response times, support channels, maintenance windows, and duration are expected?
- Answer 332: The City expects the vendor to provide standard product support following implementation. Vendors should describe their support hours, support channels, service level commitments, maintenance windows, and available support plans.
- Question 333: Should ongoing technical support be included in base pricing or priced as optional support tiers?

Answer 333: Vendors should include their standard ongoing technical support in the base pricing and may also provide optional enhanced support tiers.

Question 334: Does the City have a desired target go-live date after September/October 2026 authorization?

Answer 334: The City has not established a target go-live date. Vendors should propose a realistic implementation schedule based on their recommended approach.

Question 335: Is a phased rollout acceptable, or does the City expect one enterprise go-live?

Answer 335: The City is open to a phased implementation. Vendors should recommend an implementation approach and deployment strategy that best supports a successful implementation.

Question 336: Will City SMEs be available for weekly workshops, design reviews, testing, and UAT?

Answer 336: Yes. City subject matter experts will be available throughout the implementation to participate in project meetings, requirements workshops, design reviews, testing, and user acceptance testing, as appropriate.

Question 337: Does the 30-sheet/60-side limit include cover letter, table of contents, dividers, or only narrative content?

Answer 337: The 30-sheet (60-side) limit applies to the proposal narrative. Cover letters, table of contents, dividers, and required forms are not included in the page limit.

Question 338: Should vendors include exceptions if the City states it will not entertain changes to the Professional Services Agreement?

Answer 338: Firms are welcome to propose changes to the Professional Services Agreement.

Question 339: Should travel expenses be included, excluded, or itemized separately?

Answer 339: Vendors should include all anticipated travel expenses in their Fee Proposal and clearly identify any associated costs.

Question 340: Are subcontractors permitted if disclosed, or does the City prefer prime-only delivery?

Answer 340: Subcontractors are permitted. Vendors should identify any proposed subcontractors and clearly describe their roles and responsibilities in the proposal.

Question 341: Must proof of insurance be submitted with proposal or only after award before work begins?

Answer 341: Only after award and before work begins.

Question 342: For a software/SaaS implementation, what environmental reporting, if any, is expected?

Answer 342: The City has not identified any environmental reporting requirements specific to this software implementation. Vendors should comply with any applicable requirements identified in the RFP.

Question 343: Are public sector references preferred or required for similar projects?

Answer 343: Vendors should provide references in accordance with the requirements identified in the RFP. Public sector references are encouraged but are not required unless otherwise specified in the RFP.

Question 344: Will shortlisted vendors be asked to demonstrate the proposed ITSM platform during interviews?

Answer 344: Yes.

- Question 345: Are AI, CMDB maturity, and asset management weighted equally within the work plan, or are some capabilities higher priority?
- Answer 345: Evaluation priorities are described in the RFP. Vendors should propose a solution that comprehensively addresses all requirements, including ITSM, CMDB, asset management, and AI capabilities, as applicable.
- Question 346: How many IT fulfillers (service desk agents, technicians, administrators, managers, and approvers) will require access to the ITSM platform?
- Answer 346: IT service desk agents – 32
Backend IT staff/system administrators – 2
- Question 347: How many City employees are expected to access the self-service portal?
- Answer 347: City employees who will use the self-service portal – 894
- Question 348: How many users will require administrative or platform configuration privileges?
- Answer 348: Backend IT staff/system administrators – 2
- Question 349: Does the City require a specific cloud hosting environment or compliance framework, including but not limited to FedRAMP Moderate, FedRAMP High, ServiceNow Government Community Cloud (GCC), GCC High, CJIS, IRS Publication 1075, Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS), or other government-specific security requirements?
- Answer 349: No.
- Question 350: Are there data residency, U.S.-hosting, or U.S.-persons-only support requirements?
- Answer 350: No.
- Question 351: Will vendors be required to complete a security assessment, vendor risk review, or cybersecurity questionnaire?
- Answer 351: No.
- Question 352: How many hardware assets are currently managed within the existing environment?
- Answer 352: We currently have approximately 2,380 assets.
- Question 353: Please provide a breakdown of assets by category (laptops, desktops, servers, network devices, mobile devices, printers, peripherals, etc.).
- Answer 353: The City currently manages approximately 2,380 IT assets. A detailed breakdown by category is not available at this time and will be reviewed during implementation.
- Question 354: Approximately how many configuration items (CIs) currently exist?
- Answer 354: The City currently manages approximately 2,380 IT assets and maintains approximately 700 configuration items (CIs) within its CMDB.
- Question 355: Please provide a list of CI classes/categories currently tracked.
- Answer 355: The City has not finalized the CI classes that will be tracked in the new solution. During implementation, the City will work with the selected vendor to review existing configuration items and establish appropriate CI classes based on the capabilities of the solution and ITIL best practices.
- Question 356: Are CI relationships currently maintained and trusted within the existing CMDB?
- Answer 356: The City maintains a CMDB but recognizes there are opportunities to improve its completeness and accuracy. During implementation, the City will work with the selected vendor to review and enhance CI relationships and overall CMDB

maturity.

Question 357: Besides SCCM and Intune, what systems currently serve as sources of asset and configuration data?

Answer 357: The City has identified Microsoft SCCM and Microsoft Intune as the primary sources of asset and configuration data. Vendors may recommend additional discovery or integration capabilities to improve the completeness and accuracy of the CMDB.

Question 358: Which Cireson/SCSM modules and capabilities are currently in use?

Answer 358: The City currently uses its existing ITSM solution for incident management, service request management, problem management, asset management, CMDB, workflows, reporting, and the employee self-service portal. Vendors should base their proposals on the requirements identified in the RFP rather than the City's current implementation.

Question 359: What are the primary business and technical drivers for replacing the current platform?

Answer 359: The City's primary drivers for replacing the current platform are to modernize its ITSM capabilities, improve asset management and CMDB maturity, enhance automation and workflow capabilities, improve the user experience, and provide a more flexible, scalable, and supportable solution aligned with current ITIL best practices.

Question 360: Which current capabilities or processes are not meeting expectations today?

Answer 360: The City is seeking improvements in asset management, CMDB maturity, workflow flexibility, automation, reporting, and overall user experience. The current platform's architecture has limited the City's ability to efficiently adapt processes and fully leverage modern ITSM capabilities aligned with ITIL best practices.

Question 361: Which existing workflows or customizations are considered business critical and must be preserved?

Answer 361: The City has not identified any existing workflows or customizations that must be preserved as-is. During implementation, the City will work with the selected vendor to review existing processes and determine which should be retained, redesigned, or replaced to align with the capabilities and best practices of the selected solution.

Question 362: Are documented ITIL processes currently established for Incident, Request, Change, Asset, Configuration, and Knowledge Management?

Answer 362: The City has established processes for incident management, service request management, problem management, asset management, and configuration management. These processes will be reviewed and refined during implementation to align with ITIL best practices. The City does not currently utilize change management or knowledge management within its existing ITSM solution.

Question 363: How many open incidents, requests, and change records currently exist?

Answer 363: The City has not inventoried the current number of open incidents, service requests, or change records. As historical ticket data is not planned for migration, this information is not expected to impact the proposed implementation.

Question 364: How many years of historical ticket data are expected to be migrated?

Answer 364: 0.

Question 365: Are ticket attachments required to be migrated?

Answer 365: No.

Question 366: Are existing service catalog items required to be migrated?

Answer 366: Yes. The City currently has 12 service catalog items that will serve as the initial baseline. During implementation, the City will work with the selected vendor to review, refine, and update these service catalog items based on the capabilities of the selected solution and ITIL best practices.

Question 367: Are existing asset and CMDB records required to be migrated?

Answer 367: Yes. The City expects current asset records and CMDB/configuration data to be migrated to the new solution. During implementation, the City will work with the selected vendor to review, cleanse, and refine this data, evaluate the use of discovery capabilities, and recommend an approach for populating and maintaining the CMDB that aligns with industry best practices and the capabilities of the proposed solution.

Question 368: How many service catalog items currently exist?

Answer 368: The City currently has approximately 12 service catalog items. During implementation, these items will be reviewed and refined to align with the capabilities and best practices of the selected solution.

Question 369: How many service catalog items are expected to be available at go-live?

Answer 369: The City anticipates that the existing 12 service catalog items will serve as the initial baseline for go-live. During implementation, the City will work with the selected vendor to review, refine, and determine whether additional service catalog items should be included based on business needs and industry best practices.

Question 370: Approximately how many knowledge articles currently exist?

Answer 370: 0.

Question 371: Are knowledge articles formally governed, reviewed, and approved today?

Answer 371: No.

Question 372: Approximately how many change requests are processed annually?

Answer 372: The City does not currently utilize change management within its existing ITSM solution and does not have annual change request volumes to provide.

Question 373: Is a Change Advisory Board (CAB) currently utilized?

Answer 373: No. The City does not currently utilize a formal Change Advisory Board (CAB). During implementation, the City will work with the selected vendor to evaluate change management processes and determine appropriate governance based on ITIL best practices.

Question 374: Is the City utilizing Active Directory, Entra ID, or a hybrid identity model?

Answer 374: Hybrid.

Question 375: Beyond Active Directory, SCCM, and Intune, what additional integrations are expected?

Answer 375: The City has not identified any additional required integrations beyond Microsoft Active Directory, Microsoft SCCM, and Microsoft Intune. Vendors are encouraged to recommend additional integrations that would provide value and align with industry best practices and the capabilities of the proposed solution.

Question 376: What email platform is currently utilized for ticketing and notifications?

Answer 376: Microsoft Exchange Online.

Question 377: Are there GIS, Public Works, Facilities, ERP, HR, or other City systems that require integration?

Answer 377: The City has not identified any additional required integrations at this time. During implementation, the City will work with the selected vendor to evaluate opportunities for integration with other City systems where they provide business value and align with the capabilities of the proposed solution.

Question 378: What reports and dashboards are considered critical at go-live?

Answer 378: The City has not identified specific reports or dashboards required for go-live. During implementation, the City will work with the selected vendor to review reporting needs, refine KPIs, and determine the reports and dashboards that best support IT operations and align with ITIL best practices.

Question 379: Are executive-level KPI and SLA dashboards required?

Answer 379: The City has not defined specific executive-level KPI or SLA dashboard requirements. During implementation, the City will work with the selected vendor to identify reporting needs and develop dashboards that support operational and executive reporting aligned with ITIL best practices.

Question 380: Is AI functionality considered required, preferred, or future-state only?

Answer 380: AI functionality is preferred but not required. Vendors should describe the AI capabilities included with their solution and identify which features are available at go-live versus those recommended for future implementation phases.

Question 381: Are there restrictions regarding the use of Generative AI technologies?

Answer 381: The City has not identified specific restrictions regarding the use of generative AI for this procurement. Vendors should describe how their AI capabilities address security, privacy, administrative controls, and responsible use.

Question 382: What are the highest-priority automation opportunities the City would like addressed?

Answer 382: The City has not identified specific automation priorities. During implementation, the City will work with the selected vendor to identify and prioritize automation opportunities that improve service delivery, operational efficiency, asset management, and CMDB accuracy, while aligning with ITIL and industry best practices.

Question 383: Are offshore or nearshore implementation resources permitted?

Answer 383: Yes. Offshore or nearshore implementation resources are permitted. Vendors should clearly identify the roles, responsibilities, and locations of all proposed implementation resources in their proposal.

Question 384: Are there restrictions regarding offshore access to production or sensitive data?

Answer 384: No.

Question 385: What is the desired implementation timeline and target go-live date?

Answer 385: The City has not established a target go-live date. Vendors should propose a realistic implementation timeline and deployment approach based on their recommended methodology. A phased implementation is acceptable.

Question 386: What City resources will be available to support workshops, testing, training, and data validation?

Answer 386: The City will provide appropriate subject matter experts, project stakeholders, and technical resources throughout the implementation to support requirements workshops, solution design, data validation, testing, training, and user acceptance testing, as needed.

Question 387: What training audiences are anticipated (administrators, fulfillers, end users)?

Answer 387: The City anticipates training for IT system administrators and IT service desk staff. Training needs for managers, approvers, and end users will be evaluated during implementation based on the capabilities of the selected solution and the City's change management approach.

Question 388: What are the expected post-go-live support hours and service levels?

Answer 388: The City expects the vendor to provide standard post-go-live product support. Vendors should describe their support hours, service level commitments, support channels, and available support options as part of their proposal.

Question 389: Is 24x7 vendor support required?

Answer 389: No. The City does not require 24x7 vendor support. Vendors should describe their standard support hours and available support options.

Question 390: Are there specific SLA requirements for ongoing support and maintenance?

Answer 390: The City has not established specific SLA requirements for ongoing support and maintenance. Vendors should describe their standard service level commitments and available support options.

Question 391: Do you expect automated Discovery or are you planning to populate the CMDB only through SCCM/Intune imports?

Answer 391: The City is open to vendor recommendations. During implementation, the City will evaluate the use of automated discovery capabilities in addition to Microsoft SCCM and Microsoft Intune to populate and maintain an accurate CMDB aligned with industry best practices.

Question 392: Are you looking for true IT Asset Management with purchasing, stockrooms, warranties and lifecycle management or simply an inventory of devices?

Answer 392: The City is seeking a comprehensive IT Asset Management solution that includes hardware assets, consumables, software licenses, and asset lifecycle management. During implementation, the City will work with the selected vendor to evaluate additional capabilities, such as purchasing, stockrooms, contracts, and warranties, and determine the appropriate scope based on business needs and industry best practices.

Question 393: Are you looking for generative AI capabilities or rule-based automation only?

Answer 393: The City is interested in both generative AI capabilities and rule-based automation. Vendors should describe the capabilities included with their solution and recommend an approach that aligns with the City's needs and industry best practices.

Question 394: How many and what type of devices are you looking to track with asset management? Can you break down the type and quantity of each type of devices you are looking to track with asset management? Laptops, desktops, mobile devices, servers, network, virtual, etc.

Answer 394: The City currently manages approximately 2,380 IT assets. A detailed breakdown by asset type is not available at this time. Vendors should propose an asset management solution capable of managing a broad range of IT assets, including laptops, desktops, mobile devices, servers, network equipment, peripherals, software licenses, and other asset types commonly found in a municipal IT environment.

Question 395: How many IT staff will be using the platform daily?

Answer 395: IT service desk agents – 32

Question 396: Approximately how many City employees will be submitting requests?

Answer 396: City employees who will use the self-service portal - 894

Question 397: Do you currently have a ticketing system? If so what product?

Answer 397: Yes, Cireson.

Question 398: How many technicians (people working / modifying tickets) will be using the system?

Answer 398: IT service desk agents – 32

Question 399: If you already have a ticketing system, how many tickets do you open in a year?

Answer 399: Approximately 15,000 to 20,000 per year.

Question 400: Are you wanting a SaaS solution or an on-premises solution?

Answer 400: The City has no preference regarding the deployment model. Vendors may propose either a SaaS/cloud-hosted or on-premises solution, provided it meets the requirements identified in the RFP.

Question 401: Do you already have your Service Catalog built / defined or are you looking to the vendor to also help structure the Service Catalog?

Answer 401: The City currently has an existing service catalog with approximately 12 service catalog items. During implementation, the City expects to work with the selected vendor to review, refine, and expand the service catalog as appropriate, leveraging the capabilities of the proposed solution and industry best practices.

Question 402: Do you already have the processes defined for problem management or are you looking to the vendor to help define and structure these processes?

Answer 402: The City currently has problem management processes in place. During implementation, the City expects to work with the selected vendor to review, refine, and enhance these processes to align with the capabilities of the proposed solution and ITIL best practices.

Question 403: How many Configuration Items do you expect to have in your CMDB?

Answer 403: The City currently manages approximately 2,380 IT assets and maintains approximately 700 configuration items (CIs) within its CMDB. During implementation, the City expects to review and enhance the CMDB, including evaluating automated discovery and vendor recommendations, which may result in changes to the number and types of configuration items managed.

Question 404: What is your desired implementation timeline?

Answer 404: The City has not established a desired implementation timeline. Vendors should propose a realistic implementation schedule based on their recommended methodology, project approach, and resource requirements. A phased implementation approach is acceptable.

Question 405: Do we need to respond as to how we support each of the requirements listed in bullet points?

- If yes, do you want these in an appendix, or in the main body of the response?

Answer 405: Yes. Vendors should address how their proposed solution meets the requirements identified in the RFP. Responses may be included in either the main body of the proposal or an appendix, provided they are clearly organized and easy to reference.

Question 406: How many Analysts will be working on the records day to day?

- Full time in the system:
- Part time in the system:

Answer 406: IT service desk agents – 32

Question 407: What is your AD situation; Entra in the cloud, or on-premises AD?

Answer 407: Hybrid.

Question 408: Will you have users from outside the city logging in? How would we get those users into the system?

Answer 408: No.

Question 409: How long have you had your current ITSM solution in place?

Answer 409: Approximately 10 years.

Question 410: Data migration from your current solution? Is it on premises? SQL?

Answer 410: The City's current Cireson/System Center Service Manager (SCSM) environment is deployed on-premises. Vendors should assume that data migration will be performed from the existing on-premises environment. The City will provide appropriate access to the required data sources during implementation.

Question 411: How many devices are you wishing to track in the Asset Management solution?

- Server
- Software
- Phones
- Computers
- Etc.

Answer 411: The City currently manages approximately 2,380 IT assets. A detailed breakdown by asset type is not available at this time. The City expects the Asset Management solution to support a broad range of asset types, including servers, software licenses, computers, laptops, mobile devices, network equipment, peripherals, consumables, and other IT assets commonly found in a municipal IT environment. During implementation, the City will work with the selected vendor to refine asset classifications and lifecycle management processes.

Question 412: If our solution also has a discovery and software licensing management element, are you interested in pricing options on this component?

Answer 412: Yes. The City is interested in understanding available discovery and software license management capabilities. Vendors may include pricing for these components and should clearly identify whether they are included in the proposed solution or offered as optional functionality.

Question 413: Do you require on-site consulting time?

Answer 413: The City does not require a specific amount of on-site consulting time. Vendors should recommend an appropriate balance of on-site and remote consulting services based on their implementation approach and identify any on-site activities they believe are critical to a successful implementation.

Question 414: Where would you say your maturity level is from a process standpoint?

Answer 414: The City has not conducted a formal ITSM process maturity assessment. Vendors should base their proposals on the requirements identified in the RFP. During implementation, the City expects to work with the selected vendor to assess current processes and identify opportunities for improvement aligned with ITIL and industry best practices.

Question 415: Are there any additional integrations, aside from SCCM/Intune/Entra, which need to be considered?

- If yes, please provide the software name and a brief description/use case of what needs to be accomplished

Answer 415: The City has not identified any additional required integrations beyond Microsoft

SCCM, Microsoft Intune, and Microsoft Entra ID at this time. During implementation, the City will work with the selected vendor to evaluate opportunities for additional integrations that provide business value and align with the capabilities of the proposed solution.

Question 416: When does licensing on your existing ITSM software (Ciseron/SCSM) expire?

Answer 416: The City's current licensing term is not material to this procurement. Vendors should base their proposals on the requirements identified in the RFP.

Question 417: Can you share who the other bidders are?

Answer 417: A proposal tab will be provided shortly after the proposal due date that will outline the names of all firms who submitted a proposal.

Question 418: Can you please confirm City of Ann Arbor's current budget cycle, and if this project included/approved in the current year's budget?

Answer 418: The City operates on a fiscal year budget cycle beginning July 1. A project budget has not yet been established. Vendors should base their proposals on the requirements and procurement schedule identified in the RFP.

Question 419: Will all questions be shared with all bidders?

Answer 419: Yes.

Question 420: To help us scope our response appropriately: we provide ITSM/ESM software platforms along with implementation, configuration, and support services delivered by our team. We do not provide staff augmentation or embedded personnel to work tickets on the City's behalf. Given that, could the City confirm whether the intent of this RFP is a software subscription with implementation and support services (our model), versus an ongoing staffing/service-desk-as-a-service arrangement? This will help us determine fit and structure our fee proposal correctly.

Answer 420: The intent of this procurement is to acquire an ITSM software solution, including implementation, configuration, training, and ongoing product support. The City is not seeking staff augmentation, embedded personnel, or an outsourced service desk as part of this RFP. Vendors should structure their proposals accordingly.

Question 421: How many total employees/end users will use the new ITSM platform (portal submitters, not just IT staff)?

Answer 421: IT service desk agents – 32
Backend IT staff/system administrators – 2
City employees who will use the self-service portal - 894

Question 422: How many IT staff/agents will need licensed access to the backend system?

Answer 422: IT service desk agents – 32
Backend IT staff/system administrators – 2

Question 423: Roughly how many assets (devices, servers, network equipment) will need to be tracked in the CMDB?

Answer 423: The City currently manages approximately 2,380 IT assets and maintains approximately 700 configuration items (CIs) within its CMDB. During implementation, the City expects to review and enhance the CMDB, including evaluating automated discovery and vendor recommendations, which may result in changes to the number and types of configuration items managed.

Question 424: What's the current monthly/annual ticket volume in Cireson/SCSM (incidents + service requests)?

Answer 424: Approximately 15,000 to 20,000 per year.

Question 425: Does the City's IT department support other City entities beyond core municipal government (e.g., Ann Arbor District Library, DDA, AAATA)? If so, are those users in scope?

Answer 425: No.

Question 426: How many years of historical ticket data need to be migrated from Cireson/SCSM, and is full migration required or is a summary/archive approach acceptable?

Answer 426: The City does not require migration of historical ticket data from Cireson/SCSM, including open or closed incidents, service requests, problem records, or change records. No fixed number of years of ticket history is required to be migrated. The City expects current asset and CMDB/configuration data to be migrated, and vendors may recommend an archive or search-only approach for historical ticket data if appropriate.

Question 427: How many existing knowledge base articles need to be migrated?

Answer 427: 0.

Question 428: Beyond AD, SCCM, and Intune, are there other systems requiring integration (e.g., HR/HRIS, financial system)?

Answer 428: The City has not identified any additional required integrations beyond Microsoft Entra ID, Microsoft SCCM, and Microsoft Intune. Integrations with other enterprise systems, such as HR, financial, facilities, GIS, or other City applications, are not within the scope of this RFP. During implementation, the City may evaluate future integration opportunities where they provide business value and align with the capabilities of the selected solution.

Question 429: Is there a current CMDB in place today, or would this be a net-new build?

Answer 429: The City currently maintains a CMDB within its existing ITSM solution. The selected vendor will be expected to migrate and enhance the existing CMDB rather than implement a net-new CMDB. During implementation, the City will work with the selected vendor to review, cleanse, and improve CMDB data quality, evaluate automated discovery capabilities, and align the CMDB with industry best practices and the capabilities of the proposed solution.

Question 430: Is there a budgeted range or not-to-exceed amount for this project the City can share, to help offerors right-size their proposal?

Answer 430: A project budget has not yet been established.

Question 431: Is the City open to a multi-year subscription term with a corresponding discount, or is this evaluated strictly as an annual cost?

Answer 431: Yes. The City is open to either a one-year or multi-year subscription term. Vendors should provide pricing for the subscription term(s) they recommend and clearly identify any discounts associated with multi-year commitments.

Question 432: Can the interview presentation (Section III) be conducted in person in Ann Arbor, or is a virtual option available?

Answer 432: Virtual is available and preferred.

Question 433: What does the City have tasked as its #1 goal?

Answer 433: The City's primary goal is to implement a modern, scalable IT Service Management solution that improves service delivery, enhances the user experience, strengthens asset management and CMDB capabilities, supports automation, and provides a flexible platform that aligns with ITIL and industry best practices. The City is seeking a long-term solution that can evolve with its operational needs.

Question 434: What strategic initiative is this engagement in support of?

Answer 434: This engagement supports the City's strategic initiative to modernize its IT service management capabilities by replacing its existing ITSM platform with a modern, scalable solution. The initiative is intended to improve service delivery, enhance operational efficiency, strengthen asset and configuration management, increase automation, and provide a flexible platform that supports the City's long-term technology strategy and evolving business needs.

Question 435: What roadblocks or challenges are the City experiencing in delivering on this strategic initiative?

Answer 435: The City's current ITSM platform has limitations that make it more difficult to modernize and mature IT service management practices. Key challenges include improving asset management and CMDB maturity, increasing automation, enhancing reporting and analytics, improving the end-user experience, and adopting modern capabilities that better align with current ITIL and industry best practices. The City is seeking a more flexible, scalable platform to support these objectives.

Question 436: What future projects and/or initiatives are dependent on/ awaiting the completion of this engagement?

Answer 436: The City has not identified any specific future projects that are dependent upon completion of this engagement. However, the selected ITSM platform is expected to serve as a foundational capability that supports the City's ongoing IT service management maturity, future automation initiatives, enhanced asset and configuration management, and continued modernization of IT service delivery.

Question 437: What capability does the City currently not have that you are looking to have at the end of this engagement?

Answer 437: The City is seeking capabilities that will enhance and mature its current ITSM environment rather than introduce a single new capability. Desired outcomes include improved automation, stronger asset management and CMDB maturity, enhanced reporting and analytics, a modern self-service experience, greater workflow flexibility, and the ability to leverage AI capabilities where they provide operational value. The City also seeks a solution that better aligns with current ITIL and industry best practices and can scale to support future needs.

Question 438: Is there a prevailing event/initiative/etc. that triggered the creation and release of this solicitation?

Answer 438: No.

Question 439: On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate your ITIL process maturity? Why?

Answer 439: The City has not conducted a formal assessment of its ITIL process maturity and therefore is not assigning a maturity rating. Vendors should base their proposals on the requirements identified in the RFP. During implementation, the City expects to work with the selected vendor to assess current processes, identify opportunities for improvement, and further align IT service management practices with ITIL and industry best practices.

Question 440: Does the City currently distinguish between Incidents and Service Requests?

Answer 440: Yes.

Question 441: How many forms do you have on your current solution?

Answer 441: 12.

Question 442: Are IT onboarding workflows in scope? Please provide an overview of what is expected to be in the new solution.

Answer 442: Yes. IT onboarding workflows are within the scope of this RFP. The City currently has approximately 15 workflows, including IT onboarding workflows, that will serve as the baseline for implementation. During implementation, the City will work with the selected vendor to review, refine, and optimize these workflows based on business needs, the capabilities of the proposed solution, and industry best practices.

Question 443: Are IT offboarding workflows in scope? Please provide an overview of what is expected to be in the new solution.

Answer 443: Yes. IT offboarding workflows are within the scope of this RFP. The City currently has approximately 15 workflows, including IT offboarding workflows, that will serve as the baseline for implementation. During implementation, the City will work with the selected vendor to review, refine, and optimize these workflows based on business needs, the capabilities of the proposed solution, and industry best practices.

Question 444: Do you currently have a self service portal?

Answer 444: Yes.

Question 445: Do you currently have chat in place?

Answer 445: No.

Question 446: Do you currently have SLAs? If so, please describe them at a high-level.

Answer 446: Yes. The City currently utilizes service level agreements (SLAs) within its existing ITSM solution. During implementation, the City will work with the selected vendor to review and refine its SLA framework, including priorities, response and resolution targets, and escalation rules, to align with business needs and ITIL best practices.

Question 447: What is your current IT asset management solution?

Answer 447: The City currently uses Cireson integrated with Microsoft System Center Service Manager (SCSM) for IT service management, including its current IT asset management capabilities. The City is seeking a modern solution that provides enhanced IT asset management capabilities aligned with the requirements identified in the RFP.

Question 448: Are there any sources other than Intune and SCCM from which we will need to bring in asset data? (e.g., one-time import of an existing spreadsheet)

Answer 448: The City has identified Microsoft Intune, Microsoft SCCM, and its existing Cireson/System Center Service Manager (SCSM) environment as the primary sources of asset data. During implementation, the City will work with the selected vendor to determine whether any supplemental data sources or one-time imports are appropriate to support asset management and CMDB accuracy.

Question 449: Do you currently have Knowledge Articles? If so, where do they reside (e.g., SharePoint)?

Answer 449: No.

Question 450: Does the solution need to be in a FedRAMP certified environment?

Answer 450: No.

Question 451: What processes (e.g., Incident, Request, Change, etc.) are in scope of the initial implementation?

Answer 451: Vendors should base their proposals on the requirements identified in the RFP. During implementation, the City will work with the selected vendor to review and refine these processes in alignment with the capabilities of the proposed solution

and ITIL best practices.

Question 452: What processes are in scope and not in place at the City today?

Answer 452: Vendors should base their proposals on the requirements identified in the RFP. During implementation, the City will work with the selected vendor to review and refine these processes in alignment with the capabilities of the proposed solution and ITIL best practices.

Question 453: Are you looking for agents to be able to complete their work via a mobile app?

Answer 453: The City considers agent mobile application capabilities to be a desirable feature but not a requirement for this procurement. Vendors are encouraged to describe any mobile capabilities included with their proposed solution.

Question 454: Are you looking to have employees be able to submit tickets via a mobile app?

Answer 454: The City considers mobile application capabilities to be a desirable feature but not a requirement for this procurement. Vendors are encouraged to describe any mobile capabilities included with their proposed solution.

Question 455: What integrations are in scope of the initial implementation? Please provide the tool and the use case; e.g., SCCM and InTune for CMDB population.

Answer 455: The initial implementation includes the following integrations:

Microsoft Entra ID – User authentication and identity management.

Microsoft SCCM – Asset discovery, inventory, and CMDB population.

Microsoft Intune – Asset discovery, inventory, and CMDB population.

The City is also open to vendor recommendations for additional discovery capabilities or tools that improve the accuracy and completeness of the CMDB and align with industry best practices. No other enterprise system integrations are within the scope of this RFP.

Question 456: Do you have any non-IT departments using the SCSM that will need to be moved onto the new solution?

Answer 456: No.

Question 457: What data, if any, need to be migrated from the current solution?

Answer 457: The City expects the migration of users, groups, asset records, CMDB/configuration data, service catalog items, workflows, and other configuration necessary to support the new solution. Historical incident, service request, problem, and change records are not required to be migrated. During implementation, the City will work with the selected vendor to validate the final migration scope, data mapping, data quality, and opportunities to improve asset and CMDB data through discovery and industry best practices.

Question 458: Does the City have a target go-live date or implementation completion date that respondents should use when developing the project schedule?

Answer 458: The City has not established a target go-live date or implementation completion date. Vendors should propose a realistic implementation schedule based on their recommended methodology, project approach, and resource requirements.

Question 459: Are there any blackout periods, fiscal year constraints, or other scheduling considerations that should be reflected in the proposed implementation plan?

Answer 459: No.

Question 460: How many employees does the City have?

Answer 460: 894.

Question 461: How many IT employees does the City have?

Answer 461: 32.

Question 462: How many employees will need to work on IT tickets within the solution (i.e., how many fulfillers)? Please provide a breakdown by department or function.

Answer 462: 32.

Question 463: What tool (or tools) aside from Cireson / SCSM is the City currently using to meet the ITSM needs outlined in the RFP?

Answer 463: The City currently utilizes Cireson integrated with Microsoft System Center Service Manager (SCSM) as its primary IT Service Management solution. Microsoft SCCM and Microsoft Intune are used to support asset inventory and configuration management. No other ITSM tools are within the scope of this procurement.

Question 464: Can you please confirm that there is not a digital copy of the fee proposal that should be submitted?

Answer 464: Correct. Fees should be provided in paper form as outlined in the RFP Document.

Question 465: The RFP limits proposals to 30 sheets (60 sides), excluding resumes and required attachments. Are cover pages, table of contents, divider pages, and appendix materials excluded from this limit?

Answer 465: The 30-sheet (60-side) limit applies to the proposal narrative. Cover letters, table of contents, dividers, and required forms are not included in the page limit.

Question 466: The RFP states that the City will not entertain changes to its Professional Services Agreement. Should vendors identify contractual exceptions within their proposal for awareness during evaluation, or will no exceptions be considered?

Answer 466: Firms are welcome to propose changes to the Professional Services Agreement.

Question 467: What was the annual spend under the previous contract for these services?

Answer 467: \$18,125.

Question 468: If this is a new contract, what is the estimated annual budget?

Answer 468: A project budget has not yet been established.

Question 469: Is the agency open to a hybrid delivery model utilizing a combination of onshore and offshore resources?

Answer 469: It is preferred that the resources are located in the US but not required.

Question 470: Will the work be performed onsite, remotely, or through a hybrid arrangement?

Answer 470: Remote/virtual is preferred.

Question 471: Would it be possible to consider a 1–2 week extension to the proposal submission deadline?

Answer 471: No.

Question 472: Is this contract intended for a single vendor or for multiple vendors?

Answer 472: The City intends to award a contract to a single vendor.

Question 473: Who is the current or previous incumbent vendor for these services?

Answer 473: Cireson.

Question 474: Are there any challenges, gaps, or pain points with the current solution or contractor that the agency is looking to address through this procurement?

Answer 474: Yes. The City is seeking to address limitations in its current ITSM solution related

to flexibility, automation, asset management, CMDB maturity, reporting, and the overall user experience. The City is also looking to better align its IT service management practices with current ITIL and industry best practices while implementing a modern, scalable platform that can support future needs, including AI capabilities where they provide operational value.

Question 475: Is there a projected contract award date and anticipated start date?

Answer 475: Please see the schedule in the RFP.

Question 476: Are there any mandatory subcontracting goals associated with this contract?

Answer 476: No.

Question 477: Is there a projected award and start date?

Answer 477: Please see the schedule in the RFP.

Offerors are responsible for any conclusions that they may draw from the information contained in the Addendum.