Finance Department
Purchasing Division

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)
Specification No. 27-11797-C
FOR
ServiceNow Professional Services
PROPOSALS WILL NOT BE OPENED AND READ PUBLICLY

ADDENDUM "C"
11/10/2026

Dear Proposer:

Questions received from proposers along with answers are attached.

Proposals/bids must be received no later than 2:00 pm, on Friday, November 20, 2026. All responses should be sent via email to Solicitations@berkeleyca.gov and have **"ServiceNow Professional Services"** and **Specification No. 27-11797-C** indicated in the subject line of the email. Please submit one (1) PDF of the technical proposal. Corresponding cost proposal shall be submitted as a separate PDF document.

Proposals will not be accepted after the date and time stated above.

We look forward to receiving and reviewing your proposal.

Sincerely,

Henry Oyekanmi
Finance Director

Addendum "C"

Questions and Answers for Specification No. **27-11797-C**
ServiceNow Professional Services

The City of Berkeley has received questions from some potential respondents regarding Specification No. 27-11797-C, ServiceNow Professional Services. In an effort to provide the same information to all, listed below are the questions received to date, with responses from City staff.

1. Q. We are reviewing RFP 27-11797-C, ServiceNow Professional Services. Section III.5 requires completion of Attachment N, the Cost Proposal spreadsheet, but we could not locate it in the RFP PDF or on the opportunity webpage. Could you please provide the spreadsheet or direct us to its download location?
1. A. Addendum A, which includes the Attachment N Cost Proposal spreadsheet, is available on the City's ServiceNow Professional Services RFP page. From the ServiceNow Professional Services RFP page, click on "Additional Files" button to view the list of addendums for download.

2. Q. Could you please provide Attachment N, the Price Proposal form, if it is available?
2. A. Refer to question #1.

3. Q. Your assistance in sending the RFP would be highly appreciated.
3. A. The RFP is available for download on the City's website.

4. Q. If the prime contractor is not a ServiceNow Partner, may the prime satisfy the ServiceNow Partnership requirement through a subcontractor or teaming partner that is a current ServiceNow Partner?
4. A. The prime contractor must be a ServiceNow Partner. The City contracts only with the prime contractor, which is responsible for its subcontractors, their qualification/certification, and performance of their work. All City contract requirements, terms, agreements, privacy and security apply to the subcontractors.

All sub-contractors and employees who will work on the project must be listed and clearly called out on the RFP's response. No sub-contracting with companies that were not listed on RFP response.

5. Q. Is subcontracting or teaming with other firms permitted under this solicitation?
5. A. Refer to question #4.

6. Q. Is offshore delivery permitted for any portion of the scope? If so, are there any restrictions on offshore personnel or locations?
6. A. The vendor is responsible for conducting background checks, vetting personnel, and ensuring their compliance with City contract requirements, terms, agreements, privacy, and security. The City reserves the right to request that personnel be removed from the account when deemed necessary. Please find the uploaded addendum for the City's Privacy and Security policy on the City's ServiceNow Professional Services RFP page. Refer to question #22.

7. Q. Is remote delivery permitted, or does the City require personnel to perform services onsite?
7. A. Fully remote delivery is permitted and must be able to support City's business hours. There are no requirements to perform services onsite.

8. Q. May the prime contractor use the qualifications, past performance, project experience, and client references of a proposed subcontractor or teaming partner to satisfy the RFP's experience and reference requirements?
8. A. The experience and reference requirements must be based on projects in which the prime contractor participated. They cannot be based on a subcontractor's project in which the prime contractor was not involved.

9. Q. Does the City have an estimated Not-to-Exceed (NTE) budget, contract ceiling, or anticipated total contract value for this procurement?
9. A. The City Council approved $150,000 for the RFP contract award covering FY27 through FY29. The contract may be renewed or extended with additional funding.

10. Q. Is there an incumbent contractor currently providing the ServiceNow professional services?
10. A. Yes

11. Q. If there is an incumbent contractor currently providing these services, will the incumbent be eligible to submit a proposal in response to this solicitation? If so, will the incumbent be evaluated under the same criteria and scoring methodology as all other proposers?
11. A. Yes and Yes.

12. Q. Is the City seeking to maintain the existing service provider relationship, or is the City specifically seeking a change in service provider through this procurement?
12. A. City seeks the best contract for a service provider.

13. Q. Can the City confirm whether this solicitation is a recompete, continuation, or replacement of the prior ServiceNow professional services contract awarded to Alcor Solutions, Inc.?
13. A. Recompete

14. Q. Section III (Submission Requirements), page 4, states that the proposal should not exceed 25 pages. Please confirm whether the 25-page limit applies only to the main technical proposal or also includes required forms, certifications, and other attachments.
14. A. The 25 pages apply to the entire proposal excluding attachments A, B, C, D, E, F, G, and N, personnel resumes, and certifications. Append the attachments, personnel resumes and certifications at the end of the technical proposal.

15. Q. Attachment A lists the following submission items: proposal describing the service, contractor identification and company information, and client references. Please confirm whether contractor identification and company information, along with client references, must be included in the single PDF containing the service proposal.
15. A. Include in a single pdf.

16. Q. Please confirm whether a cover letter and an executive summary may be included in the technical proposal. If permitted, please clarify whether the pages containing the cover letter and executive summary count toward the 25-page limit.
16. A. Cover letter and executive summary is part of the 25-page limit.

17. Q. We understand that resumes submitted as an appendix are excluded from the 25-page proposal limit. Please confirm whether our understanding is correct.
17. A. Refer to question #14

18. Q. Please confirm the anticipated initial contract term, including the start and end dates, and whether any renewal or extension options are available.
18. A. Refer to question #9. Contract date is April 21, 2027 – June 30, 2029.

19. Q. Please clarify whether the resources assigned to this engagement are required to work onsite at the City of Berkeley's premises or whether remote service delivery is permitted.
19. A. Refer to question #7

20. Q. The RFP includes references to both Professional Services and Managed Services. Could the City please clarify the intended service model and confirm whether the scope is expected to be delivered as Professional Services, Managed Services, or a combination of both?
20. A. Combination of both

21. Q. Under the Client References requirement, the RFP states that references should be California cities or other large public sector entities. As this requirement is important to our qualification for this opportunity, would the City consider relaxing the requirement to accept references from private-sector clients, provided the referenced projects demonstrate comparable ServiceNow scope, complexity, and support experience?
21. A. The preference is California cities, and public sectors references. You may list private-sector clients if you don't have the public sector references.

22. Q. Could you please confirm whether qualified international vendors may participate if they can satisfy the partnership, insurance, security, and contracting requirements?
22. A. Qualified international vendors may participate provided all the City requirements can be met.

23. Q. Nuclear Free Disclosure (Attachment C). Would providing IT project portfolio management (ServiceNow SPM) configuration services to the management and operating contractor of a U.S. Department of Energy national site be considered "work for nuclear weapons" under BMC 12.90.130? The services are IT administration software configuration only.
23. A. Providing configuration services to a Department of Energy national site in itself is not considered work for nuclear weapons. The City will need additional details on the type of work and location to evaluate.

24. Q. Attachment N, Sheet 1. The Total formula sums rows 7 to 9 and excludes Evaluation Project #2. Should all four cost categories be included in the total?
24. A. Yes, the sum should include Evaluation Project #2. Please download the updated Attachment N from the City's ServiceNow Professional Services RFP page.

25. Q. Monthly managed services. Sheet 2 references "up to [10] hours per month." Please confirm the intended monthly hour allowance, and whether break/fix support counts against it.
25. A. Break/fix support counts against it. The intended monthly allowance will be defined during contracting.

26. Q. Environment. Beyond the DEV and Production instances named in the upgrade sheet, does the City maintain any additional instances (e.g., TEST)? Which ServiceNow subscriptions are licensed (e.g., ITSM Pro, SPM, HAM Pro, SAM Pro, IntegrationHub tier)?
26. A. Two instances (DEV and Prod) only.

City has the following subscription licenses:
PROD14947 Workplace Service Delivery – Workplace User v3
PROD16951 Strategic Portfolio Management Standard-User

PROD22417 Integration Hub Starter v4- Transactions (Monthly)
PROD12015 Application Portfolio Management-User
PROD17243 IT Service Management Standard – Fulfiller User
PROD15033 Software Asset Management Professional
PROD17800 Business Stakeholder User
PROD11655 ServiceNow custom tables
PROD12492 ServiceNow Agile Team

27. Q. Volume. Approximately how many fulfiller licences, end users, and monthly incidents and requests does the platform handle?

27. A.

- 65 ITSM Fulfiller licenses
- 1800 end users
- 46 PPM licenses
- 10 Business Stakeholder licenses.

ITSM is averaging 345 incidents and 360 requests per month. These ITSM tickets are handled by the I.T. Helpdesk. Out of these monthly tickets, there could be 1 or 2 tickets related to ServiceNow platform.

28. Q. Transition. Is the incumbent partner contractually required to support knowledge transfer through June 15, 2027?

28. A. Incumbent partner is not contractually required to support knowledge transfer. The City's ServiceNow Administrators can provide access, available requirements and runbook documentations, and knowledge transfer. The City will work with the incumbent for possible knowledge transfer and support during the transition.

29. Q. Work location. Is fully remote delivery acceptable, with on-site attendance as needed? Does the City require contractor personnel to be U.S. citizens, or require that all work be performed from within the United States?

29. A. Refer to question #6, and #7.

30. Q. Term. What contract term and option years does the City anticipate?

30. A. Refer to question #9

31. Q. Page limit. Are resumes and the required City forms excluded from the 25-page limit?

31. A. Refer to question #14

32. Q. Budget scope. The current support contract also covers the City's Intranet. Approximately what share of annual support spend and hours has gone to ServiceNow, and how many hours per month has managed support averaged?

32. A. The bulk of the incumbent contract is supporting ServiceNow. There was no monthly ServiceNow managed services support established. The City wants to evaluate managed services option for the new contract.

33. Q. Could you please confirm whether the references must be exclusively from California-based or other public-sector entities, or whether similar commercial/private-sector references and references from clients in other states would also be acceptable?

33. A. Refer to question #21

34. Q. What is the current ServiceNow release/family, and when was the last major upgrade completed?

34. A. Australia, upgraded in June, 2026.

35. Q. How many instances does the City have (e.g., Prod, Test, Dev), and are there plans to add any?

35. A. 2 instances (DEV, and PROD). No plans to add new instances.

36. Q. What ServiceNow subscriptions and license tiers does the City hold for ITSM, ITAM (HAM/SAM Pro), PPM/SPM, and the platform (e.g., Standard/Pro/Enterprise), and what IntegrationHub entitlement is included?

36. A. Refer to questions #26

37. Q. Approximately how many fulfiller/ITIL users, requesters, and Agent mobile app users does the City have?

37. A. Refer to question #27. Approximately 20 mobile app users.

38. Q. Approximately how many records exist for the key tables: monthly incidents and requests, Cis in the CMDB, hardware assets, software installations, and active PPM demands and projects?

38. A. Refer to question #27.
CI in the CMDB: 123K
Hardware Assets: 20K
Software Installations: 554K
Active demands: 300
Active projects: 500

39. Q. How many catalog items, record producers, and active workflows/flows are in production?

39. A. Active Catalog Items: approx. 30
Active record producers: approx. 32
Active workflows: approx. 30

40. Q. Can the City estimate the extent of customization, for example the number of custom tables, custom script includes and business rules, and modified out-of-box objects?

40. A. Custom tables: approx.12
Custom script includes, and business rules: approx. 200
Modified out-of-box objects: approx. 300

41. Q. Please describe the custom PPM demand scoring and ranking application: is it a scoped application or global customization, approximately how many components does it have, and is any documentation available?

41. A. The scoring and ranking application business purpose is for City Councilmembers to score their proposed idea/demand items, and to rank the proposal on a re-weighted ranking algorithm. There are no enhancement or remediation needs at this moment. The Custom PPM scoring and ranking application utilizes the PPM demand tables. It is a global scope application with custom views, fields, scripts, ranking algorithm, business rules, ACL, report to a subset of demands based on a specific demand project type and program. There are around 500 records total. The requirements document is available.

42. Q. Which modules are in scope for the Service Portal, and is the Employee Center or a custom portal theme in use?

42. A. The Service Portal (/sp) and stock theme. Employee Center is not deployed.

43. Q. Does the City use Discovery, Service Mapping, or other ITOM capabilities, or is CMDB population limited to the listed integrations?
43. A. Limited to the listed integrations.

44. Q. How many MID Servers are deployed, where are they hosted (on-premises or Azure), and who maintains the underlying servers?
44. A. Total of two MID servers. One MID server per ServiceNow instance. They are hosted on-premise and managed by the City. As necessary, the vendor resources can be granted server access.

45. Q. For each listed integration (SSO, LDAP, Intune, SolarWinds, Microsoft 365, Adobe Creative Cloud, Azure), is it built with an out-of-box Store app or Service Graph Connector, IntegrationHub spokes, or custom code (REST/SOAP/scripted)?
45. A.

- Microsoft Intune, Microsoft 365/Azure and Adobe creative cloud – Out of the box API and service graph connectors.
- SSO – SAML
- SolarWinds – Import set
- LDAP – LDAPS via MID server

46. Q. Is LDAP still actively used alongside Azure AD/Entra ID SSO, or is a consolidation to Entra ID planned?
46. A. LDAP still active. The City would consider consolidation if it needed.

47. Q. Are there any integrations not shown in the architecture diagram, such as email, Teams, a monitoring or alerting tool, HR or ERP systems, or telephony?
47. A. Inbound and outbound email.

48. Q. What is the historical monthly volume of support tickets raised to the current ServiceNow support partner or internal platform team, broken down by priority and category (incident, minor enhancement, request)?
48. A. Currently, the City ServiceNow administrators work on the 1 to 2 tickets or requests related to the platform. They are low-priority tickets.

49. Q. What support hours are required: business hours Pacific Time (e.g., 8 AM–5 PM, Monday–Friday), extended hours, or 24x7 for P1 issues?
49. A. Support during City's business hours 8 AM–5 PM Pacific Time, Monday–Friday. Weekend and Holidays are coverage are not expected. Deployments and upgrades are performed outside of business hours on Wednesdays, after 6pm Pacific Time or over the weekend.

50. Q. Are there existing SLAs and KPIs with the current provider that the City would like to retain or improve upon?
50. A. The City does not have pre-defined Service Level Agreements (SLAs) or Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). We request vendors to propose their SLAs and KPIs based on industry's best practices for inclusion in the contract.

51. Q. What is the size and role of the City's internal ServiceNow team (administrators, developers, process owners), and how does the City envision the division of responsibilities?

51. A. City internal staff consists of
    - Two administrators are responsible for ServiceNow issues and requests triage, basic configurations, and fixes, and project coordination.
    - One ITSM application owner is responsible for process, requirements, and change approval.
    - One PPM application owner and two SME are responsible for process, requirements, and change approval.
    - One CMDB owner is responsible for CI assets requirements and change approval.
    - One SAM owner is responsible for process, requirements, and change approval.

    For new ServiceNow applications, integration, and enhancements, City will provide requirements, UAT testing and signoff, coordination with external party for integration (if necessary). The selected vendor is responsible for discovery, analysis, solutioning, designing, implementing, testing (unit, system, integration), and production deployment and support.

    For operational ServiceNow support, it will be joint effort by the City Administrator, and the selected vendor. The City ServiceNow administrator will be able to handle simple requests such as user/group admin, reports, configuration, scripting, and workflow while vendor will handle more complex requests and issues.

    For major version upgrade, City will provide test script, perform UAT testing and sign-off. Selected vendor is responsible for cloning and preparing the DEV environment, remediate and fix upgrade skipped changes and conflicts remediation, regression testing, support UAT, perform Production upgrade, post-upgrade validation, smoke test and support, and Rollback (if necessary)

52. Q. Does the City prefer a fixed monthly managed services fee, a retainer or bank of hours, or time-and-materials billing for support? Should unused hours roll over?

52. A. Block of hours. Monthly unused hours will roll over.

53. Q. Does "quarterly patches and hotfixes" in Section 2.1 refer to ServiceNow patch releases applied within the current family, separate from the annual major upgrade in Section 2.2?

53. A. Yes, the City has not experienced issues with the patches and hotfixes. However, should defect arise in the future due to the patches and hotfixes, the contracted partner will be asked to take the lead to resolution.

54. Q. ServiceNow typically releases two families per year. Is the City's expectation exactly one major upgrade per year, or should vendors price an option for staying current with both releases?

54. A. Please price for one major upgrade.

55. Q. Does the City use Automated Test Framework (ATF) today, and how many test cases exist? Who performs user acceptance testing during upgrades?

55. A. No ATF. City's I.T. does the UAT during upgrades.

56. Q. Does the City have an existing backlog of enhancements and new application requests? If so, approximately how many items are in it, and could it be shared?

56. A. Here are some ideas the City would like to explore with the selected vendor to define the set of enhancements and new application items for the backlog. 1) Review the current Service Portal for improvements to better serve the City staff, 2) ways to increase efficiency in the current ITSM process with untapped ServiceNow capability to assist with service delivery for limited I.T. workforce, and 3) mature and automate SAM lifecycle and workflow.

57. Q. Are there specific new modules or Store apps under consideration over the next 12–24 months (e.g., HRSD, CSM, GRC/IRM, ITOM, Now Assist / GenAI)?
57. A. Refer to question #56 for possible areas.

58. Q. Should enhancement and new application work be included within the managed services fee up to a capacity limit, or priced separately per project or statement of work?
58. A. Large enhancement and new applications implementation will be priced separately from the monthly managed services.

59. Q. Who is the incumbent ServiceNow partner, and when does their contract expire?
59. A. Alcor Solutions, Inc contract term ends on 6/30/2027

60. Q. What documentation exists today (architecture diagrams, integration specifications, runbooks, design documents, the custom PPM application's technical specifications)?
60. A. Requirements documents, and runbooks.

61. Q. Is a blended onshore/offshore delivery model acceptable? Are there any restrictions on offshore resources accessing the City's instance or data?
61. A. Refer to question #6

62. Q. Is any on-site presence in Berkeley expected (e.g., for workshops, upgrades, or quarterly reviews), or can services be delivered fully remotely?
62. A. Refer to question #7

63. Q. What is the anticipated contract term (initial term and renewal options), and is there an estimated annual budget or not-to-exceed amount?
63. A. Refer to question #9

64. Q. Will the City accept three comparable references from private-sector organizations where the bidder does not have three California local-government or large public-sector ServiceNow references? If so, how will those references be evaluated?
64. A. Refer to question #21

65. Q. Are remote and/or offshore resources permitted for ongoing platform support, integrations, development, upgrades, and transition activities? Please identify any mandatory US-based, onsite, background-screening, or data-access requirements.
65. A. Refer to question #6 & #7.

66. Q. Please provide the current ServiceNow release, active modules, approximate number of fulfiller users, and available sizing indicators for managed assets, configuration items, and the PPM environment, including the tailored demand-ranking application.
66. A. Refer to question #27, #34, #35, #37, #38, #39, #40, and #41.

67. Q. To size the proposed monthly managed service, please share approximate monthly incident, service request, defect, and change volumes, together with any significant open backlog or recurring operational issues.
67. A. Refer to question #27, and #56.

68. Q. What support coverage hours, time zone, severity definitions, and target response and resolution SLAs should vendors price for steady-state platform support? Is out-of-hours critical incident coverage required?

68. A. Refer to question #49, #50.

69. Q. For the included allowance of up to 10 minor-fix/enhancement hours per month, how are hours approved and tracked, may unused hours roll over, and should requests above the allowance be billed at the proposed rate-card rates?
69. A. Refer to question #52. Please recommend a process for hours tracking and approval. The rate-card rates above the allowance may be used. The City needs to approve all hours above the allowance.

70. Q. Can the City provide an inventory or approximate count of active integrations (including Entra ID/LDAP, Intune, SolarWinds, Microsoft 365, and Adobe), their integration methods, and the division of support responsibilities between the City, ServiceNow vendor, and other application providers?
70. A. Refer to question #45 and #51

71. Q. Given the anticipated April 23, 2027 notice to proceed and June 15, 2027 hard cutover, what level of incumbent-provider knowledge transfer, platform documentation, access, and City staff availability should bidders assume? Are there any pre-cutover access restrictions or fixed transition milestones?
71. A. Refer to question #28. Engagement and ServiceNow access can start when a contract is signed. Please propose recommended transition milestones.

72. Q. For the Yokohama-to-Australia major-upgrade pricing scenario, please confirm whether it reflects the City's planned production upgrade or is solely for evaluation. As the workbook specifies DEV and Production instances, will a separate Test/UAT instance or equivalent environment be available for validation?
72. A. Solely for evaluation. Refer to question #34 and #35.

73. Q. For the major-upgrade scope, will the City provide test scripts, business testers, and formal UAT sign-off, while the vendor performs technical regression testing and remediation? Please clarify the expected split of responsibilities.
73. A. Refer to question #51

74. Q. Please confirm the City's existing ServiceNow product editions and subscription entitlements relevant to IntegrationHub, ITAM/SAM, Flow Designer, and dashboards/reporting. Should bidders include any new or incremental ServiceNow subscription costs in the evaluation project estimates, or identify them separately for City procurement?
74. A. Refer to question #26. For the evaluation project, please separately list additional procurement as necessary.

75. Q. For the Microsoft Azure Account Integration scenario, are target identities cloud-only in Microsoft Entra ID or synchronized from on-premises Active Directory? Will the City supply the department-to-security-group mapping rules, account naming standards, and required integration permissions?
75. A. The Azure account integration scenario with target the on-premises active directory. For the estimate, refer to question #258 and add any assumptions for your estimate.

76. Q. For the SLA Process Improvement scenario, please confirm the approximate number of current Incident SLA definitions and the expected number of new Service Request SLA definitions, along with any target dashboards, KPI definitions, reporting audiences, and historical-data requirements.

76. A. There are currently 8 incident SLA definitions and no service request SLA definitions. Use the following for the SLA Process Improvement scenario:
Number of new Service Request SLA: 10
Dashboards: SLA Compliance (SLA meet/breach/near breach), Performance (of requests per catalog item complete & open, average fulfillment time), Executive (overall SLA, monthly trends, KPI)
KPI: SLA % met vs breached, average fulfillment time
Reporting audiences: Service Desk supervisors, IT management, and process owners
Historical data: trend report on rolling 12 months historical data.

77. Q. What is the expected initial contract term and number of renewal options? Can the City share an indicative annual spend range or not-to-exceed amount to support an appropriately scaled managed-service proposal?
77. A. Refer to question #9

78. Q. The RFP states that Attachment N evaluation projects may not represent projects ultimately implemented. Should bidders treat the project-cost ranges as evaluation estimates only, with any future projects separately scoped and authorized, while the monthly managed-service fee and resource rate card form the operational pricing basis?
78. A. Yes, the 2 scenarios are used for RFP evaluation. However, please provide the best estimate for the project cost as it could be an actual project the City will want to contract with the selected vendor. The monthly managed-service fee and rate card are for operational pricing.

79. Q. Are remote/international vendors eligible to participate if they can support U.S. working hours, workflow configuration, application support, documentation, implementation coordination, and ongoing technical support?
79. A. Refer to question #6

80. Q. Could you point me to the process for *** to become an approved engineering and automation vendor for City of Berkeley?**
80. A. Information can be found on the City's website Doing Business page.

81. Q. Who would be best to speak with about supplier approval?
81. A. Refer to question #80

82. Q. Nature of the Requirement: Could you please confirm whether this solicitation represents a new requirement or a re-bid, renewal, or replacement of an existing contract?
82. A. Refer to question #13

83. Q. Incumbent Vendor(s): If this requirement was previously contracted, could you please identify the current or previous incumbent vendor(s)?
83. A. Refer to question #59

84. Q. Existing Contract Details: Could you please provide the effective date, expiration date, and current status of the existing contract, if applicable?
84. A. Refer to question #59

85. Q. Historical Contract Expenditure: If this is a re-bid or replacement of an existing contract, could you please provide the total amount spent under the current or previous contract to date?
85. A. This information is available on the City's Records Online portal.

86. Q. Estimated Budget: If this is a new requirement, could you please provide the estimated annual budget or anticipated expenditure for the services being solicited?
86. A. Refer to question #9

87. Q. Historical or Projected Utilization: If available, could you please share historical or projected utilization data, such as staffing hours, number of assignments, purchase orders, work orders, transactions, or other applicable volume metrics?
87. A. Historically, the annual assignments are one major version upgrade, 1 to 2 enhancements or new application.

88. Q. Previous Awardee's Proposal: If permitted under applicable public-records laws and procurement requirements, could you please provide a copy of the incumbent's or previous awardee's proposal/response?
88. A. During this active procurement the City is unable to provide the requested information

89. Q. Previous Awardee's Pricing Information: Could you please provide the incumbent's or previous awardee's pricing proposal, rate sheet, cost proposal, or other available pricing information, subject to applicable disclosure requirements?
89. A. Refer to question #88

90. Q. Performance and Areas for Improvement: If this is a re-bid or replacement of an existing contract, has the Entity identified any service deficiencies, performance challenges, operational gaps, or areas for improvement with the current or previous arrangement?
90. A. Refer to question #88

91. Q. Licensing and Compliance Requirements: Could you please identify all licenses, permits, registrations, certifications, accreditations, and other authorizations that a successful proposer must possess to perform the services under this solicitation?
91. A. Information is available on the City's website Working with the City

92. Q. Please identify who performed the initial ServiceNow Implementation.
92. A. Refer to question #59.

93. Q. Is the vendor that performed the initial implementation eligible to bid on this RFP.
93. A. Yes

94. Q. Could you please clarify whether the City will consider a prime contractor focused on platform governance, ITAM/PPM advisory, and service delivery oversight with qualified specialist subcontractors for hands-on administration and development? We would also appreciate confirmation of the expected onsite presence, if any, and whether the City requires particular ServiceNow partner status or certifications for the prime contractor.
94. A. Refer to question #4, and #7.

95. Q. Please confirm the anticipated initial contract term, renewal/option structure, and maximum contract duration.
95. A. Refer to question #9

96. Q. Please confirm the expected managed services support coverage, including business hours, time zone, after-hours/on-call, weekend, and holiday support requirements, if any.
96. A. Refer to question #49

97. Q. Please provide approximate historical monthly volumes for incidents, service requests, problems, changes, enhancement requests, and the current open backlog.
97. A. Refer to question #27 and #56.

98. Q. Attachment N references a Yokohama-to-Australia major version upgrade for DEV and Production. Please confirm whether these represent the City's actual current ServiceNow release and instance topology or assumptions provided solely for RFP pricing evaluation.
98. A. Refer to question #72

99. Q. Please provide the City's current ServiceNow subscription and entitlement details relevant to the scope, including ITSM, PPM/SPM, ITAM/SAM, IntegrationHub, Store Apps, and any other applicable products or spokes.
99. A. Refer to question #26

100. Q. Please clarify whether the selected vendor is expected to purchase or fund any incremental ServiceNow licenses, IntegrationHub spokes, Store Apps, subscriptions, or other delivery tools, or whether these will be provided under the City's existing entitlements.
100. A. City will procure the necessary ServiceNow licenses and store apps to implement the solution. City will not purchase vendor development tools, project management tool, and defect tracking tools etc. that are not required for running the application.

101. Q. Are there any known critical integration failures, major unresolved defects, or significant remediation items that the City expects the selected vendor to address immediately during transition?
101. A. None at this moment.

102. Q. Please provide additional information regarding the tailored PPM workflow/application used for scoring and ranking demands, including its business purpose, level of customization, and any known enhancement or remediation needs.
102. A. Refer to question #41.

103. Q. Please provide the City's current incident priority/severity definitions and any minimum response and resolution targets that vendors should consider when proposing managed services SLAs and KPIs.
103. A. Refer to question #50

104. Q. Does the City have any minimum KPI targets or acceptance criteria that vendors should consider when proposing SLAs/KPIs for major release upgrades and new application delivery?
104. A Refer to question #50

105. Q. For planning purposes, can the City provide an approximate historical or anticipated annual volume of Change Requests, enhancements, and new application requests outside the standard managed services scope?
105. A. Refer to question #87.

106. Q. Please clarify the expected onsite presence, if any, for onboarding, governance meetings, major upgrades, critical incidents, or other activities.
106. A. Refer to question #7

107. Q. What City and incumbent-provider resources, documentation, and knowledge-transfer support will be available to the selected vendor during onboarding and before the June 15, 2027

hard cutover?
107. A. Refer to question #28.

108. Q. Will the selected vendor be permitted to begin discovery, access provisioning, documentation review, or knowledge-transfer activities before the planned Notice to Proceed, or will all transition activities begin only after the Notice to Proceed?
108. A. Engagement can start once a contract is signed.

109. Q. What criteria will the City use to determine successful completion of onboarding and readiness for the June 15, 2027 hard cutover? Will there be any parallel-support or stabilization period with the incumbent provider?
109. A. Refer to question #28. A Health check report of existing system including the RRV customization, and recommendation for improvements to gauge readiness.

110. Q. Are there any major in-flight ServiceNow projects, enhancements, releases, upgrades, remediation initiatives, or other committed work that the selected vendor will be expected to assume or complete during the onboarding/cutover period?
110. A. A major version upgrade will be performed near the cutover period.

111. Q. Please provide approximate current environment volumes, including number of ServiceNow users/fulfillers, CIs in the CMDB, hardware/software assets, catalog items, active demands/projects, MID Servers, and other significant platform volume metrics.
111. A. Refer to question #27, # 37, #38, #39, #40, and #44

112. Q. Please describe the expected division of responsibilities between City staff and the selected vendor for platform administration, ticket triage, change approvals/CAB, UAT, production deployments, license administration, and integration support.
112. A. Refer to question #51

113. Q. Are there any City security, privacy, data handling, background check, remote-access, device, or other access requirements that proposed personnel must satisfy before accessing the ServiceNow environment?
113. A. Refer to question #6.

114. Q. Does the City have any geographic restrictions on personnel accessing or supporting the ServiceNow environment, including requirements for U.S.-based or onshore resources?
114. A. Refer to question #29

115. Q. Are subcontractors or teaming partners permitted? If so, please identify any required disclosures, approvals, City business licenses, insurance, forms, or other requirements applicable to subcontractors.
115. A. Refer to question #4

116. Q. Are there established maintenance windows, change-freeze periods, CAB schedules, or after-hours requirements that the selected vendor must follow for patches, upgrades, enhancements, and production deployments?
116. A. The City CAB meets on Tuesdays to approve changes. Standard change window is Wednesdays after 6pm PT. Refer to question #49.

117. Q. Please clarify the City's expected training scope, including target audiences, preferred delivery format, anticipated frequency, and whether formal training materials are expected for

ongoing enhancements and new applications.
117. A. Vendor training is expected for major enhancements and new applications. The target audiences are the City's ServiceNow Administrator, ServiceNow application owner, and IT support staff for IT department applications. This will be roughly 50 users. For applications used by all City staff such as a user portal, the audience size would be the entire City. The City prefers virtual training delivery format. Training materials should include cheat sheets and end user documentation, technical specification and runbook documentation for support staff.

118. Q. The RFP references ITAM in the platform scope and SAM in the onboarding and staffing requirements. Please clarify the intended SAM scope and how it relates to the broader ITAM services expected under this engagement.
118. A. The current scope is to assist the City to optimize the value of SAM with automation, and integration for user software licensing.

119. Q. For the Monthly Managed Services pricing in Attachment N, does the stated 'up to 10 hours per month' apply to all Run operations, including maintenance and support, or only to minor fixes and enhancements?
119. A. The monthly managed services hours apply to all run operation requests.

120. Q. For Monthly Managed Services, how should effort exceeding the included 10 hours in a month be handled and priced? Should excess effort be billed using the hourly rates in the Rate Card, and do unused monthly hours expire or carry forward?
120. A. Refer to question # 69.

121. Q. Please clarify the distinction between a 'minor fix/enhancement' included within Monthly Managed Services and a 'Change Request' or 'New Application' that should be billed separately using the Rate Card.
121. A. Minor fixes are quick and simple changes. While implementing a new application, major and large enhancement is a project that would be quoted separately.

122. Q. Attachment N includes two weeks of hypercare in the Yokohama-to-Australia upgrade scenario. Should vendors assume two weeks of hypercare for each annual major platform upgrade, or is this assumption only for the Attachment N evaluation scenario?
122. A. Vendors can assume the two weeks for each annual major platform upgrade.

123. Q. Addendum A states that the corresponding cost proposal shall be submitted as a separate PDF. Should vendors also submit the completed native Attachment N Excel workbook in addition to the separate PDF?
123. A. Please complete the Attachment N workbook and append it to the proposal file.

124. Q. For the three comparable ServiceNow engagements requested in the Experience section, must each engagement individually include all ServiceNow applications used by the City, or may the three examples collectively demonstrate coverage across the City's application landscape?
124. A. An engagement refers to all work performed for a single client (City, public sector, etc). Please list the ServiceNow applications supported across that engagement. Provide three separate Cities or public sectors for the three engagement requirements.

125. Q. Please confirm whether key personnel resumes and required forms/attachments are excluded from the 25-page proposal limit, and whether they should be appended to the single technical proposal PDF.
125. A. Refer to question #14

126. Q. Please confirm whether Attachment F (Living Wage Form) and Attachment G (Equal Benefits Certification) are required with the initial proposal submission or only upon selection/contract execution, as applicable.
126. A. Attachment F and Attachment G are required for the initial proposal submission.

127. Q. Please confirm whether the Local Vendor Preference described in the RFP applies to this professional services procurement.
127. A. It does not apply.

128. Q. Please confirm whether California prevailing wage requirements apply to any labor categories anticipated under this ServiceNow professional services engagement.
128. A. Yes

129. Q. Please confirm whether the quarterly ServiceNow patches and hotfixes required under the RFP are included within the Monthly Managed Services fixed fee in Attachment N, while the annual major version upgrade is priced separately.
129. A. Minor defect fixes for ServiceNow patches and hotfixes falls in the monthly managed services. Major version upgrade is priced separately.

130. Q. For Attachment N Project for RFP Evaluation #1, the requirements state that generated account credentials are to be provided to the service request submitter via email. Should vendors follow this method as stated, or may vendors propose a more secure credential-delivery method consistent with the City's security standards?
130. A. Please follow the method as stated for consistency in the evaluation.

131. Q. For Attachment N Project for RFP Evaluation #2, should vendors assume a common SLA framework for service requests, or are different SLA targets expected by catalog item, request type, priority, or fulfillment group? If differentiated, please provide the approximate number of service request categories or SLA variations expected to be in scope.
131. A. Refer to question #76

132. Q. Could you please clarify whether the City will consider a qualified subcontracting or teaming arrangement, and whether there are specific incumbent-transition or platform governance priorities bidders should address?
132. A. Refer to question #94

133. Q. Attachment B-F: Should the forms be included in the technical proposal PDF or submitted as a separate file?
133. A. Refer to question #14

134. Q. Key Personnel: May one individual be proposed for more than one of the seven key personnel roles listed in the table?
134. A. Yes, if the personnel have the qualifications for the role.

135. Q. Key Personnel; Addendum A, Attachment N, Sheet 6 Does the City have role descriptions or minimum qualifications (education, years of experience, or certifications) for the seven key personnel roles in Section III.2.B and the rate card roles in Attachment N, Sheet 6? If not, may proposers define the qualifications for each role?
135. A. City requests for the best fit and seasoned personnel in the proposal. You may separately elaborate the qualifications you used for each role.

136. Q. Client References Will the City provide a client reference form or questionnaire, or may proposers present references in their own format? If so, what should be included in the client reference form?

136. A. You are free to present in own format. The minimum information is:

- Organization
- Name
- Title
- Contact information (phone number, email address)
- Engagement Summary
- Reference's role in project
- Your company's role in project

137. Q. Attachments List; Attachment A Attachments F (Living Wage Form) and G (Equal Benefits Certification) are marked "may be optional." Under what conditions are these forms required with the proposal?

137. A. Refer to question #126

138. Q. Cost/Price Proposal Beyond the completed Attachment N, does the City expect a pricing narrative, assumptions, or separate rate schedule in the pricing document?

138. A. You may include additional information to support the pricing.

139. Q. Cost/Price Proposal Does the City expect ongoing managed services to be priced as a fixed monthly fee, a block of hours, or time and materials at the hourly rates in Attachment N?

139. A. Refer to question #52.

140. Q. Onboarding; Cost/Price Proposal 6 Section III.3.B requests an onboarding "strategy, cost, project plan, and risk registry," while Section III.5 and the cover letter require pricing in a separate document. Should onboarding cost appear only in the pricing document (for example, as a line item in Attachment N) and be referenced in the technical proposal?

140. A. Yes, please add the Onboarding cost in Attachment N sheet 1-Summary. The strategy, project plan, and risk registry stay in the technical proposal. Please download the updated Attachment N from the City's RFP page.

141. Q. Cost/Price Proposal Section III.5 states prices must include "tools (integrationHub, subscription level, etc.) required for service delivery." Does this refer only to tools the proposer uses to deliver services, or does the City expect proposers to price ServiceNow subscriptions such as IntegrationHub for the City's instance?

141. A. You only need to list the ServiceNow subscriptions or apps for the proposal.

142. Q. Addendum A, Attachment N, Sheet 1 Sheet 1 The Total row on Sheet 1 (=SUM(B7:B9)) does not include Project for RFP Evaluation #2 (row 10). Should the total include all four cost categories?

142. A. Refer to question #24

143. Q. Addendum A, Attachment N, Sheets 1 and 2 Sheet 2 requests a fixed monthly cost for managed services. Should Sheet 1 show one month of managed services, or a total for a defined period? If a period, what contract term should proposers assume?

143. A. Sheet 1-summary should show the annual 12-month cost. In addition, please provide the projected managed service cost for year 2 and year 3. Please download the updated Attachment N from the City's ServiceNow Professional Service RFP page.

144. Q. Addendum A, Attachment N, Sheet 2 Sheet 2 states the monthly fee includes minor fixes and enhancements "up to [10] hours per month." Is 10 hours the City's required amount, or may proposers propose a different number of hours?
144. A. Please use 10 hours for the proposal.

145. Q. Addendum A, Attachment N, Sheets 3 to 5 Sheets 3 through 5 request an upgrade methodology, process, and sample timeline, project plans, and lists of ServiceNow subscription and license requirements. Should this material be included in the cost proposal PDF or the technical proposal PDF, and does it count toward the 25-page limit?
145. A. Please add relevant details to the proposal PDF. It will count toward 25-page limit.

146. Q. Addendum A, Attachment N, Sheets 4 and 5 Sheets 4, 5 Sheets 4 and 5 request an "estimated cost range," but each deliverable has a single Cost Range cell and the Total row (=SUM(B7:B12)) does not include "Other (please specify)." Should proposers enter low and high values, and how will cost ranges be evaluated?
146. A. The cost range is now updated to provide a single cost. Please download the updated Attachment N from the City's RFP page.

147. Q. Addendum A, Attachment N, Sheet 6 Sheet 6 The Total row on Sheet 6 sums the hourly rates for all roles. Should proposers leave this row blank, or does the City want a blended hourly rate?
147. A. For the total, please provide the blended hourly rate. Please download the updated Attachment N from the City's RFP page.

148. Q. Purpose; 2.1 Platform Maintenance and Support; III.5; Attachment N, Sheet 3 2, 3, 6; Sheet 3 Please identify the actual ServiceNow instances and current release versions, and provide fulfiller and requester user counts. Do the customer Portal and Service Portal refer to the same portal, and which audiences use it: City employees, external partners, or the public? Please identify the mobile applications in use and any Agent mobile customization. Do the two-instance upgrade assumptions in Attachment N, Sheet 3 reflect the actual environment?
148. A. Refer to question #27, #34, and #35. Customer portal and service portal refer to the same portal. It is used by City staff only. Now agent mobile application is configured to display assigned service request.

149. Q. Scope of Services 2 Please describe the tailored project portfolio management (PPM) workflow or application for scoring and ranking demands, including its main custom components, integration dependencies, and available design, support, and test documentation.
149. A. Refer to question #41

150. Q. Platform Maintenance and Support; Attachment N, Sheet 2 3; Sheet 2 For the most recent 12 months available, please provide average monthly volumes of incidents, service requests, and enhancement requests handled by the current support partner, or average monthly support hours used. If available, please identify the volume of critical incidents.
150. A. Refer to question #32 and #48.

151. Q. Platform Maintenance and Support What support hours and time zone should proposers assume, including any after-hours coverage for critical incidents or emergency hotfixes? Please identify permitted maintenance windows and required approvals for planned or urgent changes.
151. A. Refer to question #49, and #116.

152. Q. Platform Maintenance and Support How many Management, Instrumentation, and Discovery (MID) Servers are in scope, where are they hosted, and which integrations listed in Section 2.1 use them? Who is responsible for host and operating-system maintenance?
152. A. Refer to question #44 and #45.

153. Q. Platform Upgrades; Onboarding; VIII. Schedule Please identify any major ServiceNow upgrades planned before or during transition and the expected release at Notice to Proceed. Which partner is responsible for performing any upgrade before the June 15, 2027 cutover?
153. A. The selected RFP partner will perform the annual major version upgrade.

154. Q. Enhancements; Attachment N, Sheets 2 and 6 Please provide the anticipated annual volume or known backlog of enhancements and new applications outside the monthly managed-services allowance. How will this work be authorized and priced using the rate card in Attachment N, Sheet 6?
154. A. Refer to question #27, #56, and #87. Vendor will submit a fixed price quote for the requested enhancements or new applications for work authorization. The City will authorize to proceed after reviewing the quote.

155. Q. Scope of Services; Cost/Price Proposal Does the City expect any work to be performed on-site in Berkeley, or may services be delivered remotely? If on-site presence is required, which activities or milestones require it, and how often?
155. A. Refer to question #7

156. Q. Platform Maintenance and Support; Onboarding What existing personnel background-check, security, and access-approval requirements apply before contractor staff may access ServiceNow or City systems, and what are their typical completion times?
156. A. Refer to question #6.

157. Q. Service Level Agreement and Key Performance Indicator 5 Please provide any existing contractor service level agreements (SLAs), key performance indicators (KPIs), and measurement rules available for proposal planning. For managed services, major upgrades, and new application delivery, please identify any targets already established for this procurement. Will the accepted targets be incorporated into the contract?
157. A. Refer to question #50

158. Q. Experience Please confirm whether three comparable ServiceNow engagements in total, completed or supported within the past five years and collectively covering the City's ServiceNow applications, satisfy Section III.3.A. If not, please specify the required number of examples per application and whether an engagement may count toward more than one application.
158. A. Refer to question #124.

159. Q. Partner Requirements; For proposals with named subcontractors, may those firms' relevant ServiceNow experience and client references be used to satisfy the experience and reference requirements in Section 1.3 and Sections III.3-4? The proposal would identify the firm that performed each engagement, its actual responsibilities, and its committed scope on the proposed team.
159. A. Refer to question #8.

160. Q. Client References May references for separate engagements within the same public-sector organization count separately toward the minimum three client references in Section III.4? If so, may one customer representative verify more than one engagement when that person directly

oversaw the work?
160. A. Refer to question #124.

161. Q. Strategic Advisory; III.3.B Onboarding Please identify the current ServiceNow service provider and the date its operational-support responsibility is expected to end. What knowledge-transfer assistance will that provider be required to supply, including any committed handover sessions or support hours? Please identify the configuration, integration, operating, and support documentation available for handover, including any current platform roadmap.
161. A. Refer to question #59, #60, and #71.

162. Q. Onboarding; VIII Schedule Please define the operational responsibilities and acceptance criteria for the June 15, 2027 hard cutover, including any permitted incumbent overlap or support after that date. When may transition activities and system access be authorized, including any preparation before Notice to Proceed? If award or Notice to Proceed is delayed, will the cutover date be adjusted?
162. A. Refer to question #71, and #109. The latest date for a cutover is 6/30/2027.

163. Q. Will the City publish a list of firms that have downloaded the RFP or registered interest, so that prospective subcontractors can connect with proposers?
163. A. No

164. Q. May a ServiceNow Partner proposer include subcontractors that are not ServiceNow Partners for specialized services such as security?
164. A. Refer to question #4.

165. Q. Attachment N requests a hard cutover strategy, cost, project plan, and risk registry for a cutover 'no later than June 15, 2027' (Section III.3.B), yet the Schedule in Section VIII shows Award of Contract on 3/17/2027, Contract Signing on 4/21/2027, and Notice to Proceed on 4/23/2027. This leaves under two months from Notice to Proceed to complete a full knowledge transfer and cutover of ITSM, SAM and PPM from the incumbent partner. Please confirm whether June 15, 2027 remains the firm cutover target or whether this date will move in line with the revised award schedule.
165. A. Refer to question # 162

166. Q. The RFP does not state an estimated contract value, budget range, or funding envelope for the ongoing managed services engagement. Please confirm whether an indicative annual or total budget has been established, or provide prior-year spend on ServiceNow professional/managed services for comparison.
166. A. Refer to question #9

167. Q. Related to Transition and Onboarding activities, could you clarify the expected transition activities and knowledge-transfer responsibilities of the incumbent provider before the June 15, 2027 cutover?
167. A. Refer to question #28

168. Q. The RFP does not specify an overall contract term (e.g., initial period plus renewal options) for these professional services. Please confirm the intended contract duration and any renewal terms, as this affects staffing plans, rate structures, and total pricing.
168. A. Refer to question #9, and #18

169. Q. Does the City require dedicated full-time resources for the seven identified roles, or would

a shared-resource/on-demand delivery model be acceptable?
169. A. Shared resource/on-demand

170. Q. Could you provide the estimated monthly or annual support hours?
170. A. Refer to question #48

171. Q. The RFP does not specify Service Delivery Model. Can the services be delivered entirely remotely, or is onsite support required? Are offshore resources or delivery teams located outside the United States permitted?
171. A. Refer to Question #6, and #7.

172. Q. Section IV.1-4 allows the City to reject a proposal at its 'sole discretion' based on past contract history (Section III.6), without defined scoring criteria. Please clarify what weight, if any, this disclosure carries in the scoring methodology versus being treated as an independent disqualification gate.
172. A. The termination type and reason along with your response will play in the qualification.

173. Q. The RFP and sample contract documents do not address intellectual property ownership for custom configurations, workflows, or the tailored PPM scoring/ranking application developed by the vendor. Please confirm the City's expected IP ownership position for deliverables created under this engagement (e.g., City ownership of configurations, vendor retains ownership of pre-existing tools/accelerators).
173. A. The City will own all deliverables, work product, documentation, data, and other materials that the Vendor creates for the City under the contract. This ownership, including all associated intellectual property rights, transfers to the City upon creation and continues after the contract expires or is terminated for any reason. Upon expiration or termination, the Vendor will be expected to deliver all such work products to the City. Vendors should identify in their proposal any pre-existing tools or accelerators they intend to use, so that ownership can be clearly documented in the final contract.

174. Q. No warranty period or terms are specified for delivered work (e.g., defect remediation period following upgrade go-live or new application delivery). Please confirm whether a specific warranty period is expected post-deployment, or confirm that bidders may propose a warranty period as part of their technical and commercial proposal.
174. A. Bidder may propose the warranty period in the proposal.

175. Q. Section 1.3 requires 'successful delivery of annual platform upgrades with minimal business disruption' and Section 2.2 states vendors should assume a minimum of one major ServiceNow platform upgrade annually. Please confirm the current ServiceNow release/version in production today and the City's target release cadence (e.g., does the City intend to adopt every major release, or skip releases), as this affects annual upgrade effort sizing.
175. A. Refer to question #34 and #87.

176. Q. Section 2.1 lists existing integrations including SSO, LDAP, Microsoft Intune, SolarWinds, Microsoft 365, and Adobe Creative Cloud. Please confirm whether these integrations currently exist and are operational in production today (i.e., maintenance-only) or whether any are partially built, deprecated, or planned, and whether existing API/integration documentation can be shared with shortlisted bidders.
176. A. The integrations are operational in production. The API/Integrations are standard ServiceNow API and connectors.

177. Q. Section II states the ServiceNow platform remains 'largely standard, out-of-box' except for a single tailored workflow/application built on PPM for scoring and ranking demands. Please provide additional detail on the complexity of this custom PPM application (e.g., number of custom tables, scripts, integrations) or confirm that detailed documentation will be made available to shortlisted bidders during due diligence.
177. A. Refer to question #41.

178. Q. Please confirm whether the City's ServiceNow instance is hosted on ServiceNow's standard SaaS infrastructure (as is typical) or whether there are any non-standard hosting, data residency, or network access arrangements the vendor must accommodate (e.g., VPN requirements for remote administration).
178. A. Refer to question #44. ServiceNow's standard SaaS.

179. Q. Please provide the approximate number of ServiceNow licensed users (by fulfiller, ITAM/SAM, PPM and self-service/portal user types) and current ticket/request volumes, as this is needed to size the ongoing managed services support team.
179. A. Refer to question #26, and #27.

180. Q. Section 2.3 references 'New Application Development…as business requirements evolve' and Section 2.4 references a 12-24 month roadmap, but no specific number or list of planned new applications, enhancements, or roadmap initiatives is provided. Please confirm whether any specific new applications or major enhancements are already planned for the first contract year, or confirm that enhancement scope will be defined and prioritized jointly during the engagement.
180. A. Refer to question #56.

181. Q. Attachment N (Cost Proposal) is referenced as containing projects for RFP evaluation purposes that 'may not be the actual projects the City is implementing' (Section III.5). Please confirm what cost structure is expected for the steady-state managed services component (e.g., fixed monthly retainer, block of hours, time-and-materials) separate from the example projects priced in Attachment N.
181. A. Refer to question #52.

182. Q. The RFP references Attachment N – Cost Proposal Spreadsheet, which does not appear to be included in the document we received. Could you please advise where we can obtain this attachment?
182. A. Refer to question #1.

183. Q. Should annual platform upgrades be included in the managed services pricing or quoted separately?
183. A. Quote Separately from managed services pricing.

184. Q. Please clarify whether the current ServiceNow environment is supported today by an incumbent third-party partner, and if so, whether that incumbent is expected to participate in this RFP, as this affects the transition/cutover approach and risk assessment we must plan for.
184. A. Yes, incumbent is supporting the environment, and they can participate in the RFP.

185. Q. Section III.2.C requests a proposed SLA and KPI metrics for managed services, major release upgrades, and new application delivery, but no target response/resolution times or baseline performance expectations are given. Please confirm whether bidders should propose their own

standard SLA/KPI framework, or confirm whether specific minimum service levels (e.g., incident response times by priority) are expected.
185. A. Refer to question #50.

186. Q. Please confirm the expected onsite versus remote work ratio for key personnel (e.g., Account/Engagement Manager, Lead Architect) supporting this engagement, as this affects staffing cost and travel/logistics planning, or confirm that bidders may propose a remote-first delivery model with periodic onsite visits.
186. A. Refer to Question #7.

187. Q. Please clarify how the 30% weighting for 'Costs' under Section IV will be calculated — for example, whether it is based on total proposed cost across the example Attachment N projects only, blended rates, or a combination including the ongoing managed services pricing structure.
187. A. The cost evaluation will use Attachment N sheet 1-Summary, and the sheet 6-Rate Card. Please download the updated Attachment N from the City's ServiceNow Professional Services RFP page.

188. Q. Section 3.A requests three examples of comparable engagements 'each of the ServiceNow applications used at City of Berkeley' with preference for California local government experience. Please clarify whether 'comparable' requires public-sector experience specifically, or whether substantial private-sector experience with the same ServiceNow modules (ITSM, PPM, ITAM) would also be considered fully responsive.
188. A. Refer to question #21

189. Q. Section III.2.A requests the 'number of ServiceNow-certified technical resources available within the firm's practice' without specifying whether this means firm-wide totals or resources specifically dedicated to the City's account. Please clarify whether firm-wide certification counts are acceptable or whether only resources assigned to this engagement should be counted.
189. A. firm-wide

190. Q. Please confirm whether the City currently holds existing ServiceNow add-on subscriptions (e.g., IntegrationHub tier, Performance Analytics, Virtual Agent) that the vendor must work within, or whether bidders should propose any additional ServiceNow licensing/subscription tiers needed to deliver the required services, given Section III.5 states all tools including IntegrationHub must be included in pricing.
190. A. Refer to question #26 for current subscription. Please list additional subscription required for the proposed solution.

191. Q. Please confirm whether a product demonstration, technical interview, or oral presentation forms part of the evaluation process in addition to the written proposal, so bidders can plan accordingly.
191. A. The City will meet with the shortlisted finalists for proposal follow-up.

192. Q. Please confirm how long proposal pricing must remain valid/firm following the November 20, 2026 submission deadline, given that Council Approval is not expected until March 16, 2027 and Notice to Proceed until April 23, 2027 — a gap of roughly five months.
192. A. The proposal pricing is to be valid for when the contract starts.

193. Q. Please confirm whether the professional liability (errors & omissions) insurance requirement of $2,000,000 must be maintained on a per-occurrence or aggregate basis, and whether claims-made policies with a specified retroactive date are acceptable.
193. A. Per-occurrence

194. Q. Please confirm whether subcontracted or offshore resources are permitted for any of the key personnel roles (e.g., Senior Developer/Engineer, Integration Specialist), or whether all key personnel must be employees of the prime bidder located onshore in the United States.
194. A. Refer to question #6, and #7.

195. Q. Please confirm the approximate number of years of historical ticket, asset, and project data currently held in the City's ServiceNow instance, and whether any data migration, archiving, or cleanup work is anticipated as part of this engagement.
195. A. Approximately 7 years. No data migration, archiving, and cleanup are anticipated.

196. Q. Please clarify whether the 'ServiceNow Agent mobile application' referenced in Section 2.1 is the standard out-of-box ServiceNow mobile app or a custom-branded/configured mobile application requiring additional ongoing maintenance effort.
196. A. Standard out-of-box

197. Q. Can the City share the anticipated budget or not-to-exceed amount for this contract, and any expected term?
197. A. Refer to question #9

198. Q. Can the City share expected annual hours or monthly ticket volume for ongoing support, to help vendors size the SLA and Attachment N pricing?
198. A. Refer to #48, and #336.

199. Q. What release is the City on, and how many instances does it run? Does the City's current subscription include IntegrationHub, or should vendors include it in pricing? Any other details on the current environment would be helpful.
199. A. Refer to question #26, #34, and #35,

200. Q. Customer Portal: Is this the employee-facing Service Portal, or a resident-facing portal? If it's resident-facing, is it on CSM or a custom portal?
200. A. Refer to question #148.

201. Q. Support model and staffing: What support hours and P1 response coverage are expected, in Pacific Time? Is an onsite presence required, or is remote delivery acceptable? Can the seven key personnel roles be fractional or combined, such as Architect/Integration or BA/PM?
201. A. Refer to questions #6, #7, #49, #134, and #169.

202. Q. Please list every ServiceNow product and SKU the City is licensed for, for example ITSM Standard/Pro, SAM Pro, HAM Pro, ITOM Discovery, PPM Standard/Pro, IntegrationHub tier, and Now Assist. Please also say which of these are implemented and which are licensed but not implemented.
202. A. Refer to question #26. The City is not using workplace delivery.

203. Q. What ServiceNow family release is the City on now, and when was the last upgrade?
203. A. Refer to question #34.

204. Q. How many instances does the City have (Production, Test, Dev, other), and how are they used?
204. A. Refer to question #35. DEV is used for new development and enhancements, version upgrade testing, and troubleshooting.

205. Q. How many fulfiller (ITIL) users, requesters, and PPM users are there?
205. A. Refer to question #27

206. Q. Section 1.1 mentions a "customer Portal." Is this Service Portal, Employee Center, or a public-facing portal for residents? Are any CSM or HRSD modules in use?
206. A. Refer to question #42 and #148. No CSM or HRSD in use.

207. Q. Is the mobile app only the ServiceNow Agent app, or is Now Mobile/Mobile Publishing also in use?
207. A. Agent app.

208. Q. Are Virtual Agent, Knowledge Management, Performance Analytics, or Automated Test Framework (ATF) in use?
208. A. Knowledge Management is in use.

209. Q. About how many catalog items, record producers, and active flows/workflows are there? How much uses Flow Designer versus legacy Workflow Editor?
209. A. Refer to question #39. Evenly split between designer vs editor.

210. Q. Can the City share a recent Instance Scan/HealthScan result, or an estimate of customization (the number of custom tables, business rules, and client scripts)?
210. A. Refer to question #40.

211. Q. For the custom PPM demand scoring and ranking application, is it a scoped app or built in global scope? How large is it, and is it documented?
211. A. Refer to question #41.

212. Q. Which ServiceNow Store apps or plugins are installed?
212. A. There are roughly 300 ServiceNow apps and plugins installed from the standard ITSM, PPM, and SAM installation.

213. Section 2.1 lists "SSO and LDAP," and the diagram shows Azure for SSO and user profiles. Is LDAP connecting to on-premises Active Directory through the MID Server, to Entra ID, or both? What is the SSO protocol (SAML or OIDC)?
213. A. Refer to question #45

214. Q. Are the Intune and SolarWinds integrations built on Service Graph Connectors or custom (REST, Import Sets, MID Server)? Who built them?
214. A. Refer to question #45. Incumbent vendor implemented them.

215. Q. Are Microsoft 365 and Adobe set up as SAM Pro SaaS License Management integrations? Are there other software publishers or discovery sources in SAM?
215. A. Yes. InTune.

216. Q. Is ServiceNow Discovery in use? What CI classes are populated, and is CMDB data quality (health dashboards, IRE rules) in scope?
216. A. ServiceNow Discovery is not in use. CI classes include Computer, Software, UPS, Windows Server, Wireless Access Point, and IP Router/Switch. CMDB data quality is in scope for the contract.

217. Q. How many MID Servers are there, and where are they hosted? Will vendor staff have access to the MID Server hosts, or will City IT handle host-level work?
217. A. Refer to question #44.

218. Q. Are there integrations or data feeds not shown in the diagram, for example email, Teams, monitoring/event sources, HR/ERP, or GIS?
218. A. Refer to question #47.

219. Q. How many support tickets and enhancement requests per month does the City expect the vendor to handle? Can the City share the current enhancement backlog size?
219. A. Refer to question #27, and #56.

220. Q. Does the City want a fixed monthly managed service (retainer), time and materials, a bank of hours, or a mix? Is there an expected number of hours per month?
220. A. Refer to question #52, and #336.

221. Q. Section 2.1 says "quarterly patches." Should vendors price patch application on ServiceNow's patch schedule, or only once per quarter?
221. A. It should be on ServiceNow's patch schedule.

222. Q. ServiceNow ships two family releases each year, and the RFP says to assume at least one major upgrade per year. Should vendors price one or two upgrades a year? Does the City have a policy on how current it stays (N or N-1)?
222. A. Refer to Question #54. Target N.

223. Q. What split of responsibilities does the City expect between City IT staff and the vendor? Does the City have in-house admins, a platform owner, and a Change Advisory Board?
223. A. Refer to question #51 and #116.

224. Q. For the 12–24-month roadmap, are any new modules or capabilities already planned, such as ITOM, SecOps, GRC/IRM, HRSD, CSM, or Now Assist/AI?
224. A. Refer to question #56.

225. Q. What support hours are required (business hours Pacific, 24x7 for P1)? Are after-hours or weekend windows needed for upgrades and deployments?
225. A. Refer to question #49

226. Q. For the SLAs and KPIs, does the City have its own priority/severity definitions or target response and resolution times that vendors should align with? Are service credits or penalties expected?
226. A. Refer to question #50.

227. Q. Who is the current ServiceNow partner, and when does that contract end? Is the incumbent eligible to bid?
227. A. Refer to question #59, and #93.

228. Q. Notice to Proceed is 4/23/2027 and hard cutover is 6/15/2027, which gives about seven weeks. Is the incumbent contractually required to support knowledge transfer and run in parallel during that period?
228. A. Refer to question #28.

229. Q. What documentation exists today (solution design, integration specs, runbooks, admin guides)? Will it be shared before or at transition?
229. A. Refer to question #60. Available documents will be shared after contract is signed.

230. Q. Section 3.B mentions "ITSM, SAM and PPM." Does transition scope also include ITAM/HAM, CMDB, the Service Portal, the MID Server, and the mobile app?
230. A. Yes

231. Q. Should onboarding/transition be priced as a separate one-time cost apart from the ongoing service?
231. A. Yes. Enter the price in Attachment N.

232. Q. Please confirm whether Attachment N must be submitted as the native Excel workbook, incorporated into the separate cost proposal PDF, or both.
232. A. Refer to question #14.

233. Q. Section III.5 says prices must include tools such as IntegrationHub and subscription levels needed for service delivery. Is the vendor expected to buy any ServiceNow licenses, spokes, or subscriptions? Or does the City own all platform licensing, so vendors should only include their own internal tools?
233. A. Refer to question #100.

234. Q. Are the Attachment N projects meant to be priced fixed-fee or as estimated hours × rate? Can vendors state assumptions?
234. A. Fixed-fee project. Yes, you can state assumptions.

235. Q. What is the expected contract term (for example, 3 years plus option years)? Should rates be held for the whole term or include yearly escalation?
235. A. Refer to question #9. Please include any expected yearly escalation,

236. Q. Is there a budget or not-to-exceed amount the City can share?
236. A. Refer to question #9

237. Q. Section IV says the local vendor preference applies to goods up to $100,000 or non-professional services up to $250,000. Does it apply to this professional services RFP?
237. A. Refer to question #127

238. Q. Can one person fill more than one of the seven key personnel roles (for example, Business Analyst/Project Manager, or Lead Architect/Integration Specialist)?
238. A. Refer to question #134.

239. Q. What availability does the City expect for each role (dedicated, a percentage of FTE, or as needed)?
239. A. Refer to question #167.

240. Q. Is any onsite presence in Berkeley required, or is fully remote delivery acceptable?
240. A. Refer to question #7.

241. Q. Are offshore or non-U.S. resources allowed? Are there data residency, background check, or CJIS requirements for people who access the instance?

241. A. Refer to question #6.

242. Q. How will vendor staff access the City's instances (City-issued accounts, MFA, VPN)?
242. A. The City provides City-issued accounts and VPN access. MFA is required for login.

243. Q. Will the City accept proposals from staffing firms providing ServiceNow-certified professionals under a staff-augmentation model?
243. A. Refer to question #4. The City is not looking for a staff-augmentation.

244. Q. Does the City require proposers to submit actual candidate resumes for all key personnel identified in Section B at the time of proposal submission?
244. A. Yes

245. Q. Does the City intend to procure end-to-end ServiceNow professional services providing qualified ServiceNow professionals under the City's direction also be accepted?
245. A. Refer to question #4

246. Q. Will the City considers private client references?
246. A. Refer to question #21.

247. Q. Could you please confirm if the formal ServiceNow partner status mandatory for the prime contractor at the time of proposal submission?
247. A. Yes

248. Q. Are teaming agreements between a staffing firm and a qualified ServiceNow consulting partner permitted?
248. A. Refer to question #4

249. Q. What is the estimated budget for this RFP?
249. A. Refer to question #9

250. Q. What is the anticipated initial contract duration, and will there be optional renewal periods?
250. A. Refer to question #9, and #18

251. Q. Can the City provide additional information regarding the estimated budget or funding allocated for this engagement, including ongoing managed services and separately authorized projects?
251. A. Refer to question #9, and #56.

252. Q. Does the City anticipate any changes in project scope or priorities during the contract period? Are there additional or optional ServiceNow capabilities the city would like to implement?
252. A. Refer to question #56

253. Q. Can the City share any challenges experienced with its current ServiceNow environment or previous professional services providers that the selected vendor should prioritize addressing?
253. A. The City is not maximizing the ServiceNow capabilities and investments.

254. Q. Approximately how many ServiceNow users, active workflows, service catalog items, custom applications, and custom scripts are currently deployed?
254. A. Refer to question #39, and #40.

255. Q. Can the City provide its current ServiceNow licensing inventory, including ITSM, PPM/SPM, ITAM/SAM, Integration Hub or Workflow Data Fabric entitlements, and licensed user quantities? Will the City procure any additional subscriptions identified as necessary?
255. A. Refer to question #26. City will procure additional ServiceNow subscription as necessary.

256. Q. Will the incumbent ServiceNow provider participate in knowledge transfer and provide access to existing documentation, configurations, integration details, and outstanding support issues to facilitate the June 15, 2027 transition?
256. A. Refer to question #28

257. Q. What is the current incumbent's contract value and contract duration? Is the incumbent eligible to compete for this solicitation?
257. A. Refer to question #85 and #93.

258. Q. For the Microsoft Azure Account Integration project, how many departments, security groups, and unique provisioning rules must be supported? Are Microsoft Graph API access and an approved secure credential-delivery method already available?
258. A. For the evaluation, assume 14 departments, 72 security groups, and 80 provisioning rules.

259. Q. Does the City anticipate a specific annual volume or budget for additional ServiceNow enhancements and new application development beyond the projects identified in Attachment N?
259. A. Refer to question #9

260. Q. Does the City prefer on-site, virtual, or hybrid training? Approximately how many end users and administrators are expected to participate?
260. A. Refer to question #117

261. Q. Can the vendor use a combination of US-based and offshore resources, or must all services be delivered exclusively by personnel located within the continental United States?
261. A. Refer to question #6.

262. Q. Does the City require dedicated personnel or minimum staffing allocations for the seven identified roles, or may qualified individuals fulfill multiple roles where appropriate?
262. A. Refer to question #134 and #169.

263. Q. The RFP requires formal ServiceNow Partner status. Would the City accept a proposal from a prime contractor that is not a ServiceNow Partner if its subcontractor maintains the required partnership status?
263. Q. Refer to question #4.

264. Q. Has the City worked with any ServiceNow vendors, consultants, or other organizations during market research or development of this RFP?
264. A. No

265. Q. Section III requests three comparable ServiceNow engagements. Does the City require three engagements in total demonstrating experience across its ServiceNow modules, or three separate engagements for each application/module?
265. A. Refer to question #124.

266. Q. Are Key Personnel resumes and required appendices included within the 25-page technical

proposal limit, or may they be submitted separately without counting toward the limit?
266. A. Refer to question #14

267. Q. Following the award decision, what feedback or debriefing opportunities will be available to unsuccessful proposers?
267. A. When requested in a reasonable timeframe, the City does allow feedback or debriefing to unsuccessful proposers.

268. Q. May an out-of-state vendor submit a California Public Records Act request following the award decision to obtain award documentation, evaluation records, and other releasable procurement information?
268. A. Yes.

269. Q. Given that responses to vendor questions are scheduled for November 10, 2026, would the city consider extending the November 20, 2026 proposal deadline by one week to allow vendors adequate time to incorporate the clarifications into their technical and pricing proposals?
269. A. No.

270. Q. Will the City accept commercial-sector references that demonstrate comparable ServiceNow implementation and support experience, or are public-sector references required for full evaluation consideration?
270. A. Refer to question #21.

271. Q. The solicitation requests three client references and indicates a preference for California cities or other large public-sector entities. Would the City consider waiving the California-specific and public-sector reference requirements/preferences and accept three private-sector ServiceNow client references, provided the engagements demonstrate comparable scope, scale, technical complexity, modules, integrations, and professional or managed-services experience?
271. A. Refer to question #21

272. Q. May ongoing ServiceNow engagements be submitted as comparable engagements and/or client references, provided sufficient work has been completed for the client to validate the proposer's capabilities and performance?
272. A. Yes

273. Q. The solicitation references both professional services and managed services requirements. Can the City clarify whether it expects a dedicated ongoing managed-services team, an on-demand professional-services model, or a hybrid model combining baseline support with project-based services?
273. A. Refer to question #169

274. Q. Does the City expect proposed key personnel to be dedicated exclusively to the City, or may the vendor utilize a shared managed-services team, provided all required SLAs, availability, continuity, and escalation requirements are met?
274. A. Refer to question #169

275. Q. Does the City have any restrictions regarding remote, onshore, offshore, or hybrid delivery? If specific roles or activities must be performed within the United States or onsite, please identify those requirements.
275. A. Refer to Question #6, and #7.

276. Q. Please clarify whether any activities require onsite presence at City facilities, including transition, workshops, major platform upgrades, go-live activities, training, or critical-incident support. If so, please provide the anticipated frequency.
276. A. Refer to question #7

277. Q. Please provide the current ServiceNow user footprint, including the approximate number of fulfillers, approvers, business users, and end users, as well as the approximate number of City departments/agencies currently using the platform.
277. A. Refer to question #27. 14 departments.

278. Q. Please provide the expected average monthly volume of incidents, ServiceNow requests, enhancement requests, and other platform-related issues assigned to the ServiceNow Support Team, including severity/priority distribution and, where available, the approximate split by complexity or effort level.
278. A. Refer to question #27, and #48.

279. Q. What are the City's service coverage and SLA expectations for the managed service, including business-hours versus 24x7 coverage, P1/P2 response and restoration expectations, after-hours/on-call coverage, and holiday support requirements?
279. A. Refer to question #49, and #50.

280. Q. How many ServiceNow Production and Non-Production instances are currently in scope for the engagement?
280. A. Refer to question #35

281. Q. What are the key challenges or service gaps the City has experienced with the existing vendor supporting the ServiceNow platform that it would like the selected vendor to address?
281. A. Refer to question #253.

282. Q. Are there any significant technical issues, defects, platform constraints, or technical-debt items that remain unresolved and are expected to transition to the selected vendor? If yes, please provide a high-level description.
282. A. Refer to question #253.

283. Q. What is the current health and maturity of the CMDB, including approximate CI volume, key CI classes, primary data sources, ownership model, reconciliation practices, and any known data-quality challenges?
283. A. Refer to question #38. Primary data source is InTune and relying on the InTune Service Graph connector IRE.

284. Q. Which ServiceNow modules are currently well established and widely adopted across the City, and which modules require further adoption, optimization, or process maturity?
284. A. ITSM is widely adopted. PPM, and SAM require further adoption, optimization, and maturity.

285. Q. With reference to Section 2.B on Page 5, does the City expect the vendor to provide a dedicated Business Analyst role as part of the ongoing managed-services team, or would Business Analyst support primarily be required for project implementations, requirements gathering, and workshops?
285. A. Refer to question #169. Primarily for project implementations and major enhancements as necessary.

286. Q. What automated testing capabilities exist today, including current ServiceNow Automated Test Framework (ATF) coverage, and what level of regression testing is expected from the managed-services partner for releases, enhancements, and platform upgrades?
286. A. There are no automated testing scripts. Manual regression testing for platform upgrades, and enhancements.

287. Q. How does the City expect demand for continuous improvements and enhancements to be managed, for example through fixed monthly capacity, a defined backlog/sprint model, separate projects, or consumption-based hours? Additionally, what historical enhancement volume can the City share?
287. A. Depending on the scale, the continuous improvements may fall under the managed services, and large enhancements will likely be a separate project handled outside of the managed services. Refer to question #87.

288. Q. What are the City's key business and technology priorities for the ServiceNow platform over the next 12–24 months, based on the City's current or planned roadmap?
288. A. Refer to question #56.

289. Q. Will the incumbent vendor be required to provide transition assistance, knowledge-transfer sessions, documentation, configuration and integration inventories, open-ticket information, backlog information, and other relevant artifacts to the selected vendor prior to cutover?
289. A. Refer to question #28

290. Q. Will the City permit an overlap or transition period between the incumbent and selected vendor before the required hard cutover? If yes, what duration should vendors assume for transition planning and pricing purposes?
290. A. Yes, refer to question #59 for the current incumbent contract expiration.

291. Q. What ServiceNow documentation is currently maintained and expected to be available to the selected vendor during transition, such as architecture diagrams, configuration documentation, integration documentation, runbooks, SOPs, CMDB documentation, customization inventories, test assets, and upgrade history?
291. A. Refer to question #60.

292. Q. In addition to the project scenarios identified in the solicitation, does the City expect vendors to propose a recurring managed-services fee, time-and-materials/rate-card pricing for professional services, fixed pricing for defined projects/upgrades, or a combination of these commercial models?
292. A. Yes, complete all sheets in the Attachment N including the monthly managed services, rate card, and fixed price upgrade. Please download the updated Attachment N from the City's ServiceNow Professional Services RFP page.

293. Q. Can the City provide an estimated annual budget, historical annual spend, anticipated number of hours, or expected level of effort for ServiceNow professional and managed services to help vendors develop consistent and appropriately sized commercial proposals?
293. A. Refer to question #9, #27, #56, and #87.

294. Q. Will the resulting agreement include a committed minimum volume of work, hours, or annual spend, or should vendors assume that professional services and enhancement work will be requested on an as-needed basis with no guaranteed minimum?
294. A. Assume an as-needed basis.

295. Q. Attachment N references "up to [10] hours per month." Does this allowance cover all maintenance, support, minor fixes, and enhancements combined, or only enhancements? How should work exceeding the allowance be authorized and priced?
295. A. Refer to question #69, and #119

296. Q. Please provide the past 12 months of support request volumes, severity levels, and approximate monthly support hours, along with any outstanding backlog the selected vendor will inherit.
296. A. Refer to question #27, #56, and #87.

297. Q. What support hours and response expectations should vendors assume? Is after-hours, weekend, or holiday coverage required, and will the vendor support end users directly or handle escalations from City IT staff?
297. A. Refer to question #49. City IT staff will escalate to vendor support.

298. Q. Should quarterly patching, emergency hotfixes, governance meetings, and roadmap planning be included in the monthly fee or priced separately?
298. A. Part of monthly manage services.

299. Q. May one qualified individual fulfill multiple proposed roles, and may the City be supported through a shared services team, or are dedicated resources and minimum staffing commitments expected?
299. A. Refer to question #169

300. Q. May services be delivered remotely using U.S.-based and offshore personnel? Please identify any onsite requirements, personnel-location restrictions, or limitations on subcontractors.
300. A. Refer to Question #6 and #7

301. Q. What background checks, security approvals, equipment, and access requirements apply to vendor personnel, and what lead time should vendors allow for onboarding?
301. A. Refer to question #6. ServiceNow access can be provided after contract is signed and takes 2-3 days.

302. Q. What transition assistance will the incumbent provide, including knowledge-transfer sessions, technical documentation, configuration inventories, integration details, open-ticket handoff, and access transfer? Is this cooperation included in the incumbent's existing contractual obligations?
302. A. Refer to question #28

303. Q. When will the incoming vendor receive system access and begin working with the incumbent? Will there be an overlap period before the June 15, 2027 hard cutover?
303. A. Refer to Question #71 and #290.

304. Q. What criteria will determine successful transition, and how will the cutover date be addressed if contract execution, access provisioning, or incumbent deliverables are delayed?
304. A. Refer to question #109.

305. Q. Will inherited defects, technical debt, and outstanding enhancements be documented and separately prioritized, or is their remediation expected within the onboarding cost or recurring

support fee?
305. A. If there is any outstanding remediation, the City and incoming vendor can separately prioritize together.

306. Q. Please identify the City's existing ServiceNow subscriptions and IntegrationHub entitlements. Does all-inclusive pricing require the vendor to purchase additional platform or third-party licenses, or should those costs be identified separately for City procurement?
306. A. Refer to Question #34. Proposal pricing should include non-ServiceNow platform and 3rd party licenses. Only list the ServiceNow subscriptions. Do not include ServceNow subscription prices.

307. Q. For the fixed-price upgrade, what customization inventory, known defects, prior upgrade findings, and regression test materials will be provided? How should vendors address remediation that cannot reasonably be identified before award?
307. A. Please provide a strategy should these materials not be available.

308. Q. What is the anticipated initial contract term, and what renewal options will be available?
308. A. Refer to question #9

309. Q. Does the City intend to select one partner for the full scope, or could support, upgrades, and enhancement projects be awarded to different vendors?
309. A. Refer to question #4.

310. Q. Beyond the two evaluation scenarios, what initiatives are anticipated during the first 12–24 months, and which have approved funding?
310. A. Refer to question #56

311. Q. Will the vendor provide direct end-user support or primarily escalated platform administration and technical support? Please identify the responsibilities retained by City staff, the incumbent provider, and ServiceNow support.
311. A. Refer to question #51 and #297.

312. Q. What ITSM modules are currently being utilized and what ITSM modules would the City of Berkeley like to utilize? Ie HAM, SAM
312. A. ITSM core modules being utilized are Incident Management, Change Management, Service Catalog, and Knowledge Management. The City has not used Problem Management.

313. Q. Is CMDB currently deployed for the City?
313. A. Yes

314. Q. Would the City entertain the utilize ServicesNow to address the current Solarwinds deployment?
314. A. We can entertain the idea to determine if it is a good fit.

315. Q. What is the City's anticipated contract duration (e.g., initial 1-year, 2-year, or multi-year base term, with option years) to be evaluated under this solicitation and reflected in Attachment N?
315. A. Refer to question #9

316. Q. Section III.5 states that all travel and accommodation expenses are the vendor's responsibility and will not be reimbursed by the City. To ensure pricing models across all proposers

are comparable and accurately incorporate any required travel overhead, could the City confirm whether any phases, milestones, or percentage of the engagement will require resources to be physically on-site?
316. A. Refer to question #7.

317. Q. The proposal "should not exceed 25 pages." Do the following count toward the limit: cover letter, table of contents, resumes (requested as an appendix) and the required forms (Attachments B–G)? Section III (page limit)
317. A. Refer to question #14

318. Q. The required filenames include a colon ("Proposal: Vendor Name – 27-11797-C…"). Colons can't be used in file names on Windows. Is a hyphen or underscore acceptable instead? Cover letter (file naming)
318. A. Yes, hyphen or underscore is acceptable.

319. Q. Do we have to submit this form with our proposal package as well? Attachment A
319. A. Yes, please submit this form.

320. Q. Forms must be "completed and signed in blue ink," but proposals are submitted by email. Are scanned wet-ink signatures or verified electronic signatures acceptable? Attachment A (signatures)
320. A. Scanned wet-ink or verified electronic signatures are acceptable.

321. Q. Do we have to provide named personnel?
321. A Yes

322. Q. Can we use the same resource for a different category?
322. A. Refer to question #134.

323. Q. Sheet 3 lists DEV and Production. Is there also a Test/UAT instance? If not, should UAT be done in DEV? (Section II; Sheet 3)
323. A. Refer to question #35. UAT is performed in DEV.

324. Q. Which ServiceNow subscriptions and tiers does the City hold (ITSM, PPM, ITAM/SAM/HAM, IntegrationHub, Performance Analytics), and how many users are licensed? (Sections 1.1, 2.1)
324. A. Refer to question #26, and #27.

325. Q. Can the City share monthly ticket volumes, number of catalog items, CMDB size and any recent instance health scan? (Section 2.1)
325. A. Refer to #27, #38, and #39.

326. Q. Is documentation available for the custom PPM demand scoring and ranking application? (Section II)
326. A. Refer to question #41

327. Q. How is each integration built today, and how many MID Servers are in use? (Section 2.1)
327. A. Refer to question #44, and #45.

328. Q. For the integrations, is the vendor responsible only for the ServiceNow side, or also for changes in the connected systems? (Section 2.1)

328. A. ServiceNow side.

329. Q. Which ServiceNow subscriptions and tiers does the City currently hold? Specifically: ITSM Standard or Pro, ITAM (SAM Pro and HAM Pro), PPM Standard or Pro, IntegrationHub tier, and Performance Analytics. (Section 2.4 and Attachment N)
329. A. Refer to question #26

330. Q. Do the required prices include only the vendor's own delivery tools, or is the vendor expected to fund ServiceNow platform subscriptions such as IntegrationHub on the City's instance? (Section III.5)
330. A. Refer to question #100.

331. Q. Should required subscriptions be listed only, or also priced? If priced, should they be excluded from the evaluated total? (Attachment N, Sheets 4 and 5)
331. A. Refer to question #141.

332. Q. If a new application or Store App needs an added subscription, will the City buy it directly, or should vendors price it? (Section 2.3)
332. A. Refer to question #100.

333. Q. Approximately how many users does the City's ServiceNow environment serve (employees and IT fulfillers)? (Sections 1.1, 2.1)
333. A. Refer to question #27

334. Q. What support hours, holiday coverage and after-hours support does the City require? (Section 2.1)
334. A. Refer to question #49

335. Q. Does the City have existing priority definitions, SLA targets or service credit expectations? (Section III.2.C)
335. A. Refer to question #50

336. Q. Is the 10-hour monthly allowance final? Are patches, hotfixes, documentation, training and governance included in those hours? (Sheet 2; Section 2.1)
336. A. 10-hour is not final and will be defined in the contract. Those hours may be used for the stated.

337. Q. Will new applications and change requests be approved separately and billed at the Sheet 6 rates? (Section 2.3; Sheet 6)
337. A. Yes, a fixed price quote will be requested for the City approval.

338. Q. Should the proposal cover custom applications, Store Apps, or both? (Section 2.3)
338. A. Both.

339. Q. Azure AD project: should accounts be created in on-prem AD or directly in Entra ID? Should Microsoft 365 licenses also be assigned? (Sheet 4)
339. A. Create account in on-prem AD, and assign M365 license.

340. Q. SLA project: how many SLA definitions are expected, and is Performance Analytics licensed? (Sheet 5)
340. A. Refer to question #26 and #76

341. Q. Does the City run hybrid identity (on-premises Active Directory synced to Entra ID through Azure AD Connect), or cloud-only accounts? In a hybrid setup, should accounts be created in on-premises AD rather than Azure AD? (Sheet 4—Azure provisioning)
341. A. Refer to question #339.

342. Q. Does City security policy allow generated passwords to be sent by email to the request submitter? Or should a temporary password with forced reset, or another secure method, be used? (Sheet 4—credentials by email)
342. A. Yes, temporary password can be sent through encrypted email and forced reset.

343. Q. Who is the current partner, and will they provide knowledge transfer before the June 15, 2027 cutover? (Section III.3.B)
343. A. Refer to question #28, and #59.

344. Q. Notice to Proceed is April 23, 2027, about 7 weeks before cutover. Can transition work start earlier, and will the incumbent's contract overlap with the new vendor during this period? (Sections III.3.B and VIII)
344. A. Refer to question #59, and #108.

345. Q. Are remote or offshore resources acceptable? (Section III.2.B)
345. A. Refer to question #6, and #7.

346. Q. Should ServiceNow licenses the City must buy be listed separately, or included in the vendor's price? (Section III.5)
346. A. Refer to question #100, and #141.

347. Q. Where should onboarding cost go, since Attachment N has no sheet for it? (Section III.3.B; Attachment N)
347. A. Refer to question #140

348. Q. Should managed services be entered on the cover sheet as a monthly or annual amount? What contract term will be evaluated? (Cover sheet)
348. A. Refer to question #9, and #143.

349. Q. How will the requested cost ranges be scored? (Attachment N, Sheets 4 and 5)
349. A. Refer to question #146.

350. Q. What level of detail is expected in the project plans? (Attachment N, Sheets 3, 4 and 5)
350. A. Please add the standard details in your typical project plan.

351. Q. May hourly rates increase each year of the contract? (Attachment N, Sheet 6)
351. A. Please state the hourly rate card increase each year of the contract in Attachment N sheet 6-Rate Card "Comments" column.

352. Q. Does the local vendor preference apply to this contract? (Section IV)
352. A. Refer to question #127.

353. Q. The upgrade sheet asks us to "provide the upgrade methodology, process, and sample timeline." Sheets 4 and 5 also ask for a project plan and methodology. Pricing must be a separate document. Should this narrative go in the technical proposal, the pricing document, or both? (Attachment N, Sheets 3, 4 and 5)

353. A. Please add the narrative in the technical proposal as part of the 25-page limit. All pricing in Attachment N.

354. Q. Onboarding asks for a "strategy, cost, project plan, and risk registry." Attachment N has no transition or onboarding line. Where should onboarding cost be shown? Should it be left out of the technical proposal to keep pricing separate? (Section III.3.B; Attachment N)
354. A. Refer to question #140

The managed services description states "up to [10] hours per month," with the number in brackets. The related questions are below. (Attachment N, Sheet 2)
355. Q. Is 10 hours the final figure? (Attachment N, Sheet 2)
355. A. Refer to question #336

356. Q. Do unused hours roll over to the next month? (Attachment N, Sheet 2)
356. A. Refer to question #52.

357. Q. Is work above 10 hours billed at the Sheet 6 rate card? (Attachment N, Sheets 2 and 6)
357. A. Refer to question #69.

358. Q. Where should bidders show the requested onboarding/transition cost, given that there is no transition line item? (Section III.3.B; Attachment N)
358. A. Refer to question #140

359. Q. Does the 25-page limit exclude resumes, forms and appendices? (Section III)
359. A. Refer to question #14

360. Q. Are scanned or digital signatures acceptable in place of blue ink? (Attachment A)
360. A. Refer to question 320.

361. Q. The RFP does not state the contract term. What is the initial term, and are there options or renewal years? Period of performance
361. A. Refer to question #9

362. Q. May proposers include annual rate escalation in the rate card for multi-year terms? If so, is there a cap? Rate changes
362. A. Refer to question #351.

363. Q. The 5% preference applies to "goods up to $100,000 or non-professional services up to $250,000." Since this RFP is for professional services, does the preference apply to this procurement? Section IV (Local Vendor Preference)
363. A. Refer to question #127.

364. Q. Are all seven roles in the table key personnel subject to the substitution clause? These are Account/Engagement Manager, Lead Architect, Senior Developer/Engineer, ITAM/SAM Specialist, Integration Specialist, Business Analyst, and Project Manager. Or are some supporting roles? Section III.2.B (key personnel)
364. A. Yes, it applies to all roles.

365. Q. May one person fill more than one role, such as Project Manager and Business Analyst, if

qualified? Section III.2.B (combined roles)
365. A. Refer to question #134.

366. Q. Does the City expect dedicated full-time resources, or availability as needed within the managed services hours? Section III.2.B ("Availability" column)
366. A. Refer to question #169.

367. Q. Are on-site visits to Berkeley expected? If so, how often? Is remote delivery acceptable? Must all personnel be based in the United States? Work location
367. A. Refer to question #6 and #7.

368. Q. Must vendor personnel pass City background checks or sign confidentiality agreements before getting instance access? Background checks
368. A. Refer to question #6.

369. Q. May the three engagements in Experience (3.A) be the same clients given as Client References? If so, may the Client References section provide only the contact details and refer back to 3.A to avoid repetition? (Sections III.3 and III.4)
369. A. Refer to question #124 and #136. Yes, you can refer the references back to section 3.A engagements provided the references information are listed.

370. Q. References "should be California cities or other large public sector entities." Are out-of-state public agencies, state agencies, or federal agencies acceptable? Section III.4 (reference types)
370. A. Yes

371. Q. Is there a minimum length of engagement? Section III.3.A (ongoing work)
371. A. Refer to question #272.

372. Q. Please share the following environment-size figures: (Section 2)
• number of fulfiller (ITIL) users and requesters;
• average monthly incident and request volume;
• number of catalog items;
• number of CIs in the CMDB.
372. A. Refer to question #27, #38, and #39.

373. Q. Sheet 3 mentions two instances (DEV and Prod). Is there a Test/UAT instance? Is the City planning to add one? (Attachment N, Sheet 3—instances)
373. A. Refer to question #35.

374. Q. Is the City currently on Yokohama? The planned upgrade to Australia would skip the Zurich release. Is that intended, or should vendors plan a stepped upgrade? About when should the evaluation upgrade happen relative to the April 23, 2027 Notice to Proceed? (Attachment N, Sheet 3—release path)
374. A. Refer to question #34, #87, and #110. The City performs one major upgrade annually so we would skip releases.

375. Q. ServiceNow releases two families a year. Is the "minimum of one major upgrade annually" within the monthly managed services fee, or priced separately each time? (Sections 2.1 and 2.2; Attachment N, Sheet 3)
375. A. Priced separately outside of monthly managed services.

376. Q. Is technical documentation available for the custom PPM demand scoring and ranking application? Was it built in a scoped application or in the global scope? (Section 2—custom PPM application)
376. A. Refer to question #41.

377. Q. Where is the MID Server hosted (on-premises or Azure)? Will the vendor get remote access (VPN) to support it? (Section 2.1—MID Server)
377. A. Refer to question #44.

378. Q. Does the City have target response and resolution times by priority? Or should vendors propose their own SLAs and KPIs? (Section III.2.C—SLAs and KPIs)
378. A. Refer to question #50.

379. Q. Please confirm a City of Berkeley business license isn't required at submission. Our understanding is that it's only needed within seven days of being selected. Section VII.C (business license)
379. A. Business license is not required for RFP submission. It is required for contract award.

380. Q. Do proposers need to respond to Section VII (insurance, workers' compensation, business license, recycled paper, prevailing wage, local vendor preference) in the proposal? Or is a statement of compliance enough? Section VII (other requirements)
380. A. A statement of compliance is enough.

381. Q. Please confirm that insurance certificates, the Right to Audit Form (Attachment H), and the Insurance Endorsement (Attachment I) are needed only after Council approval, not with the proposal. Attachment A (post-award documents)
381. A. Correct.

382. Q. Should the form cover only employees who'll work on this contract, or the whole company? Attachment B (Workforce Composition Form)
382. A. Whole company

383. Q. Is Attachment F & G mandatory?
383. A. Refer to question #126

384. Q. In Attachment E, the declaration states, "Executed this _____ day of ____, 20, at _____, California." Could you please clarify whether these execution details must be completed at the time of proposal submission or after contract award? If they must be completed at submission, may the reference to "California" be modified to reflect the Proposer's state of execution?
384. A. Must be completed at the time of proposal submission. Must fill in the date, month, and year. and may cross out "California" and modify to the proposer's state of execution.

385. Q. Similarly, Attachment G states, "Executed this _____ day of _____, in the year _____, at _____, _____," without specifying California. Could you please clarify whether the execution details in Attachment G must also be completed at the time of proposal submission or after contract award, and whether the state should reflect the Proposer's state of execution?
385. A. Completed at time of proposal submission and reflects the proposer's state of execution.

386. Q. Could you clarify whether an international software-development team may participate as a specialist subcontractor to a qualified ServiceNow prime contractor, and whether any mandatory certifications, local registration or US-only performance requirements apply?
386. A. Refer to question #4 and #22

387. Q. Could the City provide an overview of its current ServiceNow environment, including the platform release, hosting model, instance architecture, and applicable subscription tiers?
387. A. Refer to question #26, #34, #35, and #178.

388. Q. How many ServiceNow instances are currently maintained, including production, development, test, and other sub-production instances?
388. A. Refer to question #35.

389. Q. What are the current user population, active fulfiller population, approximate ticket volumes, asset record volumes, and PPM project volumes?
389. A. Refer to question #27, #38, and #39.

390. Q. Are there any existing platform limitations, technical constraints, or planned architectural changes that we must accommodate?
390. A. None at this moment.

391. Q. Which ITSM processes are currently implemented, such as incident, problem, change, request, knowledge, and service catalog management?
391. A. Refer to question #312.

392. Q. What are the City's primary ITSM pain points, outstanding backlog items, and desired process improvements?
392. A. Refer to question #56 and #253.

393. Q. What PPM capabilities are currently in use, and are there any planned changes to project intake, prioritization, resource management, or portfolio reporting?
393. A. The City has not fully adopted PPM. It is being used on a very small scale and there are no planned changes. The City is using PPM for the following: Information Technology department has an Idea form that feeds into PPM Ideas. City Clerk department is using the scoring and ranking custom app utilizing Demands tables. City departments are using Projects for reporting project dates and completion percentage.

394. Q. Which integration mechanisms are currently used for Microsoft Azure, Microsoft 365, Microsoft Intune, SolarWinds, Adobe Creative Cloud, SSO, and LDAP?
394. A. Refer to question #45.

395. Q. Does the City currently use IntegrationHub or other ServiceNow integration capabilities? If so, which spokes, connectors, subscription tiers, and integration licenses are available?
395. A. Refer to question #26 and #45.

396. Q. Are we expected to build new integrations, or is the baseline scope limited to maintaining and optimizing existing integrations?
396. Q. Selected vendor is expected to have the skillsets to provide all the mentioned.

397. Q. Are we permitted to use offshore resources or remote delivery teams? If so, what restrictions apply to personnel location, system access, and handling of City data?
397. A. Refer to question #6, and #7.

398. Q. Who is responsible for executing user acceptance testing, providing test scenarios, approving results, and signing off on production deployment?
398. A. Refer to question #51.

399. Q. What are the City's expectations for regression testing, integration testing, automated testing, and remediation of skipped changes or upgrade conflicts?
399. A. Refer to question #51.

400. Q. What rollback, recovery, and contingency procedures are required if an upgrade causes production issues?
400. A. The City has not had to rollback an upgrade nor encounter major defects post-upgrade in Production. For non-critical issues, the preference is to quickly work on a fix or workaround. Rollback would be reserved for major outage and issues. Please include your typical rollback, recovery, and contingency procedures recommendation in the proposal.

401. Q. What development standards, code-review procedures, update-set or application deployment practices, and technical documentation requirements must be followed?
401. A. The City has not established standard practice. Please provide a recommended process and procedure for the engagement.

402. Q. What escalation process should be followed for critical incidents, and who will serve as the City's technical and executive points of contact?
402. A. The City's ServiceNow Admin will be the point of contact during business hours. IT HelpDesk on-call support will be the point of contact during non-business hours.

403. Q. Are there existing ticketing, monitoring, alerting, or reporting tools that the vendor must use or integrate with?
403. A. None at this moment.

404. Q. Who will have authority to approve technical changes, project scope, invoices, deliverables, and service-level exceptions?
404. A. The primary authority will come from the I.T. ServiceNow Administrator and I.T. Project manager.

405. Q. For each sample project in Attachment N, are bidders expected to price a fixed scope and deliverable, provide an estimated level of effort, or use specified hourly rates?
405. A. The preference is fixed price.

406. Q. Does the City require personnel to be based in California, or may the vendor provide qualified resources from other locations?
406. A. Refer to question #7.

407. Q. Does the 25-page technical proposal limit include personnel resumes, client references, appendices, and supporting certification documents, or are these excluded from the page count?
407. A. Refer to question #14

408. Q, Is ServiceNow partnership mandatory to submit this response?

408. A. Refer to question #4.

409. Q. Regarding the Berkeley Business License (Current Year Certificate), may we provide it after the contract award?
408. A. Refer to question #379

409. Q. What is the anticipated budget for this project?
409. A. Refer to question #9

410. Q. Who is the incumbent vendor currently providing these services?
410. A. Refer to question #59.

411. Q. What is the approved budget or not-to-exceed ceiling, base term, renewal structure, expected managed-services months and annual upgrade quantities? Are any minimum expenditures guaranteed?
411. A. Refer to question #9, and #175.

412. Q. Volume of incident/request/enhancement tickets coming in on a weekly and/or monthly basis for ITSM and Service Portal?
412. A. Refer to question #27.

413. Q. Volume of incident/request/enhancement tickets coming in on a weekly and/or monthly basis for PPM?
413. A. Annually, one or two PPM platform incident/requests/enhancement.

414. Q. Volume of incident/request/enhancement tickets coming in on a weekly and/or monthly basis for ITAM?
414. A. Monthly at most one ITAM platform incident/requests/enhancement.

415. Q. Please provide the total ServiceNow user count for City of Berkley:
- **Fullfillers count?**
- **Self-Service user count?**
- **Approver users?**

415. A. Refer to Question #27. There are zero approver users.

416. Q. Please provide, if available, the average monthly volume of ServiceNow support tickets/incidents, enhancement requests, defects, integration issues, and administrative requests over the most recent representative period, including any severity distribution.
416. A. Refer to question #27, and #87

417. Q. Which ServiceNow modules/products are currently implemented and in active use? Are there plans to expand the ServiceNow footprint by implementing additional modules, capabilities, or business use cases during the contract period?
417. A. Refer to question #56, #284 and #312.

418. Q. What is the current size and composition of the team supporting ServiceNow platform operations, including key roles and responsibilities and, if applicable, the mix of internal staff and external/contractor resources?
418. A. Refer to question #51.

419. Q. Please provide the average weekly and/or monthly volume of incidents and service requests associated with the ServiceNow platform.
419. A. Refer to question #27

420. Q. Please confirm whether the City anticipates O&M support and the ServiceNow assessment/roadmap activities to be performed concurrently as separate workstreams, or sequentially.
420. A. Based on the historical low volume, the City anticipates sequentially.

421. Q. Is there a specific reason enhancements are capped at 10 Hours?
421. A. Large enhancements can be a project outside of the managed services.

422. Q. Please confirm the required managed-services coverage window and escalation expectations, including whether the City requires business-hours support only or after-hours/on-call support for critical incidents, upgrades, patches, and production releases.
422. A. Refer to question #49.

423. Q. Please confirm the complete ServiceNow instance landscape. Is the environment limited to DEV and Production, or are there other instances such as TEST/UAT, staging, sandbox.
423. A. Refer to question #35

424. Q. Beyond out-of-the-box ITSM, SPM , SAM application hosted on ServiceNow, are there any comlex customizations, custom applications, integrations currently implemented?
424. A. Refer to question #41.

425. Q. How many instances (Prod, Test, Dev, other) and what release/patch is each on today? Is there a clone instance or process?
425. Q. Refer to question #34, and #35. During major release upgrade, Prod is cloned to DEV instance.

426. Q. Will you share a recent Instance Scan/HealthScan report and the skipped-changes list from the last upgrade?
426. A. Selected vendor can perform instance healthscan and review previous skipped-changes list after contract is signed.

427. Q. How many users by persona (fulfillers/ITIL, requesters, approvers, mobile)? What are the license entitlements (ITSM tier, ITAM/SAM Pro, HAM Pro, PPM/SPM, IntegrationHub tier)?
427. A. Refer to question #26, and #27.

428. Q. Over the last 12 months, what was the monthly volume of tickets, enhancement requests, and defects handled by the current partner and internal staff, and what was the P1–P4 mix?
428. A. Refer to question #150.

429. Q. How many internal ServiceNow admins/developers do you have, and at what allocation? What stays in-house vs. moves to the vendor (user/group admin, catalog, notifications, reports/dashboards)?
429. A. Refer to question #51.

430. Q. What support coverage is expected: Pacific business hours, 24x7 for P1, on-call, weekends? What response/resolution targets are expected in the SLA?
430. A. Refer to question #49, and #50.

431. Q. Are maintenance hours limited to 10 hours/month, or is a different monthly block expected?
431. A. Refer to question #336.

432. Q. Does "quarterly patches and hotfixes" mean ServiceNow patch releases only, or also Store app and plugin updates?
432. A. Would include store app and plugin updates.

433. Q. For each integration (SSO, LDAP, Intune, SolarWinds, M365, Adobe CC): is it Spoke/IntegrationHub, Service Graph Connector, Store app, or custom REST/SOAP? What are the frequency, volume, other-system owner, and stability over the last 12 months?
433. A. Refer to question #45. The integrations are stable.

434. Q. Are there integrations beyond the RFP list (Entra/Azure AD provisioning, email, Teams, GIS)? The RFP says "including but not limited to."
434. A. No

435. Q. What are the average hours spent today on maintaining and monitoring the health of the existing integrations?
435. A. Very little to none at this moment.

436. Q. Can you share the current enhancement backlog (count, size, priority) and the 12-month planned project list?
436. A. Refer to question #56

437. Q. What does "new application development" mean: custom scoped apps, or activating licensed modules (SPM expansion, HRSD, CSM for residents)?
437. A. It can be custom scoped apps, new licensed modules, and new integrations.

438. Q. Is there an annual budget or target hour pool for enhancements separate from run support?
438. A. Refer to question #9

439. Q. Do any projects need resident-facing capability (WCAG/Section 508 accessibility, multilingual, public portal)?
439. A. The City's ServiceNow applications are not resident-facing. Although not a Federal requirement for non-resident public facing, WCAG/Section 508 accessibility should be best practice for internal portals.

440. Q. Current version and history: What release are you on, and when was the last major

upgrade? How many family releases behind will you be at contract start (April 2027)? Could this require a double-hop?
440. A. Refer to Question #34. It will likely be N-2 in April, 2027 and a major release upgrade would be required to stay on a supported version.

441. Q. Store apps and plugins: Which are installed (Spokes, Service Graph Connectors, Intune/SolarWinds/Adobe connectors), and are they current?
441. A. Refer to question #45.

442. Q. City testing: Who performs UAT, how many testers, and how long is the test window? Will City staff run regression, or is the vendor expected to?
442. A. Refer to question #51.

443. Q. Integration testing: Who owns testing on each integrated system (M365, Intune, SolarWinds, Adobe, IdP)? Are test/sandbox tenants available?
443. A. Refer to question #35 and #51.

444. Q. Who is the current partner, and will they cooperate on transition (overlap period, KT sessions, documentation handover)?
444. A. Refer to question #28, and #59

445. Q. Are there open projects, upgrades, or defects we would inherit mid-flight?
445. A. All projects, upgrades, and defects are completed. We are not anticipating starting new projects and upgrades for a mid-flight transition.

446. Q. With Notice to Proceed on April 23 and hard cutover by June 15, 2027 (~7.5 weeks), can onboarding/transition KT be priced separately from the managed-services retainer?
446. A. Refer to question #140.

447. Q. Is fully remote delivery acceptable, or are on-site visits expected (travel at vendor cost)?
447. A. Refer to Question #7.

448. Q. Can you work with offshore resources?
448. A. Refer to Question #6, and #7

449. Q. Can you work with onshore contractors?
449. A. Yes

450. Q. Can you work with offshore contractors?
450. A. Refer to question #6, #7, and #22.

Except as provided herein all other terms and conditions remain unchanged.