

Addendum #1 to Data Integration Platform RFP

Responses to Questions

February 5, 2018

Addendum #1 shall be included in the RFP and this addendum shall be part of the RFP documents. All conditions not affected by this addendum shall remain unchanged.

1. Whether companies from Outside USA can apply for this? (like, from India or Canada)
Yes, vendors that meet the requirements outlined in the RFP and Appendix A can apply.
2. Whether we need to come over there for meetings?
Yes, there will be some in person meetings necessary for this engagement.
3. Can we perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside USA? (like, from India or Canada)
Yes. Please see question 1 of this Addendum.
4. Can the development / Part of development happen outside US (e.g India)?
Yes. Please see question 1 of this Addendum.
5. Can we submit the proposals via email?
Please see page 15 of the posted RFP.
6. Will MNSCU be building the integrations, or is the selected vendor expected to be involved in the development of the integration and/or API services? If the vendor is expected to be involved, will there be more details or uses cases provided?
Minnesota State expects to perform all integrations beyond those required to demonstrate the product, provide initial training on the product, and for a proof-of-concept.
7. Is Minnesota State Colleges & Universities System looking for the Cloud Data Integration System to be hosted by vendor, fully managed by vendor, or other? Please provide more specifics.
Minnesota State is looking for a commercial, off-the-shelf cloud based integration platform, hosted by the vendor, where the vendor assumes responsibility for the operation and maintenance of the platform but Minnesota State assumes responsibility for the development, configuration, and maintenance of the actual integrations, transformations and API's.
8. Is Minnesota State looking for any Commercial off the shelf or custom solution?
Please see page 3 of the posted RFP and M1.4 in Appendix A.
9. Is the current system Commercial Off The Shelf or customized solutions? Which is the current system in place?
See 'Problem Statement' on page 3 of the posted RFP.

10. What kind of difficulties are faced by the current system?

See 'Problem Statement' on page 3 of the posted RFP.

11. Do you have a preference between on-premises or cloud hosted infrastructure / software?

Please see page 3 of the posted RFP and M1.1 in Appendix A.

Can you provide a diagram of preferred or acceptable architectures?

Please see Appendix A, G1.1, G1.2.

12. Is there a preferred Cloud Storage Vendor IBM (SoftLayer), Amazon AWS, MSFT Azure, other?

Please see Appendix A, F1.7.

13. How many instances of Azure or Amazon will Minnesota State connect to? Does Minnesota State have multiple instances of PeopleSoft? How many? How many Oracle and SQL Server instances does Minnesota State need to integrate? Which modules of Workday is Minnesota State using?

As indicated in Appendix A, Section F1 and elsewhere in this Addendum, Minnesota State anticipates integration with multiple data stores, databases and API's over the life of this product. Vendors should respond with licensing and pricing structured to accommodate future flexibility in integrations.

Please see also question 39 in this Addendum.

14. Are there any solution configuration or deployment use cases or functionality that are requirements? If so, please identify.

Please see the RFP and this Addendum.

15. Is there an existing IdM solution that MNSCU would prefer to use?

Minnesota State expects the solution to use existing enterprise-wide directory services via the protocols listed in Appendix A, S.2. for authentication and authorization.

16. Are all user known users and business units in an existing Identity Management (IdM) Solution (e.g. Active Directory/LDAP)?

Yes.

17. Will there be multiple/separate IdM solutions for this effort?

No, please see question 17 of this Addendum.

18. For each integration pattern: What are the requirements for latency, volume, number of records, size of records, type of records?

Vendors should respond with licensing and pricing structured to accommodate a broad variety of use cases, future flexibility and growth in integrations.

19. Are mainframe/midrange systems involved? If so, what's the speed of integration required? What data types/formats? Do these systems need to be integrated in a pub-sub fashion?

Minnesota State anticipates a future need for integrations of the types listed in Appendix A, F.1, and as further described in this Addendum. Minnesota State does not anticipate a need to directly integrate with mainframe or midrange systems.

20. What would be the volume of data that we would be anticipating for the solution? Also, what would be the growth rate of the data per annum?

Vendors should respond with licensing and pricing structured to accommodate a broad variety of use cases, future flexibility and growth in integrations.

21. What type of users/personas will make use of the proposed solution?

Minnesota State expects to use the solution to create and manage integrations and API's using existing IT software development staff. The APIs' and integrations that are created using the solution will be used by the entire organization.

22. How many users would be using the system?

Minnesota State anticipates that the number of developers who will use the system to create and manage integrations will be less than a dozen. The systems that are integrated and any exposed API's will serve hundreds of thousands of students.

23. What size are the source systems?

- a. The number of tables?
- b. Approximate size of the database on disk?
- c. What are the largest tables in each system?

Vendors should respond with licensing and pricing structured to accommodate a broad variety of use cases, future flexibility and growth in integrations.

24. Please provide more details on the Workloads

- a. Volumes of Records
- b. Frequency (Hours, Daily, Weekly, Monthly, etc....)
- c. What are the Batch Window & SLA's

Vendors should respond with licensing and pricing structured to accommodate a broad variety of use cases, future flexibility and growth in integrations.

25. How many environments would the Integration Platform be installed?

Minnesota State anticipates a minimum of one each of development, QA and production environments. The scope of each environment may include integrations as listed in Appendix A, Section F1 and elsewhere in this Addendum.

For vendors with per-environment pricing, vendors should respond appropriately in the cost proposal.

26. How many systems are in scope for configuration of Integration Platform?

Please see question 39 of this Addendum.

27. What programming languages are acceptable / preferred for MNSCU-performed custom integration connectors and transformations?

Vendors should respond with which languages that their product supports.

28. If possible, please identify which products are currently in use or a priority?

Minnesota State has no commercial, off-the shelf integration products in use at this time.

29. What are ERP tools currently being used?

Please see question 39 of this Addendum.

30. What are the anticipated web services endpoints in scope? Can Minnesota State provide a list of anticipated web services end points?

As indicated in Appendix A, Section F1 and elsewhere in this Addendum, Minnesota State anticipates integration with multiple data stores, databases and API's over the life of this product/solution. Vendors should respond with licensing and pricing structured to accommodate future flexibility in integrations.

31. Please provide examples of any higher education data models currently in use or have potential interest in.

Please see Appendix A, F1.11.

32. Is Minnesota State looking for any reporting solution as well?

Please see question 33 of this Addendum.

33. Describe ad hoc reporting capabilities. List available parameters for ad hoc reporting. What data do you want to perform ad hoc reporting on, data from the systems or the usage and performance data?

The intent is to be able to perform ad hoc reporting on the integration and API utilization, performance, jobs status, errors etc.; but not on the data in the source or destination systems being integrated.

34. Can Minnesota State clarify what is meant by response caching?

Minnesota State anticipates that in some cases, it may be desirable to cache API responses in the APIS layer, rather than re-querying the source data.

35. Is the installation and configuration of integration platform included in scope of work for the RFP?

We are looking for a SaaS solution. If the solution proposed requires installation/configuration related to the SaaS offering, any on-premise agents, or any data stores, the response should indicate this.

36. Is implementation service included in scope of work for the RFP (post Integration Platform installation and configuration)?

Responses should include anything the vendor feels is necessary to meet the needs of the project outlined in the RFP (eg. Professional services or training to use the tool) up through and including a proof of concept as indicated in #47. Additionally, respond with any costs related ongoing maintenance and support for the solution.

37. What is the high level scope of implementation services?

Please see question 36 of this Addendum.

38. Please describe the type of integration or support desired.

Please see questions 7 and 39 of this Addendum.

39. You mention the outcome of this RFP is that it “will support Minnesota State in creating integrations between premise-to-premise, premise-to-cloud and cloud-to-cloud applications, data sources, databases, and API’s.” Do you want to bring data together into a centralized data warehouse or just integrate systems by sending data from one system to another?

The type of integrations that Minnesota State expects to perform include, but are not limited to:

- During the multi-year transition between the existing custom written ERP and any new, off the shelf SaaS higher education ERP, we anticipate the need for near real-time integration between those systems.*
- Population of new and existing warehouses with data from existing and new ERP, eLearning and other home-grown and 3rd party applications.*
- Exposing existing and new data sources and applications to campus IT developers via API’s and message queues, so that they can develop local applications that use data from enterprise applications.*

40. What data transformations might need to occur, could you please provide a few examples?

Minnesota State envisions a wide array of possible transformations, including data type transformation, data model/schema transformations, and protocol transformations.

41. What are the endpoints in scope? Can you provide a list of anticipated sources and targets?

Please see Appendix A, section F1.

42. As part of the Integration do you require any of the following capabilities Data Profiling?

- Data Quality?
- Metadata Management?
- Data Lineage?
- Data Governance?

These capabilities are not specifically requested in this RFP but are of interest to Minnesota State.

43. Do you require both batch and/or real-time data integration?

Minnesota State requires a platform that can perform real-time, queue based, and batch integrations.

44. Is the data integration real-time or batch oriented?

Minnesota State requires a platform that can perform real-time, queue based, and batch integrations.

45. Proposed solution does not comply with Appendix A, M1.7 (Accessibility Specifications and Standards, WCAG 2.09 VPAT). Will the vendor be disqualified? Will this put the vendor at a disadvantage?

Please see M1.7 in Appendix A of the RFP.

46. Was there a prior RFI Data Integration platform issued? If so, when?

No.

47. Please describe what a proof of concept means to Minnesota State.

Minnesota State will take an existing integration processes and using the new tool to replace that processes.

48. Is Minnesota State seeking a similar solution to that which is being pursued by the selection process that was initiated by the University of Minnesota in 2017?

This is a Minnesota State RFP intended to help Minnesota State meet its own needs.

49. Is this a budget project? Is it a business or IT lead project?

This is a Minnesota State project.

50. Cost proposal - "Identify any other costs associated with the adoption of the solution within the Minnesota State system." Please describe the scope of work as expected by you in adoption of solution.

Please see question 36 of this Addendum.

Additionally, respond with any costs related ongoing maintenance and support for the solution.

51. Can multiple prices be submitted for various configurations (e.g. on-premises and/or SaaS)?

Yes.

52. Can multiple RFP responses be submitted with configurations and associated pricing?

Yes.

53. Is there a compelling event driving the June 1st contract execution?

The deadline is driven by the need to meet deadlines of projects that depend on this integration.

54. Would it be possible extend the RFP Due Date until Feb 29th?

Minnesota State intends to meet the dates published in the RFP.