2026

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL RFP-2026IT-C13219

ADDENDUM #2

Development of a Records Management Structure in SharePoint

ADDENDUM #2

TO ALL BIDDERS:

The following changes, additions or deletions are hereby made a part of the Invitation to Tender Documents for The County of Newell as full and completely as if the same were set forth therein. Please be sure to submit this addendum with your tender:

Records & Information Management (RIM), Classification Framework & Retention Schedule

Question: Does the County have a dedicated internal Records Manager or RIM team who will be actively engaged throughout the project?

Answer: Yes

Question: Will County Records staff be available to approve retention mappings, record declaration rules, and disposition workflows, or is the vendor expected to propose these based strictly on existing bylaws?

Answer: Yes County Records staff will be available to approve retention mapping, records declaration rules, and disposition workflows.

Question: Are records-related decisions centralized (e.g., Clerk / Records Office), or do departments have delegated authority that must be accommodated?

Answer: Centralized

Question: Will County Records staff participate in pilot department validation and sign-off, or will approvals be IT-led?

Answer: County Records Staff

Question: In what format is the approved Records Retention and Disposition Bylaw and Schedule available (e.g., Excel, Word, PDF)? Would it be possible to receive a copy as part of an addendum or after proponent selection?

Answer: Bylaw 1993-20 is available on our website using the Public Documents link
https://laserfiche.countyofnewell.ab.ca/WebLink/DocView.aspx?id=1249125&dbid=0&repo=Newell

Schedule A (the Classification Index/Retention & Disposition Schedule) is in Excel

Question: Approximately how many record classes are defined in the classification framework (e.g., 50, 100, 200+)?

Answer: 150

Question: How many hierarchical levels does the classification framework contain (e.g., Function > Activity > Transaction)? What is the maximum depth?

Answer: As stated in the RFP we want to stick with best practices, which is that you maintain a flat architecture. So although we have Classifications, Categories, and Types we understand that metadata

will be required to keep the agility of the structure but reduce depth. We anticipate that we will require a depth of two but are open to other options that would still allow us to achieve the expected access, views, and filters.

Question: Is the classification framework consistent across all departments, or do individual departments have their own unique schedules?

Answer: We currently have one classification framework for the organization, but the Department is identified in the metadata. For instance, Equipment Purchase agreements are associated with Municipal Services, IT, and Agricultural Services departments.

Question: Are retention periods already assigned to all record classes, or is there still work required to map retention periods to specific classes?

Answer: Yes, retention periods are assigned to all record classes

Question: Have event-based retention triggers already been identified (e.g., employee departure, end of contract, asset disposal)? Approximately how many event-based record classes are there?

Answer: Yes, event-based retention triggers have already been identified. Approximately 30, but they are all of similar event-based retention triggers that fall broadly in these three categories: Asset Disposal, Expired, and Project Completion

Question: Does the Bylaw address email/Exchange records? Is Exchange Online (Outlook) intended to fall within the scope of Purview retention policies?

Answer: Emails are format of correspondence so yes, they fall within the Bylaw. Emails can also contain attachments or other records that are covered under the Bylaw

Question: What is the County's digitization or scanning volume per year, approximately?

Answer: In 2025, 43,204 documents were created in Laserfiche. This includes scanning and documents created by Laserfiche Forms.

Question: Is file share/legacy content migration part of the base scope or strictly optional? If optional, what are the approximate volumes and source systems?

Answer: Not in scope as identified in Section 6.3 Optional Equipment/Services. Managed records within the County EDRMS system (Laserfiche) number 573,939 as of February 2, 2026.

IT & Microsoft 365 Administration, Technical Environment & Microsoft 365 Licensing

Question: Will the County assign a primary Microsoft 365 / SharePoint Administrator to work alongside the vendor team?

Answer: Yes

Question: What level of tenant/administrative access will be granted to vendor resources (e.g., SharePoint Admin, Purview Admin, Global Reader)? If yes, what access model is required (named accounts, PIM/time-bound access, logging, approval process, break-glass controls)?

Answer: Will be determined by the scope of the project and permissions required, based on the best practice of least access principles. Named accounts, PIM/time-bound access, logging, approval process, break-glass controls will be applied as per the recommendation of those in the organization responsible for data security and will follow best practice. Time to consider and implement this aspect of the project should form part of the project plan (timelines) submitted by the proponent.

Question: Are there existing tenant-level policies (DLP, sensitivity labels, conditional access) that vendor resources must align with or cannot modify?

Answer: We expect that this will need to be determined by the County with guidance from the Vendor. With the Vendor being responsible for the identification of tenant-level policies to be considered, configuration of the policies, and training of County staff related to their administration in the future. We expect that policies and practices related to our current EDRMS will be mirrored within SharePoint where possible.

Question: Are there change windows or blackout periods where configuration changes are restricted?

Answer: None are currently identified. The County of Newell will use existing internal change management and/or communication plans, while working with the vendor to ensure change management by identifying and communicating when changes will be occurring with adequate lead time for staff to plan around those periods of time.

Question: How many active Microsoft 365 users does the County currently have?

Answer: The County has 141 active licensed users and 177 active unlicensed users (some clean up is required)

Question: What M365 license tier(s) are currently assigned (e.g., E1, E3, E5, F1, F3)? Are any Microsoft Purview Compliance add-ons (e.g., Compliance P2) currently active?

Answer: Microsoft 365 Business Basic – 25, Microsoft 365 Business Premium – 41, Microsoft 365 E3 – 5, Microsoft 365 E3 (no teams) – 2, Microsoft 365 E5 – 20. No Microsoft Purview Compliance add-ons are active.

Question: Are there existing SharePoint Online sites already in use? If so, approximately how many sites and what is the total estimated storage volume (GB)?

Answer: Yes. 242 sites (largely Team sites), Storage Used 107.64 GB

Question: Approximately how many SharePoint sites, libraries, and active users are currently in use (or expected) within scope?

Answer: Number of sites can be found above, how many of those sites are within scope is negotiable. It might be more productive to start clean. Clearly indicate what you are proposing in your submission. The County has 141 active licensed users and 177 active unlicensed users (some clean up is required)

Question: In SharePoint are any workflows/forms/integrations in use?

Answer: Nothing of significance in SharePoint

Question: What is the current state of M365 governance — is site/Teams group creation currently controlled (approval workflow) or open to all users?

Answer: Currently open to all users but developing governance and setting these policies/restrictions will form part of the project. Preliminary work on deciding who will form that governance will be completed by the County committee responsible.

Question: Are any retention policies or records management settings currently configured in Microsoft Purview, even partially?

Answer: No. We do have retention policies and records management settings currently configured in our existing EDRMS and expect those same policies and records management settings to be reflected in a SharePoint EDRMS.

Question: Is a Content Type Hub or a centralized Site Content Type Gallery already in use in the tenant?

Answer: No

Question: Do all departments and functions currently have active SharePoint sites or Teams groups for adding records management? If not, will content migration be necessary?

Answer: Do all departments and functions currently have active SharePoint sites or Teams groups – Yes, for adding records management – Not sure if they are ready for adding records management. No content migration is necessary.

Question: Is the M365 tenant commercial, GCC, or a government cloud variant? Are there any data residency requirements mandating storage within Canada (e.g., Microsoft Cloud for Sovereignty)?

Answer: Government. No requirement for storage within Canada but want data to remain in North America where similar privacy laws exist.

Question: Are there active third-party business applications (e.g., Amanda, POSSE, Dynamics, JDE, or other ERPs) that generate official records that would need to be governed within SharePoint?

Answer: Not within scope at this time but we are looking to replace our financial system and would like the application to integrate with our SharePoint EDRMS if possible. We have an integration between our ESRI Web Map and our existing EDRMS. We would like to maintain that relationship.

Question: Are Microsoft Teams channels currently used for file collaboration that would need to be brought under the governance model?

Answer: Yes

Question: Are there tenant restrictions we must follow (e.g., limits on Power Automate, custom scripts/SPFx, third-party tools, external sharing, or connector usage)?

Answer: None exist, but we expect them to form part of the project.

Solution Architecture & Technical Configuration

Question: Is a formal, written Solution Architecture Blueprint or Information Architecture document expected as a standalone deliverable to be reviewed and approved prior to any configuration work beginning?

Answer: The County would expect a proponent to have a formal, written Solution Architecture Blueprint or Information Architecture document and seek County approval prior to beginning the project.

Question: Is there a preference for managing Content Types centrally via the tenant-level Content Type Hub, or are department-level content types acceptable?

Answer: No current preference, but pros and cons of each method needs to be communicated allowing for informed decisions. As per the RFP the County expects best practices to form part of the architecture, "Create a SharePoint and information architecture built using best practices..."

Question: Are Microsoft Purview Sensitivity Labels (Information Protection) within scope? Is there an existing information classification policy the solution should align with?

Answer: Yes

Question: For the distinction between transitory content, working documents, and official records — is there a preference for how this is implemented (e.g., metadata columns, content types, separate libraries, or a combination)?

Answer: No current preference, but pros and cons of each method needs to be communicated allowing for informed decisions. As per the RFP the County expects best practices to form part of the architecture, "Create a SharePoint and information architecture built using best practices..."

Question: For disposition workflows: is a human review/approval step required before any record is deleted, or can certain record classes follow a fully automated disposition path?

Answer: Yes

Question: Do you require multi-stage disposition review/approval (e.g., department review then records/legal), and do you require disposition reports to be retained/exported?

Answer: Yes

Question: Should audit logs and compliance reports be surfaced through a dedicated Power BI dashboard, exported to a SIEM/external tool, or managed natively within Microsoft Purview Compliance Center?

Answer: Minimal expectation, managed natively with Microsoft Purview Compliance Center, but a proponent can present other options as added value.

Question: Are Data Loss Prevention (DLP) policies for sensitive data categories (e.g., personal information, payroll data, protected financial records) within the scope of this engagement?

Answer: Yes

Question: Do you require a standardized departmental site template and a controlled site provisioning process (request/approval workflow)?

Answer: Yes, as per Section 5.3 Key Deliverables in the RFP department sites are required as well as site size limitations.

Question: Are there accessibility requirements (e.g., WCAG/AODA) and branding standards for public-facing pages and documents?

Answer: No

Organizational Scope & Departmental Participation, Context & Availability

Question: How many departments are expected to participate actively during Phase 1 versus later rollout phases?

Answer: We are flexible. Please clearly identify your recommended approach in the submission

Question: Will each department provide a designated site owner or business representative for workshops and validation?

Answer: Coordination with County departments will be performed by the County Committee in charge of the project and will be scheduled as needed. There is full cooperation from all functions/departments related to this project.

Question: What is the expected time commitment from departmental staff during discovery, pilot, and training phases?

Answer: There are plans in place to navigate time commitments from County staff. As we are currently unclear on the expectations of staff service capacity, we expect the proponent to communicate the service capacity requirements, and the County Committee will work internally to secure the required resources. Timeline modifications may be required.

Question: Are any departments considered high priority or high risk (e.g., Legislative Services, HR, Enforcement)?

Answer: We have identified a hierarchy of records to be configured first and have developed a method of prioritization. We are prepared for an agile implementation.

Question: Could you provide an approximate user count per department for the ~20 in-scope functions? This will help size departmental site architecture and training efforts.

Answer: Users are not exclusive to a department/function. For example, all users under Corporate Safety are also under Human Resources but are not counted twice. This is why some departments/functions do not have any users listed. Each user was only counted once. These are the number of users generally for each function: Legislative – 10, Administration – 2, Agriculture Services – 6, Facilities – 4, Finance – 4, Payroll – 1, Tax and Assessment – 2, Corporate Safety – 3, Information & Technology – 8, GIS – 1, Communications – 1, Enforcement – 2, Fleet Services – 3, Roads, Streets, Walks, Lighting – 26, Planning & Development – 3, Fire & Emergency Services – 5, Minibus – 4, Parks & Programs - 1

Question: Are certain departments (e.g., Human Resources, Payroll, Corporate Safety, GIS) expected to require isolated site collections or elevated security controls beyond the standard governance model?

Answer: Yes

Question: Will elected officials or Council members require specific access profiles, particularly for Legislative records?

Answer: Yes,

Question: Regarding the public document access site: is this a new creation or the migration of an existing public-facing web portal? What volume of documents is expected to be publicly accessible?

Answer: The County currently has a public document portal (see link below). We expect that a structure for publicly sharing documents is part of the project, migration is not in scope, but can be quoted as part of the value-add section. Please visit our website, public documents
https://laserfiche.countyofnewell.ab.ca/WebLink/Browse.aspx?id=434856&dbid=0&repo=Newell&cr=1

Question: For the public document access site, do you want anonymous access or controlled access, and what publishing model is preferred (approved library → published site)?

Answer: Anonymous. A public document approved library → published site

Question: Is there a plan to designate departmental Records Coordinators or Super Users who would act as champions post-implementation? If so, how many are anticipated?

Answer: Yes, 8-10

Question: How many employees does the County have?

Answer: Approximately 80 FTE

Question: Approximately how many total employees will interact with the new system? Are there external users (contractors, volunteers, partners) requiring access?

Answer: A small group to start with but eventually all staff. No external users.

Governance & Decision Authority

Question:

1. Who is the final decision authority for:
   - SharePoint architecture standards?
   - Retention and disposition implementation?
   - Public document publishing rules?
2. Is there an existing information governance committee, or should one be established for this project?
3. How will conflicting departmental requirements be resolved if they conflict with standardized governance?

Answer: We have developed a governance model for the project. We have a governing body who are authorized to make final decisions when and where required (Records Information Governance Committee). A working committee (LIC) who will be tasked with working with the vendor, who have a scope of authority and will make recommendations to the governing body when decisions lay beyond that scope. The working committee is well represented with IT, , Executive Assistant, and key staff representing department stakeholders (Data Stewards). We have a well-established retention and disposition structures as well as public document publishing rules.

Training & Adoption Expectations:

Question:

What is the approximate total number of County staff who will require training? Please distinguish between end users, Records Coordinators/Super Users, and IT administrators if possible**.**

How many users are expected to receive training by role:
- End users
- Site owners
- Records / IT administrators?

Answer: TBD. The working committee are currently working through a training curriculum in preparation for the project and to position ourselves to make the required decisions we anticipate will need to be made during the project implementation. Part of the project prep, by the County, is to identify County staff who will fill roles related to SharePoint Site Administrator, etc. We are open to a train-the-trainer approach.

Question: What are the acceptance criteria for go-live (pilot sign-off, retention validation, disposition workflow validation, training completion, etc.)?

Answer: Acceptance criteria will be documented after final scope is agreed to and prior to project start and should follow best practices.

Question: Does the County prefer live instructor-led training, recorded sessions, or a hybrid approach?

Answer: Open to any of the above. A proponent can provide each option with a corresponding dollar value (under section 6.3 Optional Equipment/Services of the RFP) or select a single option, clearly identifying which option is quoted.

Question: Are there expectations for post-go-live support or office hours as part of transition?

Answer: Currently no expectations, but that is something that could be quoted under section 6.3 Optional Equipment/Services of the RFP.

Question: Should training materials be tailored by department, or standardized across the organization?

Answer: Standardized across the organization.

Question: Is there an existing internal change management or communication plan in place, or is the Consultant expected to design and lead the full change management strategy?

Answer: There is no expectation for the Consultant to design and lead the full change management strategy. The County of Newell will use existing internal change management and/or communication plans, while working with the vendor to ensure change management by identifying and communicating when changes will be occurring with adequate lead time for staff.

Question: What is the current level of staff familiarity with SharePoint and records processes? Have there been past adoption challenges we should account for in the training/change plan?

Answer: There is an adequate level of staff familiarity with SharePoint and records processes. No adoption challenges need to be considered.

Security, Privacy & Compliance

Question: Are ATIA/FOIP or legal staff expected to participate in requirements validation or sign-off?

Answer: Yes

Question: Are there specific FOIP/ATIA requirements we must design for (e.g., classification of sensitive records, retention of audit/disposition reports, eDiscovery/search expectations, and redaction/publishing controls for the public access site)? If you have a standard FOIP response workflow, can it be shared?

Answer: Yes, for design requirements, no standard FOIP response workflow

Question: Are there specific audit or defensibility scenarios the County wants validated during implementation?

Answer: Yes

Question: Are there data classification or sensitivity standards that must be enforced in parallel with records retention?

Answer: Yes

Question: Are user guides and training materials required in both English and French, or English only?

Answer: English Only

Resource Constraints & Risk Management

Question: Are there known resource availability constraints within the County that may affect timelines?

Answer: Yes, and the internal County team will manage appropriately

Question: Does the County anticipate concurrent initiatives (ERP, GIS, finance, HR systems) that may compete for the same staff?

Answer: Yes, and the internal County team will manage appropriately

Question: Is the County open to a phased departmental onboarding if resource availability becomes constrained?

Answer: Yes

Question: Is the County planning to allocate staff to support this project? If yes, what roles and technical/business expertise do they have?

Answer: Yes. Roles and technical/business expertise varies but is representative of the organization as a whole and includes senior members of the organization.

Post-Implementation Ownership/Post Go-Live Support & Long-Term Governance

Question: Who will assume day-to-day ownership of the EDRMS post go-live (IT, Records, Clerk's Office)?

Is there a designated Records Manager or Compliance Officer role within the County who will own ongoing governance post-implementation?

Answer: Data Stewards Committee is tasked with the maintenance of record related responsibilities in their area of responsibility.

Question: Is the expectation that County staff will be self-sufficient post-transition, or is ongoing vendor support anticipated?

Answer: Self-sufficient

Question: Should vendor knowledge transfer include administrative runbooks and troubleshooting guides?

Answer: Please quote those options in the RFP response, either under Section 6.1 and 6.2 or under 6.3

Question: Are written Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for records management workflows expected as part of the project deliverables?

Answer: Yes

Question: Is the County pursuing alignment with any formal records management standard (e.g., ISO 15489, ARMA GARP principles)? If so, this may influence the level of documentation rigor required.

Answer: ARMA and as outlined in the RFP

Question: Is Year 1 post-go-live support (warranty and governance advisory) expected to be included in the base project price, or proposed as a separately scoped service?

Answer: Separately scoped service

Delivery Model

Question: Please confirm if the client has a preferred delivery approach for project execution on-site, hybrid, or offshore. This will help us align our delivery model, resource allocation, and communication cadence accordingly.

Answer: We are open to any model the proponent wants to quote, but the method quoted should be identified.

Question: We would like to request for an extension period of 2 weeks from the current submission date, which will allow us to thoroughly address all your requirements and provide a comprehensive, high-quality proposal.

Answer: This request will be considered and posted in an addendum if approved.

Project Management & Commercial Terms

Question: Is there an approved or indicative budget range for this project that proponents should be aware of in order to calibrate the scope of their proposal?

Answer: $139,825. Scope should not be limited to budget, but rather limited to deliverables, no key deliverable should be omitted to accommodate budget.

Question: What internal County resources will be dedicated to this project (e.g., IT staff, Records Management staff, departmental representatives), and what is their estimated time availability (approximate % of their working hours)?

Answer: All of the above will be dedicated to this project. There are plans in place to navigate time commitments from County staff. As we are currently unclear on the expectations of staff service capacity, we expect the proponent to communicate the service capacity requirements, and the County Committee will work internally to secure the required resources. Timeline modifications may be required.

Question: Are there other existing IT vendors or managed service providers currently supporting the County's M365 tenant with whom the selected Consultant would need to coordinate?

Answer: No

Question: Is the Project Close Target date of September 15, 2026 a firm contractual deadline, or an indicative milestone subject to mutual agreement?

Answer: This is our target completion date considering staff workloads and other priorities, but the County understands that other constraints and/or project deliverables may require an adjusted project completion date which will be mutually agreed to.

Contract Model & Commercial Structure

Question: The RFP pricing form (Section 6.1) references a "Total Lump Sum Contract Price", while Section 6.2 requests a detailed breakdown by quantity and line item. Can you confirm whether the County requires a strictly fixed lump sum price, or whether a time-and-materials (with not-to exceed cap) or hybrid model (fixed price per phase with a T&M allowance for out-of-scope work) would also be considered?

Answer: Section 6.1 is an aggregated cost of items listed in Section 6.2. Section 6.2 is meant to inform the County of what is contained within Section 6.1 and allow us to determine if key deliverables will be met and/or if there are components that can be removed if price adjustments are required to meet budget. It is up to the proponent to identify if it is a fixed or T&M quotation. The amount in the RFP will be used to evaluate under Section 4.2

Question: In the event that the scope of work changes materially during the project (e.g., the classification framework is significantly more complex than anticipated, or additional departments are added), what is the County's preferred mechanism for handling scope changes — formal change orders, a contingency reserve, or renegotiation of the lump sum?

Answer: The County would prefer a formal change order

Question: Does the County expect proponents to include a contingency budget within the lump sum price, or should contingency be identified as a separate line item in Table A2?

Answer: The determination of whether to include a contingency is up to the proponent and should be identified in Table A2 (designed to help the County understand what is contained within the items listed in Table A1)

Question: Are disbursement and travel expenses (if any on-site visits are required) expected to be included within the lump sum price, or will they be reimbursed separately against actuals?

Answer: As noted in Table A1 in Section 6.1 of the RFP the County expects transparency pricing and has asked that all costs associated with disbursement fees, administrative fees and any other undisclosed fees be included and will be part of the evaluation processes. If travel expenses are expected and have not been included in Items 1-4 of Table A1, then they should be included in Item 5 of Table A1 and then clearly listed in Table A2.

WCB & Insurance Requirements

Question: Section 7.3 requires a "valid WCB clearance letter" without specifying a particular provincial jurisdiction. Would a clearance certificate issued by an equivalent workers' compensation body in the province(s) where the proponent's employees are based — such as the CNESST in Quebec — satisfy this requirement? If not, is there a grace period within which a WCB Alberta registration could be completed after contract award?

Answer: If a proponent is quoting on-site services, then a WCB Alberta registration will be required. If the proponent quoting on-site services is successful in their bid discussion can be had regarding a grace period.

End of Addendum 2