



## Q&A Addendum

### Information Technology Service Management System (ITSM) RFP 615510

**This document provides question and answer information pertaining to the above captioned RFP and will be updated as necessary.**

**REMINDER:** It is the Respondent's responsibility to thoroughly examine and read the entire RFP document and any appendices and addenda to this RFP.

#### Posted September 2, 2016

**Question:** Are there any Existing Knowledge tools?

**Answer:** Varied tools. KACE is used by some departments. We also have a web based Tech Articles page.

**Question:** What are the sources of knowledge articles?

**Answer:** Articles are created by tech departments across campus.

**Question:** Is there a requirement to migrate knowledge Articles to ServiceNow Knowledge Base?

**Answer:** We need to understand if and how articles can be imported in or migrated into a knowledgebase within the ITSM tool that we choose.

**Question:** Is there a need to translate the knowledge base articles to users local language?

**Answer:** Not currently, but possibly at some time in the future.

**Question:** Which Ticketing tool is currently used in UAF networks?

**Answer:** Multiple - Dell KACE, internal tools ASKIT and HogIT, Housing has their own tool.

**Question:** What is the scope of data migration to ServiceNow from the existing Ticketing tool?

**Answer:** The existing tools will be left operational until all cases and queues are closed. The ITSM tool that is chosen will be starting as a clean slate.

**Question:** What is the volume of the data that needs to be migrated from incumbent tool to ServiceNow?

**Answer:** None.

**Question:** Is there an Enterprise architecture diagram of the ITSM platform or tools used in environment you can provide?

**Answer:** No.

**Question:** Do you have any DMZ specific implementation requirements within ServiceNow platform or any Domain separation within environment?

**Answer:** No.

**Question:** Is ITSM process established and Process documentation available to share?

**Answer:** No.

**Question:** What are current testing cycles and testing tools used? DO you have any testing automation tools?

**Answer:** No.

**Question:** Approximately how many CI does UAF have?

**Answer:** Unknown.

**Question:** What is your current asset management process?

**Answer:** Manual - Some areas use Dell KACE.

**Question:** Are you planning to use ServiceNow Discovery or do you plan to integrate with existing discovery tools?

**Answer:** Hope to integrate with an agent-based asset management tool.

**Question:** Is there a requirement to map the Critical Business Services? If Yes, How Many?

**Answer:** Primary purpose is for the IT departments. Business units such as HR and Facilities may be part of future growth of the tool.

**Question:** Language internationalization can be performed in ServiceNow, Which Language Plugin would be required for UAF network?

**Answer:** English is the primary language that will be used. We currently do not have plans to convert to other languages. This would be looked at as a future step.

**Question:** Is there a requirement to implement and build Orchestration? If yes, can UAF provide us with the scope of the activities which need to be performed using Orchestration & which are the interfacing environment & devices at high level?

**Answer:** Not sure what is meant by Orchestration. If this is part of the building of the CMDB and the relationship between devices, we do want to implement and build an all-encompassing CMDB. We currently do not have this in house currently.

## Posted September 6, 2016

**Question:** Section 10. Integration / API “Ability to make changes to AD from ITSM tool”  
*What changes specifically are you asking about?*

**Answer:** We would like to know if the tool is capable, with API links to Active Directory, to disable an account in AD within a workflow in the ITSM tool. There other pieces that we might like to automate, but this is a good example.

**Question:** Section 19. Custom Workflows "Queue Configuration - Ability to easily build workflows within and between task and project queues."  
*Would you please provide a use case(s) for this functionality?*

**Answer:** Onboarding of an employee. Request for equipment that might go to manager for approval, once approved creates a task for purchasing to order the equipment, once received, a task would be created for configuration of the machine to Desktop, etc....

**Question:** Appendix II: Pricing

In this Appendix the RFP states: “As an assumption for pricing concerns consider the following breakout of agents:

20 Administrative (FTE)  
130 Technician (FTE)  
150 Student / Hourly Worker

UAF understands that these numbers would be less if the agents are licensed concurrently.”

*The sum of the license types above is 300. Later in the associated ‘Cost items’ Table – the RFP indicates:*

Cost Items - “If you cannot separate User License fees indicate so in notes, however include license pricing for the quantity in Counts column so that the total quantity is 350”

*In the table the sum of the license types is 350 – 50 of which are listed as ‘Concurrent’. How would you have vendors respond for license counts if Concurrent Licenses are not offered?*

**Answer:** We understand that we would need less licenses if they are concurrently licensed. We added this option for the vendors that license their agents this way. We also understand that many vendors offer only named licenses. If so, mark concurrent licenses as N/A. Some vendors also offer a combination of the two. We were hoping to give the opportunity to price both ways.

**Question:** What Help Desk tool(s) are you using today?

**Answer:** Many – Dell KACE, Homegrown ticketing tools AskIT, HogIT, and Housing has their own.

**Question:** How many licenses do you own? Are they named or concurrent?

**Answer:** Unlimited with Dell KACE, Others are internal built tools.

**Question:** On page 26 of your RFP you provide the following: “As an assumption for pricing concerns consider the following breakout of agents: 20 - Administrative (FTE), 130 - technician (FTE) and 150 - Student / Hourly Worker. UAF

*understands that these numbers would be less if the agents are licensed concurrently.”*

The technology we are proposing uses a concurrent license model. How many concurrent licenses would you suggest we propose? How many of these users would be logged in at the same time actively working on and updating records?

**Answer:** We do not have a complete answer for this question, but would like to know if there were different costs for different types of concurrent agents. Example: Student part time agents, Full time technical agents, part time technical agents, Administrative agents, and if an agent might be needed for management approval.

**Question:** Do you have a preference for a purchase license model or a subscription license model?

**Answer:** Preference for a Subscription based solution, but would entertain both.

**Question:** Do you have a preference for a system hosted by the vendor or installed on your premises?

**Answer:** Preference for Hosted, but need pricing for both Hosted and on Prem.

**Question:** For implementation, what processes/capabilities should we include in our cost estimates (ie. Incident, Request, Change, Self-Service etc.)?

**Answer:** Yes on all of those for implementation. Goal is to replace the ticketing systems we have and to provide a Self-Service portal within the initial phase of deployment.

**Question:** For implementation, what integrations should we include in our cost estimates (ie. AD, email etc.)?

**Answer:** AD, email, DELL KACE, MS SCCM, Bomgar, and may be more.

**Question:** For importing of user/employee contact data what sources do you have that we will need to integrate to (ie. Active Directory)?

**Answer:** Active Directory mainly, but we also have a need in Housing to integrate with a system that provides student dorm locations.

**Question:** For single sign-on what technology do you have in place today (ie. SAML, Windows Authentication, Shibboleth)? If you are looking at a hosted solution do you have ADFS enabled?

**Answer:** Using Shibboleth now, but working with Microsoft and Dell on a new solution.

**Question:** Does the Vendor Identification Form need to be completed and submitted with the bid response? Or is that only applicable for the selected vendor?

**Answer:** This form is a requirement to receive payment from UofA Fayetteville. However, it's suggested that all bidders complete the form and submit with proposals so appropriate information can be updated in our Procurement system - for future bid opportunities if nothing else.

**Question:** On page 11 of the Standard Terms and Conditions document is the “Contract and Grant Disclosure and Certification Award”. Does a completed copy of this form need to be completed and submitted with the bid response? Or is that only applicable for the selected vendor?

**Answer:** Yes – a completed copy of this form needs to be included with your proposal.

**Question:** In section 6 Software License Management of the Vendor Evaluation Matrix can you provide more detail on what capabilities you are looking for in the two (2) items listed “Inventory Software Licenses” and “Inventory Infrastructure Software”?

**Answer:** We need to use the ITSM solution to provide a framework for Software licensing including the ability to either deploy an agent on the endpoints to gather software installed on those machines, use discovery methodology to pull this information, or work with tools such as KACE or SCCM to gather that information.

**Question:** In Appendix II it states "In this section, we will also need to know costs for Asset Discovery, i.e. is there a charge for agents deployed on each machine to collect and report software and hardware components on the asset." - How many devices is the University looking to manage?

**Answer:** The total number is currently unknown. We are estimating 5000 plus.

**Question:** In what capacity is the University currently using SCCM? (administer devices, deploy software, etc.)

**Answer:** A few departments including Engineering and out Server Management team.

**Question:** In what capacity is the University currently using KACE? (asset management, ticketing, etc.)

**Answer:** Walton College, College of Architecture, College of Education, Student Services management of General Access Lab environments.

**Question:** In Appendix II, it state "as an assumption for pricing concerns consider the following breakout of agents:

20	Administrative (FTE)
130	Technician (FTE)
150	Student / Hourly Worker"

But later in the cost items chart, it has a row for 50 Concurrent Licenses, and requests that total be 350. Could you please confirm the license count that the University is looking for? (Is the University looking for 300 named users AND 50 concurrent users? Or does the University estimate that 50 concurrent licenses would be sufficient for the 300 users listed?)

**Answer:** In order to allow vendors the ability to quote named and concurrent licenses, we added the 50 concurrent licenses. We are unsure of the exact number of agents that we will have using the ITSM tool at any one time, and probably will not know until we have been using the tool for some time. We need to know the types of agent licensing that each vendor offers and be able to evaluate cost effectiveness and value as these licenses relate to the University of Arkansas.

**Question:** Use case examples for tickets opened for non-affiliates (end users outside of the university system)

**Answer:** Calls from Parents who need their passwords reset. Parents are given access to Student accounts with the permission of the student, but are not part of the University system.

Adjunct Professors that teach a specific class, but are not part of the University.

Emeritus individuals that have retired from the university, but are still supported.  
No longer part of the University system.

**Question:** Telephone system in place today in call center(s)?

**Answer:** Current system is analog with a Nortel (10-year-old) system that is limited to 5 phones. Looking at Cisco Call Center Express solution in near future.

**Question:** Use case examples for “ability to make changes to AD from ITSM Tool”

**Answer:** Would like the ability to create or disable an account in AD via a workflow in ITSM tool.

Would like the ability to create accounts as part of a workflow for common profiles.

Would like the ability to grant access to shared folders via workflow in ITSM tool.

**Question:** Describe “billing functionality” under section 18

**Answer:** An area of the University needs the ability to create invoices and for services performed. Need the ability within the tool to invoice for these services. May need the ability to track work and bill services to other departments.

**Questions:** What data must be encrypted at rest?

**Answers:** This information has not been defined.

### **Incident Management and Request Management**

1. Ability to set pre-approved communications, response templates, and phone messages

1. Please describe the desired functionality and process for phone messages

We would like the ability to preload the phone system with known issues. This is similar to our want to post known issues and outages on our Service Desk Portal.

2. Is it assumed that there is an integration with a phone system?

Yes

1. If yes, what phone system?

The current phone system will be replaced. We are in the process of evaluation solutions. We would hope that the ITSM solution will integrate with the phone system. The hope is that when a call comes in, it would auto create a ticket with the caller’s information.

3. Does the University already have an SMS solution?

Not sure

2. Ticket rules to auto assign from Bomgar session.

1. Does the University already use Bomgar?

Yes. We use Bomgar.

3. Auto generated / Scheduled ticket generation.

1. Please describe this process in more detail.

The process that we are describing is part of a workflow that would auto create tickets through the workflow after each task is completed within the workflow. We also have repetitive tasks that occur on a

- regular basis that we would like to schedule with an auto generated / scheduled ticket.
2. Is this requirement in regards to auto-generated alerts?  
Yes. Could be. We would eventually like to have monitoring systems generate tickets for the proper personnel. Not something we will pursue early in the process.
  3. Is this requirement in regards to asset maintenance?  
Yes. Could be. Not something we will pursue early in the process.
  4. Auto identification of thresholds of similar cases over specified time frame  
Please describe this process in more detail  
With the advent on this one tool used across campus, we are hoping to be able to identify similar issues that are happening across campus. Our current environments are not part of the same system, so we do not know of issues happening across campus. We need to know if similar issues are happening throughout the campus.
  5. End user acceptance capability: Ability to accept legal acceptable use policy, Permission to repair, not held liable, etc. Please describe this process in more detail  
We need to incorporate in the ticketing process a permission to repair and not held liable document because we will be working on technical equipment that is not owned by the University.

### **Problem Management**

1. System automatically prompts user with potentially related tickets based on multiple criteria. Please describe this process in more detail.  
Would like to see within the portal a self-service area with a search feature that prompts the user to search for the solution to their problem. We would also like to see this search incorporated within the ticket creation window with suggestions of relevant articles.

### **Integrations/APIs**

1. Interface/integration with inventory/discovery technologies (e.g. - KACE, SCCM, Altiris, etc.). Please describe what solutions the University is using and how they are using them.  
The UAF currently owns KACE and SCCM. These tools are currently not being used consistently across campus. There will be a decision made on which tool will be used as an asset tool, but that decision has not been made.  
We need to know that the ITSM tool that we chose has the ability to use data from either of these tools.

**Question:** 5. PROJECT TIMELINE OF ACTIVITIES  
We noted that some items are TBD. Is there an ideal time that you intend to choose and implement the chosen ITSM solution (for example, in conjunction with the calendar year, school year or budget cycle)?

**Answer:** We hope to have a go live date prior to the start of Fall Semester 2017, if not before.

**Question:** 7.7 RESERVATION  
We understand that there is no commitment to make an award but has funding been budgeted and appropriated for this expenditure? If it has not been, what is the timing involved in that process.

**Answer:** Budget has been approved for this project.

**Question:** 8.4 Section related to opening of proposals  
Since the proposals will be publicly opened are responding bidders allowed and encouraged to attend? If not will you quickly provide the names of respondents and the “preliminary determination of proposal responsiveness”?

**Answer:** Considering this is a RFP process, the determination of proposal responsiveness is subject to protocol which extends beyond the tabbing of respondent names. There is no significant information provided at the time of bid opening, and therefore it is not encouraged for bidders to attend.

**Questions:** 13. EVALUATION AND SELECTION PROCESS

- Please explain the composition of the evaluation team referenced in section “A”?

**Answers:**

Computer Support Manager	Service Desk (UITS)
Project/Program Specialist	Project Management (UITS)
Computer Support Specialist	Agricultural Research
Director of Technology Service	Education
Student Tech Services Manager	Student Services (UITS)
Senior Web and App Developer	UITS
Computer Support Coordinator	Housing
Computer Support Manager	Walton College of Business
Computer Lab Technician	Service Desk (UITS)
Computer Support Technician	Fulbright
Network Service Team Lead	UITS

- Will any members of the evaluation team be individuals who previously chose or currently manage your existing ITSM solution(s)?  
**We currently do not have a true ITSM Solution. Some of these individuals manage the ticketing tool for their areas.**
- After reviewing, the “rate themselves” answers from each vendor, you indicate that you’ll also rate based on “research”. Does this research include the most recent Gartner Magic Quadrant and Critical Capabilities? If not, we can supply that information.  
**We have the current Gartner Magic Quadrant information and Critical Capabilities documents.**
- What other “research” is being used?  
**We have asked for references from current customers, minimum of three and for two customers that have left the platform. We will be contacting these customers and performing interviews with them. We will also be researching via industry sources such as PinkElephant, HDI and SDI.**
- In section “B”, will you share what you consider to be “must, should, could, want” prior to any potential presentations?  
**Our Must, Should, Could, and Want criteria will be kept internal.**
- Please explain any additional weighting of sections A, B and C. How will pricing be weighted related to the technical considerations? Is there a formal budgeted amount or informal target amount for this project?  
**We have a budgeted amount for an ITSM Tool. This is not an amount that will be published, but is part of the formal budgeting for the Campus IT Department. Pricing will be evaluated from a cost-effectiveness/value**



proposition. We will be looking for a solution that best fits the needs of the UAF not only now, but for the future.

**Questions:** MISCELLEANEOUS

- Who is the incumbent vendor (or vendors) and has the University already decided that they will be replaced?

**Answers:** There is not an incumbent vendor that is being replaced. The ticketing system in use is an internally created system.

- If the incumbent vendor (or vendors) are likely to reply, will they be given any preferential consideration?

N/A

- When does the current agreement(s) expire with any incumbent vendor (or vendors)?

N/A

- And are the expiration dates driving your potential timetable for award and implementation of the solution chosen through this RFP?

N/A

**Questions:** APPENDIX II: PRICING

- In other sections of the RFP, the University indicates a desire to integrate with SCCM or Dell KACE. We inferred that those tools are in use, which could facilitate collection and reporting of software and hardware components. Is the University looking for additional discovery tools to be provided by the selected vendors or would integration to those existing tools be preferred?

**Answers:** The UAF currently owns licensing for SCCM and KACE. We would prefer an agent based tool for reporting of software and hardware information on University owned equipment. We would like for the ITSM tool to integrate with KACE or SCCM via APIs. We are also open to evaluating an agent based tool from another vendor. We prefer agent based tools over discovery methodology.

- In the chart for license pricing, do you want “Fixed” (aka “Named”) licenses quoted for Administrative, Technician, and Student Users?

Yes

- Will you consider “Concurrent” users for any of those categories, in particular the “Student User” who is not indicated as a Full Time Employee?

Yes

- Our assumption is that the “Student User” is a part time employee of IT, is that correct?

Student workers are part time / hourly employees that are Students of the University.

- How many hours do each of the “Student User(s)” work per day and on what type of schedule? We would potentially use that to make a recommendation for them to use “Concurrent” licenses.

Student worker hours vary because of the nature of their class schedules. The reason that we included a line item for concurrent licenses is to include the opportunity for vendors with concurrent licensing to have the ability to bid. The UAF will evaluate the cost-effectiveness and value of the proposed licensing solutions to ascertain which licensing methodology best fits the UAF.

- Question:** What ITAM related goals does the University of Arkansas have for its new system? (i.e. consolidating assets in one place, Contract Management, Procurement, Software Asset Management, etc.)
- Answer:** The UAF asset management is currently within each department's purview. UAF hopes to bring all University owned equipment under one asset management platform to manage software and hardware assets.
- Question:** What asset classes are in scope? (Servers, network devices, tablets, desktops, laptops, software licenses, non-IT, etc.)
- Answer:** Yes to all.
- Question:** Is the University of Arkansas looking to migrate data from any existing systems, databases or spreadsheets? If yes, please describe.
- Answer:** No. We do want to import Knowledgebase articles.
- Question:** Is University of Arkansas looking to replace any technologies in which this new system must replicate some workflows, features or functionality? If yes, please describe.
- Answer:** This product will be replacing an existing internally built ticketing system. There are currently no workflows that will be migrated.
- Question:** Please describe how the University of Arkansas intends to use mobile devices/mobile functionality for IT Asset Management. (i.e. to conduct physical inventory, moving assets, receiving assets, etc.)
- Answer:** Would like to have the ability to scan barcodes via mobile devices to collect physical inventory, verify location of an asset and verify receipt.
- Question:** Please list all the integrations the University of Arkansas expects have with this system (i.e. Procurement system, Contract Management System, Financial/ERP system, etc.). Define each integration at a high level (functionality, uni or bi directional, etc.)
- Answer:** Incident Management  
Request Management  
Change Management  
Asset Management  
Software License Management  
Knowledge Management
- Question:** Personalized user interface and options flexibility (i.e. customize your screen for your preferences and tools you use)
- a. Is the target capability requested here envisioned to be global across all screens? And, is it intended that a user would be able to add or remove fields from standard form, such as the Incident form, or even to change the layout and order of fields on the standard forms?
- Answer:** The idea here is that the experience of the user of this ITSM tool/platform to be based on the login credentials of that user. Access to specific knowledgebase articles, reports, dashboards and queues are controlled by the credentials of the logged in user.
- Question:** Incident and Request Management (section header)
- a. Does UAF execute these as a single process or separate processes?

**Answer:** Currently managed within each college's help desk system individually.

**Question:** Ability to set pre-approved communications, response templates, and phone messages

- "Phone messages"? Is this requirement intended to be a voice recording that will playback when a phone number is answered or goes to the number's voice mailbox, or is it intended to be an SMS text message went to a mobile phone number?

**Answer:** This would be addressed within a phone system.

**Questions:** Ability to submit and track tickets on behalf of users (Non-Affiliates) outside the University system

- Assumption: this would be someone within the University system opening a ticket for someone outside the University system

**Answers**

**Yes**

- What would be the intended input channel/mechanism? (Phone, email, self-service portal?)

**All three**

- Would the individual 'outside the University system' have a User record within the solution, in which an email address and/or phone numbers might be captured? Or, would that individual's name simply be captured in an open text field?

**Most likely an open text field. The best example here would be a parent.**

- Would it be intended that the "Opened for" individual would receive any kind of notifications or update in regards to specific types of requests?

**Only for their own requests.**

**Question:** Tickets trackable/searchable both by the agent and the client.

- To continue the line of questioning from above, who is the "client"? If the "client" could possibly be defined as the "Opened for" individual, how would they track/search 'their' tickets? How do you envision that working?

**Answer:** As answered above, the idea here is that the experience of the user of this ITSM tool/platform to be based on the login credentials of that user. A logged on user/client should be able to view the tickets that they have in the system as a client. They should be able to see only their tickets within the ticketing system and see what progress is posted on these tickets. This would not be available for clients that are not part of the University system.

**Question:** Parent / Child ticket capability: Ability to group multiple calls/tickets into a common or master incident

- Is a potential target of this capability intended to create a 'parent' record for a "Major Incident/Outage"? If so, how do you envision identifying the 'parent' as such and then, presumably, applying a different workflow?
- Is a potential target of this capability intended to be the creation of a "Request" record, which would be the 'parent' of a collection of specific "Request Items"?
- Are there other potential ticket types that you'd like to have this 'parent/child' relationship available?

**Answer:** Parent / Child tickets allow for many scenarios. Parent ticket = Onboarding of user. Child tickets = purchase of machine (1 child Ticket), configuration of machine (2<sup>nd</sup> child ticket), User ID created (3<sup>rd</sup> child Ticket), etc... Another scenario could be a Parent ticket for a specific outage and users calling in with the same issue as child tickets under this one issue. Many scenarios where this works.

**Question:** Client vs. Customer: are these synonymous or do they point to different communities of users?

**Answer:** Synonyms

**Question:** What are the business drivers for this platform change (if it is one)? Is it simply a tool swap / tool consolidation exercise or are there wider drivers or imperatives to be considered?

**Answer:** Multiple tools converging into 1. Duplication of effort around campus being addressed. Best Practices being deployed across Campus. Many more.

**Question:** Is the vision defined and documented and supported by a strategic roadmap?

**Answer:** Yes

**Question:** How many IT users in total require to be trained in the ITSM platform? Where are these users dispersed geographically? Are any external IT vendors?

**Answer:** Total numbers have not been determined, but local to the UAF campus.

**Question:** Do you run a dedicated IT ServiceDesk / HelpDesk function?

**Answer:** Yes. But there are also separate departmental Help Desks across the campus.

**Question:** Our assumption is that training initially requires to undertaken on the following functions and processes (General tool orientation and navigation, Reporting, Incident, Problem, Change, Knowledge, Asset Management, Software License Management and Request Management). Is this assumption correct?

**Answer:** Yes

**Question:** Our assumption is that a foundational knowledge of best practice ITSM already exists for the current IT users and that this training proposal does not need to cater for this need. Is this correct?

**Answer:** Yes

**Question:** Our assumption is that training requires to be role based and contextual to the internal nuances and processes within the University rather than "one size fits all out-of-the box training". Is this correct?

**Answer:** Yes

**Question:** Have any training needs analysis activities been carried out?

**Answer:** Yes. ITIL Foundations training for some.

**Question:** Is there a service culture in place within the IT organizations impacted by this change?

**Answer:** Yes

- Question:** Are all of the ITSM processes currently in use, and familiar to the IT users, or are some of the ITSM processes being introduced for the first time? Please expand.
- Answer:** Many of the ITSM processes will be defined by the tool/platform that we choose. Many processes need to be refined and developed. Some will be first-time.
- Question:** Do you have any voice of the customer or customer satisfaction stats that you can share with us that provide a user perspective on the service that IT currently provides?
- Answer:** Not during this process, but will be provided to the vendor awarded this contract.
- Question:** Have any baseline process maturity assessments taken place and if so what were the principle findings from a broad and a people skills perspective?
- Answer:** No
- Question:** Are ITSM process owners in place for each of the key processes?
- Answer:** No
- Question:** Are key performance targets and indicators in place at a process level to align with and to support business outcomes?
- Answer:** No
- Question:** Is it your intention that formal ITSM process policies, processes and work instructions will be in place prior to training development activities?
- Answer:** Some, At least
- Question:** Has a training approach and strategy been formulated and approved?
- Answer:** Some. We have not completely defined the process, but are working on a training model.
- Question:** Is the primary training approach based on face to face classroom sessions?
- Answer:** No. Side-by-side training is large in our environment.
- Question:** Would all training be conducted by your own trainers (enabled by a train the trainer program) and if so, how many trainers have been identified?
- Answer:** Defiantly hope to identify trainers who would then train our employees.
- Question:** Do you operate a central Learning Management System (LMS) or portal where digital learning and other learning assist could be hosted?
- Answer:** Yes
- Question:** Our assumption is that the University would be responsible for all training administration activities (room booking, scheduling, joining instructions). Is this correct?
- Answer:** Yes
- Question:** Our assumption is that it is likely that training will also be required for those participating in User Acceptance Testing (UAT), is this a correct assumption?
- Answer:** Yes