



CLARIFICATIONS

Ref: ECMWF/RFP/2019/BOND25
ISSUED BY: ECMWF Administration Department Procurement Section
Date: 8 January 2020
Version: Final

We are pleased to provide the following clarification responses to questions received.

1 Ref: C4_RFP_BOND25

Question:

How accurate is the current logical data model design? Has it changed since May 2019?

Answer:

The CMDB data model has not been changed since May 2019 and is expected to be appropriate for use in Bologna, IT.

2 Ref: C5_RFP_BOND25

Question:

Can we have some examples of the "Existing CMDB data covering ECMWF Reading Data Centre"? We assume these are "CMDB data is MS Excel tables including 2834 classified CI's and 4970 relationships". How many technical services are covered by your newly formed / current CMDB? (is it the same 33 'IT services' referred to in later sections). Do you have a draft / final CMDB reflecting the FMO (i.e. after Bologna goes live)? Please can you share these?

In WP5 – please provide the list of your “thirty-three identified IT services “. Do you already have associated KPIs in place or drafted?

Answer:

ECMWF will not be able to provide the CMDB data as part of the RFP. The information provided in the RFP regarding the CMDB data is considered sufficient to make an offer.

3 Ref: C6_RFP_BOND26

Question:

Have there been any significant changes to the current operational components since the data set was produced?

Answer:

Since May 2019, there have been some changes to the operational components which are not reflected in the current dataset. These are not considered to be significant for the undertaking.

4 Ref: C7_RFP_BOND26

Question:

To what extent do ECMWF require the respondent to install and configure the Insight software (WP2), the KPI dashboard (WP 5) and Change management tooling (WP 6) and build the interfaces with other components of the test environment? Are we expected to:

Produce detailed specifications; Partner an ECMWF colleague and collaborate on the installation and configuration activities; Take direct responsibility for building the PoC environment, including software coding in Python / Bash / another and inbound and outbound interfaces as required?

Answer:

A specification sufficient to reproduce the work locally will be needed. It is expected within the engagement that the successful vendor will partner with ECMWF analyst(s) on installation and configuration of Insight in order that ECMWF can undertake operational responsibility in the future.

Yes. Making use of ECMWF onsite pre-production JSD stack if/when appropriate.

5 Ref: C8_RFP_BOND26

Question:

Are there some concrete requirements regarding the following Integrations?

- Integration with Netzoom DCIM
- Integration with Infoblox IPAM
- Integration with Opsview monitoring
- Integration with Splunk logging and aggregation

Will any tools other than Jira require feeds from the CMDB in the PoC? - Would a configurable API be sufficient?

Answer:

There are no concrete requirements. The vendor is expected based on their previous experience to capture the requirements and suggest designs. Integration between Insight and JSD/ Change/ Opsview/ Splunk/ DCIM/ Infoblox should be demonstrated by exercising the API of Insight. Only JSD and Change integrations are expected to be significant from an end-user perspective. For Opsview/ Splunk/ DCIM/ Infoblox, actual real-time integration should not be necessary within scope but it should be conceptually proved, for example using the JIRA/Insight API. The following details can be assumed:

- JSD integration should be out-of-the-box and 2-way
- Change integration would need to be demonstrated and 2-way
- DCIM is read-only to Insight
- Infoblox IPAM is read-only to Insight
- Opsview would be read-only to Insight
- Splunk would be read-only to Insight

6 Ref: C9_RFP_BOND26

Question:

Can we safely assume that the JSD/Change/Opsview/Splunk/DCIM/Infoblox versions in the PoC test environment will be representative of production versions?

Answer:

The versions of JSD/Change/Opsview/Splunk/DCIM/Infoblox will be representative of the production versions.

7 Ref: C10_RFP_BOND26

Question:

Are there any acceptance criteria for these Integrations? We have some experience with many Integrations (AWS, GCE, Azure, OpenStack, VCenter 6.5, Chef, Ansible Tower + Facts, Puppet, Matrix42 etc) and we know that the implementation effort can vary by a factor of 10x depending on the different integration requirements. To be able to provide a fix Price offer we would need some more detailed requirements and in the best-case acceptance criteria.

In WP2 – please can you confirm that Riada has successfully completed integration (for other clients) with all the tools you list in scope. Please can you confirm that Riada will be involved in this workstream (or an approved UK channel partner / services provider)? How many (Riada specialist) FTEs are involved to date?

Answer:

No acceptance criteria have been defined for integrations. ECMWF's expectation is to focus its investment in Configuration Management to give the maximum return on our investment. We are starting from a green-field in terms of formal CM tooling so expect that this iteration will aim to deliver 80% value for 20% effort. As such implementation effort should be kept to a minimum. Future evolutions will take us forward only when our base capability develops. We have also kept the number of integrations limited to those specific tools that we have designated as strategic. Any offers made should take this guidance into account in light of experience the company has in undertaking similar work.

Tenderers should also take note of the following clarification published previously with regards to Riada:

The RFP document published refers to “Riada Insight and Discovery” as the identified tool. ECMWF recognises that as of 9th December 2019, the company Riada has rebranded its product business to Mindville. Therefore, in reading and responding to the RFP, when referring to “Riada Insight and Discovery” this should be translated directly to “Mindville Insight and Discovery”.

8 Ref: C11_RFP_BOND26

Question:

"Data reconciliation report generation tools": what are the requirements for this tool?

Answer:

Data reconciliation report tools are expected to demonstrate the degree of consistency/compliance of the captured or discovered CMDB data with respect to related data that exists in each of the integrated tools (JSD/ Change/ Opsview/ Splunk/ DCIM/ Infoblox). It should be possible for these tools to be executed repeatably as needed to detect “configuration drift” across those tools. As previously indicated, the 80/20 rule should be applied in terms of ROI and the offer made should take this guidance into account in light of the companies experience in undertaking similar work.

9 Ref: C12_RFP_BOND26

Question:

For WP2 - Please can you confirm our understanding – that Tool Selection has been performed but no POC/Implementation has taken place with Riada - so essentially this is a ‘Greenfield’ implementation.

Regarding WP5, WP6, WP7 – have ECMWF already assessed & worked with Riada to plan against the proposed timetable? Do Riada support this approach and planned timelines?

Will Riada (or an authorised EMEA partner / service provider) be bidding for some / all of this scope? Are ECMWF expecting Riada (or an authorised EMEA partner / service provider) to be delivering other workstreams alongside the work identified in RFP25? Is this already contracted between ECMWF and Riada / other supplier(s)?

Answer:

ECMWF has no existing relationship with Riada/Mindville. ECMWF has no plans to have an additional relationship in this area beyond what is offered. The relationship with Riada/Mindville will be supply only. ECMWF has not undertaken an extensive evaluation of Insight as regards integrations. It is expected that the vendor will undertake this work. ECMWF has not implemented Insight in any form to date and this implementation can be considered PoC and “green-field”.

10 Ref: C13_RFP_BOND26

Question:

"Software for integration is Python or Bash". As far as we understand the target platform is JIRA Server and Insight (which is a Java based App for JIRA). Does it mean, we are not allowed to use JIRA Server Apps which must be written in Java?

Answer:

ECMWF software development predominantly uses Python/Bash for high level needs. In principal ECMWF does not undertake software development in Java except in specific niches where no other alternatives exist. Bespoke modules should be avoided if possible and off-the-shelf modules should be implemented. Any bespoke modules needed that are best developed in Java for use in JIRA with Insight should be identified, agreed, fully documented and use standard practice. Making best use of the Mindville solution means that development of modules in Java is not excluded.

11 Ref: C14_RFP_BOND26

Question:

With regards to both the KPI dashboard and also change management tool implementation the scope is defined in technical terms. Is there an expectation that adoption of those tools and revised processes is going to be covered by another/internal workstream? In particular activities like training, creation of procedures, migration of users etc.

Answer:

The optional work packages covering technical implementation of KPI dashboards and Change tooling (if taken up) will be quantified, agreed and scheduled with ECMWF analysts based on the results of discovery work undertaken. ECMWF will then plan to undertake the necessary tasks to bring the tools into use.

12 Ref: C15_RFP_BOND26

Question:

"As part of the technical review earlier in 2019, a recommendation was accepted to implement process KPI dashboards to provide reports on ITSM coverage and performance of processes and services. This progressed to the creation of a visual mock-up covering service availability, configuration management." Can we have a copy of this review and of this visual mock-up in order to be able to make some estimation for this work package?

Can ECMWF share the visual mock-up of the style of dashboard reporting they are after?

For WP3 (WRT ‘‘ Reporting/Dashboarding - Requirements, ‘’) - Does Riada have additional tools that could be used here? Do ECMWF already have a preference (e.g. Power BI / Tableau - who else?)

Answer:

The visual mock-up of KPI dashboard will be not be provided to vendors. The information within the RFP is expected to be sufficient for the vendor to make an offer. Further, ECMWF has no current solution for KPI dashboard implementation and the vendor will be expected to identify and qualify possible options as part of WP3.

13 Ref: C16_RFP_BOND26

Question:

For WP4 – please can you define ‘‘implementation’’ WRT ‘‘Delivery in time to enable implementation WP6 before 24 April 2020 in order for Data Centre fit-out to make use of the capability. ‘’ (This seems to be a tight timeline unless you / Riada have already shortlisted and trialled Change Management tools.) Do you have a preference for a tool already?

Answer:

In undertaking WP4 (Change Management Discovery), technical options will be identified. If any of these options are viable and can be implemented in the tight timescales indicated for WP6, then ECMWF may decide to undertake the optional WP6 as outlined. If WP4 indicates that more effort/time is needed for WP6 then we will consider our plans. In making an offer covering WP6 it is expected that vendors will offer a rate rather than a fixed price. The vendor should make an estimate of days required (based on the information they have and their experience of previous work) but this will not be contractually considered until later in the programme of work after discovery is completed.

14 Ref: C17_RFP_BOND26

Question:

"Tenderers (and any subcontractors, if applicable) should note that the successful tenderer for this contract will not be permitted to tender for the procurement of the solutions (referred in WP5 or WP6); however, they may assist with the process of procurement and implementation of the chosen solution." -> This means that no offers for WP5 and WP6 have to be supplied?

Answer:

As indicated in RFP 2.2 the successful tenderer will not provide the selected solution/tool itself but will undertake the support for the implantation of such. Hence tenderers shall provide offers to WP5 and WP6.

15 Ref: C18_RFP_BOND26

Question:

Do ECMWF have a preference to procure from market leading (or 'Magic Quadrant') suppliers? We ask because more tools = more complexity and we could, for example, tweak Jira service desk to deal with CR's.

Answer:

ECMWF has no preference on using market leaders or "Magic Quadrants". The solutions/tools selected should be best-fit for purposes.

16 Ref: C19_RFP_BOND26

Question:

Where is most of the work with Riada currently underway (Shinfield Park, Bologna, remote?)

What is your expectation of the mix of locations for working (across Shinfield Park, Bologna, remote)?

Answer:

Please see previous clarifications published.

ECMWF expects the work to be undertaken at Reading, UK and remotely. Work is not expected at Bologna, IT. Office facilities for working at Reading will be provided. The proportion of Reading work and remote work will be agreed with the vendor during contracting. The vendor is expected to present proposals on the proportion based on previous experience.

17 Ref: C20_RFP_BOND26

Question:

We would like to get a bit more granularity on the migration/transition plan/approach below.

The overall time constraints (as currently planned) of the ECMWF Bologna programme are:

- 6th May 2020 - Data Centre power stable and handover. IT Fitout begins.

- 1st Oct 2020 - Data Centre operational
- 1st Aug 2021 - ECMWF forecast operations from Bologna begin

From the above it feels like you will be going with a big bang approach rather than a service by service approach. On reflection and either way we don't think it materially affects our offering, in context of our scope for this RFP. It's more about getting a good understanding/feel of what you are trying to achieve and how to go about it - in spirit of partnership/collaboration.

Please can you provide more granularity on your transition plan CMO -> FMO and the approach (e.g. service by service, 'big-bang'?)

WRT "The timescales suggested account for the BOND programme 6 May 2019 milestone. The new Bologna Data Centre will start IT fit-out then, so tooling needs to be in ready." - For avoidance of doubt, please can ECMWF clarify criteria for what "in ready" means (e.g. implemented in production CMO environment, UAT complete and signed off, partial or fully integrated)?

Answer:

ECMWF will implement the ITSM capabilities outlined (if taken up) in advance of Bologna implementation in its UK operation (before May 6th). These will be in a pseudo-operational phase and will exercise the capabilities implemented - a form of User Acceptance Testing. From May 6th, as the Data Centre is being rapidly fitted out in Italy, personnel there who are responsible for the fitout, as well as personal based in UK who have a stake, will work with the tooling in an operational state to capture the configurations. From 1st Oct, as services are migrated from UK to IT they will be progressively reflected in the Italy CMDB. A degree of automation is planned. From 1st Aug 2021, operations are planned to be undertaken from IT and the CMDB will reflect this and be part of the operational toolset.

18 Ref: C21_RFP_BOND26

Question:

Please can you provide more granularity on your transition plan CMO -> FMO and the approach (e.g. service by service, 'big-bang'?)

Please provide a high-level schematic of the FMO.

Can ECMWF provide architecture diagram for FMO environment?

Answer:

The Future Mode of Operation (FMO Configuration and Change Management) does not exist at this time and will be developed as the CMDB and Change tooling is implemented. The organisational structure and roles that will be in place during Transition and Future Modes of Operation and information on the Current, Transitional and Future Modes of Operation (CMO, TMO, FMO) will not be provided as part of the RFP. The information provided in the RFP is expected to be sufficient for vendors to make an offer. The FMO architecture cannot be made available as part of the RFP and should not be needed to formulate an offer. It will be available when a vendor is selected as part of scheduling of work.

19 Ref: C22_RFP_BOND26

Question:

Can ECMWF provide the volumes of incidents and changes over last 12 months?

Answer:

ECMWF recorded 9202 incidents in 2019 across of all its services.

ECMWF undertakes approximately 500 non-trivial changes per year over its services.