CalHFA Consolidated Vendor Questions and Responses

Document Management, eDiscovery, Retention and Storage RFP

Legal, Compliance, and eDiscovery Requirements

CQ-LH-01

Topic

Records-retention schedules, configuration and disposition governance

Consolidated question

Please provide the approved records-retention schedules, record categories/series, retention periods and triggering events to be configured; confirm whether the vendor is to implement existing schedules rather than develop or rationalize them; identify the applicable retention for audit trails and custodian/collection logs; and describe the authority and approval process for legacy disposition, exceptions, overrides, extensions and secure disposal after hold conflicts are cleared.

Source entries

190, 31, 48, 198, 208, 210, 206

RFP page(s)

6; 4; 6; 8-9; 9

RFP section(s)

3.4; 3.2 | 3.4; 3.3 | 3.4

CalHFA Response:

CalHFA currently has 11 records retention schedules, different by department. A twelfth may be added by the time the eDiscovery solution is in place. Each department has its own categories and retention periods. Attached is a sample retention schedule.

CalHFA has a records retention schedule in place. The vendor will not need to further revise the schedule, only implement it as part of the migration of records. Currently, records are deleted manually and so there may be documents migrated over that are past their retention period.

CalHFA treats immutable audit trails and custodian/collection logs as official records. Their retention periods are set by CalHFA's approved Records Retention Schedule. The platform must support exceptions/overrides and litigation holds that pause deletion.

Vendors are not expected to develop or rationalize these policies.

CalHFA wants the system to delete records automatically when their approved retention period ends, but only after the system confirms there are no active litigation holds, audits, public-records requests, "Notify Archives" flags, or other exceptions. Automatic deletion should happen under the agency's approved retention schedule, with full audit logs.

CQ-LH-02

Topic

Retention exceptions, legal-hold conflicts, lineage and connected-source enforcement

Consolidated question

Please describe the retention exceptions, overrides, litigation holds and conflicts the solution must support; whether retention/disposal follows copied or derived content and, if so, at what deletion level; and whether rules must be enforced in connected source systems such as SharePoint and Windows file shares or only in repositories managed by the proposed solution.

Source entries

191, 195, 196, 197

RFP page(s)

6

RFP section(s)

3.4

CalHFA Response:

CalHFA requires the proposed solution to support automated handling of retention exceptions, rule overrides, litigation holds, and retention conflicts, with capabilities for alerts, in-place preservation, custodian acknowledgement tracking, and tamper-evident audit logs, as specified in the RFP's eDiscovery and Retention & Storage sections. Litigation holds must suspend deletion and preserve relevant data. Relevant examples: CPRA request in progress: When a California Public Records Act request is open, the system should preserve responsive records and allow CalHFA to redact exempt information. Litigation hold vs. scheduled deletion: If a lawsuit or investigation arises, the system must issue automated litigation hold notices, capture custodian acknowledgements, pause deletion (in-place preserve) for affected repositories, and keep a complete audit trail.

Yes. Inside CalHFA's governed systems (SharePoint, OneDrive, Teams), our retention rules, litigation holds, and disposal rules should automatically apply to copies and new versions, and we need a clear activity history and alerts if two rules ever conflict.

CalHFA expects deletion to occur at the document level, not the paragraph level; a document that includes copied text should follow its own retention schedule unless it's truly a duplicate of the source.

Retention and disposition must be enforced for content managed within the proposed solution. The RFP does not require the solution to delete or enforce retention directly in external source systems, unless otherwise proposed and described by the vendor.

CQ-LH-03

Topic

SEC/SOX alignment, WORM scope, periods and acceptance evidence

Consolidated question

Identify the specific SEC/SOX requirements and record classes that require immutable or WORM storage, the applicable immutability periods at initial acceptance, whether Microsoft 365 immutability is sufficient or specialized WORM storage is required, and the evidence respondents must provide to demonstrate compliance.

Source entries

193, 203, 209, 200, 207, 201

RFP page(s)

6; 9; 5

RFP section(s)

3.4

CalHFA Response:

CalHFA is a municipal securities issuer and is subject to continuing-disclosure obligations under written Continuing Disclosure Agreements established pursuant to SEC Rule 15c2-12 (filings to MSRB EMMA). SEC Rule 17a-4 is cited as an industry benchmark for immutable electronic recordkeeping—either classic WORM or the 2022 audit-trail alternative (system can recreate originals and maintain time-stamped, tamper-evident logs), but it does not apply directly to CalHFA. Accordingly, the RFP requires WORM/audit-trail immutability, configurable retention, and tamper-evident audit trails for records governed by CalHFA's approved

retention schedules and legal preservation, including financial records, bond/disclosure documentation, and materials under litigation hold.

At acceptance, vendors must provide documentation and demonstrable evidence that the proposed solution meets CalHFA's immutability and WORM-compliance requirements. Evidence should include: • Configuration documentation showing how immutability/WORM settings are enabled and administered within the platform. • Demonstration of enforcement, including the inability to alter, overwrite, or delete protected records outside of approved retention and legal-hold workflows. • Audit-trail evidence showing tamper-evident logging of access, retention changes, holds, and attempts to modify protected items. • Retention and legal-hold behavior validation, including confirmation that WORM protections remain in effect during legal holds and through the full retention lifecycle. • Certification or vendor attestation describing how the system's WORM/immutability controls operate and mapping them to the requirements in RFP Sections 3.3 and 3.4. • Test results or acceptance-phase verification demonstrating these controls within CalHFA's environment. These materials should collectively confirm that CalHFA records designated as immutable or under WORM protections cannot be changed or removed except through authorized, policy-driven retention or legal-hold processes.

CQ-LH-04

Topic

Public Records Act operating model, lifecycle and current platform

Consolidated question

Describe CalHFA's target Public Records Act operating model, including shared versus separate environments and matter-level permissions; confirm the lifecycle stages the solution must support from intake through secure delivery and audit history; and identify the current commercial platform, modules and redaction capabilities and whether alternative solutions may be proposed.

Source entries

40, 60, 69

RFP page(s)

6, 8; 3; 6

RFP section(s)

3.1 | 3.3; 3.1; 3.1 - Reference "Public Records Act requests"

CalHFA Response:

CalHFA will manage Public Records Act (PRA) matters in a single, shared eDiscovery environment administered by Office of General Counsel (OGC), using matter-level permissions. For each PRA request, OGC will create a case/matter and grant access only to the responding department(s) and designated staff for that matter. Departments will identify custodians, collect or stage responsive records. OGC will control exemptions, redactions, productions, and release.

Yes. CalHFA intends for the solution to support the complete California Public Records Act request lifecycle: intake, tracking (including statutory response deadlines), collection, review, redaction, exemption coding, production, secure delivery to requesters, and audit history.

CalHFA currently uses a commercial eDiscovery platform . The platform software has modules that categorize records once uploaded into system. Reviewing the documents we can mark responsive, not responsive, further review or exempt . Need full page redact or text redact. Redactions need to occur on the native document since the Public Records Act requires that the native document be produced. The basis for the redaction can be automatically generated. Privilege log's can be produced in minutes.

CQ-LH-05

Topic

eDiscovery workload, concurrency, custodians, ingestion and storage sizing

Consolidated question

Provide the planning baseline for eDiscovery and records-production sizing and comparable pricing: annual request/matter volumes by type; typical and peak concurrent matters, reviewers/administrators and custodians; active legal holds; typical and maximum per-matter data and document counts; current hosted and hold data; annual growth, ingestion, OCR and production volumes; retention/storage requirements; and related enterprise baseline estimates relevant to three-year pricing; and the endpoint-collection assumptions needed for defensible sizing.

Source entries

32, 164, 59, 169, 58, 185, 19, 44, 151, 153, 154, 159, 165, 166, 170, 176, 187, 280

RFP page(s)

3; 5; 5; 3; 8-9; 4-6, 9

RFP section(s)

3.1 | 3.3; 3.3; 3.1; 3.3 | 3.4; 3.2 | 3.4 | 4.2.4

CalHFA Response:

Based on CalHFA's current workload: (a) Annual matter volumes (approximate): PRA (Public Records Act): ~70 per year; with anticipated new program launches, plan for 90–100 PRA requests annually. IPA (Information Practices Act): 20 per year. Subpoenas: 12 per year. Litigation holds no more than 10 at any given time. Please size for a small, variable intake (CalHFA will confirm exact figures during design). (b) Typical data volume per matter: PRA/Subpoena: about ~26 GB or ~15,000 emails (incl. attachments) per matter. Maximum per matter: not formally tracked; for capacity planning, please size with 2×–3× headroom over the typical value and support burst ingestion. (c) Typical custodians per matter: Varies by request. Legal team members (16) are included as custodians when appropriate (e.g., privilege review and production oversight). The responding business unit(s) may add custodians depending on scope. Please design to comfortably accommodate multi-department matters (d) Concurrent reviewers/administrators: All Legal team members are authorized to review/administer matters. Size the environment to allow full legal team concurrency (simultaneous access, review, redaction, and production workflows) without performance degradation. (e) Current data under litigation hold (aggregate): Approximately ~250–280 GB.

Typical per-matter data size, 30 GB and peak per-matter data size, 500 GB. Document counts vary by matter and are not fixed; vendors should design without a hard document-count cap.

Please see the baseline volumes in Entry 32 for sizing, and design the eDiscovery environment to support peak concurrency above that baseline. In particular, size upward to account for new Agency programs and activities that may increase request counts and overlap across PRA, IPA, subpoenas, investigations, and litigation.

Current eDiscovery data volume (aggregate): ~300 GB currently hosted in CalHFA's eDiscovery platform Anticipated annual ingestion/processing volume. Document counts: vary by matter and are not fixed; design without a hard document-count cap.

For annual matter volumes, typical matter size, custodian counts, reviewer concurrency, and litigation-hold volume. See Entry 169 for current aggregate eDiscovery data volume and storage-planning assumptions. CalHFA currently hosts approximately 300 GB of eDiscovery data and seeks scalable capacity of approximately 500 GB, with the ability to expand as PRA and litigation-hold demands increase. Document counts vary by matter, and vendors should design without a fixed document-count limitation

The RFP requires endpoint collection capability with tamper-evident audit logging. It does not mandate a specific method (e.g., forensic imaging); CalHFA will direct the appropriate, defensible approach per matter.

CalHFA has fewer than 10 active litigation holds. Typical custodians per hold range between 5–10. We anticipate a steady increase and therefore require a solution that can expand beyond current figures, supporting more simultaneous holds and larger custodian sets without performance degradation.

CQ-LH-06

Topic

Current environment, hosting model, tool preferences and licensing

Consolidated question

Describe the current eDiscovery and Microsoft 365 government-cloud environment, including GCC or GCC High, existing platforms and approximate hosted activity, Purview/eDiscovery capability and licensing, preferred tools, and whether a separately hosted FedRAMP-authorized eDiscovery service may connect to CalHFA's GCC tenant or the service must operate within the tenant.

Source entries

14, 57, 68, 175, 186, 189

RFP page(s)

5; 3; 6

RFP section(s)

3.2 | 3.3; 3.1; 3.1 – Reference "CalHFA is also seeking an eDiscovery software"; 3.3

CalHFA Response:

The RFP's Office 365/Exchange GCC connectivity requirement does not require the eDiscovery solution to be hosted within CalHFA's GCC tenant. Vendors may propose an eDiscovery service hosted in a separate FedRAMP Moderate-authorized (or equivalent) U.S.-based cloud environment, as long as the solution can securely integrate with CalHFA's Microsoft 365 Government Community Cloud (GCC) tenant and meets all RFP requirements. This includes supporting secure connectivity to CalHFA's GCC environment (per RFP 3.3) and operating on a platform with SOC 2 Type II certification and FedRAMP Moderate (or equivalent) security compliance (per RFP 3.2). The RFP does not prescribe a specific deployment model beyond these integration and security requirements, so vendors have flexibility in their eDiscovery architecture if all such requirements are satisfied.

CalHFA currently utilizes an eDiscovery platform for review and production. . The number of active matters fluctuates throughout the year. CalHFA's eDiscovery presently hosts 300 GB of CalHFA data. CalHFA is conducting this RFP to evaluate new platforms and pricing/storage tiers; vendors should size for the annual throughput noted above and propose scalable storage/licensing to accommodate variations in concurrent matters.

CalHFA is not assigning product ratings in the Q&A and does not currently use Microsoft Purview eDiscovery.

CalHFA has no preference for specific eDiscovery tools for data processing, data collection, hosting, or AI workflows.

CalHFA operates in Microsoft 365 GCC (not GCC High). Vendors should not assume the availability of existing advanced eDiscovery, Purview, or other compliance tooling beyond standard Microsoft 365 services. Any required eDiscovery capabilities or licenses should be included in the vendor's proposed solution.

Vendors should assume that required eDiscovery tooling and related licensing are part of the vendor's solution and pricing, unless otherwise specified.

CQ-LH-07

Topic

Migration of discovery matters, holds, audit history and document versions

Consolidated question

Identify the existing discovery matters, productions, litigation-hold data, custodian records, audit history and active holds that must migrate, and clarify whether historical document versions must be carried forward or only the latest approved version when retention policy permits.

Source entries

20, 184, 119

RFP page(s)

3; 5; 5; 7

RFP section(s)

3.1 | 3.3; 3.3; 3.2

CalHFA Response:

All active/pending discovery matters, including ongoing productions, current litigation hold scopes and custodian lists, and related audit history must be migrated into the new eDiscovery solution.

CalHFA currently uses a manual litigation-hold process. If any litigation holds are active at the time of implementation, the selected Vendor will be expected to maintain uninterrupted preservation.

Vendors should size migration assuming the latest approved version is carried forward plus all historical versions required by retention schedules, litigation holds, audits, or business need.

CQ-LH-08

Topic

Exemption coding, privilege logs, redaction and approval workflow

Consolidated question

Provide the required exemption-code and privilege-log conventions, including format, fields, page numbers and any sanitized sample; clarify whether PII/exemption identification and redaction may be automated or require human approval; and describe the review stages, roles and authorization workflow for redaction, withholding and release; and clarify whether a Microsoft 365 compliance-stack capability is acceptable if all Section 3.3 requirements are met.

Source entries

33, 157, 158, 168, 180

RFP page(s)

3; 5; 5; 8

RFP section(s)

3.1 | 3.3; 3.3

CalHFA Response:

CalHFA does not have a sample privilege-log template to provide in the Q&A. Per §3.3, vendors must demonstrate the ability to generate a page-numbered privilege/exemption log and support configurable exemption/privilege coding as part of the eDiscovery workflow. CalHFA does not mandate a specific platform. A purpose-built review tool or capabilities within Microsoft 365's compliance stack are acceptable if all §3.3 requirements are met (e.g., litigation hold automation/acknowledgement tracking, OCR, deduplication, redaction with exemption coding, Bates stamping, page-numbered privilege logs, audit logs, productions) and the hosting/records requirements in §§3.2–3.4 are satisfied.

CalHFA will use automation to assist identification of PII and exempt information, but human review and approval are required and will be performed by CalHFA staff before production.

CalHFA will not require a proprietary privilege log template. The eDiscovery solution must support an industry-standard privilege log (i.e., expressly assert the privilege and describe the nature of the withheld item with sufficient detail) to allow the other side to assess the claim without revealing privileged content.

A team of attorneys and support staff will review (subpoena, PRA, IPA or Discovery request) and determine which CalHFA department would be housing the responsive records. After collection of documents, they are viewed in the native file or processed into an e-discovery software depending on the document size. Each document is viewed page by page. If exemptions or redactions are needed, Attorneys must review the exemptions or redactions and authorize before release.

CalHFA is not able to provide an example, but the eDiscovery solution must include these functions.

CQ-LH-09

Topic

Production and export deliverables

Consolidated question

Identify the production and export formats and load-file specifications required at initial go-live in addition to PDF, including native files, metadata, Bates numbering and other litigation or public-record deliverables.

Source entries

160, 177

RFP page(s)

5

RFP section(s)

3.3

CalHFA Response:

None.

CalHFA requires spreadsheet-to-PDF output and support for black-and-white or color productions; beyond that, CalHFA does not prescribe a single set of deliverable formats or load-file specs. CalHFA expects vendors to support industry-standard eDiscovery deliverables. In practice, this means the platform should be capable of outputting standard production formats, for example, generating document images or PDFs with corresponding metadata load files, as needed to meet CalHFA's legal and Public Records Act use cases. Vendors have flexibility in how they implement the production workflow, but they should clearly describe the deliverable formats and load-file options their solution supports and ensure these align with the RFP's requirements and CalHFA's needs as stated therein.

CQ-LH-10

Topic

AI/GenAI capabilities, questionnaire and governance

Consolidated question

Identify which AI/GenAI eDiscovery capabilities are required versus desirable, provide or describe the timing of the AI Questionnaire, confirm the status of Microsoft 365 Copilot, and state the agency or State policy restrictions and governance requirements applicable to proposed AI features.

Source entries

61, 283

RFP page(s)

3; 3; 8

RFP section(s)

3.1; 3.1 | 4.1.5

CalHFA Response:

Required (per §3.3 eDiscovery + §3.1 AI posture): PII identification/redaction and exemption handling; privilege-log support; automated litigation hold notifications/acknowledgements/tracking; audit logs of custodian actions; OCR/text recognition; robust search with saved history; Bates stamping; production controls (including Excel viewing and conversion to PDF); and adequate

storage for litigation holds. [AI/GenAI constraints (mandatory): Features must be fully configurable, human-validated, include an administrative on/off control, and must not train on CalHFA data. Desirable (efficiency features referenced in §3.1): Semantic/conversational (vector) search, document/multi-document summarization, automated classification/coding, relevance analysis, privilege and PII pre-flagging cues, chronology/timeline generation, fact extraction, and case analysis— implemented subject to the required AI constraints above. Vendors should map these capabilities to CalHFA's use cases per §4.2.2 Use Case Mapping and indicate whether each item is generally available, requires configuration, or customization.

The AI Questionnaire will be provided to vendors after CalHFA's review of proposals and must be completed based on the vendor's proposed solution. It may be distributed separately from the UpGuard Information Security Questionnaire. CalHFA currently permits Microsoft 365 Copilot for eligible users within its GCC tenant. Any proposed AI features must comply with the requirements in RFP Sections 3.1, 3.2, and 4.1.5 and applicable State of California policies, including: • No model training on CalHFA data (prompts, documents, embeddings, or outputs). • Human-in-the-loop validation of AI-generated content. • Administrative control to fully configure or disable AI features. • U.S.-resident hosting and data handling consistent with State security standards. • Retention, legal hold, and audit governance for any AI-related artifacts (e.g., indexes, logs, embeddings). Vendors must describe their proposed AI models, data flows, hosting locations, and subprocessors in the AI Questionnaire.

CQ-LH-11

Topic

Collection sources, connectors, endpoint scope and collection method

Consolidated question

Identify the ESI sources, connectors and endpoint types required for initial go-live and future use, including Microsoft 365, network, endpoint, mobile, third-party and cloud sources; describe relevant endpoint-management tools; and clarify whether collection must be performed directly by the platform, may occur through Purview, CalHFA IT or a forensic partner, or should support both direct collection and ingestion of defensibly collected exports.

Source entries

152, 155, 171, 172, 178, 179, 183

RFP page(s)

5; 5; 8; 8; 7

RFP section(s)

3.3

CalHFA Response:

The eDiscovery solution must support collection (or ingestion) of data from all key sources in CalHFA's environment – including Office 365 content (Exchange emails, Teams messages, OneDrive files) and agency-managed endpoints (for example, employee laptops/desktops, mobile devices, and shared network file repositories where relevant data may reside). The RFP does not prescribe a specific tool or method for collecting endpoint data. It is preferred for the solution to perform collections natively or for CalHFA's IT staff to then load it into the eDiscovery platform. Third party involvement is not preferred. The core requirement is that the platform supports defensible collection from all necessary sources and can securely ingest, process, and manage the collected data – providing features like chain-of-custody tracking and audit logs – regardless of how the initial collection is performed.

CalHFA primarily uses Microsoft 365 sources for eDiscovery, including Exchange email, Teams messages, and OneDrive/SharePoint, as well as agency-managed endpoints and file servers where responsive data may reside. At this time, no additional data sources beyond those identified are required. The eDiscovery solution should support these sources and be flexible enough to accommodate additional sources if identified in the future.

CalHFA's eDiscovery solution should collect/ingest ESI from the sources already identified in RFP §3.3. - Email (Exchange/Outlook), Teams messages, and OneDrive/SharePoint. - Agency-managed endpoints (e.g., assigned laptops; agency cell phones when device-only content is responsive. - Network file shares/file servers and scanned/faxed documents stored in SharePoint. - Current

SharePoint 2016 on-prem libraries until migration is complete. At this time, CalHFA is not aware of any additional places where ESI is held if any additional sources are identified during inventory/migration, vendors should be prepared to ingest and govern them consistent with the RFP's requirements.

The RFP does not require a single collection approach. Data may be collected directly by the eDiscovery platform or via other defensible methods (including Microsoft-native or third-party tools), with the data then ingested into the platform. The key requirement is that the eDiscovery solution can securely ingest, process, and manage the collected data, including maintaining appropriate audit and chain-of-custody controls, regardless of how collection is performed.

CalHFA's primary data sources for eDiscovery are Microsoft 365 services (Exchange email, Teams messages, and OneDrive/SharePoint content) and agency-managed endpoints (e.g. staff laptops/desktops or shared network drives where responsive data may reside). These are the key sources that must be supported at initial eDiscovery go-live. No additional data sources beyond those identified are required at this time. The eDiscovery solution should support all of the above sources and remain flexible enough to accommodate any other relevant sources if they are identified in the future.

CalHFA does not mandate a single endpoint collection method. Vendors may support direct remote collection, ingestion of CalHFA-collected exports, or both, provided the solution can securely ingest, process, and manage the data with appropriate audit and chain-of-custody controls.

In-scope endpoints include agency-managed laptops and desktops, and other locations where responsive data may reside (e.g., shared network repositories).. CalHFA uses SCCM and Intune in a comanaged configuration to manage endpoints.

CQ-LH-12

Topic

Legal-hold propagation, preservation architecture and custodian workflow

Consolidated question

Clarify whether legal holds must propagate across document-management repositories and archive copies; whether eDiscovery should retain separate collected copies, access source repositories or support both approaches; and whether hold notification, acknowledgment, escalation, preservation tracking and custodian management must reside in the proposed platform or may be delivered through an integrated legal-hold or Microsoft solution.

Source entries

45, 167, 173

RFP page(s)

8-9; 5

RFP section(s)

3.3 | 3.4; 3.3

CalHFA Response:

Yes. An active litigation hold should automatically apply across all affected repositories as well as the eDiscovery preservation store.

CalHFA does not prescribe a single storage method for eDiscovery; vendors may propose retaining separate collected copies, accessing content in place in the document-management repositories, or supporting both, provided the solution meets all RFP requirements.

CalHFA does not require litigation hold notification, acknowledgment, escalation, preservation tracking, and custodian management to reside only inside the eDiscovery module. Vendors may propose these functions natively in the eDiscovery platform or via an integrated litigation hold/Microsoft solution, provided the approach delivers all capabilities.

CQ-LH-13

Topic

Real-time help desk and service levels

Consolidated question

Clarify the expected service model for real-time help desk assistance and defined SLAs, including support hours and minimum targets for incident response, uptime, indexing latency and search latency.

Source entries

188

RFP page(s)

5

RFP section(s)

3.3

CalHFA Response:

Vendors must provide real-time help desk support and propose clearly defined SLAs for system availability and performance. The RFP does not prescribe specific support hours or numerical targets; vendors should propose industry-standard SLAs appropriate for an enterprise eDiscovery platform.

CQ-LH-14

Topic

U.S.-only data processing, personnel access and subprocessors

Consolidated question

Confirm the U.S.-location requirements for project personnel, remote support access, primary and disaster-recovery storage, backups, telemetry, indexing, OCR, AI processing and subprocessors, and describe the documentation vendors must provide to demonstrate U.S.-only processing and maintenance of CalHFA system data.

Source entries

282, 289, 297

RFP page(s)

4 and 7; 4 and 8; 4, 8

RFP section(s)

3.2 | 4.1.5

CalHFA Response:

California's statewide security standards require that any person who remotely accesses State information systems or information assets be physically located in the United States. This requirement is set out in the Telework & Remote Access Security Standard (SIMM 5360-A) and enforced through the State Administrative Manual's information-security controls (SAM Chapter 5300). Offshore personnel may not perform project activities that involve any access to CalHFA systems or information. Remote access must originate from within the U.S. and comply with SIMM/SAM controls.

Vendors must document any proposed OCR, backup, support, telemetry, indexing, or AI services that process, store, transmit, or provide access to CalHFA system data. Documentation should identify: • All processing and storage locations (including DR/backup regions). • Subprocessors and support personnel locations. • Data-flow diagrams and architectural descriptions. •

Applicable data-handling, retention, and access-control practices. • Security and compliance controls demonstrating U.S.-only processing, consistent with Section 3.2. This information must also be reflected in the required security and AI questionnaires and is subject to CalHFA review.

Yes. In accordance with Section 3.2, all services that process, store, transmit, or provide access to CalHFA system data—including production processing, support access, backups, disaster-recovery copies, telemetry, indexing, AI processing, and subprocessors-must operate exclusively within the United States. In addition, California's statewide security standards require that any person who remotely accesses State information systems or information assets be physically located within the United States. This requirement is established in the Telework & Remote Access Security Standard (SIMM 5360-A) and enforced through the State Administrative Manual (SAM) Chapter 5300. As a result: • Offshore personnel may not access CalHFA systems or information. • Remote access must originate from within the U.S. and comply with SIMM/SAM security controls. • Vendors must identify all data-processing locations, subprocessors, support models, and data flows in their proposal and in the required security and AI questionnaires. Services that do not access or process CalHFA system data should still be disclosed when they form part of the proposed solution and will be evaluated as part of CalHFA's security review.

Technical Architecture, Integration, and System Functionality

CQ-01

Topic

Migration inventory — SharePoint 2016

Consolidated question

Please provide the SharePoint 2016 migration baseline: content databases, site collections, sites, libraries/lists, document and non-document item counts (including attachments and versions), total stored size, file-type profile, active users, and material farm solutions, service applications, third-party products, custom code, InfoPath/MySites or other customizations. Identify unusually large, encrypted, unsupported, long-path or otherwise migration-sensitive content, and confirm whether existing inventory/schema exports will be available.

Source entries

13, 16, 36, 37, 51, 54, 70, 82, 102, 104, 110, 112, 118, 120, 135, 144

RFP page(s)

3–4; 4; 4 and 2-3; 3-5; 2–3; 2; 6; 7

RFP section(s)

3.1 | 3.2; 3.2 | 3.1; 3.1; 3.1 - Reference "migration of all SharePoint 2016 content"; 3.2

CalHFA Response:

Below is the current estimate of the total data volume and related metadata within our SharePoint environment:

SharePoint Farm Data Volume
• Total SharePoint Farm Size: approximately 2.2 TB
• Actual storage consumption is slightly higher than the per-site totals shown in the spreadsheet due to additional databases such as:
– Managed Metadata Service DB
– Search Service Application DB
– Other supporting system databases

At this time, we do not yet have a confirmed list of which files or repositories will be migrated versus retained, so the percentage of content requiring cleanup/disposition is still undetermined.

SharePoint Farm Totals
• Top-Level Sites: 16
• Subsites: 3,494

• Lists and Libraries: 1,447,452
• Total Items: 3,300,916
• Unique SharePoint Groups: 635

Term Store Summary
• Term Stores: 1
• Term Groups: 61
• Term Sets: 218
• Total Terms: 8,114

Below is the current count of users by role within the SharePoint environment:

User Counts by Role
• Farm Administrators: 3
• Site Collection Administrators: 7
• Total SharePoint Users Returned by *Get-AllSharePointUsers*: 880
– Note: This list includes many legacy accounts that no longer exist.
– Estimated number of active users is likely between 200–400.

Additional Notes
• SharePoint On-Prem does **not** have any external collaborators; the environment does not support or utilize external sharing.
• We do **not** have defined Records Managers within SharePoint, as this role is not formally tracked or assigned in our current configuration.

CQ-02

Topic

Migration inventory — Windows file servers

Consolidated question

Please provide the Windows file-server migration baseline: number of servers, repositories/shares and archival stores; total data volume and file count; primary file types; age and active-versus-archive distribution; permissions complexity; and known long paths, unsupported types, encrypted files or other migration constraints. Identify any shares expected to remain on-premises.

Source entries

13, 21, 36, 50, 71, 82, 85, 102, 104, 108, 110, 112, 135, 136, 140

RFP page(s)

3–4; 4 and 2-3; 3-5; 6; 4; 4; 7; 7

RFP section(s)

3.1 | 3.2; 3.2 | 3.1; 3.1 – Reference “file server content”; 3.2

CalHFA Response:

File Server 1

Files = 13,290,212

Folders = 1,137,590

Size = 9.12TB

File Types = 4809

Media = 1.04TB

Web Pages = 8.68GB

Archives = 1.02TB

Documents = 4.37TB

Others = 2.68TB

Duplicate Files = 3,394,208

Size = 1.64TB

File Server 2

Files = 200,628

Folders = 29,145

Size = 605.54GB

File Types = 573

Media = 1.47GB

Web Pages = 3.55GB

Archives = 31.14GB

Documents = 6.84GB

Others = 560.47GB

Duplicate Files = 68,060

Size = 33.51GB

CQ-03

Topic

Migration scope, growth and disposition

Consolidated question

Confirm which SharePoint 2016 and file-server content is in scope for assessment and migration, the annual growth assumptions for the three-year period, and whether CalHFA or the vendor will classify and approve content for migration, archive, exclusion or disposition. For redundant, obsolete or trivial content, clarify whether the vendor only recommends cleanup or also executes approved deletion.

Source entries

22, 88, 104, 136, 194

RFP page(s)

3–4; 3–4; 7; 4; 6

RFP section(s)

3.1 | 3.2; 3.2; 3.4

CalHFA Response:

The content in scope includes all data in the answers to CQ-01 and CQ-02. At this time, we do not have accurate estimates for annual growth, the selected vendor should apply their industry knowledge and best practices.

It is assumed that the selected vendor and CalHFA will collaborate on classification of documents and data.

CQ-04

Topic

Migration fidelity and target access model

Consolidated question

Identify which source properties must be preserved or remapped during migration, including versions, authorship, timestamps, check-in/check-out and audit history, active workflow state, metadata, unique permissions and sharing relationships, email/message links, attachments, document URLs and embedded links. Describe the approved target access model and whether redirects are required.

Source entries

70, 86, 91, 92, 107, 121, 122

RFP page(s)

6; 4; 3–4; 7

RFP section(s)

3.1 - Reference “migration of all SharePoint 2016 content”; 3.2

CalHFA Response:

The selected vendor should plan on preserving all metadata that is technically feasible to retain. Redirects are not required for data not in the selected platform.

CQ-05

Topic

Migration pilots, cutover and acceptance

Consolidated question

State the expected number of pilot/calibration cycles, production cutover window, maximum allowable downtime, and required reconciliation/acceptance criteria for counts, metadata, permissions, workflows and search.

Source entries

93, 94, 123, 125

RFP page(s)

3–4; 4; 7-8

RFP section(s)

3.2

CalHFA Response:

CalHFA expects a minimum of one pilot cycle, more are preferred. Additionally, CalHFA expects the selected vendor to perform mock migration tests until errors are resolved. Downtime is flexible and can be coordinated with CalHFA.

CQ-06

Topic

Source decommissioning and transition support

Consolidated question

Clarify whether decommissioning SharePoint 2016 and file servers, including certified data destruction, is in scope; the expected post-migration support duration; and whether the incumbent SharePoint/MacroView provider will support knowledge transfer.

Source entries

34

RFP page(s)

2–5

RFP section(s)

3.1 | 3.2

CalHFA Response:

Decommissioning of on-premises systems (SharePoint 2016 and file servers) is not in scope. Selected vendor is expected to be knowledgeable about SharePoint and MacroView, though CalHFA will provide information on our specific implementation.

CQ-07

Topic

Users, roles and business units

Consolidated question

Provide initial and three-year user estimates by department/business unit and role, including named and peak concurrent DMS users, administrators, records managers, eDiscovery reviewers and external collaborators.

Source entries

15, 35, 41, 75, 105

RFP page(s)

5; 4–5; 6-7; 3; 4

RFP section(s)

3.1 | 3.2 | 3.3; 3.2 | 3.3; 3.1 | 3.2; 3.1; 3.2

CalHFA Response:

Below is the current count of users by role within the SharePoint environment:
User Counts by Role
• Farm Administrators: 3
• Site Collection Administrators: 7
• Total SharePoint Users Returned by *Get-AllSharePointUsers*: 880
– Note: This list includes many legacy accounts that no longer exist.
– Estimated number of active users is likely between **200–400**.

Additional Notes
• SharePoint On-Prem does **not** have any external collaborators; the environment does not support or utilize external sharing.
• We do **not** have defined Records Managers within SharePoint, as this role is not formally tracked or assigned in our current configuration.
• We do not have exact concurrent usage metrics, but the new system should be able to support **approximately 350 simultaneous users**.

For e-Discovery (Legal Input Applied)
• CalHFA's Office of General Counsel (OGC) has 16 employees.
• Typical active reviewers: **5–6 concurrent users**.
• Peak reviewer load for major matters: **12–16 concurrent users** (full legal-team concurrency).

Custodians (Legal Input Applied)
• PRA/IPA/Subpoena custodians: typically **1–5 custodians per matter**, possibly spanning multiple departments when requests

overlap.
• Litigation hold custodians: typically **5–10 individuals per matter**, with scalability required for larger cases.

CQ-08

Topic

Workflow inventory and target treatment

Consolidated question

Provide an inventory of workflows to migrate, replace or build, with business purpose, current technology, systems/integrations, steps or available diagrams, transaction volume, complexity, priority and whether each is document approval/publishing, records disposition or line-of-business automation. State how many are expected at initial deployment, whether running instances/history must be preserved, and whether each should be recreated, retired, consolidated or redesigned using built-in Microsoft 365/Power Automate or another approach.

Source entries

17, 28, 42, 64, 70, 90, 106, 141, 145, 148, 149

RFP page(s)

4; 2–4; 6-7; 5; 6; 3–4

RFP section(s)

3.1 | 3.2; 3.1 - Reference “CalHFA has identified the need to replace its aging SharePoint 2016 on-premises document management system, which currently relies on custom workflows”; 3.1 - Reference “migration of all SharePoint 2016 content”; 3.2

CalHFA Response:

There are 151 existing PowerApps cloud flows. These workflows support various business processes and are integrated into our Model-Driven PowerApps solution. Details of function and purpose will be provided during discovery. The environment uses Dataverse and SharePoint Online for storage and user management.

Which ones will be migrated will be dependent on the selected solution’s capabilities.

CQ-09

Topic

MacroView DMF inventory and migration

Consolidated question

Provide the MacroView DMF modules/versions, tag and metadata-field counts, content types, term sets, required fields and controlled vocabularies; available schema/configuration documentation; export/API capabilities and formats; and whether Outlook/email filing or other functionality must be replicated. Clarify whether MacroView requires ongoing integration or metadata migration only and whether a migration tool is available or vendor-supplied.

Source entries

13, 27, 28, 36, 43, 51, 65, 66, 74, 89, 102, 145, 148

RFP page(s)

3–4; 3-4; 2–4; 4 and 2-3; 6-7; 3-5; 5; 2; 4

RFP section(s)

3.1 | 3.2; 3.2 | 3.1; 3.1 - Reference “MacroView DMF; 3.1 - Reference “an extensive set of tags to support Agency operations”; 3.1; 3.2

CalHFA Response:

We do not have specific MacroView metadata tags. However, we have 8,114 terms in our MacroView Term Store which includes all managed-metadata term sets and fields used across the farm, details to be provided during discovery.

It is preferred to not use MacroView going forward. CalHFA does not have a migration tool specific to MacroView.

CQ-10

Topic

Scanning, fax, barcode and batch capture

Consolidated question

Describe the current and target scanning, fax, barcode-recognition and batch-ingestion environment: devices, capture software/tools and versions, barcode formats and separation rules, connectors/APIs or file-drop methods, metadata/content-type assignment, OCR status and output (searchable PDF, indexed text or both), annual/daily volumes, peak batch sizes, three-year growth, accuracy/quality targets, back-file conversion scope, and go-live integrations/use cases.

Source entries

18, 29, 67, 95, 96, 113, 114, 115, 116, 133, 143, 146, 150

RFP page(s)

5; 2; 4; 4; 4; 7; 7; 4-5

RFP section(s)

3.2 | 3.3; 3.1 | 3.2; 3.1 – Reference “The existing platform also ingests scanned documents from multiple sources”; 3.2; 3.2 – Reference “faxing processes”

CalHFA Response:

Our Business Services team uses **OmniPage (Owned by Kofax/Tungsten Automation)** to scan non-vital documents and **Kofax Capture** for vital documents. Non-vital scans are processed and OCR’d through **AccuRoute 7.0**, which uses barcode headers to split batches before placing the files into network folders for processing. Vital scans are OCR’d and barcode-split directly in **Kofax Capture** and then moved to a network directory for a similar nightly processing workflow.

- Last year’s scan volumes were:
  - Kofax: 8,593
  - OmniPage/AccuRoute: 15,387
  - **Total:** 23,980

These counts represent individual documents after barcode-based splitting. For reference, OmniPage/AccuRoute processed 3,455 combined scan batches before separation into individual files.

- Our current scanning environment includes the following components:

- **Scanner Models:**
  – OmniPage: Canon DR-G2140
  – Kofax: Canon imageFORMULA DR-X10C II

- **Capture Software:**
  – AccuRoute 7.0
  – OmniPage (Kofax/Tungsten Automation)
  – Kofax Capture

These systems use barcode recognition to split combined scan batches into individual documents, which are then routed into our processing workflows.

We do not currently route faxes into SharePoint. All incoming faxes are delivered directly to individual or group email inboxes or to designated network folders.

CQ-11

Topic

Email-to-repository ingestion

Consolidated question

Describe email-to-repository requirements: source mailboxes/platform, current tools, expected volumes and growth, attachment handling, metadata capture, and whether messages and attachments remain together, are stored separately with linkage, or both.

Source entries

18, 28, 97, 117, 146

RFP page(s)

5; 2–4; 4; 7; 4-5

RFP section(s)

3.2 | 3.3; 3.1 | 3.2; 3.2

CalHFA Response:

Requirements are outlined in the RFP. CalHFA's mail system is Microsoft Exchange in a hybrid on-premises/M365 configuration within the GCC environment. The RFP does not include requirements for email-to-repository ingestion, and CalHFA does not currently use this functionality. Vendors are not required to propose or price email ingestion unless offered as an optional capability. The selected vendor may provide best-practice guidance if such functionality is considered in the future.

CQ-12

Topic

Enterprise integration inventory

Consolidated question

List every CalHFA system/interface in scope for ongoing integration and, for each, provide business purpose, product/version, hosting model, authentication, available API/interface documentation, data exchanged, directionality (link/read-only, metadata sync or bidirectional document/data exchange), transaction volume and delivery phase. Include loan/servicing, ERP/financial, CRM/case-management/partner portals, identity, scanning/fax/barcode and in-house tools as applicable.

Source entries

23, 27, 30, 70, 72, 87, 96, 101, 127, 137, 142, 150

RFP page(s)

3–4; 3-4; 6; 4; 4; 7; 4; 4-5; 7

RFP section(s)

3.1 | 3.2; 3.1 - Reference "migration of all SharePoint 2016 content"; 3.1 – Reference "integrating seamlessly with existing agency systems"; 3.2

CalHFA Response:

This information is confidential and will be provided during discovery.

CQ-13

Topic

Microsoft 365 tenant and licensing

Consolidated question

Confirm whether CalHFA currently operates Commercial, GCC or GCC High Microsoft 365 (or plans a migration), current license SKUs, quantities and add-ons (including Purview/eDiscovery, SharePoint Premium and Copilot), which entitlements are Agency-

furnished, and whether vendors should price additional licenses. Clarify which vendor/module is responsible for tenant configuration.

Source entries

26, 81, 103, 128, 129, 156

RFP page(s)

4-5; 4; 7; 5

RFP section(s)

3.2 | 3.3; 3.2; 3.3

CalHFA Response:

CalHFA currently operates in a combination of Commercial and GCC, with all M365 applications (including SharePoint) operating in GCC under Microsoft G5 licenses.

Additional information will be provided to the selected vendor following contract award during implementation planning, subject to applicable confidentiality, security, and access requirements.

CQ-14

Topic

Target platform and solution flexibility

Consolidated question

Confirm whether a target platform/tenant has already been selected or platform selection and tenant establishment are in scope. Clarify whether CalHFA will accept configurable platform-based, COTS, Microsoft 365/SharePoint Online with add-ons, and non-Microsoft solutions that meet all requirements, rather than preferring a particular product architecture.

Source entries

84, 109, 110, 111

RFP page(s)

4; 7

RFP section(s)

3.2

CalHFA Response:

No target platform has been selected. The selected vendor should make a recommendation for their solution based on their experience and best practices.

CQ-15

Topic

Implementation environments

Consolidated question

State whether CalHFA will provide development, test and production environments or vendors should include provisioning and operating costs.

Source entries

130

RFP page(s)

7

RFP section(s)

3.2

CalHFA Response:

The selected vendor is expected to provide development, test, and production environments for their proposed solution.

CQ-16

Topic

Identity, conditional access and network baseline

Consolidated question

Provide the existing identity, role/group, conditional-access and network-access configurations vendors should use when designing and implementing the target platform.

Source entries

30, 107, 131

RFP page(s)

3–4; 4; 7

RFP section(s)

3.1 | 3.2; 3.2

CalHFA Response:

This information is confidential and will not be provided during the solicitation. Relevant information will be provided to the selected vendor following contract award during implementation planning, subject to applicable confidentiality, security, and access requirements.

CQ-17

Topic

FedRAMP Moderate or equivalent

Consolidated question

Clarify whether each cloud component must hold current FedRAMP Moderate authorization, be deployable within such an environment, or may demonstrate equivalent controls (for example SOC 2 Type II plus a control mapping). State the evidence and control-mapping guidance CalHFA will accept, whether vendor-hosted SaaS is permitted under Zero Trust requirements, and whether an equivalent U.S.-hosted AWS or other non-Microsoft environment is acceptable.

Source entries

80, 83, 84, 132, 138, 288

RFP page(s)

4; 7; 4 and 8

RFP section(s)

3.2; 3.2 | 4.1.5

CalHFA Response:

It is preferred that cloud components be FedRAMP compliant and be deployed within such an environment. Equivalent controls may be acceptable but are not preferred. A vendor hosted SaaS solution is permitted but must be U.S. based. An AWS U.S. hosted environment is acceptable. Other non-Microsoft environments are not preferred.

CQ-18

Topic

U.S. data residency and offshore personnel

Consolidated question

Clarify whether personnel outside the United States may perform development/configuration using synthetic data without access to CalHFA systems or data, and whether the U.S.-data-center requirement prohibits offshore personnel from accessing production or other CalHFA data.

Source entries

134, 218, 219

RFP page(s)

4; 11; 8

RFP section(s)

3.2; 4.1.5

CalHFA Response:

Development using synthetic data: Personnel located outside the United States may perform development or configuration work only in an isolated vendor environment using synthetic data that is not derived from CalHFA information. Such personnel may not access CalHFA systems, tenants, environments, credentials, repositories, logs, support records, or other CalHFA information. Any deployment or support activity requiring access to a CalHFA environment or information must be performed by personnel physically located within the United States.

Access to CalHFA information: CalHFA system data must be stored, processed, and maintained exclusively within the United States. Personnel outside the United States may not access, view, process, transmit, administer, or support CalHFA information in production or non-production environments. This requirement includes backups, disaster-recovery copies, logs, telemetry, indexes, support tickets containing CalHFA information, OCR and AI processing, and screen-sharing sessions that display CalHFA systems or information.

Vendors must disclose the location and role of all personnel and subcontractors involved in performance, including any personnel outside the United States, and describe the controls preventing those personnel from accessing CalHFA systems or information. For proposal and pricing purposes, vendors should assume that no offshore-access exception will be granted. Any proposed exception would require CalHFA's prior written approval and all applicable state security approvals and risk documentation.

CQ-19

Topic

AI/RAG use and control requirements

Consolidated question

Confirm whether generative AI and retrieval-augmented generation may process CalHFA content in an authorized secure U.S. government-cloud environment when data is not retained or used to train shared/foundation models. Specify minimum requirements for inference retention, audit, human review, data processing and an administrator-controlled complete AI-off setting in GCC/GCC High.

Source entries

38, 62, 76

RFP page(s)

3 and 4; 3

RFP section(s)

3.1 | 3.2; 3.1

CalHFA Response:

Vendors will be required to fill out an AI questionnaire. This should be filled out based on the vendor's proposed solution.

Vendors will be required to complete CalHFA's AI Questionnaire based on their proposed solution. As clarified in Section 3.1, CalHFA allows generative AI and RAG to process CalHFA content within an authorized, secure U.S.-resident government-cloud environment (e.g., GCC/GCC High), provided that:

• CalHFA data is not used to train shared/foundation models.
• Human-in-the-loop validation is supported.
• Administrators can fully configure or disable AI features.
• Hosting and data handling comply with Section 3.2 security requirements.
• AI-related artifacts (embeddings, indexes, logs, audit data) comply with Sections 3.3–3.4 governance, including retention, legal holds, and audit integrity.

Vendors must describe how their proposed solution meets these requirements.

CQ-20

Topic

Required AI capabilities and timing

Consolidated question

Identify which AI/GenAI capabilities are mandatory—natural-language search, semantic/vector search, metadata extraction, summarization and AI-assisted Q&A—which must be available at initial operational use, and any approved AI platform, model, governance framework or licensing vendors must use.

Source entries

55, 79

RFP page(s)

3

RFP section(s)

3.1

CalHFA Response:

CalHFA requires vendors to include modern AI/GenAI capabilities that materially improve document findability and governance. The features listed in Section 3.1—such as natural-language search, semantic/vector search, automated metadata extraction, summarization, and AI-assisted Q&A—are provided as examples ("e.g.") rather than as an all-items-mandatory checklist. Proposals may meet this requirement with functionally equivalent capabilities, provided they achieve the outcomes specified in the RFP.

CalHFA currently allows Enterprise Copilot (Microsoft Copilot for Microsoft 365) for eligible users in our tenant. At initial operational use (go-live), vendors must deliver AI/GenAI capabilities that materially improve findability and governance with human-in-the-loop validation, full administrative configurability (including an "off" switch), and no model training on CalHFA data.

CalHFA does not prescribe specific AI or GenAI capabilities, platforms, or models beyond what is required to meet the functional and security requirements described in the RFP. Vendors are expected to propose the most appropriate AI/GenAI capabilities, architectures, and governance frameworks that support a secure, reliable, and compliant document-management solution suitable for a government agency. Vendors must justify how their proposed capabilities support the required outcomes, improve

findability and governance, and comply with CalHFA and State of California security, data-protection, and operational governance expectations.

CQ-21

Topic

Supplemental OCR/barcode/AI modules

Consolidated question

If required OCR, barcode recognition or AI metadata extraction is unavailable natively in GCC/GCC High, may vendors include a separately licensed, government-available, wholly U.S.-based module? Specify the licensing and processing evidence required.

Source entries

39, 290

RFP page(s)

3-4; 3-4 and 9

RFP section(s)

3.1 | 3.2; 3.1 | 3.2 | 4.2.4

Answer

This is not preferred.

CQ-22

Topic

Security and AI questionnaires

Consolidated question

Provide the UpGuard Information Security Questionnaire and AI Questionnaire (including all referenced review questions), and confirm when/how they will be released and whether completed responses are due with the proposal.

Source entries

220, 221, 299

RFP page(s)

8; 7; 10–11; 13; XXXI

RFP section(s)

4.1.5; 3.2 | 4.1.5 | 4.2.8 | Exhibit E

CalHFA Response:

The UpGuard Information Security Questionnaire and the AI Questionnaire are not required with vendor proposals. These questionnaires will be provided after CalHFA's initial review of proposals, during the security and AI due-diligence phase. Vendors must complete the questionnaires based on their proposed solution's architecture, hosting, subprocessors, data flows, and AI features.

Questionnaire responses will be evaluated as part of CalHFA's security, compliance, and AI-governance review prior to contract award.

CQ-23

Topic

Search use cases and repository scope

Consolidated question

Provide representative advanced/custom search, semantic retrieval and eDiscovery use cases. For “cross-repository search,” clarify whether searching content after consolidation into the target repository satisfies the requirement or whether live SharePoint/file-server repositories must remain searchable after migration.

Source entries

98, 100, 126

RFP page(s)

4; 5; 7-8

RFP section(s)

3.2

CalHFA Response:

CalHFA requires advanced search and semantic retrieval capabilities that materially improve findability and support eDiscovery and Public Records Act (PRA) workflows. Representative use cases include:
• Searching for a case name with additional terms (e.g., “case name + stipulation”) and retrieving documents the system identifies as likely stipulations.
• Searching “case name + email” and returning all relevant emails, including both internal and external messages, with the ability to distinguish categories (e.g., internal/external) and flag the most recent email.
• Performing PRA-related searches that support complex filtering (e.g., “internal emails”) and allowing reviewers to click through results one by one and easily mark items for production.

Regarding cross-repository search: The RFP requires vendors to support effective search and retrieval across CalHFA’s content. Searching consolidated content in the target repository is acceptable if the vendor’s solution meets the functional requirements and preserves findability, governance, and eDiscovery workflows. The RFP does not require ongoing live search across legacy SharePoint or file-server repositories after migration unless a vendor proposes that approach as part of their recommended solution.

CQ-24

Topic

Service levels and support targets

Consolidated question

Provide required numeric targets and measurement workloads for uptime, indexing latency, search latency, help-desk response/restoration, and incident-severity definitions for post-migration and ongoing support.

Source entries

46, 161

RFP page(s)

8; 5; 8

RFP section(s)

3.2 | 3.3; 3.3

CalHFA Response:

Non-functional requirements for performance are not defined. CalHFA will collaborate with the selected vendor to define.

CQ-25

Topic

Excel viewing and production validation

Consolidated question

Provide representative sanitized Excel workbooks, including large or complex examples, for validating native viewing and PDF-production fidelity.

Source entries

181

RFP page(s)

8

RFP section(s)

3.3

CalHFA Response:

CalHFA will not provide sample Excel workbooks during the solicitation. Vendors should demonstrate native viewing and PDF-production fidelity using vendor-supplied, sanitized examples, including large or complex workbooks. Representative sanitized CalHFA files will be provided to the selected vendor during implementation and acceptance testing, subject to applicable confidentiality and security requirements.

CQ-26

Topic

Storage tiering and resilience

Consolidated question

Provide required RTO/RPO, archive-retrieval targets and criteria for moving content among hot, cool and archive tiers; clarify whether the vendor must define the tiering strategy.

Source entries

192, 204

RFP page(s)

6; 9

RFP section(s)

3.4

CalHFA Response:

CalHFA is looking for the selected vendor to collaborate on defining the tiering strategy using their experience and industry best practices.

CQ-27

Topic

Retention schedules and triggers

Consolidated question

Provide approved records-retention schedules/file plan and program-specific rules, including event-based triggers, legal holds, overrides and retention-conflict handling, in documented or machine-readable form for configuration and migration planning.

Source entries

199, 202

RFP page(s)

6; 9

RFP section(s)

3.4

CalHFA Response:

CalHFA has defined retention schedules and rules based on the type of document and type of information. A sample retention schedule is attached to this document. CalHFA will provide additional information to the selected vendor during implementation and acceptance testing.

CQ-28

Topic

Encryption-key ownership

Consolidated question

Specify whether encryption keys must be CalHFA-owned, CalHFA-operated or managed through a shared-control model.

Source entries

205

RFP page(s)

9

RFP section(s)

3.4

CalHFA Response:

Encryption keys should be CalHFA owned and operated.

CQ-29

Topic

Target information architecture and taxonomy

Consolidated question

Clarify whether CalHFA will provide the target information architecture, taxonomy, metadata model and permission model, or whether the selected vendor must design them from the ground up.

Source entries

99

RFP page(s)

4

RFP section(s)

3.2

CalHFA Response:

CalHFA will provide their current information architecture, taxonomy, metadata model, and permission model to the selected vendor.

Consolidated Miscellaneous Questions Set for Group 4

CQ-M-01

Topic

Solicitation schedule and proposal due dates

Consolidated Question

Please confirm the controlling procurement schedule, including the evaluation-completion milestone and the interval between publication of Q&A responses and the proposal due date.

Source Entries

1, 2

RFP Page(s)

1; 4

RFP Section(s)

1.1

CalHFA Response:

Controlling date: The Evaluation of Proposals Completed milestone is Monday, December 7, 2026. This is the corrected and controlling date set in Addendum No. 1, which extended all remaining milestones by one week

CalHFA has already issued Addendum No. 1 revising the schedule:

• Official Q&A Responses: Monday, November 2, 2026, 5:00 PM PT

• Proposal Due Date: Monday, November 16, 2026, 5:00 PM PT

• All remaining milestones extended by one week

These dates are controlling. At this time, CalHFA is maintaining the two-week interval between Q&A posting and proposal submission

CQ-M-02

Topic

Short-list demonstrations and optional proof of concept

Consolidated Question

Please describe the short-list demonstration and optional 14-day POC process, including selection and timing, cost responsibility, participants, sample data and environment, scenarios, functionality, and acceptance criteria.

Source Entries

3, 4, 5, 270, 271

RFP Page(s)

1; 4; 1 and 4

RFP Section(s)

1.1.1 | 1.1.2; 1.1.2; 1.1.2 – Reference “Optional Proof-of-Concept (POC)”; 1.1.2 | 3.2

CalHFA Response:

CalHFA may require shortlisted vendors to participate in scripted demonstrations and, if deemed necessary, an optional 14 day Proof of Concept (POC). These activities will occur after initial proposal evaluations and any demonstrations, anticipated in Nov/Dec 2026, and will be conducted at no additional cost to CalHFA.

If a POC is requested, CalHFA will provide short-listed vendors with the scenarios to be executed as part of the evaluation process. CalHFA will also provide, in writing and before the POC begins, the evaluation criteria and expectations that will be applied uniformly to all participating vendors. These criteria will align strictly with the requirements already stated in the RFP and will not introduce new obligations beyond what vendors have proposed and committed to in their submissions. All short-listed vendors will receive the same scenarios, instructions, and evaluation criteria.

The POC is intended solely to validate the vendor's proposed capabilities in functional areas relevant to the RFP such as migration behavior, search performance, workflow execution, retention functionality, and eDiscovery capabilities based on the vendor's stated solution configuration. The POC is not intended to introduce new requirements or require vendors to demonstrate functionality outside the scope of their proposals.

Successful completion of the POC means demonstrating that the proposed solution can perform the required functions as described in the vendor's proposal and as defined in the published evaluation criteria. Because all criteria will be communicated in advance and applied consistently, CalHFA's assessment will be based only on the disclosed criteria. Failure to meet the published criteria may result in non-advancement. CalHFA will provide all necessary instructions, schedules, and evaluation materials to short-listed vendors prior to the start of any required demonstration or POC.

CQ-M-03

Topic

Project budget and funding range

Consolidated Question

Please identify any approved budget, planning range, funding allocation, anticipated three-year contract value, or not-to-exceed amount that vendors should use to scale their proposals.

Source Entries

6, 227, 234, 238, 303

RFP Page(s)

4; 9; 12; 9; 11

RFP Section(s)

2 – Reference Project "Overview and Background"; 4.2.4; 4.2.4 | 5.2.3

CalHFA Response:

CalHFA is not providing a budget range. Vendors should propose a complete, cost-effective three-year solution, including all implementation, licensing, support, and training costs. Pricing will be evaluated for reasonableness and value.

Proposals will be evaluated based on the evaluation criteria set forth in the RFP.

Vendors should submit complete three-year pricing in accordance with RFP §4.2.4, clearly identifying all costs, assumptions, dependencies, optional items, and pricing tiers. Pricing will be evaluated for reasonableness under the evaluation criteria stated in the RFP and will not be measured against an undisclosed pass/fail budget threshold.

CQ-M-04

Topic

Delivery location, remote work and travel reimbursement

Consolidated Question

Please clarify which activities, if any, must be performed on-site, the expected frequency of on-site presence, whether remote or blended delivery is acceptable, and how travel and incidental expenses must be priced or reimbursed.

Source Entries

8, 147, 266, 317

RFP Page(s)

4; 4-5; XIV–XV; VI; XV

RFP Section(s)

2 – Reference Project “Overview and Background”; 3.2; Exhibit D | Exhibit D 4(b); Exhibit A V | Exhibit D 4b

CalHFA Response:

CalHFA is flexible regarding on-site versus remote work. Vendors may propose primarily remote delivery with on-site sessions where beneficial. Travel costs must be included in pricing. CalHFA will evaluate the proposed approach for effectiveness and cost.

A primarily remote approach is acceptable, provided it supports effective collaboration, knowledge transfer, and stakeholder engagement. Any recommended on-site activities should be clearly identified and justified in the proposal.

Vendors should assume proposed pricing includes any travel or on-site expenses associated with their delivery approach.

On-site work is not required; most tasks may be performed remotely. Vendors may propose hybrid approaches if certain sessions (e.g., workshops, training) would benefit from in-person delivery. Travel costs must be included if applicable.

For this engagement, CalHFA will apply the “No Reimbursement” alternative in Exhibit D, §4(b). Vendors must include all travel and incidental expenses in their proposed pricing; CalHFA will not separately reimburse T&E. If CalHFA later authorizes reimbursable travel for a specific activity, the Agreement would be amended in writing to use the State’s travel reimbursement framework

Travel costs must follow State of California reimbursement rules unless included in the vendor’s fixed pricing. Vendors should clearly state how travel is priced; CalHFA will finalize the approach during contracting.

The RFP does not require specific on-site presence. Vendors may propose remote, hybrid, or on-site delivery based on effectiveness. Any required travel must comply with State per-diem rules or be included in all-inclusive pricing. Travel assumptions should be clearly identified in the proposal.

CQ-M-05

Topic

Platform neutrality and prior procurement involvement

Consolidated Question

Please confirm whether any vendor assisted with or is precluded by development of this procurement, and whether CalHFA has selected, standardized on, funded, or prefers any target platform, product, publisher, or technical approach.

Source Entries

9, 10, 274

RFP Page(s)

4

RFP Section(s)

2 – Reference Project “Overview and Background”; 2.1 | 3.1 | 3.2

CalHFA Response:

No external vendor contributed to the RFP, and no party is precluded from bidding due to involvement in its development. All qualified vendors may participate, subject to standard conflict-of-interest rules.

CalHFA is platform-neutral and will not score proposals based on whether they are Microsoft-centric. Solutions will be evaluated solely on how well they meet RFP requirements. Vendors should justify their recommended approach regardless of platform.

CalHFA has not preselected or committed to any specific platform. While Microsoft 365 is referenced as a potential environment, the RFP fully permits non-Microsoft solutions that meet security and functional requirements. All proposed platform licensing costs must be included in the vendor's three-year cost proposal.

CQ-M-06

Topic

Proposal forms, formatting, file naming and submission

Consolidated Question

Please identify the required response forms, point-by-point compliance format, page and file-size limits, use-case-mapping placement, file naming, number of submission files, and other proposal formatting and submission instructions.

Source Entries

11, 12, 222, 224, 261, 276, 277, 278

RFP Page(s)

2; 8; 11; 16; 2, 8, and 10; 2, 8, IV

RFP Section(s)

2.3; 2.4; 4.2.1; 4.2.2; Exhibit A "Organizational Structure and Key Details; 2.3 | 4.2.1 | 4.2.5 | 4.2.6; 2.3 | 4.2.1 | Exhibit A II.H

CalHFA Response:

The "CalHFA Response Form" and "Subvendors List" are part of the RFP PDF itself. Please use the fillable text fields. As stated, "If vendor prefers to submit their responses using their own template, ensure that your submission follows the exact format provided in Exhibit A. "No general page limits exist except the five-page cap for Use Case Mapping. Standard formatting practices apply.

There is no page limit for the proposal except the five-page Use Case Mapping. The RFP does not specify file size limits, but vendors should keep email attachments manageable. PDFs may be compressed if needed.

The RFP does not require a compliance matrix, but vendors must address all requirements from Sections 3.2–3.4, typically within Exhibit A Section III. A matrix may be included optionally for clarity.

As stated, "CalHFA has provided the form below for bidder's use. If vendor prefers to submit their responses using their own template, ensure that your submission follows the exact format provided in Exhibit A."

The Use Case Mapping must be provided as a distinct section, limited to five pages. Vendors are not required to duplicate that content elsewhere in the proposal. The main proposal may simply refer to the Use Case Mapping section. For submission purposes, vendors may include the Use Case Mapping within the overall proposal document, provided it is clearly identified and comply with the five-page limit.

Exhibit A must be completed exactly as structured, either by filling out the provided form or reproducing each question in order within the proposal. Every question and subsection must be included without renumbering. As stated, "CalHFA has provided the form below for bidder's use. If vendor prefers to submit their responses using their own template, ensure that your submission follows the exact format provided in Exhibit A."

The "CalHFA Response Form" refers to the structured templates included in the RFP (Exhibits A, B, C, etc.). Vendors must use these official forms-or replicate them exactly following all formatting and naming instructions. As stated, "CalHFA has provided the form below for bidder's use. If vendor prefers to submit their responses using their own template, ensure that your submission follows the exact format provided in Exhibit A."

Proposals must follow CalHFA's file-naming conventions and be emailed as single PDF document, clearly identifying all required sections.

Vendor is to provide Subvendors List in the text box section for Exhibit A II.H, and must be submitted with details for each subcontractor. Other required forms include Exhibits B, C, and F. These must accompany the proposal along with the Use Case Mapping and any optional exceptions document, using proper naming conventions. As stated, "CalHFA has provided the form

below for bidder's use. If vendor prefers to submit their responses using their own template, ensure that your submission follows the exact format provided in Exhibit A."

CQ-M-07

Topic

Subvendors list and named subcontractor disclosures

Consolidated Question

Please provide the official Subvendors List and clarify the required scope and timing of disclosures and Agency consent for named subcontractors, technical partners, and alternative partner options.

Source Entries

163, 258, 260, 265, 318

RFP Page(s)

5; XXVI; IV (Exhibit A); XXVI (Exhibit D); IV (Exhibit A) and XVIII (Exhibit D)

RFP Section(s)

3.3; 28; Exhibit A II.H; Exhibit D 28; Exhibit A II.H | Exhibit D 10

CalHFA Response:

Vendors should submit a single, cohesive solution design, choosing recommended integrations rather than presenting multiple alternatives. Optional alternatives may be mentioned but the primary proposal should reflect one clear design.

Subcontractor approval is not required at proposal submission but must be obtained before subcontractors begin work. Vendors should list subcontractors in their proposal; CalHFA will grant formal approval during contract execution.

The CalHFA Subvendors List form is part of the official RFP materials, text box specifically. As stated, "CalHFA has provided the form below for bidder's use. If vendor prefers to submit their responses using their own template, ensure that your submission follows the exact format provided in Exhibit A."

Subcontractors listed in the proposal will be reviewed and formally approved during contract execution. Vendors must obtain CalHFA approval before any subcontractor starts work, including subsequent additions or substitutions.

For each subcontractor, vendors must list the entity in Exhibit A and the Subvendors List, describe its role, provide qualifications, and include key personnel resumes as applicable. The proposal must also confirm subcontractor compliance with contractual requirements such as insurance, confidentiality, and performance obligations.

CQ-M-08

Topic

Training audiences and delivery approach

Consolidated Question

Please provide the estimated training audiences by role, including internal, administrative, power, records, eDiscovery, and external users, and the preferred on-site, virtual, blended, and train-the-trainer delivery methods.

Source Entries

24, 25, 47, 139

RFP Page(s)

4-5; 8; 5

RFP Section(s)

3.2 | 3.3; 3.2

CalHFA Response:

CalHFA has not defined exact training counts but anticipates training for several hundred end users, a few dozen power users, a small records team, a small eDiscovery group, and a few administrators. Vendors should propose a comprehensive training plan that covers all user types.

CalHFA does not mandate training formats; vendors may propose on-site, virtual, or train-the-trainer models. The training plan should cover all user groups and reflect an effective, cost-efficient approach, including travel costs if applicable.

Vendors should plan to train all user groups. Hundreds of end users, a smaller set of power users, and a handful of administrators- and propose formats such as virtual, on-site, or blended. Estimates can assume approximately 250 end users, approximately 20–30 power users, and 5–10 admins.

All end users and system administrators must be trained. Vendors may propose virtual or train-the-trainer methods. A few hundred end users and a handful of admin and external users should be assumed.

CQ-M-09

Topic

Implementation, migration and go-live schedule

Consolidated Question

Please clarify the meaning of the January 11, 2027 service-start date, required or preferred rollout sequence and milestones by module, target dates for first operational use and migration off SharePoint 2016, completion deadlines, and whether physical scanning or backfile digitization labor is in scope.

Source Entries

49, 63, 77, 257, 269, 272, 273

RFP Page(s)

3-5; 6; 2; 11; 1, 4–5; 1, 4, 10; 1, 10-11

RFP Section(s)

3.1 | 3.2; 3.1; 5.2.3; 1.1 | 3.2; 1.1 | 3.2 | 5.1.1; 1.1 | 5.1.1 | 5.2.3

CalHFA Response:

The only tentative fixed date is the start of service on January 11, 2027. Vendors must propose the full implementation timeline and rollout sequence for all modules. CalHFA has no predefined end date; timelines will be evaluated for feasibility and alignment with migration off SharePoint 2016.

CalHFA has no preferred rollout sequence. Vendors should propose their own phased implementation plan and justify the sequence, including how standalone modules like eDiscovery would operate if implemented first or separately.

No fixed deadline exists for retiring SharePoint 2016 beyond vendor-proposed timelines. Vendors should propose a reasonable migration schedule considering that extended support ended in July 2026. CalHFA seeks an efficient, low-risk transition.

No specific go-live date is required beyond the tentative January 11, 2027 start of service. Vendors should propose realistic timelines for module deployment, including phased or early eDiscovery rollout if beneficial.

January 11, 2027 is the tentative required Start of Service, meaning vendors must be ready to begin implementation work on that date. The RFP provides no fixed go-live deadlines or mandated rollout sequence; vendors must propose their own implementation schedule, including phased deployment and migration timelines. CalHFA will evaluate the proposed schedule for reasonableness, and all dates remain subject to change at the Agency's discretion.

January 11, 2027 marks the tentative start of implementation, not the system go-live. Vendors must propose their own go-live sequence and timelines. The RFP does not require physical backfile scanning; large-scale digitization is out of scope. Vendors should focus on configuring scanning capabilities (OCR, barcode ingestion) and migration of electronic content, not performing physical scanning.

Other than the January 11, 2027 tentative start date, the RFP sets no mandatory deadlines for module go-lives or overall migration completion. Vendors must propose milestones and rollout schedules, which CalHFA will evaluate for feasibility. No hidden or fixed completion date exists beyond the general expectation of a timely implementation.

CQ-M-10

Topic

Modular proposals, multiple awards and module-specific requirements

Consolidated Question

Please confirm whether vendors may propose one or more independently deployable modules, pilots, services, or multi-publisher solutions rather than the complete suite; how such proposals will be evaluated and awarded; and which common forms, use-case mappings, cross-module requirements, and three-year pricing obligations remain mandatory.

Source Entries

52, 53, 56, 78, 212, 213, 215, 216, 217, 223, 232, 240, 253, 279, 285, 286, 287, 298, 300

RFP Page(s)

3; 7; 7; 10; 10; 8; 9; 11; 3, 7; 7 and 3; 8-9 and 3; 3, 6, 12; 3; 12

RFP Section(s)

3.1; 4.1.1; 4.2.2; 4.2.4; 5.2.2; 3.1 | 4.1.1; 4.1.1 | 3.1; 4.2.2 | 3.1; 3.1 | 4.1.1 | 5.3; 3.1 | 5.3

CalHFA Response:

CalHFA accepts proposals for any subset of the three modules. Vendors must clearly indicate their scope, complete all required exhibits, and address only the relevant technical requirements for their proposed modules.

CalHFA allows integrated solutions using multiple software products under a single prime contractor. The prime must act as the single point of accountability and ensure compatibility and cohesion across all solution components.

Vendors may propose an independent eDiscovery solution without Document Management or Retention components, as long as the eDiscovery module satisfies all related requirements and integrates appropriately. All required exhibits must still be submitted.

Experience requirements will be evaluated relative to the modules proposed. Vendors bidding a single module must show five comparable projects in that area, rather than across all modules.

The referenced response does not require vendors to propose all modules. CalHFA permits module-specific proposals and may make separate module awards. The response is intended to clarify that proposals consisting solely of workflow or migration services, without a clearly defined module solution or role within the overall modular architecture, may not be considered responsive.

CalHFA may award separate module-specific contracts, including for eDiscovery alone. Vendors may propose only certain modules but must clearly state scope and complete all required exhibits. Evaluation will focus on the modules proposed.

Vendors proposing only certain modules must provide pricing only for those modules and mark others as “N/A.” Itemizing costs by module helps CalHFA evaluate and potentially mix-and-match awards.

Proposals must cover delivery of a production-ready solution. Offering only a stand-alone paid pilot would not be responsive. Vendors may include a pilot phase within a full implementation plan.

Proposals limited to one or two modules are acceptable. Vendors must provide all required exhibits and a complete technical and cost response for the modules included. Evaluation will be module-specific.

All five use cases must be addressed in the Use Case Mapping even if proposing limited modules. For unsupported use cases, vendors should acknowledge them and explain assumptions or integration points.

Cost tables should include only the modules proposed, with clear three-year pricing per module. Modules not included should be marked “N/A.” This supports potential modular awards.

Although not explicitly required, CalHFA strongly encourages itemized pricing by module to support potential module-specific awards. Vendors offering multiple modules should clearly allocate costs to each component while still presenting a full three-year total for their proposed scope.

An eDiscovery-only proposal will be evaluated solely on requirements relevant to the eDiscovery module. Requirements for modules not proposed will not count against the vendor, provided all general RFP submission requirements are still met.

The RFP explicitly allows module-specific proposals, and CalHFA may award different modules to different vendors. Vendors may bid only the module(s) they wish to offer, as long as they clearly define scope and meet requirements for those module(s).

Proposals covering only selected modules are acceptable and will be evaluated on their own merits. Vendors should clearly identify scope and fully address the requirements of the modules they choose to offer; lack of coverage for all modules will not disqualify a proposal.

All standard forms and exhibits are required even for partial-module proposals. Vendors may mark sections not relevant to their scope as N/A but must still follow the exact format and include all required sections to remain compliant.

The Use Case Mapping must cover all five use cases, even for module-specific proposals. Vendors should address each use case by mapping it to their solution or explicitly noting how that use case falls outside their scope, rather than omitting it.

Module-specific proposals are permitted and will be evaluated solely on the requirements of the modules offered. CalHFA may issue multiple awards if separate solutions provide the best value. Vendors will not be penalized for not bidding all modules.

CalHFA will consider proposals covering only selected modules, and vendors must price only those modules they offer. Sections unrelated to the proposed scope should be marked N/A. Evaluation will focus on how well the proposed modules satisfy CalHFA's needs.

CQ-M-11

Topic

Document-management use-case definitions

Consolidated Question

Please define each of the five document-management use cases in the context of CalHFA's desired solution.

Source Entries

73

RFP Page(s)

6

RFP Section(s)

3.1 – Reference "Proposed solutions must explicitly support and map capabilities to the five document management use cases: Digital Workplace, External Collaboration, Enterprise Application Content Services, Content-Centric Business Processes, and Information Governance"

CalHFA Response:

CalHFA uses the five document management use cases to describe the functional areas the proposed solution must support. In the context of this RFP, they are defined as follows:

Digital Workplace: Support for CalHFA's internal document creation, storage, search, and collaboration needs. This includes enabling staff to efficiently access, manage, and collaborate on documents as part of their daily work, with secure access and strong usability that supports hybrid work.

External Collaboration: The ability to securely share and collaborate on documents with external parties, such as partners, other agencies, consultants, or the public, while enforcing appropriate access controls, permissions, auditability, and protection of sensitive information.

Enterprise Application Content Services: Integration of document management and content services with CalHFA's enterprise and line-of-business applications, so that documents can be accessed, managed, and governed directly within business systems rather than in isolated repositories.

Content-Centric Business Processes: Support for document-driven workflows and processes, such as reviews, approvals, case management, and other business activities where documents are central. This includes workflow automation and process tracking to improve efficiency and reduce manual handling.

Information Governance: Capabilities that support records management, compliance, security, and lifecycle management of information, including retention and disposition, legal holds, audit trails, access controls, and compliance with applicable laws and regulations.

Vendors are expected to map specific solution components and capabilities to each of these five use cases in accordance with RFP Sections 3.1 and 4.2.2. The use cases are intended to guide how CalHFA will evaluate the completeness and applicability of proposed solutions; they do not introduce additional requirements beyond those stated in the RFP.

CQ-M-12

Topic

Post-migration support, managed services and service levels

Consolidated Question

Please define the required stabilization and post-migration support duration, any ongoing managed eDiscovery services, help-desk coverage, and minimum service levels for uptime, incident response, indexing, search latency, and related support measures.

Source Entries

124, 162, 174, 182, 296, 302

RFP Page(s)

7-8; 4-5; 5; 8; 8; 12; 5, VI

RFP Section(s)

3.2; 3.3; 3.2 | 3.3 | 4.2.4; 3.3 | Exhibit A V.B

CalHFA Response:

Post-migration stabilization support is required but duration is vendor-defined. Vendors should propose a reasonable support period (e.g., several weeks) and include associated activities and costs. Duration will be finalized during contract negotiations.

Vendors should propose an appropriate stabilization support period (e.g., 30–90 days). Ongoing support must cover the full three-year contract term. Additional managed services may be proposed as optional but are not required.

CalHFA is procuring eDiscovery software and implementation-not ongoing managed eDiscovery services. Daily eDiscovery tasks will be performed internally. Vendors may mention optional services, but they are not part of the required scope.

Support hours are not specified. Vendors should propose appropriate support coverage, with at least business-hours support expected. 24/7 support may be offered if standard, but it is not required.

Post-migration stabilization support is required, but duration is vendor-proposed. Vendors should recommend an appropriate hyper-care period (e.g., several weeks) with defined support levels, which CalHFA will evaluate for sufficiency.

The RFP does not define minimum service levels for uptime, support hours, response times, or performance metrics. Vendors must propose enterprise-appropriate SLAs that reflect best practices, including availability, support coverage, incident response times, and search/indexing performance. Final service levels will be negotiated and documented in the contract or SLA.

CQ-M-13

Topic

Cost proposal structure, inclusions and commercial models

Consolidated Question

Please clarify the required cost-proposal form and three-year pricing scope, including implementation, migration, subscriptions, storage tiers and overages, support, maintenance, training, third-party and optional services, POC or integration fees, rate cards, managed services, and permitted SaaS or alternative commercial models.

Source Entries

225, 226, 230, 231, 233, 235, 237, 239

RFP Page(s)

9; 12

RFP Section(s)

4.2.4

CalHFA Response:

The cost proposal must clearly itemize all three-year costs, including implementation, support, training, data storage, overages, and billing frequency. Vendors may structure the tables as they prefer as long as required elements are included.

Three-year pricing must include all solution, implementation, support, training, storage, and third-party costs necessary to deliver the complete offering. Provide a comprehensive, no-surprises cost model for Years 1-3.

Alternative pricing models (enterprise, per-GB, per-user, hybrid) are allowed. Vendors must clearly define assumptions, inclusions, overages, and provide total estimated three-year costs for evaluation.

Optional eDiscovery services (e.g., forensic collection, advanced analytics) may be included as optional line items. They must be clearly separated from the required base solution costs.

Optional integrations or additional services may be listed separately as optional items. Required integrations must be included in the base cost. The pre-award POC cannot be billed.

All necessary software subscriptions must be included unless clearly stated as Agency-provided. Vendors should explicitly note any assumptions about CalHFA-existing licenses to avoid ambiguity.

There is no formal cost template; vendors must include all elements listed in Section 4.2.4 in a clear three-year cost breakdown. Pricing may be fixed-fee, T&M, milestone-based, or hybrid. Any deviation from the default hourly/NTE contract format should be noted in the exceptions document, with full transparency on pricing methodology.

The RFP does not provide numeric eDiscovery usage estimates. Vendors must make reasonable assumptions about annual matters, data volumes, and growth, clearly documenting these assumptions in pricing. Transparency is essential for CalHFA to evaluate proposals on an equivalent basis.

CQ-M-14

Topic

Existing licenses and incremental subscription costs

Consolidated Question

Please identify the existing Microsoft 365, SharePoint, Purview/eDiscovery, government-cloud, storage, and related entitlements CalHFA will provide or expects vendors to reuse, and which incremental licenses or subscriptions must be included in proposed pricing.

Source Entries

236, 281, 284

RFP Page(s)

9; 4 and 9; 4, 9

RFP Section(s)

4.2.4; 3.2 | 4.2.4

CalHFA Response:

The RFP does not specify which Microsoft 365 licenses CalHFA will provide, so vendors should assume all required licenses must be included in their three-year pricing unless they explicitly state otherwise. Any reliance on CalHFA-provided licensing must be clearly documented to ensure compliance with Section 4.2.4's requirement for complete pricing.

CalHFA does not specify which, if any, Microsoft 365 or other licenses it will provide. Vendors should assume all required software licenses must be included in the three-year cost proposal unless clearly stated otherwise. Any assumptions about Agency-provided licenses must be explicit.

CalHFA has not disclosed its existing Microsoft 365 or cloud licensing. Vendors must propose and price all necessary software and storage for a complete solution, identifying any assumptions about using CalHFA's existing environment. Costs should not be omitted based on unconfirmed license availability.

CQ-M-15

Topic

eDiscovery and content sizing assumptions

Consolidated Question

Please provide the user, collaborator, role, storage, content-growth, matter, custodian, ingestion, processing, OCR/barcode/AI extraction, reviewer, administrator, and other capacity assumptions vendors should use for comparable three-year licensing, hosting, performance, and pricing.

Source Entries

228, 229, 275, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295

RFP Page(s)

9; 1–3; 3-4 and 9; 6-7; 12; 7-8; 12; 6; 8; 12; 8, 12

RFP Section(s)

4.2.4; 2.1 | 3.1; 3.1 | 3.2 | 4.2.4; 3.1 | 3.3 | 4.2.4; 3.3 | 4.2.4

CalHFA Response:

The core eDiscovery user base is small-estimated 5-10 regular users (attorneys, paralegals, investigators) plus 1-3 administrators. Vendors should base licensing assumptions on a limited set of power users.

eDiscovery data will fluctuation current eDiscovery data is roughly 122GB. Individual matters vary in size but can be up to 256GB. Annual matters range widely, with many PRA requests and occasional large cases. Vendors should state volume assumptions clearly.

The Document Management module is expected to serve nearly all CalHFA internal staff (a few hundred users). eDiscovery usage will be limited to a small group (primarily legal staff), and external collaboration users will be far fewer and vary by project. Vendors should make reasonable user assumptions and state them clearly in pricing models.

The RFP provides no usage metrics for OCR, barcode processing, or AI metadata extraction. Vendors must define reasonable assumptions for these workloads and specify how pricing scales with usage, ensuring the solution can accommodate variable volumes.

User counts are not defined in the RFP. Vendors should make reasonable assumptions for internal users (several hundred), power users, and external collaborators, documenting these assumptions clearly for licensing and sizing.

CalHFA provides no estimate for content growth. Vendors should propose scalable solutions and include growth assumptions (e.g., annual storage increase) that inform their three-year pricing and capacity planning.

CalHFA has not published eDiscovery matter counts or ingestion volumes. Vendors must base assumptions on similar organizations and document estimated matter volumes, data sizes, and pricing scalability per Section 4.2.4.

Concurrent eDiscovery usage is expected to involve only a small number of users at once. Vendors should design for limited concurrency with reasonable headroom and document assumed peak simultaneous users in their proposals.

CQ-M-16

Topic

Compensation, billing, acceptance and pricing assumptions

Consolidated Question

Please reconcile the Exhibit D hourly not-to-exceed compensation terms with the requested three-year itemized cost proposal, clarify whether fixed-fee or milestone pricing is permitted, and state how pricing assumptions, acceptance, invoice approval, payment timing, and negotiation adjustments will be handled.

Source Entries

244, 305, 306, 307, 308

RFP Page(s)

10; 9; 11; XIV-XV; 9, XIV-XV; 9; XIV; 12; XIV–XV

RFP Section(s)

4.2.7; 4.2.4 | 5.2.3 | Exhibit D 4; 4.2.4 | Exhibit D | Exhibit D 4; 4.2.4 | Exhibit D 4

CalHFA Response:

Vendors must present complete three-year pricing for subscriptions, services, storage, and all required costs, even though Exhibit D uses an hourly/NTE structure. CalHFA will incorporate the awarded vendor's pricing model into the contract, with any necessary contract modifications listed in the exceptions document.

Pricing submitted in the proposal is treated as firm for evaluation. While assumptions may be clarified during negotiations, vendors should not expect to revise pricing materially after submission. Any dependencies, assumptions, or pricing conditions should be explicitly stated in the proposal and the exceptions document, if applicable.

Billing, acceptance, and payment follow Exhibit D and standard State of California practices. Vendors may propose monthly or milestone-based billing, but payment occurs after CalHFA accepts deliverables and receives a correct invoice, typically within approximately 45 days. Acceptance criteria will be finalized in the contract or project plan.

No specific cost template is mandated. Vendors may use fixed-price, T&M, subscription, or hybrid models if all one-time and recurring costs for the full 36-month term tentatively beginning January 11, 2027, are clearly itemized. Any deviations from Exhibit D's hourly/NTE model must be identified in the exceptions document.

Implementation pricing may be hourly NTE, fixed-price/milestone-based, or hybrid. CalHFA has no preference as long as pricing is transparent, aligns with contract requirements, and covers all implementation tasks. Any contract adjustments needed for non-hourly structures should be noted in the exceptions document.

CQ-M-17

Topic

Vendor and team minimum qualifications

Consolidated Question

Please clarify how the minimum experience, like-service client, implementation-reference, and technical-credential qualifications apply to a prime contractor, proposed module, and disclosed subcontractor or teaming partner, including whether team experience may be combined.

Source Entries

7, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 251, 304, 314, 315

RFP Page(s)

4; 10; 11; 9-11; 10–11; XXVI; 10; XXVI

RFP Section(s)

2 – Reference Project “Overview and Background”; 5.1.1; 5.2.1; 4.2.3 | 4.2.6 | 5.1.1 | 5.2.1; 5.1.1 | 5.2.1 | Exhibit D 28; 5.1.1 | Exhibit D | Exhibit D 28

CalHFA Response:

Vendor qualifications will be evaluated per Sections 5.1 and 5.2, requiring at least three years’ experience and five similar clients. Certifications may strengthen credibility but are not separately scored; they contribute to assessing overall capability and technical competence.

While certifications and partner designations are not separately scored, vendors are encouraged to highlight qualifications, partnerships, certifications, and related experience that demonstrate expertise and delivery capability. These credentials will be considered as part of the overall assessment of vendor qualifications and technical competence.

The minimum qualifications-three years’ experience and five similar clients-must be met by the prime contractor alone. Subcontractor experience may strengthen the proposal but cannot substitute for the prime meeting these mandatory thresholds.

Experience and client minimums apply to the proposing entity, not its subcontractors or individual staff. Key personnel and partner experience may supplement the proposal but cannot replace the prime’s obligation to meet Section 5.1.1 independently.

The prime vendor must provide at least five comparable client references; subcontractor references do not count toward meeting the minimum qualification. Subcontractors’ experience may be included as supporting information only.

The prime contractor alone must meet the three-year and five-client minimum experience requirements. Team-wide experience may demonstrate broader capability but cannot be aggregated to satisfy minimum qualifications.

CalHFA requires the prime bidder itself to meet all minimum qualifications in Section 5.1.1. Subcontractor or product-manufacturer experience can support but not replace the prime’s eligibility. Vendors not meeting the minimums risk disqualification.

While only three references are required, vendors are encouraged to complete all four slots in Exhibit C. Providing four relevant references satisfies the minimum requirement and gives CalHFA additional information to assess past performance.

Minimum qualifications-three years of experience and five similar clients-must be met by the prime contractor itself. For module-specific proposals, the prime must demonstrate relevant experience for the module(s) offered. Subcontractor experience may strengthen the proposal but cannot be used to satisfy the prime’s minimum qualifications or required references.

The prime contractor must independently meet the three-year and five-client minimum qualifications; subcontractor experience cannot substitute for the prime’s eligibility. References should primarily reflect the prime’s work, though subcontractor experience may supplement overall team capability. Subcontractors listed in proposals will require CalHFA’s written approval before beginning work.

Subcontractors are not required to meet minimum qualifications individually; only the prime contractor must satisfy the three-year and five-client thresholds. Vendors should still demonstrate that subcontractors are capable of performing their assigned roles to support evaluation of overall team strength.

CQ-M-18

Topic

Reference-client forms and contact requirements

Consolidated Question

Please reconcile the number of like-service clients and reference contacts required by Sections 5.1.1 and 5.2.1 with Exhibit C, and clarify whether an additional attachment is permitted and which clients require consented contact details.

Source Entries

310, 311, 312, 313

RFP Page(s)

10 and XII (Exhibit C); 10-11 and XII (Exhibit C); 14; XII

RFP Section(s)

5.1.1 | Exhibit C; 5.1.1 | 5.2.1 | Exhibit C; 5.2.1 | Exhibit C

CalHFA Response:

Vendors may submit separate, clearly labeled page for a fifth reference since Exhibit C includes only four slots. The extra page should follow the Exhibit C format without altering the original template.

Vendors should fill all four Exhibit C reference slots when possible and provide any additional experience (e.g., fifth client) in an attached appendix. Exhibit C must remain unchanged except for completing the provided fields.

Vendors must show at least five similar client engagements and provide at least three references with contact information. The same projects may satisfy both requirements, but vendors should clearly distinguish which entries are references and which serve solely as experience evidence.

Although only three references are required, CalHFA encourages vendors to complete all four Exhibit C slots. Providing four references gives the evaluation team broader insight into past performance and strengthens the proposal.

CQ-M-19

Topic

Evaluation criteria, weights and procurement discretion

Consolidated Question

Please provide or clarify the evaluation scoring matrix, relative weights or priorities, treatment of single- versus multi-publisher solutions, and the procurement mechanism associated with CalHFA's reserved selection discretion.

Source Entries

214, 250, 252, 301

RFP Page(s)

10; 14; 11; 3; 11

RFP Section(s)

4.1.1; 5.2.2 | 5.2.3; 5.2.2; 3.1 | 5.2.2

CalHFA Response:

The clause allowing selection of vendors "other than those responding" preserves CalHFA's flexibility if no proposals meet requirements. The intent remains to award within responders unless circumstances require alternative sourcing.

CalHFA will not release an evaluation scoring matrix prior to vendor selection. Proposals are assessed qualitatively against the criteria in Sections 5.2.2 and 5.2.3, including technical merit, pricing, demos, and POCs. Vendors should focus on strong responses and competitive pricing rather than specific point allocations.

CalHFA has no preference for a single-vendor platform versus a multi-vendor integrated solution. Both approaches will be evaluated equally based on their ability to meet functional, technical, and security requirements and to deliver value.

CalHFA has not published a scoring matrix or assigned numerical weights to evaluation criteria. Proposals will be evaluated holistically based on Sections 5.2.2 and 5.2.3, covering the five DMS use cases, eDiscovery and retention requirements, AI capabilities, security, implementation approach, and total three-year cost. Vendors should address all criteria comprehensively.

CQ-M-20

Topic

SB/DVBE participation and scoring

Consolidated Question

Please clarify how SB/DVBE certification and participation through certified subcontractors affect evaluation or scoring, including any preferences, weights, evidence, and consent requirements.

Source Entries

241, 254, 255, 256

RFP Page(s)

9; 11; 14

RFP Section(s)

4.2.5; 5.2.2

CalHFA Response:

CalHFA does not publicly disclose evaluation weights or scoring rubrics prior to vendor selection

CalHFA does not publicly disclose evaluation weights or scoring rubrics prior to vendor selection. SB/DVBE participation is addressed in the RFP; vendors should follow the eligibility and documentation requirements therein.

A prime that is not California-certified as an SB or DVBE may receive this preference if it commits at least 25% of the total contract work to California-certified SB/DVBE subcontractors, and all subcontracted work is performed in accordance with the Services Agreement (Exhibit D), including its subcontracting requirements.

This participation should be documented in Exhibit B and the Subvendors List. CalHFA does not publicly disclose evaluation weights or percentages prior to vendor selection.

CQ-M-21

Topic

Service Agreement exceptions and proposal evaluation

Consolidated Question

Please clarify how proposed exceptions to Exhibit D must be submitted and how exceptions affect responsiveness, evaluation, scoring, negotiation, and the requirement to comply with the Agency Services Agreement.

Source Entries

211, 242, 243

RFP Page(s)

11, 13; 10; 13

RFP Section(s)

4.1.5 | 4.2.7; 4.2.7

CalHFA Response:

Submitting reasonable contractual exceptions will not make a proposal non-responsive. Exceptions will be reviewed and addressed by CalHFA legal staff.

Submitting reasonable contract exceptions will not make a proposal non-responsive. Exceptions are reviewed case-by-case basis. Vendors may include standard SaaS or data-protection terms via the exceptions document for consideration.

CalHFA does not award any score advantage for submitting "zero exceptions," and exceptions are not weighted in technical evaluation. Exceptions to Exhibit D are reviewed only after the top ranked vendor is identified; if an exception conflicts with mandatory terms or materially limits CalHFA's protections, it may prevent contract award and CalHFA may proceed with another vendor.

CQ-M-22

Topic

Insurance requirements

Consolidated Question

Please identify the insurance coverages, limits, endorsements, carrier ratings, and applicability to technology and professional-services subcontractors, and confirm whether construction-specific language in Exhibit D Section 33 will be omitted.

Source Entries

259, 264, 267

RFP Page(s)

XXVII; XIV, XXVII

RFP Section(s)

33; Exhibit D | Exhibit D 1(c) | Exhibit D 33; Exhibit D | Exhibit D 33

CalHFA Response:

For this software and professional-services engagement, the construction-specific bracketed language in Exhibit D §33 will be omitted. CalHFA will apply Exhibit D §33's Professional Liability / Errors & Omissions requirement (minimum $1,000,000 with an A.M. Best rating of at least BBB+, and a Certificate of Insurance prior to commencement). Workers' Compensation under Exhibit D §1(c) remains applicable

Construction-specific insurance requirements in Exhibit D Section 33 will not apply to this IT project. Only standard professional and general liability coverages are required for the contract.

CQ-M-23

Topic

Pre-existing tools, third-party software and intellectual property

Consolidated Question

Please clarify how Exhibit D ownership, work-product, and intellectual-property provisions apply to project-specific deliverables, vendor pre-existing tools, reusable materials, third-party software, and SaaS services.

Source Entries

263, 309

RFP Page(s)

XXII-XXIII, XXV; 10; XXII–XXIII

RFP Section(s)

Exhibit D | Exhibit D 19 | Exhibit D 25; 4.2.7 | Exhibit D | Exhibit D 19

CalHFA Response:

Exhibit D §§19 and 25 govern CalHFA's ownership of deliverables and work product created under the contract. CalHFA will own all "Work" and "Work Product" developed for the Agency including items implemented within contractor tools or third-party SaaS.

Pre-existing contractor/third-party software and platforms remain proprietary to their owners and are supplied to CalHFA under license. Vendors must identify and mark all pre-existing IP and submit any license terms via the Exceptions to Services Agreement process.

CalHFA will own all “Work”/“Work Product” developed for the Agency, even if implemented within contractor tools or third-party SaaS. Pre-existing contractor/third-party software and platforms remain proprietary to their owners and are supplied to CalHFA under license. Vendors must identify and mark all pre-existing IP and submit the applicable license terms via the Exceptions to Services Agreement process; such terms must not limit CalHFA’s rights to its Work/Work Product or data.

CalHFA will own project-specific deliverables created under the contract, while vendors retain ownership of pre-existing tools, software, or SaaS components, which will be licensed to CalHFA for use. Vendors must identify all pre-existing IP and provide applicable license terms or exceptions if they differ from Exhibit D.

CQ-M-24

Topic

Corporate financial information and capacity

Consolidated Question

Please clarify the revenue-reporting basis following an acquisition, the working-capital period contemplated by Exhibit F, and the supporting documents and financial-capacity criteria CalHFA may require.

Source Entries

262, 268, 316

RFP Page(s)

17; XXXII; 11, XXXII

RFP Section(s)

Exhibit A I.G; Exhibit F item 5; 5.1.2 | Exhibit F item 5

CalHFA Response:

Revenue reporting in Exhibit A should reflect the entity submitting the proposal. If an acquisition occurred, vendors should clarify whether revenues represent the acquiring entity or the subsidiary and explain the context for financial stability evaluation.

Vendors must certify they have sufficient working capital to perform the work without advance payments.

Vendors must certify they have sufficient working capital to perform the project without advance payments. CalHFA may request financial statements or comparable documentation to verify financial stability, such as audited statements or evidence of adequate liquidity.

Appendix A — Original-to-Consolidated Crosswalk: Legal, Compliance, and eDiscovery Requirements

The original question text below is reproduced in full from Legal, Compliance, and eDiscovery Requirements. Each source entry maps to one proposed consolidated question for stakeholder review; All CalHFA input has been synthesized into the official response for each consolidated question.

Source Entry	RFP page	RFP section	Original question (full text)	Consolidated ID(s)	Mapped consolidated question(s)
14	5	3.2 | 3.3	Does the Office 365/Exchange GCC connectivity requirement permit an eDiscovery service hosted in a separate FedRAMP-authorized cloud to connect securely to CalHFA's GCC tenant, or must the eDiscovery service itself operate within that tenant?	CQ-LH-06	CQ-LH-06 — Current environment, hosting model, tool preferences and licensing: Describe the current eDiscovery and Microsoft 365 government-cloud environment, including GCC or GCC High, existing platforms and approximate hosted activity, Purview/eDiscovery capability and licensing, preferred tools, and whether a separately hosted FedRAMP-authorized eDiscovery service may connect to CalHFA's GCC tenant or the service must operate within the tenant.
19	3; 5	3.1 | 3.3	Please provide annual request and matter volumes, concurrent matters, custodians per matter, typical and maximum collection sizes, monthly ingestion volumes, peak OCR loads and expected retained discovery storage.	CQ-LH-05	CQ-LH-05 — eDiscovery workload, concurrency, custodians, ingestion and storage sizing: Provide the planning baseline for eDiscovery and records-production sizing and comparable pricing: annual request/matter volumes by type; typical and peak concurrent matters, reviewers/administrators and custodians; active legal holds; typical and maximum per-matter data and document counts; current hosted and hold data; annual growth, ingestion, OCR and production volumes; retention/storage requirements; and related enterprise baseline estimates relevant to three-year pricing; and the endpoint-collection assumptions needed for defensible sizing.
20	3; 5	3.1 | 3.3	What existing discovery matters, productions, litigation-hold data, custodian records and associated audit history must be migrated into the proposed solution?	CQ-LH-07	CQ-LH-07 — Migration of discovery matters, holds, audit history and document versions: Identify the existing discovery matters, productions, litigation-hold data, custodian records, audit history and active holds that must migrate, and clarify whether historical document versions must be carried forward or only the latest approved version when retention policy permits.
31	4; 6	3.2 | 3.4	Does CalHFA have an approved records retention schedule (and if so, approximately how many record series)? Is the vendor expected to develop or revise the retention schedule, or only implement the existing schedule? Will CalHFA records staff approve disposition of legacy content identified for deletion before migration?	CQ-LH-01	CQ-LH-01 — Records-retention schedules, configuration and disposition governance: Please provide the approved records-retention schedules, record categories/series, retention periods and triggering events to be configured; confirm whether the vendor is to implement existing schedules rather than develop or rationalize them; identify the applicable retention for audit trails and custodian/collection logs; and describe the authority and approval process for legacy disposition, exceptions, overrides, extensions and secure disposal after hold conflicts are cleared.
32	3; 5	3.1 | 3.3	To size the eDiscovery module, please provide: (a) annual volume of PRA, IPA, CRD, subpoena, and litigation requests; (b) typical and maximum data volume per matter (GB); (c) typical number of custodians per matter; (d) number of concurrent reviewers/administrators; and (e) current volume of data under litigation hold.	CQ-LH-05	CQ-LH-05 — eDiscovery workload, concurrency, custodians, ingestion and storage sizing: Provide the planning baseline for eDiscovery and records-production sizing and comparable pricing: annual request/matter volumes by type; typical and peak concurrent matters, reviewers/administrators and custodians; active legal holds; typical and maximum per-matter data and document counts; current hosted and hold data; annual growth, ingestion, OCR and production volumes; retention/storage requirements; and related enterprise baseline estimates relevant to three-year pricing; and the endpoint-collection assumptions needed for defensible sizing.

Source Entry	RFP page	RFP section	Original question (full text)	Consolidated ID(s)	Mapped consolidated question(s)
33	3; 5	3.1 | 3.3	Section 3.3 requires exemption coding and a Privilege Log with page numbers. Would CalHFA provide its current exemption code list and a sample privilege log format? Does CalHFA expect the eDiscovery module to be purpose-built review software, or is a capability within the Microsoft 365 compliance stack acceptable if all §3.3 requirements are met?	CQ-LH-08	CQ-LH-08 — Exemption coding, privilege logs, redaction and approval workflow: Provide the required exemption-code and privilege-log conventions, including format, fields, page numbers and any sanitized sample; clarify whether PII/exemption identification and redaction may be automated or require human approval; and describe the review stages, roles and authorization workflow for redaction, withholding and release; and clarify whether a Microsoft 365 compliance-stack capability is acceptable if all Section 3.3 requirements are met.
40	6, 8	3.1 | 3.3	Should Public Records Act matters be managed in a shared eDiscovery environment with matter-level permissions, or in separately administered environments for the responding departments or business units?	CQ-LH-04	CQ-LH-04 — Public Records Act operating model, lifecycle and current platform: Describe CalHFA's target Public Records Act operating model, including shared versus separate environments and matter-level permissions; confirm the lifecycle stages the solution must support from intake through secure delivery and audit history; and identify the current commercial platform, modules and redaction capabilities and whether alternative solutions may be proposed.
44	8-9	3.3 | 3.4	What available counts of active legal holds and estimated preserved data volumes should vendors use to size hold storage and administration?	CQ-LH-05	CQ-LH-05 — eDiscovery workload, concurrency, custodians, ingestion and storage sizing: Provide the planning baseline for eDiscovery and records-production sizing and comparable pricing: annual request/matter volumes by type; typical and peak concurrent matters, reviewers/administrators and custodians; active legal holds; typical and maximum per-matter data and document counts; current hosted and hold data; annual growth, ingestion, OCR and production volumes; retention/storage requirements; and related enterprise baseline estimates relevant to three-year pricing; and the endpoint-collection assumptions needed for defensible sizing.
45	8-9	3.3 | 3.4	Should a matter's legal hold automatically propagate across document management repositories and archive copies as well as the eDiscovery preservation store?	CQ-LH-12	CQ-LH-12 — Legal-hold propagation, preservation architecture and custodian workflow: Clarify whether legal holds must propagate across document-management repositories and archive copies; whether eDiscovery should retain separate collected copies, access source repositories or support both approaches; and whether hold notification, acknowledgment, escalation, preservation tracking and custodian management must reside in the proposed platform or may be delivered through an integrated legal-hold or Microsoft solution.
48	8-9	3.3 | 3.4	What existing retention periods apply to immutable audit trails and custodian/collection logs?	CQ-LH-01	CQ-LH-01 — Records-retention schedules, configuration and disposition governance: Please provide the approved records-retention schedules, record categories/series, retention periods and triggering events to be configured; confirm whether the vendor is to implement existing schedules rather than develop or rationalize them; identify the applicable retention for audit trails and custodian/collection logs; and describe the authority and approval process for legacy disposition, exceptions, overrides, extensions and secure disposal after hold conflicts are cleared.
57	3	3.1	Does CalHFA currently utilize an eDiscovery, litigation-support, public-records review, or legal-hold platform? If so, please identify the platform(s), the approximate number of active matters, and the approximate volume of data currently hosted.	CQ-LH-06	CQ-LH-06 — Current environment, hosting model, tool preferences and licensing: Describe the current eDiscovery and Microsoft 365 government-cloud environment, including GCC or GCC High, existing platforms and approximate hosted activity, Purview/eDiscovery capability and licensing, preferred tools, and whether a separately hosted FedRAMP-authorized eDiscovery

Source Entry	RFP page	RFP section	Original question (full text)	Consolidated ID(s)	Mapped consolidated question(s)
					service may connect to CalHFA's GCC tenant or the service must operate within the tenant.
58	3	3.1	Approximately how many litigation, investigation, subpoena, Public Records Act, Information Practices Act, California Civil Rights Department, and other discovery or review matters does CalHFA handle annually?	CQ-LH-05	CQ-LH-05 — eDiscovery workload, concurrency, custodians, ingestion and storage sizing: Provide the planning baseline for eDiscovery and records-production sizing and comparable pricing: annual request/matter volumes by type; typical and peak concurrent matters, reviewers/administrators and custodians; active legal holds; typical and maximum per-matter data and document counts; current hosted and hold data; annual growth, ingestion, OCR and production volumes; retention/storage requirements; and related enterprise baseline estimates relevant to three-year pricing; and the endpoint-collection assumptions needed for defensible sizing.
59	3	3.1	What is the expected peak number of concurrent litigation, investigation, subpoena, Public Records Act, Information Practices Act, California Civil Rights Department, and other discovery or review matters that the eDiscovery solution must support?	CQ-LH-05	CQ-LH-05 — eDiscovery workload, concurrency, custodians, ingestion and storage sizing: Provide the planning baseline for eDiscovery and records-production sizing and comparable pricing: annual request/matter volumes by type; typical and peak concurrent matters, reviewers/administrators and custodians; active legal holds; typical and maximum per-matter data and document counts; current hosted and hold data; annual growth, ingestion, OCR and production volumes; retention/storage requirements; and related enterprise baseline estimates relevant to three-year pricing; and the endpoint-collection assumptions needed for defensible sizing.
60	3	3.1	Does CalHFA intend for the eDiscovery solution to support the complete California Public Records Act request lifecycle, including intake, tracking, collection, review, redaction, exemption coding, production and delivery, and audit history, or primarily the review and production portions of that workflow?	CQ-LH-04	CQ-LH-04 — Public Records Act operating model, lifecycle and current platform: Describe CalHFA's target Public Records Act operating model, including shared versus separate environments and matter-level permissions; confirm the lifecycle stages the solution must support from intake through secure delivery and audit history; and identify the current commercial platform, modules and redaction capabilities and whether alternative solutions may be proposed.
61	3	3.1	Please identify which AI/GenAI capabilities CalHFA considers required versus desirable for the eDiscovery component, including semantic or conversational search, document summarization, automated document classification and coding, relevance analysis, privilege identification, PII identification, chronology and timeline generation, fact extraction, and case analysis.	CQ-LH-10	CQ-LH-10 — AI/GenAI capabilities, questionnaire and governance: Identify which AI/GenAI eDiscovery capabilities are required versus desirable, provide or describe the timing of the AI Questionnaire, confirm the status of Microsoft 365 Copilot, and state the agency or State policy restrictions and governance requirements applicable to proposed AI features.
68	6	3.1 – Reference "CalHFA is also seeking an eDiscovery software"	if you are familiar with Microsoft Purview's eDiscovery capabilities; on a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 represents "Will not meet our requirements" and 5 represents "We believe that Microsoft's eDiscovery and related capabilities (e.g. Legal Holds) is the best platform for our needs", what represents your view on the continuum?	CQ-LH-06	CQ-LH-06 — Current environment, hosting model, tool preferences and licensing: Describe the current eDiscovery and Microsoft 365 government-cloud environment, including GCC or GCC High, existing platforms and approximate hosted activity, Purview/eDiscovery capability and licensing, preferred tools, and whether a separately hosted FedRAMP-authorized eDiscovery service may connect to CalHFA's GCC tenant or the service must operate within the tenant.
69	6	3.1 - Reference "Public Records Act requests"	Do you currently use a commercial product to process Public Records Act requests and if so, who manufacturers the product and what modules are in use?	CQ-LH-04	CQ-LH-04 — Public Records Act operating model, lifecycle and current platform: Describe CalHFA's target Public Records Act operating model, including shared versus separate environments and matter-level permissions; confirm the lifecycle stages the

Source Entry	RFP page	RFP section	Original question (full text)	Consolidated ID(s)	Mapped consolidated question(s)
			Are you open to exploring alternative solutions for addressing Public Records Act requests? If the Public Records Act solution you are currently using supports redaction, please provide details about its redaction capabilities.		solution must support from intake through secure delivery and audit history; and identify the current commercial platform, modules and redaction capabilities and whether alternative solutions may be proposed.
119	7	3.2	For migration sizing, should vendors carry forward all historical document versions, or only the latest approved version where the applicable retention policy permits?	CQ-LH-07	CQ-LH-07 — Migration of discovery matters, holds, audit history and document versions: Identify the existing discovery matters, productions, litigation-hold data, custodian records, audit history and active holds that must migrate, and clarify whether historical document versions must be carried forward or only the latest approved version when retention policy permits.
151	5	3.3	With reference to Section 3.3, please provide anticipated annual eDiscovery volumes, including custodians, matters, litigation holds, source-data ingestion, hosted data, OCR processing, productions, and concurrent users, and clarify whether endpoint collection requires forensic acquisition from agency-managed devices.	CQ-LH-05	CQ-LH-05 — eDiscovery workload, concurrency, custodians, ingestion and storage sizing: Provide the planning baseline for eDiscovery and records-production sizing and comparable pricing: annual request/matter volumes by type; typical and peak concurrent matters, reviewers/administrators and custodians; active legal holds; typical and maximum per-matter data and document counts; current hosted and hold data; annual growth, ingestion, OCR and production volumes; retention/storage requirements; and related enterprise baseline estimates relevant to three-year pricing; and the endpoint-collection assumptions needed for defensible sizing.
152	5	3.3	Section 3.3 calls for collection from "emails, Teams messages, OneDrive, endpoints etc." What endpoint and other data sources does CalHFA expect to be covered, such as laptops, mobile devices or network shares? Must endpoint collection be done natively in the software, or is it acceptable for CalHFA IT or a forensic partner to collect the data and then load it into the platform?	CQ-LH-11	CQ-LH-11 — Collection sources, connectors, endpoint scope and collection method: Identify the ESI sources, connectors and endpoint types required for initial go-live and future use, including Microsoft 365, network, endpoint, mobile, third-party and cloud sources; describe relevant endpoint-management tools; and clarify whether collection must be performed directly by the platform, may occur through Purview, CalHFA IT or a forensic partner, or should support both direct collection and ingestion of defensibly collected exports.
153	5	3.3	For sizing and pricing, can CalHFA estimate: (a) total eDiscovery data volume at launch and expected yearly growth (GB/TB), (b) the number of named eDiscovery users, (c) the yearly number of requests (PRA, subpoena, litigation and so on), and (d) the typical number of custodians on legal hold?	CQ-LH-05	CQ-LH-05 — eDiscovery workload, concurrency, custodians, ingestion and storage sizing: Provide the planning baseline for eDiscovery and records-production sizing and comparable pricing: annual request/matter volumes by type; typical and peak concurrent matters, reviewers/administrators and custodians; active legal holds; typical and maximum per-matter data and document counts; current hosted and hold data; annual growth, ingestion, OCR and production volumes; retention/storage requirements; and related enterprise baseline estimates relevant to three-year pricing; and the endpoint-collection assumptions needed for defensible sizing.
154	5	3.3	What is the estimated annual number of eDiscovery matters/cases, and what is the approximate volume of data/documents expected per case?	CQ-LH-05	CQ-LH-05 — eDiscovery workload, concurrency, custodians, ingestion and storage sizing: Provide the planning baseline for eDiscovery and records-production sizing and comparable pricing: annual request/matter volumes by type; typical and peak concurrent matters, reviewers/administrators and custodians; active legal holds; typical and maximum per-matter data and document counts; current hosted and hold data; annual growth, ingestion, OCR and production volumes; retention/storage requirements; and related enterprise baseline estimates relevant

Source Entry	RFP page	RFP section	Original question (full text)	Consolidated ID(s)	Mapped consolidated question(s)
					to three-year pricing; and the endpoint-collection assumptions needed for defensible sizing.
155	5	3.3	Which of the identified collection sources—emails, Teams messages, OneDrive, and endpoints—are currently used by CalHFA, and are there any additional sources that must be supported?	CQ-LH-11	CQ-LH-11 — Collection sources, connectors, endpoint scope and collection method: Identify the ESI sources, connectors and endpoint types required for initial go-live and future use, including Microsoft 365, network, endpoint, mobile, third-party and cloud sources; describe relevant endpoint-management tools; and clarify whether collection must be performed directly by the platform, may occur through Purview, CalHFA IT or a forensic partner, or should support both direct collection and ingestion of defensibly collected exports.
157	5	3.3	Should the identification and redaction of PII/exempt information be fully automated, or is human review and approval required before production?	CQ-LH-08	CQ-LH-08 — Exemption coding, privilege logs, redaction and approval workflow: Provide the required exemption-code and privilege-log conventions, including format, fields, page numbers and any sanitized sample; clarify whether PII/exemption identification and redaction may be automated or require human approval; and describe the review stages, roles and authorization workflow for redaction, withholding and release; and clarify whether a Microsoft 365 compliance-stack capability is acceptable if all Section 3.3 requirements are met.
158	5	3.3	What format, fields, and level of detail are required for the Privilege Log, and does CalHFA have an existing template that vendors must support?	CQ-LH-08	CQ-LH-08 — Exemption coding, privilege logs, redaction and approval workflow: Provide the required exemption-code and privilege-log conventions, including format, fields, page numbers and any sanitized sample; clarify whether PII/exemption identification and redaction may be automated or require human approval; and describe the review stages, roles and authorization workflow for redaction, withholding and release; and clarify whether a Microsoft 365 compliance-stack capability is acceptable if all Section 3.3 requirements are met.
159	5	3.3	What is the approximate number of active litigations holds and custodians that the solution is expected to support, and what annual growth is anticipated?	CQ-LH-05	CQ-LH-05 — eDiscovery workload, concurrency, custodians, ingestion and storage sizing: Provide the planning baseline for eDiscovery and records-production sizing and comparable pricing: annual request/matter volumes by type; typical and peak concurrent matters, reviewers/administrators and custodians; active legal holds; typical and maximum per-matter data and document counts; current hosted and hold data; annual growth, ingestion, OCR and production volumes; retention/storage requirements; and related enterprise baseline estimates relevant to three-year pricing; and the endpoint-collection assumptions needed for defensible sizing.
160	5	3.3	What production/export formats are required in addition to PDF, including native files, metadata, load files, Bates numbering, or other litigation/public-record production formats?	CQ-LH-09	CQ-LH-09 — Production and export deliverables: Identify the production and export formats and load-file specifications required at initial go-live in addition to PDF, including native files, metadata, Bates numbering and other litigation or public-record deliverables.
164	5	3.3	What typical and peak data sizes and document counts should vendors assume for a single eDiscovery matter or records-production request?	CQ-LH-05	CQ-LH-05 — eDiscovery workload, concurrency, custodians, ingestion and storage sizing: Provide the planning baseline for eDiscovery and records-production sizing and comparable pricing: annual request/matter volumes by type; typical and peak concurrent matters, reviewers/administrators and custodians; active legal holds; typical and maximum per-matter data and document counts; current hosted and hold data; annual growth, ingestion, OCR and production volumes; retention/storage

Source Entry	RFP page	RFP section	Original question (full text)	Consolidated ID(s)	Mapped consolidated question(s)
					requirements; and related enterprise baseline estimates relevant to three-year pricing; and the endpoint-collection assumptions needed for defensible sizing.
165	5	3.3	What number of simultaneously active eDiscovery matters or records-production requests should the solution support under typical and peak workloads?	CQ-LH-05	CQ-LH-05 — eDiscovery workload, concurrency, custodians, ingestion and storage sizing: Provide the planning baseline for eDiscovery and records-production sizing and comparable pricing: annual request/matter volumes by type; typical and peak concurrent matters, reviewers/administrators and custodians; active legal holds; typical and maximum per-matter data and document counts; current hosted and hold data; annual growth, ingestion, OCR and production volumes; retention/storage requirements; and related enterprise baseline estimates relevant to three-year pricing; and the endpoint-collection assumptions needed for defensible sizing.
166	5	3.3	What current data volume and expected annual growth should vendors assume for material retained under litigation holds?	CQ-LH-05	CQ-LH-05 — eDiscovery workload, concurrency, custodians, ingestion and storage sizing: Provide the planning baseline for eDiscovery and records-production sizing and comparable pricing: annual request/matter volumes by type; typical and peak concurrent matters, reviewers/administrators and custodians; active legal holds; typical and maximum per-matter data and document counts; current hosted and hold data; annual growth, ingestion, OCR and production volumes; retention/storage requirements; and related enterprise baseline estimates relevant to three-year pricing; and the endpoint-collection assumptions needed for defensible sizing.
167	5	3.3	Beyond the modularity, collection tracking and litigation-hold requirements stated in the RFP, does CalHFA prescribe whether eDiscovery must retain separate collected copies, access content in the document-management repositories, or support both approaches, or may vendors propose the storage approach?	CQ-LH-12	CQ-LH-12 — Legal-hold propagation, preservation architecture and custodian workflow: Clarify whether legal holds must propagate across document-management repositories and archive copies; whether eDiscovery should retain separate collected copies, access source repositories or support both approaches; and whether hold notification, acknowledgment, escalation, preservation tracking and custodian management must reside in the proposed platform or may be delivered through an integrated legal-hold or Microsoft solution.
168	5	3.3	Please describe the required eDiscovery review and production-approval workflow, including the review stages and roles responsible for document review, approval of redactions or withholding, and authorization of release.	CQ-LH-08	CQ-LH-08 — Exemption coding, privilege logs, redaction and approval workflow: Provide the required exemption-code and privilege-log conventions, including format, fields, page numbers and any sanitized sample; clarify whether PII/exemption identification and redaction may be automated or require human approval; and describe the review stages, roles and authorization workflow for redaction, withholding and release; and clarify whether a Microsoft 365 compliance-stack capability is acceptable if all Section 3.3 requirements are met.
169	5	3.3	Please provide CalHFA's approximate current eDiscovery data volume and anticipated annual ingestion and processing volume, including typical and maximum data volumes per matter.	CQ-LH-05	CQ-LH-05 — eDiscovery workload, concurrency, custodians, ingestion and storage sizing: Provide the planning baseline for eDiscovery and records-production sizing and comparable pricing: annual request/matter volumes by type; typical and peak concurrent matters, reviewers/administrators and custodians; active legal holds; typical and maximum per-matter data and document counts; current hosted and hold data; annual growth, ingestion, OCR and production volumes; retention/storage requirements; and related enterprise baseline estimates relevant

Source Entry	RFP page	RFP section	Original question (full text)	Consolidated ID(s)	Mapped consolidated question(s)
					to three-year pricing; and the endpoint-collection assumptions needed for defensible sizing.
170	5	3.3	Please provide the approximate number of custodians subject to legal hold or collection annually, and the typical and maximum number of custodians associated with an individual matter.	CQ-LH-05	CQ-LH-05 — eDiscovery workload, concurrency, custodians, ingestion and storage sizing: Provide the planning baseline for eDiscovery and records-production sizing and comparable pricing: annual request/matter volumes by type; typical and peak concurrent matters, reviewers/administrators and custodians; active legal holds; typical and maximum per-matter data and document counts; current hosted and hold data; annual growth, ingestion, OCR and production volumes; retention/storage requirements; and related enterprise baseline estimates relevant to three-year pricing; and the endpoint-collection assumptions needed for defensible sizing.
171	5	3.3	Please identify the primary data sources from which CalHFA expects the solution to collect or ingest ESI, including Microsoft Exchange/Outlook, Teams, OneDrive, SharePoint, network file shares, endpoints and mobile devices, third-party applications, and other cloud repositories.	CQ-LH-11	CQ-LH-11 — Collection sources, connectors, endpoint scope and collection method: Identify the ESI sources, connectors and endpoint types required for initial go-live and future use, including Microsoft 365, network, endpoint, mobile, third-party and cloud sources; describe relevant endpoint-management tools; and clarify whether collection must be performed directly by the platform, may occur through Purview, CalHFA IT or a forensic partner, or should support both direct collection and ingestion of defensibly collected exports.
172	5	3.3	Does CalHFA require the eDiscovery platform to perform direct collection from enterprise data sources and endpoints, or may collection occur through Microsoft Purview or other defensible collection tools, with collected data subsequently transferred into the eDiscovery platform?	CQ-LH-11	CQ-LH-11 — Collection sources, connectors, endpoint scope and collection method: Identify the ESI sources, connectors and endpoint types required for initial go-live and future use, including Microsoft 365, network, endpoint, mobile, third-party and cloud sources; describe relevant endpoint-management tools; and clarify whether collection must be performed directly by the platform, may occur through Purview, CalHFA IT or a forensic partner, or should support both direct collection and ingestion of defensibly collected exports.
173	5	3.3	Does CalHFA require legal-hold notification, acknowledgment, escalation, preservation tracking, and custodian management to reside within the proposed eDiscovery platform, or may these functions be provided through an integrated legal-hold or Microsoft solution?	CQ-LH-12	CQ-LH-12 — Legal-hold propagation, preservation architecture and custodian workflow: Clarify whether legal holds must propagate across document-management repositories and archive copies; whether eDiscovery should retain separate collected copies, access source repositories or support both approaches; and whether hold notification, acknowledgment, escalation, preservation tracking and custodian management must reside in the proposed platform or may be delivered through an integrated legal-hold or Microsoft solution.
175	5	3.3	Does CalHFA have any preferences for any specific eDiscovery tools for data processing, data collection, hosting and AI workflow?	CQ-LH-06	CQ-LH-06 — Current environment, hosting model, tool preferences and licensing: Describe the current eDiscovery and Microsoft 365 government-cloud environment, including GCC or GCC High, existing platforms and approximate hosted activity, Purview/eDiscovery capability and licensing, preferred tools, and whether a separately hosted FedRAMP-authorized eDiscovery service may connect to CalHFA's GCC tenant or the service must operate within the tenant.
176	5	3.3	What representative annual request counts, custodian counts and native or processed data-volume ranges should respondents use to size the eDiscovery service?	CQ-LH-05	CQ-LH-05 — eDiscovery workload, concurrency, custodians, ingestion and storage sizing: Provide the planning baseline for eDiscovery and records-production sizing and comparable pricing: annual request/matter volumes by type; typical and peak

Source Entry	RFP page	RFP section	Original question (full text)	Consolidated ID(s)	Mapped consolidated question(s)
					concurrent matters, reviewers/administrators and custodians; active legal holds; typical and maximum per-matter data and document counts; current hosted and hold data; annual growth, ingestion, OCR and production volumes; retention/storage requirements; and related enterprise baseline estimates relevant to three-year pricing; and the endpoint-collection assumptions needed for defensible sizing.
177	5	3.3	Beyond the required spreadsheet-to-PDF and black-and-white or color production support, which deliverable formats and load-file specifications must the initial eDiscovery production workflow support?	CQ-LH-09	CQ-LH-09 — Production and export deliverables: Identify the production and export formats and load-file specifications required at initial go-live in addition to PDF, including native files, metadata, Bates numbering and other litigation or public-record deliverables.
178	5; 8	3.3	Which collection sources, including email or Exchange, Teams, OneDrive and endpoints, must be connected for the initial eDiscovery go-live? Variant Question 1: Can CalHFA share the available inventory of collection sources and connectors required beyond GCC Exchange, Teams and OneDrive?	CQ-LH-11	CQ-LH-11 — Collection sources, connectors, endpoint scope and collection method: Identify the ESI sources, connectors and endpoint types required for initial go-live and future use, including Microsoft 365, network, endpoint, mobile, third-party and cloud sources; describe relevant endpoint-management tools; and clarify whether collection must be performed directly by the platform, may occur through Purview, CalHFA IT or a forensic partner, or should support both direct collection and ingestion of defensibly collected exports.
179	8	3.3	For endpoint collection, should vendors include direct remote collection from agency-managed devices, ingestion of CalHFA-collected exports, or both?	CQ-LH-11	CQ-LH-11 — Collection sources, connectors, endpoint scope and collection method: Identify the ESI sources, connectors and endpoint types required for initial go-live and future use, including Microsoft 365, network, endpoint, mobile, third-party and cloud sources; describe relevant endpoint-management tools; and clarify whether collection must be performed directly by the platform, may occur through Purview, CalHFA IT or a forensic partner, or should support both direct collection and ingestion of defensibly collected exports.
180	8	3.3	Can CalHFA share a sanitized sample production package illustrating its existing Bates numbering, redaction/exemption notation and page-numbered privilege log conventions?	CQ-LH-08	CQ-LH-08 — Exemption coding, privilege logs, redaction and approval workflow: Provide the required exemption-code and privilege-log conventions, including format, fields, page numbers and any sanitized sample; clarify whether PII/exemption identification and redaction may be automated or require human approval; and describe the review stages, roles and authorization workflow for redaction, withholding and release; and clarify whether a Microsoft 365 compliance-stack capability is acceptable if all Section 3.3 requirements are met.
183	7	3.3	Can you identify the endpoint types in scope (e.g., laptops, mobile devices) and any existing endpoint management tools in use?	CQ-LH-11	CQ-LH-11 — Collection sources, connectors, endpoint scope and collection method: Identify the ESI sources, connectors and endpoint types required for initial go-live and future use, including Microsoft 365, network, endpoint, mobile, third-party and cloud sources; describe relevant endpoint-management tools; and clarify whether collection must be performed directly by the platform, may occur through Purview, CalHFA IT or a forensic partner, or should support both direct collection and ingestion of defensibly collected exports.
184	5	3.3	Is there an existing legal hold process or solution, and do any active holds or matters need to migrate into the new system?	CQ-LH-07	CQ-LH-07 — Migration of discovery matters, holds, audit history and document versions: Identify the existing discovery matters, productions, litigation-hold data, custodian records, audit history and active holds that must migrate, and clarify whether historical

Source Entry	RFP page	RFP section	Original question (full text)	Consolidated ID(s)	Mapped consolidated question(s)
					document versions must be carried forward or only the latest approved version when retention policy permits.
185	5	3.3	Approximately how many Public Records Act requests, subpoenas, and litigation holds does CalHFA handle per year, and what is the typical and largest data volume (GB) per matter?	CQ-LH-05	CQ-LH-05 — eDiscovery workload, concurrency, custodians, ingestion and storage sizing: Provide the planning baseline for eDiscovery and records-production sizing and comparable pricing: annual request/matter volumes by type; typical and peak concurrent matters, reviewers/administrators and custodians; active legal holds; typical and maximum per-matter data and document counts; current hosted and hold data; annual growth, ingestion, OCR and production volumes; retention/storage requirements; and related enterprise baseline estimates relevant to three-year pricing; and the endpoint-collection assumptions needed for defensible sizing.
186	5	3.3	Please identify CalHFA's current Microsoft 365 government cloud environment, including whether the Agency operates GCC or GCC High, and any existing eDiscovery, Purview, Exchange, Teams, OneDrive, endpoint collection, storage, or related licenses that vendors may assume are available for this project.	CQ-LH-06	CQ-LH-06 — Current environment, hosting model, tool preferences and licensing: Describe the current eDiscovery and Microsoft 365 government-cloud environment, including GCC or GCC High, existing platforms and approximate hosted activity, Purview/eDiscovery capability and licensing, preferred tools, and whether a separately hosted FedRAMP-authorized eDiscovery service may connect to CalHFA's GCC tenant or the service must operate within the tenant.
187	5	3.3	Please provide available planning estimates for eDiscovery administrators and reviewers, typical and peak custodians per matter, expected concurrent matters or litigation holds, current source-data volume, anticipated annual growth, typical ingestion volumes, and expected retention or storage requirements so vendors can develop comparable pricing.	CQ-LH-05	CQ-LH-05 — eDiscovery workload, concurrency, custodians, ingestion and storage sizing: Provide the planning baseline for eDiscovery and records-production sizing and comparable pricing: annual request/matter volumes by type; typical and peak concurrent matters, reviewers/administrators and custodians; active legal holds; typical and maximum per-matter data and document counts; current hosted and hold data; annual growth, ingestion, OCR and production volumes; retention/storage requirements; and related enterprise baseline estimates relevant to three-year pricing; and the endpoint-collection assumptions needed for defensible sizing.
188	5	3.3	Please clarify CalHFA's expected service model for the required real-time help desk assistance and defined SLAs, including required support hours and any minimum targets for incident response, uptime, indexing latency, and search latency.	CQ-LH-13	CQ-LH-13 — Real-time help desk and service levels: Clarify the expected service model for real-time help desk assistance and defined SLAs, including support hours and minimum targets for incident response, uptime, indexing latency and search latency.
189	5	3.3	Section 3.3 requires that the eDiscovery solution "Supports connectivity to Office 365/Exchange on a GCC tenant." Please confirm whether CalHFA's current Microsoft 365 GCC licensing already includes Microsoft Purview eDiscovery (Premium), for example through Microsoft 365 G5 or an equivalent compliance add-on, or whether the eDiscovery tooling must be included in the vendor's pricing.	CQ-LH-06	CQ-LH-06 — Current environment, hosting model, tool preferences and licensing: Describe the current eDiscovery and Microsoft 365 government-cloud environment, including GCC or GCC High, existing platforms and approximate hosted activity, Purview/eDiscovery capability and licensing, preferred tools, and whether a separately hosted FedRAMP-authorized eDiscovery service may connect to CalHFA's GCC tenant or the service must operate within the tenant.
190	6	3.4	What are CalHFA's current records retention schedules, document/record categories, and retention periods that must be configured in the proposed solution?	CQ-LH-01	CQ-LH-01 — Records-retention schedules, configuration and disposition governance: Please provide the approved records-retention schedules, record categories/series, retention periods and triggering events to be configured; confirm whether the vendor is to implement existing schedules rather than develop or rationalize them; identify the applicable retention for audit trails and custodian/collection logs; and describe the authority and

Source Entry	RFP page	RFP section	Original question (full text)	Consolidated ID(s)	Mapped consolidated question(s)
					approval process for legacy disposition, exceptions, overrides, extensions and secure disposal after hold conflicts are cleared.
191	6	3.4	What types of retention exceptions, overrides, litigation holds, and retention conflicts must the proposed solution support, and can CalHFA provide representative examples?	CQ-LH-02	CQ-LH-02 — Retention exceptions, legal-hold conflicts, lineage and connected-source enforcement: Please describe the retention exceptions, overrides, litigation holds and conflicts the solution must support; whether retention/disposal follows copied or derived content and, if so, at what deletion level; and whether rules must be enforced in connected source systems such as SharePoint and Windows file shares or only in repositories managed by the proposed solution.
193	6	3.4	Section 3.4 requires storage configurations aligned with SEC/Sarbanes-Oxley mandates. Please identify the specific rules CalHFA expects to be met (for example, SEC Rule 17a-4(f) WORM requirements, SOX §802 record retention for bond-related records) and the record types they apply to.	CQ-LH-03	CQ-LH-03 — SEC/SOX alignment, WORM scope, periods and acceptance evidence: Identify the specific SEC/SOX requirements and record classes that require immutable or WORM storage, the applicable immutability periods at initial acceptance, whether Microsoft 365 immutability is sufficient or specialized WORM storage is required, and the evidence respondents must provide to demonstrate compliance.
195	6	3.4	Does CalHFA require retention and disposal rules to follow document lineage into copies and derived documents?	CQ-LH-02	CQ-LH-02 — Retention exceptions, legal-hold conflicts, lineage and connected-source enforcement: Please describe the retention exceptions, overrides, litigation holds and conflicts the solution must support; whether retention/disposal follows copied or derived content and, if so, at what deletion level; and whether rules must be enforced in connected source systems such as SharePoint and Windows file shares or only in repositories managed by the proposed solution.
196	6	3.4	If CalHFA requires lineage-aware disposal of derived documents, at what level must deletion apply? For example, if a paragraph from a source document is copied into another document and the source becomes eligible for disposal, must the copied paragraph be removed, must the entire receiving document be deleted, or should the receiving document follow its own retention schedule?	CQ-LH-02	CQ-LH-02 — Retention exceptions, legal-hold conflicts, lineage and connected-source enforcement: Please describe the retention exceptions, overrides, litigation holds and conflicts the solution must support; whether retention/disposal follows copied or derived content and, if so, at what deletion level; and whether rules must be enforced in connected source systems such as SharePoint and Windows file shares or only in repositories managed by the proposed solution.
197	6	3.4	Must the proposed solution enforce retention and disposal rules in connected source systems such as SharePoint and Windows file shares, including deleting source content, or only within the repositories managed by the proposed solution?	CQ-LH-02	CQ-LH-02 — Retention exceptions, legal-hold conflicts, lineage and connected-source enforcement: Please describe the retention exceptions, overrides, litigation holds and conflicts the solution must support; whether retention/disposal follows copied or derived content and, if so, at what deletion level; and whether rules must be enforced in connected source systems such as SharePoint and Windows file shares or only in repositories managed by the proposed solution.
198	6	3.4	Please provide the records-retention schedules to be implemented, including the event or date that starts each retention period and the process and authority for approving exceptions, overrides or extensions.	CQ-LH-01	CQ-LH-01 — Records-retention schedules, configuration and disposition governance: Please provide the approved records-retention schedules, record categories/series, retention periods and triggering events to be configured; confirm whether the vendor is to implement existing schedules rather than develop or rationalize them; identify the applicable retention for audit trails and custodian/collection logs; and describe the authority and approval process for legacy disposition, exceptions, overrides, extensions and secure disposal after hold conflicts are cleared.

Source Entry	RFP page	RFP section	Original question (full text)	Consolidated ID(s)	Mapped consolidated question(s)
200	6	3.4	What immutability or WORM periods must the proposed storage and immutable audit trails support at initial acceptance?	CQ-LH-03	CQ-LH-03 — SEC/SOX alignment, WORM scope, periods and acceptance evidence: Identify the specific SEC/SOX requirements and record classes that require immutable or WORM storage, the applicable immutability periods at initial acceptance, whether Microsoft 365 immutability is sufficient or specialized WORM storage is required, and the evidence respondents must provide to demonstrate compliance.
201	6	3.4	What evidence must respondents provide at acceptance to demonstrate the required immutability or WORM compliance?	CQ-LH-03	CQ-LH-03 — SEC/SOX alignment, WORM scope, periods and acceptance evidence: Identify the specific SEC/SOX requirements and record classes that require immutable or WORM storage, the applicable immutability periods at initial acceptance, whether Microsoft 365 immutability is sufficient or specialized WORM storage is required, and the evidence respondents must provide to demonstrate compliance.
203	9	3.4	Which existing record classes require WORM protection under the cited SEC/SOX alignment, and what currently applicable immutability periods apply to those classes?	CQ-LH-03	CQ-LH-03 — SEC/SOX alignment, WORM scope, periods and acceptance evidence: Identify the specific SEC/SOX requirements and record classes that require immutable or WORM storage, the applicable immutability periods at initial acceptance, whether Microsoft 365 immutability is sufficient or specialized WORM storage is required, and the evidence respondents must provide to demonstrate compliance.
206	9	3.4	At retention expiry, should secure disposal occur automatically under approved policy, or only after a designated records officer's approval once hold conflicts are cleared?	CQ-LH-01	CQ-LH-01 — Records-retention schedules, configuration and disposition governance: Please provide the approved records-retention schedules, record categories/series, retention periods and triggering events to be configured; confirm whether the vendor is to implement existing schedules rather than develop or rationalize them; identify the applicable retention for audit trails and custodian/collection logs; and describe the authority and approval process for legacy disposition, exceptions, overrides, extensions and secure disposal after hold conflicts are cleared.
207	5	3.4	Which specific SEC/SOX requirements apply (e.g., SEC 17a-4 for WORM)? We are trying to assess whether M365 immutability suffices or specialized WORM storage is needed.	CQ-LH-03	CQ-LH-03 — SEC/SOX alignment, WORM scope, periods and acceptance evidence: Identify the specific SEC/SOX requirements and record classes that require immutable or WORM storage, the applicable immutability periods at initial acceptance, whether Microsoft 365 immutability is sufficient or specialized WORM storage is required, and the evidence respondents must provide to demonstrate compliance.
208	6	3.4	Does CalHFA have an approved records retention schedule ready to configure, and if so, approximately how many record series does it contain?	CQ-LH-01	CQ-LH-01 — Records-retention schedules, configuration and disposition governance: Please provide the approved records-retention schedules, record categories/series, retention periods and triggering events to be configured; confirm whether the vendor is to implement existing schedules rather than develop or rationalize them; identify the applicable retention for audit trails and custodian/collection logs; and describe the authority and approval process for legacy disposition, exceptions, overrides, extensions and secure disposal after hold conflicts are cleared.
209	6	3.4	Which specific regulations is CalHFA referring to for SEC/SOX-aligned storage and WORM compliance (for example SEC Rule 17a-4), and which content types are subject to them?	CQ-LH-03	CQ-LH-03 — SEC/SOX alignment, WORM scope, periods and acceptance evidence: Identify the specific SEC/SOX requirements and record classes that require immutable or WORM storage, the applicable immutability periods at initial acceptance, whether Microsoft 365 immutability is sufficient or specialized WORM

Source Entry	RFP page	RFP section	Original question (full text)	Consolidated ID(s)	Mapped consolidated question(s)
					storage is required, and the evidence respondents must provide to demonstrate compliance.
210	6	3.4	Does CalHFA have current, approved records-retention schedules, document classifications, disposition rules, and legal-hold procedures that will be provided to the selected vendor, or is development or rationalization of these policies and schedules expected to be part of the project scope?	CQ-LH-01	CQ-LH-01 — Records-retention schedules, configuration and disposition governance: Please provide the approved records-retention schedules, record categories/series, retention periods and triggering events to be configured; confirm whether the vendor is to implement existing schedules rather than develop or rationalize them; identify the applicable retention for audit trails and custodian/collection logs; and describe the authority and approval process for legacy disposition, exceptions, overrides, extensions and secure disposal after hold conflicts are cleared.
280	4-6, 9	3.2 | 3.4 | 4.2.4	Please provide available baseline estimates for licensed and concurrent users, SharePoint/file-share file counts and data volumes, annual growth, workflow counts, scanning/OCR throughput, and eDiscovery/legal-hold volumes to support comparable three-year pricing.	CQ-LH-05	CQ-LH-05 — eDiscovery workload, concurrency, custodians, ingestion and storage sizing: Provide the planning baseline for eDiscovery and records-production sizing and comparable pricing: annual request/matter volumes by type; typical and peak concurrent matters, reviewers/administrators and custodians; active legal holds; typical and maximum per-matter data and document counts; current hosted and hold data; annual growth, ingestion, OCR and production volumes; retention/storage requirements; and related enterprise baseline estimates relevant to three-year pricing; and the endpoint-collection assumptions needed for defensible sizing.
282	4 and 7	3.2 | 4.1.5	The RFP requires system data to be stored, processed, and maintained exclusively in data centers physically located in the United States. Could CalHFA clarify whether offshore personnel may perform project activities remotely, provided all system data remains stored, processed, and maintained exclusively within the United States, or whether all project delivery personnel must also be located in the United States?	CQ-LH-14	CQ-LH-14 — U.S.-only data processing, personnel access and subprocessors: Confirm the U.S.-location requirements for project personnel, remote support access, primary and disaster-recovery storage, backups, telemetry, indexing, OCR, AI processing and subprocessors, and describe the documentation vendors must provide to demonstrate U.S.-only processing and maintenance of CalHFA system data.
283	3; 8	3.1 | 4.1.5	Section 4.1.5 references an AI Questionnaire that must be approved before award. Please provide the AI Questionnaire, or confirm it will be issued with the UpGuard questionnaires. Additionally, does CalHFA currently permit Microsoft 365 Copilot in its tenant, and are any AI features restricted by agency or State of California GenAI policy?	CQ-LH-10	CQ-LH-10 — AI/GenAI capabilities, questionnaire and governance: Identify which AI/GenAI eDiscovery capabilities are required versus desirable, provide or describe the timing of the AI Questionnaire, confirm the status of Microsoft 365 Copilot, and state the agency or State policy restrictions and governance requirements applicable to proposed AI features.
289	4 and 8	3.2 | 4.1.5	How should vendor-supplied OCR, backup, support or telemetry, and AI processing outside the primary tenant be documented to establish that system data is physically processed and maintained only within the United States?	CQ-LH-14	CQ-LH-14 — U.S.-only data processing, personnel access and subprocessors: Confirm the U.S.-location requirements for project personnel, remote support access, primary and disaster-recovery storage, backups, telemetry, indexing, OCR, AI processing and subprocessors, and describe the documentation vendors must provide to demonstrate U.S.-only processing and maintenance of CalHFA system data.
297	4, 8	3.2 | 4.1.5	Please confirm whether all data processing, support access, backups, disaster-recovery copies, telemetry, indexing, AI processing, and subprocessors must remain exclusively within the United States.	CQ-LH-14	CQ-LH-14 — U.S.-only data processing, personnel access and subprocessors: Confirm the U.S.-location requirements for project personnel, remote support access, primary and disaster-recovery storage, backups, telemetry, indexing, OCR, AI processing and subprocessors, and describe the documentation vendors must provide to demonstrate U.S.-only processing and maintenance of CalHFA system data.

Appendix B — Original-to-Consolidated Crosswalk: Technical Architecture, Integration, and System Functionality

The original question text below is reproduced in full from Technical Architecture, Integration, and System Functionality. Each source entry maps to one proposed consolidated question for stakeholder review; All CalHFA input has been synthesized into the official response for each consolidated question.

Source Entry	RFP page	RFP section	Original question (full text)	Consolidated ID(s)	Mapped consolidated question(s)
13	3–4	3.1 | 3.2	With reference to Sections 3.1 and 3.2, please provide the current number and total data volume of SharePoint sites, documents, custom workflows, permission groups, MacroView DMF tags, Windows file-server repositories, and files expected to be assessed and migrated, including the estimated percentage of content expected to require cleanup or disposition.	CQ-01, CQ-02, CQ-09	CQ-01 — Migration inventory — SharePoint 2016: Please provide the SharePoint 2016 migration baseline: content databases, site collections, sites, libraries/lists, document and non-document item counts (including attachments and versions), total stored size, file-type profile, active users, and material farm solutions, service applications, third-party products, custom code, InfoPath/MySites or other customizations. Identify unusually large, encrypted, unsupported, long-path or otherwise migration-sensitive content, and confirm whether existing inventory/schema exports will be available. CQ-02 — Migration inventory — Windows file servers: Please provide the Windows file-server migration baseline: number of servers, repositories/shares and archival stores; total data volume and file count; primary file types; age and active-versus-archive distribution; permissions complexity; and known long paths, unsupported types, encrypted files or other migration constraints. Identify any shares expected to remain on-premises. CQ-09 — MacroView DMF inventory and migration: Provide the MacroView DMF modules/versions, tag and metadata-field counts, content types, term sets, required fields and controlled vocabularies; available schema/configuration documentation; export/API capabilities and formats; and whether Outlook/email filing or other functionality must be replicated. Clarify whether MacroView requires ongoing integration or metadata migration only and whether a migration tool is available or vendor-supplied.
15	5	3.1 | 3.2 | 3.3	Please provide the expected initial and three-year user counts by role, including internal DMS users, concurrent users, administrators, records managers, eDiscovery reviewers and external collaborators.	CQ-07	CQ-07 — Users, roles and business units: Provide initial and three-year user estimates by department/business unit and role, including named and peak concurrent DMS users, administrators, records managers, eDiscovery reviewers and external collaborators.
16	4	3.1 | 3.2	Please provide the SharePoint 2016 migration inventory, including site collections, sites, libraries, item counts, stored size including versions, and file-type distribution.	CQ-01	CQ-01 — Migration inventory — SharePoint 2016: Please provide the SharePoint 2016 migration baseline: content databases, site collections, sites, libraries/lists, document and non-document item counts (including attachments and versions), total stored size, file-type profile, active users, and material farm solutions, service applications, third-party products, custom code, InfoPath/MySites or other customizations. Identify unusually large, encrypted, unsupported, long-path or otherwise migration-sensitive content, and confirm whether existing inventory/schema exports will be available.
17	4	3.1 | 3.2	Please provide an inventory of existing and requested workflows, including each workflow's business	CQ-08	CQ-08 — Workflow inventory and target treatment: Provide an inventory of workflows to migrate, replace or build, with business

Source Entry	RFP page	RFP section	Original question (full text)	Consolidated ID(s)	Mapped consolidated question(s)
			purpose, technology, integrations, activity volume, complexity and priority for initial deployment.		purpose, current technology, systems/integrations, steps or available diagrams, transaction volume, complexity, priority and whether each is document approval/publishing, records disposition or line-of-business automation. State how many are expected at initial deployment, whether running instances/history must be preserved, and whether each should be recreated, retired, consolidated or redesigned using built-in Microsoft 365/Power Automate or another approach.
18	5	3.2 | 3.3	Please provide current and projected scanning, OCR and email-ingestion volumes, including monthly pages or documents.	CQ-10, CQ-11	CQ-10 — Scanning, fax, barcode and batch capture: Describe the current and target scanning, fax, barcode-recognition and batch-ingestion environment: devices, capture software/tools and versions, barcode formats and separation rules, connectors/APIs or file-drop methods, metadata/content-type assignment, OCR status and output (searchable PDF, indexed text or both), annual/daily volumes, peak batch sizes, three-year growth, accuracy/quality targets, back-file conversion scope, and go-live integrations/use cases. CQ-11 — Email-to-repository ingestion: Describe email-to-repository requirements: source mailboxes/platform, current tools, expected volumes and growth, attachment handling, metadata capture, and whether messages and attachments remain together, are stored separately with linkage, or both.
21	3–4	3.1 | 3.2	Please provide the number of Windows file servers, repositories/shares, total storage volume, and approximate number of files currently in scope for assessment and migration.	CQ-02	CQ-02 — Migration inventory — Windows file servers: Please provide the Windows file-server migration baseline: number of servers, repositories/shares and archival stores; total data volume and file count; primary file types; age and active-versus-archive distribution; permissions complexity; and known long paths, unsupported types, encrypted files or other migration constraints. Identify any shares expected to remain on-premises.
22	3–4	3.1 | 3.2	Please confirm whether all existing SharePoint 2016 content and Windows file server content are expected to be migrated, or whether CalHFA will identify content for migration, archival, disposition, or exclusion following the assessment.	CQ-03	CQ-03 — Migration scope, growth and disposition: Confirm which SharePoint 2016 and file-server content is in scope for assessment and migration, the annual growth assumptions for the three-year period, and whether CalHFA or the vendor will classify and approve content for migration, archive, exclusion or disposition. For redundant, obsolete or trivial content, clarify whether the vendor only recommends cleanup or also executes approved deletion.
23	3–4	3.1 | 3.2	Which existing CalHFA systems must the proposed solution integrate with, and for each system, what are the purpose, integration method/API availability, and expected data to be exchanged?	CQ-12	CQ-12 — Enterprise integration inventory: List every CalHFA system/interface in scope for ongoing integration and, for each, provide business purpose, product/version, hosting model, authentication, available API/interface documentation, data exchanged, directionality (link/read-only, metadata sync or bidirectional document/data exchange), transaction volume and delivery phase. Include loan/servicing, ERP/financial, CRM/case-management/partner portals, identity, scanning/fax/barcode and in-house tools as applicable.
26	4-5	3.2 | 3.3	Which existing Microsoft 365/GCC, eDiscovery, storage, and related license entitlements will be available to the selected vendor's solution?	CQ-13	CQ-13 — Microsoft 365 tenant and licensing: Confirm whether CalHFA currently operates Commercial, GCC or GCC High Microsoft 365 (or plans a migration), current license SKUs, quantities and add-ons (including Purview/eDiscovery, SharePoint Premium and Copilot), which entitlements are Agency-furnished,

Source Entry	RFP page	RFP section	Original question (full text)	Consolidated ID(s)	Mapped consolidated question(s)
					and whether vendors should price additional licenses. Clarify which vendor/module is responsible for tenant configuration.
27	3-4	3.1 | 3.2	Please identify required ongoing integrations and available interface specifications for existing systems, including scanning/fax, barcode and in-house tools, and clarify whether MacroView DMF requires ongoing integration or metadata migration only.	CQ-09, CQ-12	CQ-09 — MacroView DMF inventory and migration: Provide the MacroView DMF modules/versions, tag and metadata-field counts, content types, term sets, required fields and controlled vocabularies; available schema/configuration documentation; export/API capabilities and formats; and whether Outlook/email filing or other functionality must be replicated. Clarify whether MacroView requires ongoing integration or metadata migration only and whether a migration tool is available or vendor-supplied. CQ-12 — Enterprise integration inventory: List every CalHFA system/interface in scope for ongoing integration and, for each, provide business purpose, product/version, hosting model, authentication, available API/interface documentation, data exchanged, directionality (link/read-only, metadata sync or bidirectional document/data exchange), transaction volume and delivery phase. Include loan/servicing, ERP/financial, CRM/case-management/partner portals, identity, scanning/fax/barcode and in-house tools as applicable.
28	2–4	3.1 | 3.2	Section 3.1 references custom workflows and MacroView DMF with an extensive tag set. Please provide (a) the number of custom workflows and the technology used (SharePoint 2010/2013 workflow, Nintex, custom code, other), (b) the number of MacroView DMF metadata fields/tags and managed-metadata term sets, and (c) whether MacroView is used for Outlook/email filing that must be replicated in the target platform.	CQ-08, CQ-09, CQ-11	CQ-08 — Workflow inventory and target treatment: Provide an inventory of workflows to migrate, replace or build, with business purpose, current technology, systems/integrations, steps or available diagrams, transaction volume, complexity, priority and whether each is document approval/publishing, records disposition or line-of-business automation. State how many are expected at initial deployment, whether running instances/history must be preserved, and whether each should be recreated, retired, consolidated or redesigned using built-in Microsoft 365/Power Automate or another approach. CQ-09 — MacroView DMF inventory and migration: Provide the MacroView DMF modules/versions, tag and metadata-field counts, content types, term sets, required fields and controlled vocabularies; available schema/configuration documentation; export/API capabilities and formats; and whether Outlook/email filing or other functionality must be replicated. Clarify whether MacroView requires ongoing integration or metadata migration only and whether a migration tool is available or vendor-supplied. CQ-11 — Email-to-repository ingestion: Describe email-to-repository requirements: source mailboxes/platform, current tools, expected volumes and growth, attachment handling, metadata capture, and whether messages and attachments remain together, are stored separately with linkage, or both.
29	2; 4	3.1 | 3.2	Please describe the current document scanning and faxing environment: scanner models/MFDs, capture software in use, monthly page volumes, the "Barcode recognition software/in-house built tools" referenced in Section 3.2, and whether a back-file conversion of existing paper records is in scope.	CQ-10	CQ-10 — Scanning, fax, barcode and batch capture: Describe the current and target scanning, fax, barcode-recognition and batch-ingestion environment: devices, capture software/tools and versions, barcode formats and separation rules, connectors/APIs or file-drop methods, metadata/content-type assignment, OCR status and output (searchable PDF, indexed text or both), annual/daily volumes, peak batch sizes, three-year growth,

Source Entry	RFP page	RFP section	Original question (full text)	Consolidated ID(s)	Mapped consolidated question(s)
					accuracy/quality targets, back-file conversion scope, and go-live integrations/use cases.
30	3–4	3.1 | 3.2	Section 3.1 and 3.2 require seamless integration with existing CalHFA systems. Please list the systems in scope for integration (e.g., loan origination/servicing, ERP/financials, case management, Active Directory/Entra ID), their hosting model, and whether integrations are expected to be read-only links, metadata synchronization, or bi-directional document exchange.	CQ-12, CQ-16	CQ-12 — Enterprise integration inventory: List every CalHFA system/interface in scope for ongoing integration and, for each, provide business purpose, product/version, hosting model, authentication, available API/interface documentation, data exchanged, directionality (link/read-only, metadata sync or bidirectional document/data exchange), transaction volume and delivery phase. Include loan/servicing, ERP/financial, CRM/case-management/partner portals, identity, scanning/fax/barcode and in-house tools as applicable. CQ-16 — Identity, conditional access and network baseline: Provide the existing identity, role/group, conditional-access and network-access configurations vendors should use when designing and implementing the target platform.
34	2–5	3.1 | 3.2	Is decommissioning of the SharePoint 2016 farm and file servers (including data destruction certification) within vendor scope? What post-migration support duration does CalHFA expect, and is there a current vendor supporting SharePoint 2016/MacroView whose cooperation and knowledge transfer will be available during the transition?	CQ-06	CQ-06 — Source decommissioning and transition support: Clarify whether decommissioning SharePoint 2016 and file servers, including certified data destruction, is in scope; the expected post-migration support duration; and whether the incumbent SharePoint/MacroView provider will support knowledge transfer.
35	4–5	3.2 | 3.3	What approximate peak number of simultaneously active users should vendors plan to support, separately for document management and eDiscovery?	CQ-07	CQ-07 — Users, roles and business units: Provide initial and three-year user estimates by department/business unit and role, including named and peak concurrent DMS users, administrators, records managers, eDiscovery reviewers and external collaborators.
36	4 and 2-3	3.2 | 3.1	What indicative sizing ranges should respondents use for SharePoint 2016 sites, libraries, record counts and content volume; Windows file-server content volume; custom workflows; and MacroView DMF tag structures?	CQ-01, CQ-02, CQ-09	CQ-01 — Migration inventory — SharePoint 2016: Please provide the SharePoint 2016 migration baseline: content databases, site collections, sites, libraries/lists, document and non-document item counts (including attachments and versions), total stored size, file-type profile, active users, and material farm solutions, service applications, third-party products, custom code, InfoPath/MySites or other customizations. Identify unusually large, encrypted, unsupported, long-path or otherwise migration-sensitive content, and confirm whether existing inventory/schema exports will be available. CQ-02 — Migration inventory — Windows file servers: Please provide the Windows file-server migration baseline: number of servers, repositories/shares and archival stores; total data volume and file count; primary file types; age and active-versus-archive distribution; permissions complexity; and known long paths, unsupported types, encrypted files or other migration constraints. Identify any shares expected to remain on-premises. CQ-09 — MacroView DMF inventory and migration: Provide the MacroView DMF modules/versions, tag and metadata-field counts, content types, term sets, required fields and controlled vocabularies; available schema/configuration documentation; export/API capabilities and formats; and whether Outlook/email

Source Entry	RFP page	RFP section	Original question (full text)	Consolidated ID(s)	Mapped consolidated question(s)
					filing or other functionality must be replicated. Clarify whether MacroView requires ongoing integration or metadata migration only and whether a migration tool is available or vendor-supplied.
37	4 and 2-3	3.2 | 3.1	Will existing source inventory and schema exports be made available for proposal sizing?	CQ-01	CQ-01 — Migration inventory — SharePoint 2016: Please provide the SharePoint 2016 migration baseline: content databases, site collections, sites, libraries/lists, document and non-document item counts (including attachments and versions), total stored size, file-type profile, active users, and material farm solutions, service applications, third-party products, custom code, InfoPath/MySites or other customizations. Identify unusually large, encrypted, unsupported, long-path or otherwise migration-sensitive content, and confirm whether existing inventory/schema exports will be available.
38	3 and 4	3.1 | 3.2	For AI-powered semantic retrieval and Q&A without training on CalHFA data and with an administrator-controlled complete AI-off setting, what minimum controls are required for data processing, inference retention, audit, human review and deployment in GCC or GCC High?	CQ-19	CQ-19 — AI/RAG use and control requirements: Confirm whether generative AI and retrieval-augmented generation may process CalHFA content in an authorized secure U.S. government-cloud environment when data is not retained or used to train shared/foundation models. Specify minimum requirements for inference retention, audit, human review, data processing and an administrator-controlled complete AI-off setting in GCC/GCC High.
39	3-4	3.1 | 3.2	Where a required OCR, barcode-recognition or AI metadata-extraction service is unavailable in Microsoft 365 GCC or GCC High, may a respondent supply a separately licensed, government-available, wholly US-based module under the same procurement?	CQ-21	CQ-21 — Supplemental OCR/barcode/AI modules: If required OCR, barcode recognition or AI metadata extraction is unavailable natively in GCC/GCC High, may vendors include a separately licensed, government-available, wholly U.S.-based module? Specify the licensing and processing evidence required.
41	6-7	3.1 | 3.2	Approximately how many departments or business units will use the replacement document management solution?	CQ-07	CQ-07 — Users, roles and business units: Provide initial and three-year user estimates by department/business unit and role, including named and peak concurrent DMS users, administrators, records managers, eDiscovery reviewers and external collaborators.
42	6-7	3.1 | 3.2	Please provide the available workflow inventory for this solicitation, identifying each workflow's business purpose, whether it is new or a replacement, its current implementation technology (where applicable), and its estimated complexity (simple, medium or complex), together with any existing process outlines or flow diagrams. Are the required workflows centered on document approval, publishing, and/or Records Management (i.e. disposition) or do they include process workflows to automate line of business functions? If your team has knowledge and experience with SharePoint and Power Automate, do you anticipate that the required workflows can be addressed with using SharePoint/Microsoft 365 built-in workflow capability?	CQ-08	CQ-08 — Workflow inventory and target treatment: Provide an inventory of workflows to migrate, replace or build, with business purpose, current technology, systems/integrations, steps or available diagrams, transaction volume, complexity, priority and whether each is document approval/publishing, records disposition or line-of-business automation. State how many are expected at initial deployment, whether running instances/history must be preserved, and whether each should be recreated, retired, consolidated or redesigned using built-in Microsoft 365/Power Automate or another approach.
43	6-7	3.1 | 3.2	Can CalHFA share the MacroView DMF version and available tag/metadata schema, including required fields and controlled vocabularies, for migration mapping?	CQ-09	CQ-09 — MacroView DMF inventory and migration: Provide the MacroView DMF modules/versions, tag and metadata-field counts, content types, term sets, required fields and controlled vocabularies; available schema/configuration documentation; export/API capabilities and formats; and whether Outlook/email filing or other functionality must be replicated. Clarify whether

Source Entry	RFP page	RFP section	Original question (full text)	Consolidated ID(s)	Mapped consolidated question(s)
					MacroView requires ongoing integration or metadata migration only and whether a migration tool is available or vendor-supplied.
46	8	3.2 | 3.3	Can CalHFA share existing incident-severity definitions and response/restoration targets for post-migration and ongoing support?	CQ-24	CQ-24 — Service levels and support targets: Provide required numeric targets and measurement workloads for uptime, indexing latency, search latency, help-desk response/restoration, and incident-severity definitions for post-migration and ongoing support.
50	3-5	3.1 | 3.2	Please provide the estimated number, total volume, file count, and primary file types for the Windows file-server repositories, including any known unsupported file types, path-length issues, encrypted files, or permission complexities.	CQ-02	CQ-02 — Migration inventory — Windows file servers: Please provide the Windows file-server migration baseline: number of servers, repositories/shares and archival stores; total data volume and file count; primary file types; age and active-versus-archive distribution; permissions complexity; and known long paths, unsupported types, encrypted files or other migration constraints. Identify any shares expected to remain on-premises.
51	3-5	3.1 | 3.2	Please provide estimated source-environment sizing, including SharePoint site collections, databases, total data volume, document count, versions, custom workflows, custom solutions, permissions, and MacroView DMF tags or metadata fields.	CQ-01, CQ-09	CQ-01 — Migration inventory — SharePoint 2016: Please provide the SharePoint 2016 migration baseline: content databases, site collections, sites, libraries/lists, document and non-document item counts (including attachments and versions), total stored size, file-type profile, active users, and material farm solutions, service applications, third-party products, custom code, InfoPath/MySites or other customizations. Identify unusually large, encrypted, unsupported, long-path or otherwise migration-sensitive content, and confirm whether existing inventory/schema exports will be available. CQ-09 — MacroView DMF inventory and migration: Provide the MacroView DMF modules/versions, tag and metadata-field counts, content types, term sets, required fields and controlled vocabularies; available schema/configuration documentation; export/API capabilities and formats; and whether Outlook/email filing or other functionality must be replicated. Clarify whether MacroView requires ongoing integration or metadata migration only and whether a migration tool is available or vendor-supplied.
54	2–3; 2	3.1	Please provide the approximate number of SharePoint 2016 sites, site collections, lists/libraries, documents, and total storage volume currently in scope for migration. Variant Question 1: Please provide current content volumes for migration planning: total SharePoint 2016 storage (GB/TB), number of site collections, sites, and document libraries, and approximate document count.	CQ-01	CQ-01 — Migration inventory — SharePoint 2016: Please provide the SharePoint 2016 migration baseline: content databases, site collections, sites, libraries/lists, document and non-document item counts (including attachments and versions), total stored size, file-type profile, active users, and material farm solutions, service applications, third-party products, custom code, InfoPath/MySites or other customizations. Identify unusually large, encrypted, unsupported, long-path or otherwise migration-sensitive content, and confirm whether existing inventory/schema exports will be available.
55	3	3.1	Are all listed AI/GenAI capabilities—natural-language search, semantic/vector search, automated metadata extraction, summarization, and AI-assisted Q&A—mandatory requirements?	CQ-20	CQ-20 — Required AI capabilities and timing: Identify which AI/GenAI capabilities are mandatory—natural-language search, semantic/vector search, metadata extraction, summarization and AI-assisted Q&A—which must be available at initial operational use, and any approved AI platform, model, governance framework or licensing vendors must use.
62	3	3.1	Section 3.1 specifies no model training on CalHFA data. Please confirm whether CalHFA permits generative AI and retrieval-augmented generation that process	CQ-19	CQ-19 — AI/RAG use and control requirements: Confirm whether generative AI and retrieval-augmented generation may process CalHFA content in an authorized secure U.S. government-cloud

Source Entry	RFP page	RFP section	Original question (full text)	Consolidated ID(s)	Mapped consolidated question(s)
			CalHFA content within an authorized secure environment, provided CalHFA data is not retained for or used to train shared or foundation models.		environment when data is not retained or used to train shared/foundation models. Specify minimum requirements for inference retention, audit, human review, data processing and an administrator-controlled complete AI-off setting in GCC/GCC High.
64	5	3.1 - Reference "CalHFA has identified the need to replace its aging SharePoint 2016 on-premises document management system, which currently relies on custom workflows"	How many workflows are to be built as part of this solicitation? Please classify the complexity of each workflow that needs to be delivered as part of the new solution using a rubric of Simple, Moderate, and Complex. If available, can you please provide an outline of the steps or flow diagrams of all existing workflows? Are the required workflows centered on document approval and records management (e.g. disposition policies) or do they include process workflows to automate line of business functions? Can we assume that the workflows are very simple in nature (e.g. document approval)? If you have knowledge and experience with SharePoint and Power Automate (Flow), do you anticipate that the required workflows can be addressed with using SharePoint/Microsoft 365's built-in workflow capability?	CQ-08	CQ-08 — Workflow inventory and target treatment: Provide an inventory of workflows to migrate, replace or build, with business purpose, current technology, systems/integrations, steps or available diagrams, transaction volume, complexity, priority and whether each is document approval/publishing, records disposition or line-of-business automation. State how many are expected at initial deployment, whether running instances/history must be preserved, and whether each should be recreated, retired, consolidated or redesigned using built-in Microsoft 365/Power Automate or another approach.
65	5	3.1 - Reference "MacroView DMF	What specific MacroView modules and corresponding versions are used in the existing solution? Does MacroView have an export feature and/or APIs that can be used to export metadata and other content such that it can be imported into the new solution? If so, what export formats does MacroView support?	CQ-09	CQ-09 — MacroView DMF inventory and migration: Provide the MacroView DMF modules/versions, tag and metadata-field counts, content types, term sets, required fields and controlled vocabularies; available schema/configuration documentation; export/API capabilities and formats; and whether Outlook/email filing or other functionality must be replicated. Clarify whether MacroView requires ongoing integration or metadata migration only and whether a migration tool is available or vendor-supplied.
66	5	3.1 - Reference "an extensive set of tags to support Agency operations"	Assuming "tags" refers to metadata, approximately how many metadata attributes exist for each document?	CQ-09	CQ-09 — MacroView DMF inventory and migration: Provide the MacroView DMF modules/versions, tag and metadata-field counts, content types, term sets, required fields and controlled vocabularies; available schema/configuration documentation; export/API capabilities and formats; and whether Outlook/email filing or other functionality must be replicated. Clarify whether MacroView requires ongoing integration or metadata migration only and whether a migration tool is available or vendor-supplied.
67	5	3.1 – Reference "The existing platform also ingests scanned documents from multiple sources"	What scan/capture software is currently used to digitize paper documents? Do you intend to use the same scan/capture software in the new solution or does the new solution need to have its own scan/capture software? Can the existing scan/capture product store scanned documents directly in SharePoint Online (SPO) document libraries? If yes, can the existing scan/capture product assign a SharePoint Content Type to the document once it arrives in the SPO document library and then store metadata that it extracts during the scan process to the fields of the assigned Content Type? Are scanned images currently OCR'd such that the text in the documents is searchable?	CQ-10	CQ-10 — Scanning, fax, barcode and batch capture: Describe the current and target scanning, fax, barcode-recognition and batch-ingestion environment: devices, capture software/tools and versions, barcode formats and separation rules, connectors/APIs or file-drop methods, metadata/content-type assignment, OCR status and output (searchable PDF, indexed text or both), annual/daily volumes, peak batch sizes, three-year growth, accuracy/quality targets, back-file conversion scope, and go-live integrations/use cases.

Source Entry	RFP page	RFP section	Original question (full text)	Consolidated ID(s)	Mapped consolidated question(s)
			How many documents do you anticipate scanning per year? What is the anticipated growth rate in documents scanned per year over the next 3 years (e.g. 5% growth in each of years 2 and 3)?		
70	6	3.1 - Reference “migration of all SharePoint 2016 content”	Are there any Farm-level Solutions or third-party products installed; if so, please provide details. If you have customizations that involve custom code (e.g. C# or JavaScript development), will these customizations be used in the new solution or will they be re-implemented using the modern features of the platform? Are there any integrations to systems that are external to SharePoint (e.g. using Business Connectivity Services or hyperlinks to documents that reside in SharePoint)? If so, please provide details. Do you have any InfoPath forms that contain code-behind? If yes, please provide details. If you are using MySites: To what degree have they been customized? How many MySites need to be migrated? If you have any workflows that need to be upgraded/migrated: What tool was used to create them (e.g. SharePoint Designer, Nintex, or Visual Studio)? Will all running workflows be complete at the time of the migration? It is unlikely that it will be possible to migration workflow histories; is this a concern? Which service applications are installed/configured and in use in the current implementation? How many active Content Databases do you have? How many Site Collections need to be migrated? How many Business Units will use the resulting solution? What is the total amount of content to be migrated? How many licensed M365 users will use the new solution? Are there any errors being logged or issues with the health of the farm or any of the content databases? SharePoint typically contains Documents, Lists, Pages with content/web parts, and Taxonomy (Content Types and Term Sets). All of these upgrade/migrate to the Modern Experience fairly easily except for the Pages: Will existing pages be replaced with modern pages? Will internal staff be responsible for the redevelopment of pages? Approximately how many pages need to be developed by the consultant?	CQ-01, CQ-04, CQ-08, CQ-12	CQ-01 — Migration inventory — SharePoint 2016: Please provide the SharePoint 2016 migration baseline: content databases, site collections, sites, libraries/lists, document and non-document item counts (including attachments and versions), total stored size, file-type profile, active users, and material farm solutions, service applications, third-party products, custom code, InfoPath/MySites or other customizations. Identify unusually large, encrypted, unsupported, long-path or otherwise migration-sensitive content, and confirm whether existing inventory/schema exports will be available. CQ-04 — Migration fidelity and target access model: Identify which source properties must be preserved or remapped during migration, including versions, authorship, timestamps, check-in/check-out and audit history, active workflow state, metadata, unique permissions and sharing relationships, email/message links, attachments, document URLs and embedded links. Describe the approved target access model and whether redirects are required. CQ-08 — Workflow inventory and target treatment: Provide an inventory of workflows to migrate, replace or build, with business purpose, current technology, systems/integrations, steps or available diagrams, transaction volume, complexity, priority and whether each is document approval/publishing, records disposition or line-of-business automation. State how many are expected at initial deployment, whether running instances/history must be preserved, and whether each should be recreated, retired, consolidated or redesigned using built-in Microsoft 365/Power Automate or another approach. CQ-12 — Enterprise integration inventory: List every CalHFA system/interface in scope for ongoing integration and, for each, provide business purpose, product/version, hosting model, authentication, available API/interface documentation, data exchanged, directionality (link/read-only, metadata sync or bidirectional document/data exchange), transaction volume and delivery phase. Include loan/servicing, ERP/financial, CRM/case-management/partner portals, identity, scanning/fax/barcode and in-house tools as applicable.
71	6	3.1 – Reference “file server content”	Approximately how many documents need to be migrated? What is the total size in GB/TB of the content to be	CQ-02	CQ-02 — Migration inventory — Windows file servers: Please provide the Windows file-server migration baseline: number of servers, repositories/shares and archival stores; total data volume

Source Entry	RFP page	RFP section	Original question (full text)	Consolidated ID(s)	Mapped consolidated question(s)
			migrated? Note: this information can be determined by right-clicking on the top-most parent folder and selecting "Properties".		and file count; primary file types; age and active-versus-archive distribution; permissions complexity; and known long paths, unsupported types, encrypted files or other migration constraints. Identify any shares expected to remain on-premises.
72	6	3.1 – Reference “integrating seamlessly with existing agency systems”	What specific products and corresponding versions require integration? What level of integration is anticipated (e.g. hyperlinks only, document-level integration, unidirectional/read only, bidirectional data updates, functional integration)? Do these systems have APIs that can be used to achieve the desired integration?	CQ-12	CQ-12 — Enterprise integration inventory: List every CalHFA system/interface in scope for ongoing integration and, for each, provide business purpose, product/version, hosting model, authentication, available API/interface documentation, data exchanged, directionality (link/read-only, metadata sync or bidirectional document/data exchange), transaction volume and delivery phase. Include loan/servicing, ERP/financial, CRM/case-management/partner portals, identity, scanning/fax/barcode and in-house tools as applicable.
74	2	3.1	How many MacroView DMF tags, content types, and metadata fields are currently in use?	CQ-09	CQ-09 — MacroView DMF inventory and migration: Provide the MacroView DMF modules/versions, tag and metadata-field counts, content types, term sets, required fields and controlled vocabularies; available schema/configuration documentation; export/API capabilities and formats; and whether Outlook/email filing or other functionality must be replicated. Clarify whether MacroView requires ongoing integration or metadata migration only and whether a migration tool is available or vendor-supplied.
75	3	3.1	How many internal named users and concurrent users will use the platform, and approximately how many external users will need access for the External Collaboration use case?	CQ-07	CQ-07 — Users, roles and business units: Provide initial and three-year user estimates by department/business unit and role, including named and peak concurrent DMS users, administrators, records managers, eDiscovery reviewers and external collaborators.
76	3	3.1	Regarding the requirement of no model training on CalHFA data, is use of a hosted large language model service in a U.S. government cloud acceptable if contractually prohibited from training on or retaining CalHFA data?	CQ-19	CQ-19 — AI/RAG use and control requirements: Confirm whether generative AI and retrieval-augmented generation may process CalHFA content in an authorized secure U.S. government-cloud environment when data is not retained or used to train shared/foundation models. Specify minimum requirements for inference retention, audit, human review, data processing and an administrator-controlled complete AI-off setting in GCC/GCC High.
79	3	3.1	For the required AI/GenAI capabilities, which functions does CalHFA expect to be available at initial operational use, and does CalHFA currently have an approved AI platform, model, governance framework, or licensing that vendors should incorporate into the proposed solution?	CQ-20	CQ-20 — Required AI capabilities and timing: Identify which AI/GenAI capabilities are mandatory—natural-language search, semantic/vector search, metadata extraction, summarization and AI-assisted Q&A—which must be available at initial operational use, and any approved AI platform, model, governance framework or licensing vendors must use.
80	4	3.2	With reference to Section 3.2, please clarify whether the selected cloud service must hold a current FedRAMP Moderate authorization, or whether CalHFA will accept a U.S.-hosted SOC 2 Type II service that demonstrates equivalent controls and alignment with FedRAMP Moderate requirements. Variant Question 1: Section 3.2 states that cloud-hosted services must align with or be deployable within FedRAMP Moderate (or equivalent) environments. Please clarify whether FedRAMP Moderate authorization is required for the eDiscovery platform and associated AI capabilities, or whether CalHFA will accept an equivalent security framework supported by appropriate independent	CQ-17	CQ-17 — FedRAMP Moderate or equivalent: Clarify whether each cloud component must hold current FedRAMP Moderate authorization, be deployable within such an environment, or may demonstrate equivalent controls (for example SOC 2 Type II plus a control mapping). State the evidence and control-mapping guidance CalHFA will accept, whether vendor-hosted SaaS is permitted under Zero Trust requirements, and whether an equivalent U.S.-hosted AWS or other non-Microsoft environment is acceptable.

Source Entry	RFP page	RFP section	Original question (full text)	Consolidated ID(s)	Mapped consolidated question(s)
			certifications and documentation. Variant Question 2: Section 3.2 states that "All hosting components must operate within platforms that meet SOC 2 Type II compliance, and any cloud-hosted services must align with or be deployable within Federal Risk and Authorization Management Program (FedRAMP) Moderate (or equivalent) environments." For a cloud-hosted component that runs outside CalHFA's Microsoft 365 GCC tenant, such as a third-party eDiscovery platform, please confirm which authorizations CalHFA will accept as equivalent to FedRAMP Moderate (for example StateRAMP/GovRAMP Moderate, or a SOC 2 Type II report mapped to NIST SP 800-53 Moderate controls) and what evidence of it must be included in the proposal. Variant Question 3: Does "FedRAMP Moderate or equivalent" require each proposed cloud component to hold a current FedRAMP Moderate authorization, or will deployment within a FedRAMP-authorized environment with equivalent documented controls satisfy the requirement?		
81	4	3.2	Is CalHFA's current Microsoft 365 tenant GCC or GCC High? Is the tenant configuration service in Section 3.2 (bullet 8) required of vendors proposing only the eDiscovery module, or only of the Document Management vendor?	CQ-13	CQ-13 — Microsoft 365 tenant and licensing: Confirm whether CalHFA currently operates Commercial, GCC or GCC High Microsoft 365 (or plans a migration), current license SKUs, quantities and add-ons (including Purview/eDiscovery, SharePoint Premium and Copilot), which entitlements are Agency-furnished, and whether vendors should price additional licenses. Clarify which vendor/module is responsible for tenant configuration.
82	4	3.2	What approximate content volume, document count and number of custom workflows should vendors use for migration sizing?	CQ-01, CQ-02	CQ-01 — Migration inventory — SharePoint 2016: Please provide the SharePoint 2016 migration baseline: content databases, site collections, sites, libraries/lists, document and non-document item counts (including attachments and versions), total stored size, file-type profile, active users, and material farm solutions, service applications, third-party products, custom code, InfoPath/MySites or other customizations. Identify unusually large, encrypted, unsupported, long-path or otherwise migration-sensitive content, and confirm whether existing inventory/schema exports will be available. CQ-02 — Migration inventory — Windows file servers: Please provide the Windows file-server migration baseline: number of servers, repositories/shares and archival stores; total data volume and file count; primary file types; age and active-versus-archive distribution; permissions complexity; and known long paths, unsupported types, encrypted files or other migration constraints. Identify any shares expected to remain on-premises.
83	4	3.2	What evidence will CalHFA accept to demonstrate that a proposed hosting environment meets the stated FedRAMP Moderate or equivalent alignment requirement? Variant Question 1: What evidence will CalHFA accept to establish that cloud services align with, or are deployable within, FedRAMP Moderate or equivalent environments? Variant Question 2: What	CQ-17	CQ-17 — FedRAMP Moderate or equivalent: Clarify whether each cloud component must hold current FedRAMP Moderate authorization, be deployable within such an environment, or may demonstrate equivalent controls (for example SOC 2 Type II plus a control mapping). State the evidence and control-mapping guidance CalHFA will accept, whether vendor-hosted SaaS is permitted under Zero Trust requirements, and whether an

Source Entry	RFP page	RFP section	Original question (full text)	Consolidated ID(s)	Mapped consolidated question(s)
			evidence will CalHFA accept to establish that a proposed cloud-hosted service is equivalent to, or deployable within, a FedRAMP Moderate environment?		equivalent U.S.-hosted AWS or other non-Microsoft environment is acceptable.
84	4	3.2	Will CalHFA accept a non-Microsoft document-management platform hosted in a FedRAMP Moderate-authorized U.S. AWS environment as the "equivalent U.S.-based hosting environment" described in Section 3.2? Variant Question 1: Will CalHFA consider a non-Microsoft document management platform hosted in an equivalent U.S.-based environment, provided it meets SOC 2 Type II and FedRAMP Moderate (or equivalent) requirements?	CQ-14, CQ-17	CQ-14 — Target platform and solution flexibility: Confirm whether a target platform/tenant has already been selected or platform selection and tenant establishment are in scope. Clarify whether CalHFA will accept configurable platform-based, COTS, Microsoft 365/SharePoint Online with add-ons, and non-Microsoft solutions that meet all requirements, rather than preferring a particular product architecture. CQ-17 — FedRAMP Moderate or equivalent: Clarify whether each cloud component must hold current FedRAMP Moderate authorization, be deployable within such an environment, or may demonstrate equivalent controls (for example SOC 2 Type II plus a control mapping). State the evidence and control-mapping guidance CalHFA will accept, whether vendor-hosted SaaS is permitted under Zero Trust requirements, and whether an equivalent U.S.-hosted AWS or other non-Microsoft environment is acceptable.
85	4	3.2	Please provide the Windows file-share inventory to be assessed and migrated, including servers or shares, file counts, total size, file types, and permission complexity.	CQ-02	CQ-02 — Migration inventory — Windows file servers: Please provide the Windows file-server migration baseline: number of servers, repositories/shares and archival stores; total data volume and file count; primary file types; age and active-versus-archive distribution; permissions complexity; and known long paths, unsupported types, encrypted files or other migration constraints. Identify any shares expected to remain on-premises.
86	4	3.2	Which source attributes must be preserved during migration, including version history, authorship, timestamps, unique permissions, links, email attachments, audit history and active workflow state?	CQ-04	CQ-04 — Migration fidelity and target access model: Identify which source properties must be preserved or remapped during migration, including versions, authorship, timestamps, check-in/check-out and audit history, active workflow state, metadata, unique permissions and sharing relationships, email/message links, attachments, document URLs and embedded links. Describe the approved target access model and whether redirects are required.
87	4	3.2	Please provide the required integration inventory, identifying each application, interface or API, data direction, transaction volume and delivery phase.	CQ-12	CQ-12 — Enterprise integration inventory: List every CalHFA system/interface in scope for ongoing integration and, for each, provide business purpose, product/version, hosting model, authentication, available API/interface documentation, data exchanged, directionality (link/read-only, metadata sync or bidirectional document/data exchange), transaction volume and delivery phase. Include loan/servicing, ERP/financial, CRM/case-management/partner portals, identity, scanning/fax/barcode and in-house tools as applicable.
88	3–4; 7	3.2	The RFP requires identification of redundant, obsolete, or trivial content. Please clarify whether the vendor is expected to perform the actual cleanup/disposition of such content or only provide recommendations for CalHFA approval. Variant Question 1: After the vendor recommends redundant, obsolete or trivial content cleanup, will CalHFA approve disposition and perform	CQ-03	CQ-03 — Migration scope, growth and disposition: Confirm which SharePoint 2016 and file-server content is in scope for assessment and migration, the annual growth assumptions for the three-year period, and whether CalHFA or the vendor will classify and approve content for migration, archive, exclusion or disposition. For redundant, obsolete or trivial content, clarify whether the vendor only recommends cleanup or also executes approved deletion.

Source Entry	RFP page	RFP section	Original question (full text)	Consolidated ID(s)	Mapped consolidated question(s)
			deletion, or should the vendor execute approved deletions as part of migration?		
89	3–4	3.2	Could CalHFA provide the current MacroView DMF metadata and tag structure, including the approximate number of metadata fields/tags and available metadata mapping or configuration documentation, to enable vendors to accurately estimate migration and configuration effort? Additionally, does CalHFA currently have a third-party migration tool such as ShareGate, or will CalHFA provide/purchase one if required for the migration?	CQ-09	CQ-09 — MacroView DMF inventory and migration: Provide the MacroView DMF modules/versions, tag and metadata-field counts, content types, term sets, required fields and controlled vocabularies; available schema/configuration documentation; export/API capabilities and formats; and whether Outlook/email filing or other functionality must be replicated. Clarify whether MacroView requires ongoing integration or metadata migration only and whether a migration tool is available or vendor-supplied.
90	3–4	3.2	Could you please provide an inventory or approximate number of existing custom workflows in SharePoint 2016 that will need to be assessed, redesigned, migrated, or replaced in the target platform, along with their complexity level: Simple (fewer than 10 actions), Medium (10–25 actions), or Complex (more than 25 actions)?	CQ-08	CQ-08 — Workflow inventory and target treatment: Provide an inventory of workflows to migrate, replace or build, with business purpose, current technology, systems/integrations, steps or available diagrams, transaction volume, complexity, priority and whether each is document approval/publishing, records disposition or line-of-business automation. State how many are expected at initial deployment, whether running instances/history must be preserved, and whether each should be recreated, retired, consolidated or redesigned using built-in Microsoft 365/Power Automate or another approach.
91	3–4	3.2	What is the approximate number and complexity of the existing SharePoint and file-server permission structures that need to be migrated or redesigned?	CQ-04	CQ-04 — Migration fidelity and target access model: Identify which source properties must be preserved or remapped during migration, including versions, authorship, timestamps, check-in/check-out and audit history, active workflow state, metadata, unique permissions and sharing relationships, email/message links, attachments, document URLs and embedded links. Describe the approved target access model and whether redirects are required.
92	3–4	3.2	Does the migration need to include document version history, check-in/check-out information, document history, audit information, and other historical metadata?	CQ-04	CQ-04 — Migration fidelity and target access model: Identify which source properties must be preserved or remapped during migration, including versions, authorship, timestamps, check-in/check-out and audit history, active workflow state, metadata, unique permissions and sharing relationships, email/message links, attachments, document URLs and embedded links. Describe the approved target access model and whether redirects are required.
93	3–4	3.2	Please clarify how many pilot migration iterations/calibration cycles CalHFA expects before production migration and whether the vendor should include multiple pilot cycles in the proposed scope.	CQ-05	CQ-05 — Migration pilots, cutover and acceptance: State the expected number of pilot/calibration cycles, production cutover window, maximum allowable downtime, and required reconciliation/acceptance criteria for counts, metadata, permissions, workflows and search.
94	4	3.2	What is the expected production migration/cutover window, and what is the maximum allowable downtime for mission-critical processes?	CQ-05	CQ-05 — Migration pilots, cutover and acceptance: State the expected number of pilot/calibration cycles, production cutover window, maximum allowable downtime, and required reconciliation/acceptance criteria for counts, metadata, permissions, workflows and search.
95	4	3.2	What is the approximate volume of physical/scanned documents requiring OCR, and what are the expected OCR accuracy and quality requirements?	CQ-10	CQ-10 — Scanning, fax, barcode and batch capture: Describe the current and target scanning, fax, barcode-recognition and batch-ingestion environment: devices, capture software/tools and versions, barcode formats and separation rules, connectors/APIs or file-drop methods, metadata/content-type assignment, OCR

Source Entry	RFP page	RFP section	Original question (full text)	Consolidated ID(s)	Mapped consolidated question(s)
					status and output (searchable PDF, indexed text or both), annual/daily volumes, peak batch sizes, three-year growth, accuracy/quality targets, back-file conversion scope, and go-live integrations/use cases.
96	4; 7	3.2	What existing barcode recognition software or in-house tools must be integrated with the proposed solution, and will API/interface documentation be provided? Variant Question 1: Which barcode recognition software or in-house tools must be retained and integrated with the replacement solution?	CQ-10, CQ-12	CQ-10 — Scanning, fax, barcode and batch capture: Describe the current and target scanning, fax, barcode-recognition and batch-ingestion environment: devices, capture software/tools and versions, barcode formats and separation rules, connectors/APIs or file-drop methods, metadata/content-type assignment, OCR status and output (searchable PDF, indexed text or both), annual/daily volumes, peak batch sizes, three-year growth, accuracy/quality targets, back-file conversion scope, and go-live integrations/use cases. CQ-12 — Enterprise integration inventory: List every CalHFA system/interface in scope for ongoing integration and, for each, provide business purpose, product/version, hosting model, authentication, available API/interface documentation, data exchanged, directionality (link/read-only, metadata sync or bidirectional document/data exchange), transaction volume and delivery phase. Include loan/servicing, ERP/financial, CRM/case-management/partner portals, identity, scanning/fax/barcode and in-house tools as applicable.
97	4	3.2	What are the email-to-repository ingestion requirements, including expected email volumes, source mailboxes, attachment handling, and whether Exchange Online/GCC is the source system?	CQ-11	CQ-11 — Email-to-repository ingestion: Describe email-to-repository requirements: source mailboxes/platform, current tools, expected volumes and growth, attachment handling, metadata capture, and whether messages and attachments remain together, are stored separately with linkage, or both.
98	4	3.2	What are representative examples of the required custom or advanced search scenarios and cross-repository search use cases to help vendors accurately assess the required functionality and effort?	CQ-23	CQ-23 — Search use cases and repository scope: Provide representative advanced/custom search, semantic retrieval and eDiscovery use cases. For “cross-repository search,” clarify whether searching content after consolidation into the target repository satisfies the requirement or whether live SharePoint/file-server repositories must remain searchable after migration.
99	4	3.2	Will CalHFA provide the target information architecture, taxonomy, metadata model, and permission model, or is the selected vendor expected to design these from the ground up?	CQ-29	CQ-29 — Target information architecture and taxonomy: Clarify whether CalHFA will provide the target information architecture, taxonomy, metadata model and permission model, or whether the selected vendor must design them from the ground up.
100	5	3.2	The RFP requirements note that the system needs to be able to perform “Cross-repository search, including eDiscovery and file servers.” It's our understanding that the project scope includes a full data migration from SharePoint and file servers. Can you confirm that the content being consolidated into a single repository for search purposes meets the requirements as outlined and therefore would eliminate the need for a cross-repository search?	CQ-23	CQ-23 — Search use cases and repository scope: Provide representative advanced/custom search, semantic retrieval and eDiscovery use cases. For “cross-repository search,” clarify whether searching content after consolidation into the target repository satisfies the requirement or whether live SharePoint/file-server repositories must remain searchable after migration.
101	4; 4-5	3.2	CalHFA requires that the new system “must ensure seamless integration with existing CalHFA systems…” Are you able to provide details on the CalHFA systems that you would like this platform to integrate with? Variant Question 1: The RFP requires seamless	CQ-12	CQ-12 — Enterprise integration inventory: List every CalHFA system/interface in scope for ongoing integration and, for each, provide business purpose, product/version, hosting model, authentication, available API/interface documentation, data exchanged, directionality (link/read-only, metadata sync or

Source Entry	RFP page	RFP section	Original question (full text)	Consolidated ID(s)	Mapped consolidated question(s)
			integration with existing CalHFA systems. Please identify the principal systems, applications, interfaces, or data sources that vendors should assume are in scope for integration with the new document-management solution.		bidirectional document/data exchange), transaction volume and delivery phase. Include loan/servicing, ERP/financial, CRM/case-management/partner portals, identity, scanning/fax/barcode and in-house tools as applicable.
102	4	3.2	To support accurate migration planning, could CalHFA provide available estimates of the volume and complexity of content to be assessed and migrated, including SharePoint sites, documents/files, total data storage, Windows file-server content, custom workflows, and MacroView DMF metadata/tags?	CQ-01, CQ-02, CQ-09	CQ-01 — Migration inventory — SharePoint 2016: Please provide the SharePoint 2016 migration baseline: content databases, site collections, sites, libraries/lists, document and non-document item counts (including attachments and versions), total stored size, file-type profile, active users, and material farm solutions, service applications, third-party products, custom code, InfoPath/MySites or other customizations. Identify unusually large, encrypted, unsupported, long-path or otherwise migration-sensitive content, and confirm whether existing inventory/schema exports will be available. CQ-02 — Migration inventory — Windows file servers: Please provide the Windows file-server migration baseline: number of servers, repositories/shares and archival stores; total data volume and file count; primary file types; age and active-versus-archive distribution; permissions complexity; and known long paths, unsupported types, encrypted files or other migration constraints. Identify any shares expected to remain on-premises. CQ-09 — MacroView DMF inventory and migration: Provide the MacroView DMF modules/versions, tag and metadata-field counts, content types, term sets, required fields and controlled vocabularies; available schema/configuration documentation; export/API capabilities and formats; and whether Outlook/email filing or other functionality must be replicated. Clarify whether MacroView requires ongoing integration or metadata migration only and whether a migration tool is available or vendor-supplied.
103	4	3.2	Section 3.2 calls for configuring "the Microsoft 365 (GCC or GCC High) tenant or equivalent." Does CalHFA currently operate a Microsoft 365 GCC or GCC High tenant? If so, which license SKUs are held today (e.g., E3/G3, E5/G5, Purview/Compliance add-ons, SharePoint Premium, Microsoft 365 Copilot), and should vendors include Microsoft licensing in the proposed cost or treat it as Agency-furnished? Variant Question 1: Does CalHFA currently have a Microsoft 365 GCC or GCC High tenant in production, and if so, which licensing tier (for example E3 or E5, Purview Premium) is held?	CQ-13	CQ-13 — Microsoft 365 tenant and licensing: Confirm whether CalHFA currently operates Commercial, GCC or GCC High Microsoft 365 (or plans a migration), current license SKUs, quantities and add-ons (including Purview/eDiscovery, SharePoint Premium and Copilot), which entitlements are Agency-furnished, and whether vendors should price additional licenses. Clarify which vendor/module is responsible for tenant configuration.
104	4	3.2	To size migration effort, please provide approximate current volumes: (a) SharePoint 2016 content database size (TB), number of site collections, sites, and libraries, and item count; (b) Windows file server shared-folder and archival storage volume (TB) and file count; and (c) the estimated percentage of content CalHFA expects to be redundant, obsolete, or trivial.	CQ-01, CQ-02, CQ-03	CQ-01 — Migration inventory — SharePoint 2016: Please provide the SharePoint 2016 migration baseline: content databases, site collections, sites, libraries/lists, document and non-document item counts (including attachments and versions), total stored size, file-type profile, active users, and material farm solutions, service applications, third-party products, custom code, InfoPath/MySites or other customizations. Identify unusually large, encrypted, unsupported, long-path or otherwise migration-sensitive content,

Source Entry	RFP page	RFP section	Original question (full text)	Consolidated ID(s)	Mapped consolidated question(s)
					and confirm whether existing inventory/schema exports will be available. CQ-02 — Migration inventory — Windows file servers: Please provide the Windows file-server migration baseline: number of servers, repositories/shares and archival stores; total data volume and file count; primary file types; age and active-versus-archive distribution; permissions complexity; and known long paths, unsupported types, encrypted files or other migration constraints. Identify any shares expected to remain on-premises. CQ-03 — Migration scope, growth and disposition: Confirm which SharePoint 2016 and file-server content is in scope for assessment and migration, the annual growth assumptions for the three-year period, and whether CalHFA or the vendor will classify and approve content for migration, archive, exclusion or disposition. For redundant, obsolete or trivial content, clarify whether the vendor only recommends cleanup or also executes approved deletion.
105	4	3.2	Please identify the departments and user roles that will use the proposed solution, including approximate user counts by role and any external users.	CQ-07	CQ-07 — Users, roles and business units: Provide initial and three-year user estimates by department/business unit and role, including named and peak concurrent DMS users, administrators, records managers, eDiscovery reviewers and external collaborators.
106	4	3.2	Please provide an inventory of the existing workflows to be migrated or replaced, including each workflow's purpose, systems involved, and approximate transaction volume.	CQ-08	CQ-08 — Workflow inventory and target treatment: Provide an inventory of workflows to migrate, replace or build, with business purpose, current technology, systems/integrations, steps or available diagrams, transaction volume, complexity, priority and whether each is document approval/publishing, records disposition or line-of-business automation. State how many are expected at initial deployment, whether running instances/history must be preserved, and whether each should be recreated, retired, consolidated or redesigned using built-in Microsoft 365/Power Automate or another approach.
107	4	3.2	Please describe the access-control model required for the replacement solution, identifying the existing SharePoint and Windows file-share permissions to be preserved and any changes CalHFA requires. Please include how access is assigned through roles or groups, the site, library, folder or document levels at which permissions apply, and exceptions to inherited permissions.	CQ-04, CQ-16	CQ-04 — Migration fidelity and target access model: Identify which source properties must be preserved or remapped during migration, including versions, authorship, timestamps, check-in/check-out and audit history, active workflow state, metadata, unique permissions and sharing relationships, email/message links, attachments, document URLs and embedded links. Describe the approved target access model and whether redirects are required. CQ-16 — Identity, conditional access and network baseline: Provide the existing identity, role/group, conditional-access and network-access configurations vendors should use when designing and implementing the target platform.
108	4; 7	3.2	Please provide the estimated total data size and file count to be migrated, separately for SharePoint 2016 and Windows file-server repositories. Variant Question 1: What approximate data size in GB or TB is currently held in SharePoint 2016 and Windows file servers, stated separately by source repository?	CQ-02	CQ-02 — Migration inventory — Windows file servers: Please provide the Windows file-server migration baseline: number of servers, repositories/shares and archival stores; total data volume and file count; primary file types; age and active-versus-archive distribution; permissions complexity; and known long paths,

Source Entry	RFP page	RFP section	Original question (full text)	Consolidated ID(s)	Mapped consolidated question(s)
					unsupported types, encrypted files or other migration constraints. Identify any shares expected to remain on-premises.
109	7	3.2	Regarding the requirement for "Design and implement a platform that improves document search and retrieval, enables workflow automation, supports compliant archiving and retention, and consolidates" On a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 represents a Commercial Off The Shelf (COTS) solution with minimal configuration and 5 represents a platform-based solution such as Microsoft 365 which requires some professional services, customization and possibly third-party products (e.g. to enhance the Document Management capabilities), what is acceptable with respect to the solution you are looking for on this continuum? Do you have plans to move to SharePoint Online from SharePoint 2016?	CQ-14	CQ-14 — Target platform and solution flexibility: Confirm whether a target platform/tenant has already been selected or platform selection and tenant establishment are in scope. Clarify whether CalHFA will accept configurable platform-based, COTS, Microsoft 365/SharePoint Online with add-ons, and non-Microsoft solutions that meet all requirements, rather than preferring a particular product architecture.
110	7	3.2	Regarding the requirement for "Must provide services that support a secure, reliable, and compliant migration of all existing SharePoint content and the extensive Windows file server repositories currently used for shared folders and archival storage.": How is the content currently stored (e.g. in Excel, PDF) in both SharePoint 2016, and file server If the migration includes documents: What approximate document counts are currently held in SharePoint 2016 and Windows file servers, stated separately by source repository? If the above is unknown related to this task, is it acceptable to include an estimate for the analysis, design, and planning for this task versus the actual migration in our RFP response? We are a SharePoint and Microsoft 365 focused consultancy and have successfully combined these platforms with best of breed third party software products (as needed) to implement comprehensive enterprise document, content and records management solutions; given what you know about SharePoint/Microsoft 365, including any as-needed 3rd-party add-ons, on a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 represents "Will not meet our requirements" and 5 represents "We believe SharePoint or Microsoft is the best platform for our needs", what represents your view on the continuum? Can you please provide additional details so that we can estimate the content migration/conversion effort?	CQ-01, CQ-02, CQ-14	CQ-01 — Migration inventory — SharePoint 2016: Please provide the SharePoint 2016 migration baseline: content databases, site collections, sites, libraries/lists, document and non-document item counts (including attachments and versions), total stored size, file-type profile, active users, and material farm solutions, service applications, third-party products, custom code, InfoPath/MySites or other customizations. Identify unusually large, encrypted, unsupported, long-path or otherwise migration-sensitive content, and confirm whether existing inventory/schema exports will be available. CQ-02 — Migration inventory — Windows file servers: Please provide the Windows file-server migration baseline: number of servers, repositories/shares and archival stores; total data volume and file count; primary file types; age and active-versus-archive distribution; permissions complexity; and known long paths, unsupported types, encrypted files or other migration constraints. Identify any shares expected to remain on-premises. CQ-14 — Target platform and solution flexibility: Confirm whether a target platform/tenant has already been selected or platform selection and tenant establishment are in scope. Clarify whether CalHFA will accept configurable platform-based, COTS, Microsoft 365/SharePoint Online with add-ons, and non-Microsoft solutions that meet all requirements, rather than preferring a particular product architecture.
111	7	3.2	Regarding the requirement for "Execute a full clean and shift migration of approved SharePoint 2016 content and Windows file server materials into the target platform" Has a target platform or tenant already been selected for this procurement, or should vendors include	CQ-14	CQ-14 — Target platform and solution flexibility: Confirm whether a target platform/tenant has already been selected or platform selection and tenant establishment are in scope. Clarify whether CalHFA will accept configurable platform-based, COTS, Microsoft 365/SharePoint Online with add-ons, and non-Microsoft solutions

Source Entry	RFP page	RFP section	Original question (full text)	Consolidated ID(s)	Mapped consolidated question(s)
			platform selection and tenant establishment in their implementation scope? Has CalHFA seen demos of any target platform within last few months? Given what you know about SharePoint, does SharePoint Online/Microsoft 365 plus a Document Management Add-on such as KnowledgeLake satisfy this requirement?		that meet all requirements, rather than preferring a particular product architecture.
112	7	3.2	Can CalHFA share an available source-content profile showing file formats and unusually large, encrypted or otherwise migration-sensitive files?	CQ-01, CQ-02	CQ-01 — Migration inventory — SharePoint 2016: Please provide the SharePoint 2016 migration baseline: content databases, site collections, sites, libraries/lists, document and non-document item counts (including attachments and versions), total stored size, file-type profile, active users, and material farm solutions, service applications, third-party products, custom code, InfoPath/MySites or other customizations. Identify unusually large, encrypted, unsupported, long-path or otherwise migration-sensitive content, and confirm whether existing inventory/schema exports will be available. CQ-02 — Migration inventory — Windows file servers: Please provide the Windows file-server migration baseline: number of servers, repositories/shares and archival stores; total data volume and file count; primary file types; age and active-versus-archive distribution; permissions complexity; and known long paths, unsupported types, encrypted files or other migration constraints. Identify any shares expected to remain on-premises.
113	7	3.2	Does the existing capture software provide a supported connector or API that exports scanned documents and their metadata to the target repository?	CQ-10	CQ-10 — Scanning, fax, barcode and batch capture: Describe the current and target scanning, fax, barcode-recognition and batch-ingestion environment: devices, capture software/tools and versions, barcode formats and separation rules, connectors/APIs or file-drop methods, metadata/content-type assignment, OCR status and output (searchable PDF, indexed text or both), annual/daily volumes, peak batch sizes, three-year growth, accuracy/quality targets, back-file conversion scope, and go-live integrations/use cases.
114	7	3.2	What available annual document/page counts and peak batch sizes should vendors use to size scanning and OCR processing?	CQ-10	CQ-10 — Scanning, fax, barcode and batch capture: Describe the current and target scanning, fax, barcode-recognition and batch-ingestion environment: devices, capture software/tools and versions, barcode formats and separation rules, connectors/APIs or file-drop methods, metadata/content-type assignment, OCR status and output (searchable PDF, indexed text or both), annual/daily volumes, peak batch sizes, three-year growth, accuracy/quality targets, back-file conversion scope, and go-live integrations/use cases.
115	7	3.2	Can CalHFA share available barcode formats and batch-separation rules used to identify documents and populate metadata?	CQ-10	CQ-10 — Scanning, fax, barcode and batch capture: Describe the current and target scanning, fax, barcode-recognition and batch-ingestion environment: devices, capture software/tools and versions, barcode formats and separation rules, connectors/APIs or file-drop methods, metadata/content-type assignment, OCR status and output (searchable PDF, indexed text or both), annual/daily volumes, peak batch sizes, three-year growth,

Source Entry	RFP page	RFP section	Original question (full text)	Consolidated ID(s)	Mapped consolidated question(s)
					accuracy/quality targets, back-file conversion scope, and go-live integrations/use cases.
116	7	3.2	For OCR ingestion, is the required output (a) searchable PDFs, (b) indexed text associated with the source images, or (c) both?	CQ-10	CQ-10 — Scanning, fax, barcode and batch capture: Describe the current and target scanning, fax, barcode-recognition and batch-ingestion environment: devices, capture software/tools and versions, barcode formats and separation rules, connectors/APIs or file-drop methods, metadata/content-type assignment, OCR status and output (searchable PDF, indexed text or both), annual/daily volumes, peak batch sizes, three-year growth, accuracy/quality targets, back-file conversion scope, and go-live integrations/use cases.
117	7	3.2	For email-to-repository ingestion, should the solution retain (a) the message and attachments together, (b) attachments as separate documents with message linkage, or (c) both patterns according to the business process?	CQ-11	CQ-11 — Email-to-repository ingestion: Describe email-to-repository requirements: source mailboxes/platform, current tools, expected volumes and growth, attachment handling, metadata capture, and whether messages and attachments remain together, are stored separately with linkage, or both.
118	7	3.2	Can CalHFA share an available inventory of SharePoint sites, libraries and lists to establish the migration and information-architecture baseline?	CQ-01	CQ-01 — Migration inventory — SharePoint 2016: Please provide the SharePoint 2016 migration baseline: content databases, site collections, sites, libraries/lists, document and non-document item counts (including attachments and versions), total stored size, file-type profile, active users, and material farm solutions, service applications, third-party products, custom code, InfoPath/MySites or other customizations. Identify unusually large, encrypted, unsupported, long-path or otherwise migration-sensitive content, and confirm whether existing inventory/schema exports will be available.
120	7	3.2	Does the approved SharePoint migration include non-document list items and their attachments as well as document libraries?	CQ-01	CQ-01 — Migration inventory — SharePoint 2016: Please provide the SharePoint 2016 migration baseline: content databases, site collections, sites, libraries/lists, document and non-document item counts (including attachments and versions), total stored size, file-type profile, active users, and material farm solutions, service applications, third-party products, custom code, InfoPath/MySites or other customizations. Identify unusually large, encrypted, unsupported, long-path or otherwise migration-sensitive content, and confirm whether existing inventory/schema exports will be available.
121	7	3.2	Should existing permissions and sharing relationships be preserved as-is, or remapped to a CalHFA-approved target access model during migration?	CQ-04	CQ-04 — Migration fidelity and target access model: Identify which source properties must be preserved or remapped during migration, including versions, authorship, timestamps, check-in/check-out and audit history, active workflow state, metadata, unique permissions and sharing relationships, email/message links, attachments, document URLs and embedded links. Describe the approved target access model and whether redirects are required.
122	7	3.2	Should existing document URLs and embedded links remain usable through redirects, or be remapped to target-system links during migration?	CQ-04	CQ-04 — Migration fidelity and target access model: Identify which source properties must be preserved or remapped during migration, including versions, authorship, timestamps, check-in/check-out and audit history, active workflow state, metadata, unique permissions and sharing relationships, email/message links, attachments, document URLs and embedded links. Describe the approved target access model and whether redirects are required.

Source Entry	RFP page	RFP section	Original question (full text)	Consolidated ID(s)	Mapped consolidated question(s)
123	7-8	3.2	Can CalHFA share existing permitted outage/cutover windows for mission-critical document processes so vendors can plan pilot and production migration?	CQ-05	CQ-05 — Migration pilots, cutover and acceptance: State the expected number of pilot/calibration cycles, production cutover window, maximum allowable downtime, and required reconciliation/acceptance criteria for counts, metadata, permissions, workflows and search.
125	7-8	3.2	Can CalHFA share an existing migration acceptance checklist or reconciliation standard for document counts, metadata, permissions, workflows and search?	CQ-05	CQ-05 — Migration pilots, cutover and acceptance: State the expected number of pilot/calibration cycles, production cutover window, maximum allowable downtime, and required reconciliation/acceptance criteria for counts, metadata, permissions, workflows and search.
126	7-8	3.2	For cross-repository search, will Windows file server repositories remain operational after migration, or is search of their migrated target content sufficient?	CQ-23	CQ-23 — Search use cases and repository scope: Provide representative advanced/custom search, semantic retrieval and eDiscovery use cases. For “cross-repository search,” clarify whether searching content after consolidation into the target repository satisfies the requirement or whether live SharePoint/file-server repositories must remain searchable after migration.
127	7	3.2	Can CalHFA identify the existing agency systems requiring integration, with any available API/interface documentation and authentication patterns?	CQ-12	CQ-12 — Enterprise integration inventory: List every CalHFA system/interface in scope for ongoing integration and, for each, provide business purpose, product/version, hosting model, authentication, available API/interface documentation, data exchanged, directionality (link/read-only, metadata sync or bidirectional document/data exchange), transaction volume and delivery phase. Include loan/servicing, ERP/financial, CRM/case-management/partner portals, identity, scanning/fax/barcode and in-house tools as applicable.
128	7	3.2	What is CalHFA’s existing Microsoft 365 tenant environment: Commercial, GCC, GCC High, or no existing tenant?	CQ-13	CQ-13 — Microsoft 365 tenant and licensing: Confirm whether CalHFA currently operates Commercial, GCC or GCC High Microsoft 365 (or plans a migration), current license SKUs, quantities and add-ons (including Purview/eDiscovery, SharePoint Premium and Copilot), which entitlements are Agency-furnished, and whether vendors should price additional licenses. Clarify which vendor/module is responsible for tenant configuration.
129	7	3.2	Which existing Microsoft 365 subscriptions, license quantities and add-ons will CalHFA make available for this project, for vendors to account for when pricing additional licensing?	CQ-13	CQ-13 — Microsoft 365 tenant and licensing: Confirm whether CalHFA currently operates Commercial, GCC or GCC High Microsoft 365 (or plans a migration), current license SKUs, quantities and add-ons (including Purview/eDiscovery, SharePoint Premium and Copilot), which entitlements are Agency-furnished, and whether vendors should price additional licenses. Clarify which vendor/module is responsible for tenant configuration.
130	7	3.2	Will CalHFA provide development, test and production environments, or should vendors include their provisioning and operating costs?	CQ-15	CQ-15 — Implementation environments: State whether CalHFA will provide development, test and production environments or vendors should include provisioning and operating costs.
131	7	3.2	Can CalHFA share existing identity, conditional-access and network-access configurations relevant to implementing the target platform?	CQ-16	CQ-16 — Identity, conditional access and network baseline: Provide the existing identity, role/group, conditional-access and network-access configurations vendors should use when designing and implementing the target platform.
132	7	3.2	For the stated FedRAMP Moderate 'or equivalent' option, can CalHFA identify existing accepted assurance documentation or control-mapping guidance for evaluating an equivalent U.S.-hosted environment?	CQ-17	CQ-17 — FedRAMP Moderate or equivalent: Clarify whether each cloud component must hold current FedRAMP Moderate authorization, be deployable within such an environment, or may demonstrate equivalent controls (for example SOC 2 Type II plus a control mapping). State the evidence and control-mapping guidance CalHFA will accept, whether vendor-hosted SaaS is

Source Entry	RFP page	RFP section	Original question (full text)	Consolidated ID(s)	Mapped consolidated question(s)
					permitted under Zero Trust requirements, and whether an equivalent U.S.-hosted AWS or other non-Microsoft environment is acceptable.
133	7	3.2 – Reference “faxing processes”	Please provide detailed information and use cases for any fax processes that need to be implemented in the new solution.	CQ-10	CQ-10 — Scanning, fax, barcode and batch capture: Describe the current and target scanning, fax, barcode-recognition and batch-ingestion environment: devices, capture software/tools and versions, barcode formats and separation rules, connectors/APIs or file-drop methods, metadata/content-type assignment, OCR status and output (searchable PDF, indexed text or both), annual/daily volumes, peak batch sizes, three-year growth, accuracy/quality targets, back-file conversion scope, and go-live integrations/use cases.
134	4	3.2	May development or configuration work be performed outside the United States using only synthetic data and without access to CalHFA systems or data?	CQ-18	CQ-18 — U.S. data residency and offshore personnel: Clarify whether personnel outside the United States may perform development/configuration using synthetic data without access to CalHFA systems or data, and whether the U.S.-data-center requirement prohibits offshore personnel from accessing production or other CalHFA data.
135	4	3.2	Can CalHFA provide an aggregate migration inventory for proposal sizing, including current data volume, document count, repository count, and custom workflow count, without disclosing protected content?	CQ-01, CQ-02	CQ-01 — Migration inventory — SharePoint 2016: Please provide the SharePoint 2016 migration baseline: content databases, site collections, sites, libraries/lists, document and non-document item counts (including attachments and versions), total stored size, file-type profile, active users, and material farm solutions, service applications, third-party products, custom code, InfoPath/MySites or other customizations. Identify unusually large, encrypted, unsupported, long-path or otherwise migration-sensitive content, and confirm whether existing inventory/schema exports will be available. CQ-02 — Migration inventory — Windows file servers: Please provide the Windows file-server migration baseline: number of servers, repositories/shares and archival stores; total data volume and file count; primary file types; age and active-versus-archive distribution; permissions complexity; and known long paths, unsupported types, encrypted files or other migration constraints. Identify any shares expected to remain on-premises.
136	4	3.2	What repositories, volumes, and workflows are in scope for migration? For Windows file servers, please provide the number of servers/shares, total TB and file count, age distribution, key complexities such as long paths, unsupported file types or NTFS permissions, and identify any shares that will remain on-premises.	CQ-02, CQ-03	CQ-02 — Migration inventory — Windows file servers: Please provide the Windows file-server migration baseline: number of servers, repositories/shares and archival stores; total data volume and file count; primary file types; age and active-versus-archive distribution; permissions complexity; and known long paths, unsupported types, encrypted files or other migration constraints. Identify any shares expected to remain on-premises. CQ-03 — Migration scope, growth and disposition: Confirm which SharePoint 2016 and file-server content is in scope for assessment and migration, the annual growth assumptions for the three-year period, and whether CalHFA or the vendor will classify and approve content for migration, archive, exclusion or disposition. For redundant, obsolete or trivial content, clarify whether the vendor only recommends cleanup or also executes approved deletion.

Source Entry	RFP page	RFP section	Original question (full text)	Consolidated ID(s)	Mapped consolidated question(s)
137	4	3.2	How many existing CalHFA systems need integration? Could you describe the function and type of integration for each system that is needed (i.e., API, Link Based Access)?	CQ-12	CQ-12 — Enterprise integration inventory: List every CalHFA system/interface in scope for ongoing integration and, for each, provide business purpose, product/version, hosting model, authentication, available API/interface documentation, data exchanged, directionality (link/read-only, metadata sync or bidirectional document/data exchange), transaction volume and delivery phase. Include loan/servicing, ERP/financial, CRM/case-management/partner portals, identity, scanning/fax/barcode and in-house tools as applicable.
138	4	3.2	Given the State's Zero Trust Architecture requirements under SAM 5350, does CalHFA require the proposed solution to be client-hosted within its own environment, or are vendor-hosted SaaS solutions acceptable?	CQ-17	CQ-17 — FedRAMP Moderate or equivalent: Clarify whether each cloud component must hold current FedRAMP Moderate authorization, be deployable within such an environment, or may demonstrate equivalent controls (for example SOC 2 Type II plus a control mapping). State the evidence and control-mapping guidance CalHFA will accept, whether vendor-hosted SaaS is permitted under Zero Trust requirements, and whether an equivalent U.S.-hosted AWS or other non-Microsoft environment is acceptable.
140	4	3.2	Please provide the approximate total volume (GB/TB) and file count of the Windows file server shares and archival storage in scope for inventory and migration. Variant Question 1: Please provide available sizing information for the Windows file-server repositories in scope, including the number of servers or shares, approximate file count, total storage volume, and the estimated proportion of active versus archival content. Variant Question 2: Section 3.2 requires the vendor to assess and inventory the existing SharePoint 2016 environment and to "Inventory and analyze Windows file server repositories to identify shared folders, archival storage, and content requiring migration or disposition." Please provide the approximate total data volume (in GB or TB) and the approximate number of documents or files in the SharePoint 2016 environment and in the Windows file servers that are in scope for migration.	CQ-02	CQ-02 — Migration inventory — Windows file servers: Please provide the Windows file-server migration baseline: number of servers, repositories/shares and archival stores; total data volume and file count; primary file types; age and active-versus-archive distribution; permissions complexity; and known long paths, unsupported types, encrypted files or other migration constraints. Identify any shares expected to remain on-premises.
141	4	3.2	How many custom SharePoint workflows are currently in use, and on what technology are they built (for example SharePoint 2010/2013 workflow, SharePoint Designer, Nintex, or custom code)?	CQ-08	CQ-08 — Workflow inventory and target treatment: Provide an inventory of workflows to migrate, replace or build, with business purpose, current technology, systems/integrations, steps or available diagrams, transaction volume, complexity, priority and whether each is document approval/publishing, records disposition or line-of-business automation. State how many are expected at initial deployment, whether running instances/history must be preserved, and whether each should be recreated, retired, consolidated or redesigned using built-in Microsoft 365/Power Automate or another approach.
142	4	3.2	Please list the existing CalHFA systems the solution must integrate with (for example loan origination or servicing, ERP, CRM, lender or partner portals).	CQ-12	CQ-12 — Enterprise integration inventory: List every CalHFA system/interface in scope for ongoing integration and, for each, provide business purpose, product/version, hosting model, authentication, available API/interface documentation, data exchanged, directionality (link/read-only, metadata sync or bidirectional document/data exchange), transaction volume and

Source Entry	RFP page	RFP section	Original question (full text)	Consolidated ID(s)	Mapped consolidated question(s)
					delivery phase. Include loan/servicing, ERP/financial, CRM/case-management/partner portals, identity, scanning/fax/barcode and in-house tools as applicable.
143	4	3.2	Please describe current scanning and fax ingestion: scanner models or capture software, the barcode recognition software or in-house tools in use, and approximate daily or annual page volumes.	CQ-10	CQ-10 — Scanning, fax, barcode and batch capture: Describe the current and target scanning, fax, barcode-recognition and batch-ingestion environment: devices, capture software/tools and versions, barcode formats and separation rules, connectors/APIs or file-drop methods, metadata/content-type assignment, OCR status and output (searchable PDF, indexed text or both), annual/daily volumes, peak batch sizes, three-year growth, accuracy/quality targets, back-file conversion scope, and go-live integrations/use cases.
144	4	3.2	Please provide available sizing information for the current SharePoint 2016 environment, including the number of site collections and sites, approximate number of documents, total storage volume, number of active users, and any material custom solutions or other components that must be considered for migration.	CQ-01	CQ-01 — Migration inventory — SharePoint 2016: Please provide the SharePoint 2016 migration baseline: content databases, site collections, sites, libraries/lists, document and non-document item counts (including attachments and versions), total stored size, file-type profile, active users, and material farm solutions, service applications, third-party products, custom code, InfoPath/MySites or other customizations. Identify unusually large, encrypted, unsupported, long-path or otherwise migration-sensitive content, and confirm whether existing inventory/schema exports will be available.
145	4	3.2	Approximately how many custom SharePoint workflows and MacroView DMF tag structures are currently in use, and does CalHFA expect all of them to be recreated in the target environment or will the selected vendor work with CalHFA to determine which should be retired, consolidated, or redesigned?	CQ-08, CQ-09	CQ-08 — Workflow inventory and target treatment: Provide an inventory of workflows to migrate, replace or build, with business purpose, current technology, systems/integrations, steps or available diagrams, transaction volume, complexity, priority and whether each is document approval/publishing, records disposition or line-of-business automation. State how many are expected at initial deployment, whether running instances/history must be preserved, and whether each should be recreated, retired, consolidated or redesigned using built-in Microsoft 365/Power Automate or another approach. CQ-09 — MacroView DMF inventory and migration: Provide the MacroView DMF modules/versions, tag and metadata-field counts, content types, term sets, required fields and controlled vocabularies; available schema/configuration documentation; export/API capabilities and formats; and whether Outlook/email filing or other functionality must be replicated. Clarify whether MacroView requires ongoing integration or metadata migration only and whether a migration tool is available or vendor-supplied.
146	4-5	3.2	Please describe the current document-scanning, fax, barcode-recognition, batch-ingestion, and email-to-repository tools and processes that the new solution will need to integrate with, including available transaction or document-volume estimates.	CQ-10, CQ-11	CQ-10 — Scanning, fax, barcode and batch capture: Describe the current and target scanning, fax, barcode-recognition and batch-ingestion environment: devices, capture software/tools and versions, barcode formats and separation rules, connectors/APIs or file-drop methods, metadata/content-type assignment, OCR status and output (searchable PDF, indexed text or both), annual/daily volumes, peak batch sizes, three-year growth, accuracy/quality targets, back-file conversion scope, and go-live integrations/use cases. CQ-11 — Email-to-repository ingestion: Describe email-to-

Source Entry	RFP page	RFP section	Original question (full text)	Consolidated ID(s)	Mapped consolidated question(s)
					repository requirements: source mailboxes/platform, current tools, expected volumes and growth, attachment handling, metadata capture, and whether messages and attachments remain together, are stored separately with linkage, or both.
148	4	3.2	Section 3.2 requires the vendor to assess and inventory the existing SharePoint 2016 environment, "including all site structures, custom workflows, and MacroView DMF tags." For pricing purposes, please provide the approximate number of custom workflows and the approximate number of MacroView DMF tags or metadata fields currently in use.	CQ-08, CQ-09	CQ-08 — Workflow inventory and target treatment: Provide an inventory of workflows to migrate, replace or build, with business purpose, current technology, systems/integrations, steps or available diagrams, transaction volume, complexity, priority and whether each is document approval/publishing, records disposition or line-of-business automation. State how many are expected at initial deployment, whether running instances/history must be preserved, and whether each should be recreated, retired, consolidated or redesigned using built-in Microsoft 365/Power Automate or another approach. CQ-09 — MacroView DMF inventory and migration: Provide the MacroView DMF modules/versions, tag and metadata-field counts, content types, term sets, required fields and controlled vocabularies; available schema/configuration documentation; export/API capabilities and formats; and whether Outlook/email filing or other functionality must be replicated. Clarify whether MacroView requires ongoing integration or metadata migration only and whether a migration tool is available or vendor-supplied.
149	4	3.2	Section 3.2 requires the vendor to assess and inventory the custom workflows in the existing SharePoint 2016 environment. Please confirm whether documentation of the current workflow logic will be available to the selected vendor before migration design.	CQ-08	CQ-08 — Workflow inventory and target treatment: Provide an inventory of workflows to migrate, replace or build, with business purpose, current technology, systems/integrations, steps or available diagrams, transaction volume, complexity, priority and whether each is document approval/publishing, records disposition or line-of-business automation. State how many are expected at initial deployment, whether running instances/history must be preserved, and whether each should be recreated, retired, consolidated or redesigned using built-in Microsoft 365/Power Automate or another approach.
150	4	3.2	Section 3.2 states that the solution "Must allow for document scanning, including OCR. Integration with Barcode recognition software/in-house built tools, for batch ingestion and email-to-repository ingestion," and asks the vendor to "Review and analyze existing document scanning and faxing processes that store documents in SharePoint." Please list the scanning, faxing and in-house built tools the solution must integrate with at go-live, and the interface each one offers (for example an API, a file drop, email, or none).	CQ-10, CQ-12	CQ-10 — Scanning, fax, barcode and batch capture: Describe the current and target scanning, fax, barcode-recognition and batch-ingestion environment: devices, capture software/tools and versions, barcode formats and separation rules, connectors/APIs or file-drop methods, metadata/content-type assignment, OCR status and output (searchable PDF, indexed text or both), annual/daily volumes, peak batch sizes, three-year growth, accuracy/quality targets, back-file conversion scope, and go-live integrations/use cases. CQ-12 — Enterprise integration inventory: List every CalHFA system/interface in scope for ongoing integration and, for each, provide business purpose, product/version, hosting model, authentication, available API/interface documentation, data exchanged, directionality (link/read-only, metadata sync or bidirectional document/data exchange), transaction volume and delivery phase. Include loan/servicing, ERP/financial, CRM/case-management/partner portals, identity, scanning/fax/barcode and in-house tools as applicable.

Source Entry	RFP page	RFP section	Original question (full text)	Consolidated ID(s)	Mapped consolidated question(s)
156	5	3.3	Does CalHFA currently operate on Microsoft 365 GCC, or is migration to GCC or GCC High planned as part of this project?	CQ-13	CQ-13 — Microsoft 365 tenant and licensing: Confirm whether CalHFA currently operates Commercial, GCC or GCC High Microsoft 365 (or plans a migration), current license SKUs, quantities and add-ons (including Purview/eDiscovery, SharePoint Premium and Copilot), which entitlements are Agency-furnished, and whether vendors should price additional licenses. Clarify which vendor/module is responsible for tenant configuration.
161	5; 8	3.3	What uptime, indexing, and search-latency SLA targets are required under the RFP? Variant Question 1: What numeric service targets should respondents use for uptime, indexing, search latency and help-desk response in the proposed eDiscovery SLAs? Variant Question 2: Please share any existing uptime, indexing and search-latency service targets and the workload sizes against which those targets are measured?	CQ-24	CQ-24 — Service levels and support targets: Provide required numeric targets and measurement workloads for uptime, indexing latency, search latency, help-desk response/restoration, and incident-severity definitions for post-migration and ongoing support.
181	8	3.3	Please share representative sanitized Excel workbooks, including large or complex workbooks, to validate native viewing and PDF production fidelity?	CQ-25	CQ-25 — Excel viewing and production validation: Provide representative sanitized Excel workbooks, including large or complex examples, for validating native viewing and PDF-production fidelity.
192	6	3.4	What criteria should govern moving content between hot, cool, and archive storage tiers, and is the vendor expected to define the tiering strategy?	CQ-26	CQ-26 — Storage tiering and resilience: Provide required RTO/RPO, archive-retrieval targets and criteria for moving content among hot, cool and archive tiers; clarify whether the vendor must define the tiering strategy.
194	6	3.4	What annual growth in data size and file count should vendors assume for the document-management repositories over the three-year pricing period?	CQ-03	CQ-03 — Migration scope, growth and disposition: Confirm which SharePoint 2016 and file-server content is in scope for assessment and migration, the annual growth assumptions for the three-year period, and whether CalHFA or the vendor will classify and approve content for migration, archive, exclusion or disposition. For redundant, obsolete or trivial content, clarify whether the vendor only recommends cleanup or also executes approved deletion.
199	6	3.4	Will CalHFA provide approved retention schedules and program-specific rules for holds, overrides and retention conflicts in machine-readable or documented form?	CQ-27	CQ-27 — Retention schedules and triggers: Provide approved records-retention schedules/file plan and program-specific rules, including event-based triggers, legal holds, overrides and retention-conflict handling, in documented or machine-readable form for configuration and migration planning.
202	9	3.4	Can CalHFA provide its current records retention schedules/file plan and existing event-based retention triggers for configuration and migration planning?	CQ-27	CQ-27 — Retention schedules and triggers: Provide approved records-retention schedules/file plan and program-specific rules, including event-based triggers, legal holds, overrides and retention-conflict handling, in documented or machine-readable form for configuration and migration planning.
204	9	3.4	Can CalHFA share existing recovery-time and recovery-point objectives, including acceptable archive retrieval times, for the required redundancy and storage-tier design?	CQ-26	CQ-26 — Storage tiering and resilience: Provide required RTO/RPO, archive-retrieval targets and criteria for moving content among hot, cool and archive tiers; clarify whether the vendor must define the tiering strategy.
205	9	3.4	Should encryption keys be CalHFA-owned, CalHFA-operated, or through a shared-control model?	CQ-28	CQ-28 — Encryption-key ownership: Specify whether encryption keys must be CalHFA-owned, CalHFA-operated or managed through a shared-control model.
218	11	4.1.5	One of the bullet points under 4.1.5 Requirements for Award mentions that “All system data must be stored, processed, and maintained exclusively within data centers physically located in the United States”. Our question is, if a Vendor has offices located globally, can	CQ-18	CQ-18 — U.S. data residency and offshore personnel: Clarify whether personnel outside the United States may perform development/configuration using synthetic data without access to CalHFA systems or data, and whether the U.S.-data-center

Source Entry	RFP page	RFP section	Original question (full text)	Consolidated ID(s)	Mapped consolidated question(s)
			they use a mix of US based project team members, and some of the project team members from their offices located in other countries (Offshore resources) to deliver the project, if CalHFA security requirements are fulfilled. Please confirm.		requirement prohibits offshore personnel from accessing production or other CalHFA data.
219	8	4.1.5	Does the requirement that all system data be stored, processed, and maintained exclusively in United States data centers also prohibit access to that data by personnel located outside the United States?	CQ-18	CQ-18 — U.S. data residency and offshore personnel: Clarify whether personnel outside the United States may perform development/configuration using synthetic data without access to CalHFA systems or data, and whether the U.S.-data-center requirement prohibits offshore personnel from accessing production or other CalHFA data.
220	8	4.1.5	Will CalHFA release the AI Questionnaire referenced in Section 4.1.5 before the proposal due date so vendors can account for its requirements?	CQ-22	CQ-22 — Security and AI questionnaires: Provide the UpGuard Information Security Questionnaire and AI Questionnaire (including all referenced review questions), and confirm when/how they will be released and whether completed responses are due with the proposal.
221	8	4.1.5	Section 4.1.5 makes award conditional on "Agency approval of the Information Security Questionnaire and AI Questionnaire responses," but Exhibit E (page XXXI) describes only CalHFA's UpGuard Information Security Questionnaires. Please confirm when and how CalHFA will provide the AI Questionnaire, and whether responses to it are due with the proposal.	CQ-22	CQ-22 — Security and AI questionnaires: Provide the UpGuard Information Security Questionnaire and AI Questionnaire (including all referenced review questions), and confirm when/how they will be released and whether completed responses are due with the proposal.
288	4 and 8	3.2 | 4.1.5	What evidence will CalHFA accept to demonstrate that each independently deployable cloud component aligns with, or can be deployed within, a FedRAMP Moderate or equivalent environment?	CQ-17	CQ-17 — FedRAMP Moderate or equivalent: Clarify whether each cloud component must hold current FedRAMP Moderate authorization, be deployable within such an environment, or may demonstrate equivalent controls (for example SOC 2 Type II plus a control mapping). State the evidence and control-mapping guidance CalHFA will accept, whether vendor-hosted SaaS is permitted under Zero Trust requirements, and whether an equivalent U.S.-hosted AWS or other non-Microsoft environment is acceptable.
290	3-4 and 9	3.1 | 3.2 | 4.2.4	What vendor-documented licensing and processing evidence should a respondent provide for OCR, barcode recognition and AI metadata extraction in its proposed Microsoft 365 GCC or GCC High environment?	CQ-21	CQ-21 — Supplemental OCR/barcode/AI modules: If required OCR, barcode recognition or AI metadata extraction is unavailable natively in GCC/GCC High, may vendors include a separately licensed, government-available, wholly U.S.-based module? Specify the licensing and processing evidence required.
299	7; 10–11; 13; XXXI	3.2 | 4.1.5 | 4.2.8 | Exhibit E	Can the UpGuard security questionnaire and any referenced AI/security review questions be made available with the Q&A response to support architecture and compliance planning?	CQ-22	CQ-22 — Security and AI questionnaires: Provide the UpGuard Information Security Questionnaire and AI Questionnaire (including all referenced review questions), and confirm when/how they will be released and whether completed responses are due with the proposal.

Appendix C — General Program, Administrative, and Process-Related Questions

The original question text below is reproduced in full from General Program, Administrative, and Process-Related Questions. Each source entry maps to one proposed consolidated question for stakeholder review; All CalHFA input has been synthesized into the official response for each consolidated question

Source Entry	RFP Page	RFP Section	Original Question (Full Text)	Consolidated ID	Mapped Consolidated Question
1	1	1.1	The evaluation-completed milestone states Friday, November 30, 2026, although that date falls on Monday. Is the intended milestone Monday, November 30 or Friday, November 27? Variant Question 1: The schedule identifies “Friday, November 30, 2026” as the evaluation-completion date; however, November 30, 2026 falls on a Monday. Please confirm the controlling date.	CQ-M-01	CQ-M-01 — Solicitation schedule and proposal due dates: Please confirm the controlling procurement schedule, including the evaluation-completion milestone and the interval between publication of Q&A responses and the proposal due date.
2	4	1.1	To ensure a comprehensive and accurate submission, we request three (3) weeks instead of two (2) weeks to submit our proposal after the official Q&A responses are released. This extra time is necessary to resolve current unknowns and properly refine our response.	CQ-M-01	CQ-M-01 — Solicitation schedule and proposal due dates: Please confirm the controlling procurement schedule, including the evaluation-completion milestone and the interval between publication of Q&A responses and the proposal due date.
3	1	1.1.1 | 1.1.2	If CalHFA requires a short-listed demonstration or an up-to-14-day proof of concept, please describe the anticipated timing, sample-data volume, security environment, functional scenarios, acceptance criteria, and required vendor participants.	CQ-M-02	CQ-M-02 — Short-list demonstrations and optional proof of concept: Please describe the short-list demonstration and optional 14-day POC process, including selection and timing, cost responsibility, participants, sample data and environment, scenarios, functionality, and acceptance criteria.
4	1	1.1.2	If CalHFA exercises the optional 14-day POC, is the vendor expected to conduct it at no additional cost, and what functionality and data will be evaluated during the POC?	CQ-M-02	CQ-M-02 — Short-list demonstrations and optional proof of concept: Please describe the short-list demonstration and optional 14-day POC process, including selection and timing, cost responsibility, participants, sample data and environment, scenarios, functionality, and acceptance criteria.
5	4	1.1.2 – Reference “Optional Proof-of-Concept (POC)”	We would like to participate in the development of a POC. What criteria will be used to determine which vendors are asked to develop a POC and at what point in the solicitation process will this be determined?	CQ-M-02	CQ-M-02 — Short-list demonstrations and optional proof of concept: Please describe the short-list demonstration and optional 14-day POC process, including selection and timing, cost responsibility, participants, sample data and environment, scenarios, functionality, and acceptance criteria.
6	4	2 – Reference Project “Overview and Background”	The implementation of software solutions can vary widely depending on project budget. Our firm has successfully delivered projects across various budget ranges. To help us best meet the goals of your solicitation, can you please approximate the anticipated budget range for this project? For example, is the anticipated budget range: Less than $150,000 $150,000 – $250,000 $250,000 – $350,000 $350,000 - $500,000 $500,000 - $750,000 $750,000 - $1M $1M+	CQ-M-03	CQ-M-03 — Project budget and funding range: Please identify any approved budget, planning range, funding allocation, anticipated three-year contract value, or not-to-exceed amount that vendors should use to scale their proposals.

7	4	2 – Reference Project “Overview and Background”	What qualifications are you looking for in an implementation partner? For example, we have all of the Microsoft Partner Solution Designations (i.e. Data & AI, Infrastructure, Security, Modern Work, Business Apps, and Digital & App Innovation); will the proposal scoring take our technical credentials into account?	CQ-M-17	CQ-M-17 — Vendor and team minimum qualifications: Please clarify how the minimum experience, like-service client, implementation-reference, and technical-credential qualifications apply to a prime contractor, proposed module, and disclosed subcontractor or teaming partner, including whether team experience may be combined.
8	4	2 – Reference Project “Overview and Background”	Remote project delivery typically enables us to reduce project duration and costs. Most of the projects we do could be delivered 100% remotely however, we sometimes find it useful to be onsite during discovery meetings, training, etc. Considering the potential effect on project duration, resource availability, and cost on a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 represents "100% onsite project delivery" and 5 represents "100% remote project delivery", what are your requirements on this continuum?	CQ-M-04	CQ-M-04 — Delivery location, remote work and travel reimbursement: Please clarify which activities, if any, must be performed on-site, the expected frequency of on-site presence, whether remote or blended delivery is acceptable, and how travel and incidental expenses must be priced or reimbursed.
9	4	2 – Reference Project “Overview and Background”	Did any contractor or vendor assist with the development of this solicitation or provide you with an initial evaluation, proof of concept, demonstration, pricing, or any other analysis related to this procurement? If so, please provide the name of all contractors and vendors. Are these contractors and/or vendors eligible to bid on this project?	CQ-M-05	CQ-M-05 — Platform neutrality and prior procurement involvement: Please confirm whether any vendor assisted with or is precluded by development of this procurement, and whether CalHFA has selected, standardized on, funded, or prefers any target platform, product, publisher, or technical approach.
10	4	2 – Reference Project “Overview and Background”	We have successfully combined SharePoint Online, the Power Platform (e.g. Power Automate), Microsoft Purview (e.g. eDiscovery and Retention and Sensitivity Labels and Policies), Copilot, etc. with as-needed best of breed third party software products (e.g. Record Point) to implement comprehensive enterprise document and records management solutions; given what you know about these Microsoft technologies, including any as-needed 3rd-party add-ons, on a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 represents “Will not meet our requirements” and 5 represents “We believe that a Microsoft-centric solution is the optimal approach/foundation for our needs”, what represents your view on the continuum?	CQ-M-05	CQ-M-05 — Platform neutrality and prior procurement involvement: Please confirm whether any vendor assisted with or is precluded by development of this procurement, and whether CalHFA has selected, standardized on, funded, or prefers any target platform, product, publisher, or technical approach.
11	2	2.3	Section 2.3 refers to a "CalHFA Response Form and file naming conventions provided in the RFP package," and Exhibit A refers to a "CalHFA-provided Subvendors List." Neither is included in the solicitation. Can CalHFA provide both, and confirm any page limits, font or formatting rules, and whether the proposal should be one PDF or several?	CQ-M-06	CQ-M-06 — Proposal forms, formatting, file naming and submission: Please identify the required response forms, point-by-point compliance format, page and file-size limits, use-case-mapping placement, file naming, number of submission files, and other proposal formatting and submission instructions.
12	2	2.4	Are there page limits for the proposal other than the five-page Use Case Mapping, and is there a maximum email attachment size for the PDF submission?	CQ-M-06	CQ-M-06 — Proposal forms, formatting, file naming and submission: Please identify the required response forms, point-by-point compliance format, page and file-size limits, use-case-mapping placement, file naming, number of submission files, and other proposal formatting and submission instructions.

24	4-5	3.2 | 3.3	What is the expected number of end users, power users, records-management users, eDiscovery users, and administrators who will require training?	CQ-M-08	CQ-M-08 — Training audiences and delivery approach: Please provide the estimated training audiences by role, including internal, administrative, power, records, eDiscovery, and external users, and the preferred on-site, virtual, blended, and train-the-trainer delivery methods.
25	4-5	3.2 | 3.3	What training delivery methods are expected, and should training be provided onsite, virtually, or through a combination of both?	CQ-M-08	CQ-M-08 — Training audiences and delivery approach: Please provide the estimated training audiences by role, including internal, administrative, power, records, eDiscovery, and external users, and the preferred on-site, virtual, blended, and train-the-trainer delivery methods.
47	8	3.2 | 3.3	What approximate user and administrator training audiences and delivery format (remote, on-site or blended) should vendors use for initial training estimates?	CQ-M-08	CQ-M-08 — Training audiences and delivery approach: Please provide the estimated training audiences by role, including internal, administrative, power, records, eDiscovery, and external users, and the preferred on-site, virtual, blended, and train-the-trainer delivery methods.
49	3-5	3.1 | 3.2	Beyond the January 11, 2027 service start, does CalHFA have required implementation milestones, a preferred sequence for the Document Management, eDiscovery, Retention and Storage modules, or a target date for completion of the overall modernization and migration effort?	CQ-M-09	CQ-M-09 — Implementation, migration and go-live schedule: Please clarify the meaning of the January 11, 2027 service-start date, required or preferred rollout sequence and milestones by module, target dates for first operational use and migration off SharePoint 2016, completion deadlines, and whether physical scanning or backfile digitization labor is in scope.
52	3	3.1	Sections 3.1 and 4.1.1 say modules may be deployed and contracted separately. Will CalHFA accept and fully evaluate a proposal for one or more modules, such as eDiscovery only, rather than all three? If so, which sections and exhibits must a module-specific proposal answer? In particular, does Section 3.4 (Retention and Storage) apply to eDiscovery data and legal hold storage, or only to the Document Management repository?	CQ-M-10	CQ-M-10 — Modular proposals, multiple awards and module-specific requirements: Please confirm whether vendors may propose one or more independently deployable modules, pilots, services, or multi-publisher solutions rather than the complete suite; how such proposals will be evaluated and awarded; and which common forms, use-case mappings, cross-module requirements, and three-year pricing obligations remain mandatory.
53	3	3.1	For a full-scope proposal, will CalHFA accept an integrated solution from multiple software publishers delivered under one prime contractor accountable for implementation, support and contractual performance, or is a single software publisher or platform required?	CQ-M-10	CQ-M-10 — Modular proposals, multiple awards and module-specific requirements: Please confirm whether vendors may propose one or more independently deployable modules, pilots, services, or multi-publisher solutions rather than the complete suite; how such proposals will be evaluated and awarded; and which common forms, use-case mappings, cross-module requirements, and three-year pricing obligations remain mandatory.
56	3	3.1	Section 3.1 requires a modular architecture that allows CalHFA to implement, configure, and deploy functional components independently, especially the eDiscovery component. Please confirm that respondents may propose an eDiscovery solution independently of the Document Management and Retention and Storage components.	CQ-M-10	CQ-M-10 — Modular proposals, multiple awards and module-specific requirements: Please confirm whether vendors may propose one or more independently deployable modules, pilots, services, or multi-publisher solutions rather than the complete suite; how such proposals will be evaluated and awarded; and which common forms, use-case mappings, cross-module requirements, and three-year pricing obligations remain mandatory.
63	6	3.1	Does CalHFA have an existing preferred rollout sequence for Document Management, eDiscovery, Retention and Storage, particularly for independent eDiscovery deployment?	CQ-M-09	CQ-M-09 — Implementation, migration and go-live schedule: Please clarify the meaning of the January 11, 2027 service-start date, required or preferred rollout sequence and milestones by module, target dates for first operational use and migration off

					SharePoint 2016, completion deadlines, and whether physical scanning or backfile digitization labor is in scope.
73	6	3.1 – Reference "Proposed solutions must explicitly support and map capabilities to the five document management use cases: Digital Workplace, External Collaboration, Enterprise Application Content Services, Content-Centric Business Processes, and Information Governance"	Please detail what is meant for each use case in this context (e.g. what does "Digital Workspace" mean as related to the desired solution?)	CQ-M-11	CQ-M-11 — Document-management use-case definitions: Please define each of the five document-management use cases in the context of CalHFA's desired solution.
77	2	3.1	What is CalHFA's target date for completing migration off SharePoint 2016?	CQ-M-09	CQ-M-09 — Implementation, migration and go-live schedule: Please clarify the meaning of the January 11, 2027 service-start date, required or preferred rollout sequence and milestones by module, target dates for first operational use and migration off SharePoint 2016, completion deadlines, and whether physical scanning or backfile digitization labor is in scope.
78	3	3.1	Because the RFP permits independently deployable modules and allows CalHFA to make multiple awards, if a vendor proposes responsibility for only one or more specific modules, will the experience requirements in Section 5.1.1 be evaluated against the scope of the proposed module or modules rather than the full combined Document Management, eDiscovery, Retention and Storage scope?	CQ-M-10	CQ-M-10 — Modular proposals, multiple awards and module-specific requirements: Please confirm whether vendors may propose one or more independently deployable modules, pilots, services, or multi-publisher solutions rather than the complete suite; how such proposals will be evaluated and awarded; and which common forms, use-case mappings, cross-module requirements, and three-year pricing obligations remain mandatory.
124	7-8	3.2	Regarding post migration support, how many weeks do you need the support for.	CQ-M-12	CQ-M-12 — Post-migration support, managed services and service levels: Please define the required stabilization and post-migration support duration, any ongoing managed eDiscovery services, help-desk coverage, and minimum service levels for uptime, incident response, indexing, search latency, and related support measures.
139	5	3.2	How many end users and system administrators will require training and will there be any external users? What is the preferred training delivery method, in-person, virtual, or train-the-trainer?	CQ-M-08	CQ-M-08 — Training audiences and delivery approach: Please provide the estimated training audiences by role, including internal, administrative, power, records, eDiscovery, and external users, and the preferred on-site, virtual, blended, and train-the-trainer delivery methods.
147	4-5	3.2	Does CalHFA anticipate that assessment, workshops, configuration, migration, training, support, or other project activities must be performed on-site, or may these services be delivered remotely except when specifically requested by the Agency?	CQ-M-04	CQ-M-04 — Delivery location, remote work and travel reimbursement: Please clarify which activities, if any, must be performed on-site, the expected frequency of on-site presence, whether remote or blended delivery is acceptable, and how travel and incidental expenses must be priced or reimbursed.
162	4-5	3.3	What is the required duration of post-migration stabilization and support, and is ongoing managed support expected beyond the initial implementation period?	CQ-M-12	CQ-M-12 — Post-migration support, managed services and service levels: Please define the required stabilization and post-migration support duration, any ongoing managed eDiscovery services, help-desk coverage, and minimum service levels for uptime, incident response, indexing, search latency, and related support measures.

163	5	3.3	If [vendor name] has multiple eDiscovery partners and scanning/capture partners that we work with and integrate with, would you prefer we provide CalHFA with options as part of our solution response, or would you prefer that we make a single solution design recommendation as part of this RFP response?	CQ-M-07	CQ-M-07 — Subvendors list and named subcontractor disclosures: Please provide the official Subvendors List and clarify the required scope and timing of disclosures and Agency consent for named subcontractors, technical partners, and alternative partner options.
174	5	3.3	Does CalHFA anticipate utilizing ongoing managed eDiscovery services in addition to software licensing, including project management, data processing, forensic and remote collection, workspace administration, document review, analytics and AI workflow consulting, productions, migration, and technical support?	CQ-M-12	CQ-M-12 — Post-migration support, managed services and service levels: Please define the required stabilization and post-migration support duration, any ongoing managed eDiscovery services, help-desk coverage, and minimum service levels for uptime, incident response, indexing, search latency, and related support measures.
182	8	3.3	For real-time help desk assistance, should vendors price business-hours coverage, extended-hours coverage or 24-hour coverage?	CQ-M-12	CQ-M-12 — Post-migration support, managed services and service levels: Please define the required stabilization and post-migration support duration, any ongoing managed eDiscovery services, help-desk coverage, and minimum service levels for uptime, incident response, indexing, search latency, and related support measures.
211	11, 13	4.1.5 | 4.2.7	The RFP states that vendors must "Have the ability to comply with all terms and conditions of the Agency's Services Agreement," but Section 4.2.7 permits bidders to submit a separate document titled "Exceptions to Service Agreement." Could CalHFA please confirm that submitting reasonable legal or business exceptions will not automatically disqualify a proposal or result in a "Non-Responsive" determination during the initial evaluation phase?	CQ-M-21	CQ-M-21 — Service Agreement exceptions and proposal evaluation: Please clarify how proposed exceptions to Exhibit D must be submitted and how exceptions affect responsiveness, evaluation, scoring, negotiation, and the requirement to comply with the Agency Services Agreement.
212	7	4.1.1	Given the provision for separate module awards, will a proposal limited to workflow automation and migration services be considered responsive?	CQ-M-10	CQ-M-10 — Modular proposals, multiple awards and module-specific requirements: Please confirm whether vendors may propose one or more independently deployable modules, pilots, services, or multi-publisher solutions rather than the complete suite; how such proposals will be evaluated and awarded; and which common forms, use-case mappings, cross-module requirements, and three-year pricing obligations remain mandatory.
213	7; 10	4.1.1	Section 4.1.1 reserves CalHFA's right to award multiple contracts that bifurcate the modules, and Section 5.3 (page 12) states that CalHFA may make multiple awards. Please confirm that CalHFA may make a separate award for the eDiscovery component alone. Variant Question 1: The RFP states that CalHFA reserves the right to "Award multiple contracts with multiple Vendors, that bifurcate the modules into separate contracts." Could CalHFA please clarify if vendors are permitted to submit partial or modular proposals restricted to specific work areas (e.g., responding exclusively to Section 3.2, 3.3, or 3.4), or is a comprehensive response covering all three modules mandatory for compliance? We want to ensure a targeted response to a particular module, leaving other modules from response would aligns with	CQ-M-10	CQ-M-10 — Modular proposals, multiple awards and module-specific requirements: Please confirm whether vendors may propose one or more independently deployable modules, pilots, services, or multi-publisher solutions rather than the complete suite; how such proposals will be evaluated and awarded; and which common forms, use-case mappings, cross-module requirements, and three-year pricing obligations remain mandatory.

			your evaluation criteria without risking disqualification for an incomplete scope. Variant Question 2: Section 4.1.1 reserves CalHFA's right to "Award multiple contracts with multiple Vendors, that bifurcate the modules into separate contracts," and Section 5.3 (page 12) states that "CalHFA may make multiple awards." Please confirm whether a vendor may submit a proposal for only one or two of the three modules (Document Management, eDiscovery, Retention and Storage).		
214	10	4.1.1	The solicitation notes that CalHFA reserves the right to "Select one or more Vendors other than those responding." Could the Agency please clarify the specific procurement mechanisms, or circumstances under which CalHFA would exercise this right to award a contract outside of the active pool of RFP respondents?	CQ-M-19	CQ-M-19 — Evaluation criteria, weights and procurement discretion: Please provide or clarify the evaluation scoring matrix, relative weights or priorities, treatment of single- versus multi-publisher solutions, and the procurement mechanism associated with CalHFA's reserved selection discretion.
215	10	4.1.1	If modular or partial bids are accepted, please confirm if vendors should only provide pricing, including the 3-year ongoing maintenance and support costs, for the specific modules they are bidding on, leaving the non-applicable sections of the Cost Proposal blank or marked as "N/A."	CQ-M-10	CQ-M-10 — Modular proposals, multiple awards and module-specific requirements: Please confirm whether vendors may propose one or more independently deployable modules, pilots, services, or multi-publisher solutions rather than the complete suite; how such proposals will be evaluated and awarded; and which common forms, use-case mappings, cross-module requirements, and three-year pricing obligations remain mandatory.
216	7	4.1.1	Under the provision allowing separate module contracts, may a vendor propose a narrowly scoped paid workflow-automation pilot, or must each proposal cover the complete solution?	CQ-M-10	CQ-M-10 — Modular proposals, multiple awards and module-specific requirements: Please confirm whether vendors may propose one or more independently deployable modules, pilots, services, or multi-publisher solutions rather than the complete suite; how such proposals will be evaluated and awarded; and which common forms, use-case mappings, cross-module requirements, and three-year pricing obligations remain mandatory.
217	7	4.1.1	Given CalHFA may award separate contracts by module, may a vendor propose on only one or two modules (for example Document Management and Retention and Storage) and still be considered responsive?	CQ-M-10	CQ-M-10 — Modular proposals, multiple awards and module-specific requirements: Please confirm whether vendors may propose one or more independently deployable modules, pilots, services, or multi-publisher solutions rather than the complete suite; how such proposals will be evaluated and awarded; and which common forms, use-case mappings, cross-module requirements, and three-year pricing obligations remain mandatory.
222	8	4.2.1	Section 4.2 does not say where vendors should respond to the requirements in Sections 3.2–3.4. Should vendors answer each requirement point by point, for example as a compliance matrix? If so, should that go within Exhibit A Section III ("Required Services") or in a separate document?	CQ-M-06	CQ-M-06 — Proposal forms, formatting, file naming and submission: Please identify the required response forms, point-by-point compliance format, page and file-size limits, use-case-mapping placement, file naming, number of submission files, and other proposal formatting and submission instructions.
223	8	4.2.2	If a vendor proposes a subset of modules, is the Use Case Mapping document still required to address all five DMS use cases? Or may the vendor address only	CQ-M-10	CQ-M-10 — Modular proposals, multiple awards and module-specific requirements: Please confirm whether vendors may propose one or more independently deployable modules, pilots,

			the use cases relevant to its proposed modules without being deemed non-responsive?		services, or multi-publisher solutions rather than the complete suite; how such proposals will be evaluated and awarded; and which common forms, use-case mappings, cross-module requirements, and three-year pricing obligations remain mandatory.
224	11	4.2.2	For the 'Use Case Mapping of the five Document Management System (DMS) use cases', do we need to put the response in the main proposal, as well as submit a separate document as mentioned within 5 page limit, or only submit a separate document of 5 page response, and mention in the proposal under that section, that a separate document has been submitted for this part of the response following the naming convention.	CQ-M-06	CQ-M-06 — Proposal forms, formatting, file naming and submission: Please identify the required response forms, point-by-point compliance format, page and file-size limits, use-case-mapping placement, file naming, number of submission files, and other proposal formatting and submission instructions.
225	9	4.2.4	Is there a required cost proposal template? For SaaS solutions, where Section 4.2.4 asks for the "cost of creation and installation," may vendors price annual subscriptions based on data volume or users, with one-time services such as implementation, migration and training listed separately? Should pricing cover only the three-year term, or also include option years?	CQ-M-13	CQ-M-13 — Cost proposal structure, inclusions and commercial models: Please clarify the required cost-proposal form and three-year pricing scope, including implementation, migration, subscriptions, storage tiers and overages, support, maintenance, training, third-party and optional services, POC or integration fees, rate cards, managed services, and permitted SaaS or alternative commercial models.
226	9	4.2.4	Does the three-year pricing requirement include all implementation, migration, configuration, licensing/subscription, storage, support, maintenance, training, and third-party costs?	CQ-M-13	CQ-M-13 — Cost proposal structure, inclusions and commercial models: Please clarify the required cost-proposal form and three-year pricing scope, including implementation, migration, subscriptions, storage tiers and overages, support, maintenance, training, third-party and optional services, POC or integration fees, rate cards, managed services, and permitted SaaS or alternative commercial models.
227	9	4.2.4	Could CalHFA please provide the estimated budget range or anticipated funding allocation for this project, including the expected total contract value over the three-year period, to help vendors develop an appropriately scoped and cost-effective proposal?	CQ-M-03	CQ-M-03 — Project budget and funding range: Please identify any approved budget, planning range, funding allocation, anticipated three-year contract value, or not-to-exceed amount that vendors should use to scale their proposals.
228	9	4.2.4	Please provide the estimated number of eDiscovery users by role, including administrators, litigation-support personnel, attorneys, investigators, document reviewers, Public Records Act personnel, and occasional users.	CQ-M-15	CQ-M-15 — eDiscovery and content sizing assumptions: Please provide the user, collaborator, role, storage, content-growth, matter, custodian, ingestion, processing, OCR/barcode/AI extraction, reviewer, administrator, and other capacity assumptions vendors should use for comparable three-year licensing, hosting, performance, and pricing.
229	9	4.2.4	For purposes of comparable three-year pricing, please provide CalHFA's estimated Year 1 through Year 3 eDiscovery storage and hosting volumes, annual ingestion and processing volumes, user counts, matter counts, and any expected growth assumptions.	CQ-M-15	CQ-M-15 — eDiscovery and content sizing assumptions: Please provide the user, collaborator, role, storage, content-growth, matter, custodian, ingestion, processing, OCR/barcode/AI extraction, reviewer, administrator, and other capacity assumptions vendors should use for comparable three-year licensing, hosting, performance, and pricing.
230	9	4.2.4	May respondents propose alternative eDiscovery commercial models, including enterprise subscription, consumption or data-based, user-based, or hybrid pricing, provided the proposal clearly identifies assumptions and presents CalHFA's anticipated total three-year cost?	CQ-M-13	CQ-M-13 — Cost proposal structure, inclusions and commercial models: Please clarify the required cost-proposal form and three-year pricing scope, including implementation, migration, subscriptions, storage tiers and overages, support, maintenance, training, third-party and optional services, POC or integration fees,

					rate cards, managed services, and permitted SaaS or alternative commercial models.
231	9	4.2.4	May respondents provide hourly rate cards and/or managed-service pricing for optional eDiscovery services such as project management, data processing, forensic and remote collection, workspace administration, document review, analytics and AI workflow consulting, productions, migration, and technical support?	CQ-M-13	CQ-M-13 — Cost proposal structure, inclusions and commercial models: Please clarify the required cost-proposal form and three-year pricing scope, including implementation, migration, subscriptions, storage tiers and overages, support, maintenance, training, third-party and optional services, POC or integration fees, rate cards, managed services, and permitted SaaS or alternative commercial models.
232	9	4.2.4	If modules may be awarded separately, should the mandatory three-year cost schedule and tiered storage pricing cover only each proposed module?	CQ-M-10	CQ-M-10 — Modular proposals, multiple awards and module-specific requirements: Please confirm whether vendors may propose one or more independently deployable modules, pilots, services, or multi-publisher solutions rather than the complete suite; how such proposals will be evaluated and awarded; and which common forms, use-case mappings, cross-module requirements, and three-year pricing obligations remain mandatory.
233	9	4.2.4	Where should respondents itemize any optional integration or POC fees in the required cost submission?	CQ-M-13	CQ-M-13 — Cost proposal structure, inclusions and commercial models: Please clarify the required cost-proposal form and three-year pricing scope, including implementation, migration, subscriptions, storage tiers and overages, support, maintenance, training, third-party and optional services, POC or integration fees, rate cards, managed services, and permitted SaaS or alternative commercial models.
234	12	4.2.4	Is an existing approved budget range available for the three-year implementation, licensing, storage and support cost response based on internal CalHFA budgeting for the project?	CQ-M-03	CQ-M-03 — Project budget and funding range: Please identify any approved budget, planning range, funding allocation, anticipated three-year contract value, or not-to-exceed amount that vendors should use to scale their proposals.
235	12	4.2.4	Should vendors include all new software subscriptions in their three-year price response, or separately identify subscriptions to be purchased directly by CalHFA?	CQ-M-13	CQ-M-13 — Cost proposal structure, inclusions and commercial models: Please clarify the required cost-proposal form and three-year pricing scope, including implementation, migration, subscriptions, storage tiers and overages, support, maintenance, training, third-party and optional services, POC or integration fees, rate cards, managed services, and permitted SaaS or alternative commercial models.
236	9	4.2.4	Which existing CalHFA Microsoft 365 or related licenses will be available to the selected vendor and should be excluded from incremental licensing costs in the three-year proposal?	CQ-M-14	CQ-M-14 — Existing licenses and incremental subscription costs: Please identify the existing Microsoft 365, SharePoint, Purview/eDiscovery, government-cloud, storage, and related entitlements CalHFA will provide or expects vendors to reuse, and which incremental licenses or subscriptions must be included in proposed pricing.
237	9	4.2.4	Is there a required cost proposal form, and does CalHFA prefer implementation and migration services to be priced as fixed fee by milestone or as time and materials?	CQ-M-13	CQ-M-13 — Cost proposal structure, inclusions and commercial models: Please clarify the required cost-proposal form and three-year pricing scope, including implementation, migration, subscriptions, storage tiers and overages, support, maintenance, training, third-party and optional services, POC or integration fees, rate cards, managed services, and permitted SaaS or alternative commercial models.
238	9	4.2.4	Has CalHFA established a budget or not-to-exceed amount for this engagement that vendors can use to scale their proposals?	CQ-M-03	CQ-M-03 — Project budget and funding range: Please identify any approved budget, planning range, funding allocation, anticipated

					three-year contract value, or not-to-exceed amount that vendors should use to scale their proposals.
239	9	4.2.4	Section 4.2.4 asks vendors to "Specify the cost for each data storage tier and the features associated with each tier" and to "Describe the pricing and fees applied when data usage exceeds allocated limits." So that all cost proposals use the same basis, please provide the expected annual number of eDiscovery requests (subpoenas, Public Records Act, Information Practices Act, California Civil Rights Department and litigation discovery requests, as listed in Section 3.1), the typical size of a collection, the volume of data currently under litigation hold, and the expected annual growth of stored content.	CQ-M-13	CQ-M-13 — Cost proposal structure, inclusions and commercial models: Please clarify the required cost-proposal form and three-year pricing scope, including implementation, migration, subscriptions, storage tiers and overages, support, maintenance, training, third-party and optional services, POC or integration fees, rate cards, managed services, and permitted SaaS or alternative commercial models.
240	9	4.2.4	Section 4.1.1 (page 7) allows CalHFA to award the modules as separate contracts. Please confirm whether the costs requested in Section 4.2.4 should be itemized separately for each module (Document Management, eDiscovery, Retention and Storage) so that CalHFA can award by module.	CQ-M-10	CQ-M-10 — Modular proposals, multiple awards and module-specific requirements: Please confirm whether vendors may propose one or more independently deployable modules, pilots, services, or multi-publisher solutions rather than the complete suite; how such proposals will be evaluated and awarded; and which common forms, use-case mappings, cross-module requirements, and three-year pricing obligations remain mandatory.
241	9	4.2.5	Section 4.2.5 and Exhibit B (pages VIII-IX) address SB and DVBE participation. May a prime contractor that is not California-certified as an SB or DVBE receive SB or DVBE participation consideration through the use of California-certified SB or DVBE subcontractors, subject to CalHFA's prior written consent to subcontracting under Section 28 of the Exhibit D Services Agreement (page XXVI)?	CQ-M-20	CQ-M-20 — SB/DVBE participation and scoring: Please clarify how SB/DVBE certification and participation through certified subcontractors affect evaluation or scoring, including any preferences, weights, evidence, and consent requirements.
242	10	4.2.7	Will exceptions listed in the "Exceptions to Service Agreement" document affect a proposal's evaluation score or responsiveness? Exhibit D is written for hourly professional services. Will CalHFA consider including the vendor's standard SaaS subscription terms, service level agreement and data processing addendum as attachments to the final agreement?	CQ-M-21	CQ-M-21 — Service Agreement exceptions and proposal evaluation: Please clarify how proposed exceptions to Exhibit D must be submitted and how exceptions affect responsiveness, evaluation, scoring, negotiation, and the requirement to comply with the Agency Services Agreement.
243	13	4.2.7	Regarding Section 4.2.7, which outlines the process for proposing exceptions to Exhibit D, could the Agency clarify how these exceptions are weighted in the evaluation criteria? Specifically, will a proposal that contains zero exceptions receive a scoring preference or a higher technical ranking over a proposal that submits an "Exceptions to Service Agreement" document?	CQ-M-21	CQ-M-21 — Service Agreement exceptions and proposal evaluation: Please clarify how proposed exceptions to Exhibit D must be submitted and how exceptions affect responsiveness, evaluation, scoring, negotiation, and the requirement to comply with the Agency Services Agreement.
244	10	4.2.7	Exhibit D, Section 4 (page XIV) sets compensation as an hourly rate with a not-to-exceed amount for the entire term, while Section 4.2.4 (page 9) asks for three-year itemized costs including storage tiers, overage fees and billing frequency. Section 4.2.7 states that the Services Agreement terms are "generally non-negotiable." Please	CQ-M-16	CQ-M-16 — Compensation, billing, acceptance and pricing assumptions: Please reconcile the Exhibit D hourly not-to-exceed compensation terms with the requested three-year itemized cost proposal, clarify whether fixed-fee or milestone pricing is permitted, and state how pricing assumptions, acceptance, invoice

			confirm how subscription, license and consumption-based fees will be incorporated into the Services Agreement, or whether vendors should address this in the separate "Exceptions to Service Agreement" document.		approval, payment timing, and negotiation adjustments will be handled.
245	10	5.1.1	May the required experience and client history be demonstrated collectively by a prime and named subcontractors, or must the prime independently satisfy them?	CQ-M-17	CQ-M-17 — Vendor and team minimum qualifications: Please clarify how the minimum experience, like-service client, implementation-reference, and technical-credential qualifications apply to a prime contractor, proposed module, and disclosed subcontractor or teaming partner, including whether team experience may be combined.
246	10	5.1.1	For a prime/subcontractor team, must the three-year and five-client experience minimums be met by the proposing legal entity, or may separately attributed experience of named project personnel and proposed subcontractors count toward those minimums?	CQ-M-17	CQ-M-17 — Vendor and team minimum qualifications: Please clarify how the minimum experience, like-service client, implementation-reference, and technical-credential qualifications apply to a prime contractor, proposed module, and disclosed subcontractor or teaming partner, including whether team experience may be combined.
247	10	5.1.1	May the prime vendor use a named subcontractor's qualifying client engagements to satisfy the requirement for at least five clients performing like services, or must the prime meet that requirement independently?	CQ-M-17	CQ-M-17 — Vendor and team minimum qualifications: Please clarify how the minimum experience, like-service client, implementation-reference, and technical-credential qualifications apply to a prime contractor, proposed module, and disclosed subcontractor or teaming partner, including whether team experience may be combined.
248	10	5.1.1	May the minimum qualification of five clients with like services be met through experience across the proposed team, including subcontractors and the software manufacturer, rather than by the prime vendor alone?	CQ-M-17	CQ-M-17 — Vendor and team minimum qualifications: Please clarify how the minimum experience, like-service client, implementation-reference, and technical-credential qualifications apply to a prime contractor, proposed module, and disclosed subcontractor or teaming partner, including whether team experience may be combined.
249	10	5.1.1	Section 5.1.1 requires at least three years of experience conducting the required services and experience with at least five other clients performing like services. May a proposing prime contractor satisfy this minimum qualification through the combined experience of the prime contractor and its named subcontractors and/or technology providers?	CQ-M-17	CQ-M-17 — Vendor and team minimum qualifications: Please clarify how the minimum experience, like-service client, implementation-reference, and technical-credential qualifications apply to a prime contractor, proposed module, and disclosed subcontractor or teaming partner, including whether team experience may be combined.
250	14	5.2.2 | 5.2.3	We request CalHFA to provide an evaluation scoring matrix or relative weightages for the proposal response sections, pricing, and demonstrations/interviews or proof-of-concept, so that all bidders know beforehand how the proposal response, and subsequent phases of the evaluations will be scored?	CQ-M-19	CQ-M-19 — Evaluation criteria, weights and procurement discretion: Please provide or clarify the evaluation scoring matrix, relative weights or priorities, treatment of single- versus multi-publisher solutions, and the procurement mechanism associated with CalHFA's reserved selection discretion.
251	11	5.2.1	Section 5.1.1 (page 10) requires "experience with at least five other clients performing like services," Section 5.2.1 states that "vendors shall provide contacts for at least three relevant implementations," and Exhibit C "Vendor References" (page XII) provides four reference blocks. Please confirm how many client references vendors should list in Exhibit C.	CQ-M-17	CQ-M-17 — Vendor and team minimum qualifications: Please clarify how the minimum experience, like-service client, implementation-reference, and technical-credential qualifications apply to a prime contractor, proposed module, and disclosed subcontractor or teaming partner, including whether team experience may be combined.
252	11	5.2.2	What evaluation preference or weighting, if any, will CalHFA apply to a single-publisher solution compared	CQ-M-19	CQ-M-19 — Evaluation criteria, weights and procurement discretion: Please provide or clarify the evaluation scoring matrix,

			with an integrated multi-publisher solution that meets the same functional and security requirements?		relative weights or priorities, treatment of single- versus multi-publisher solutions, and the procurement mechanism associated with CalHFA's reserved selection discretion.
253	11	5.2.2	If a respondent proposes only the eDiscovery component, will its proposal be evaluated solely against the requirements applicable to that component, with requirements associated exclusively with the Document Management and Retention and Storage modules considered not applicable?	CQ-M-10	CQ-M-10 — Modular proposals, multiple awards and module-specific requirements: Please confirm whether vendors may propose one or more independently deployable modules, pilots, services, or multi-publisher solutions rather than the complete suite; how such proposals will be evaluated and awarded; and which common forms, use-case mappings, cross-module requirements, and three-year pricing obligations remain mandatory.
254	11	5.2.2	Section 5.2.2 states that Certified Small Business (SB) and Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise (DVBE) participation may be taken into consideration as part of CalHFA's overall assessment. Please describe how SB and DVBE participation will be weighted or otherwise considered in the evaluation of proposals.	CQ-M-20	CQ-M-20 — SB/DVBE participation and scoring: Please clarify how SB/DVBE certification and participation through certified subcontractors affect evaluation or scoring, including any preferences, weights, evidence, and consent requirements.
255	14	5.2.2	Are there any additional scoring/weightage available for vendors who are SB/DVBE certified? If yes, please provide the details.	CQ-M-20	CQ-M-20 — SB/DVBE participation and scoring: Please clarify how SB/DVBE certification and participation through certified subcontractors affect evaluation or scoring, including any preferences, weights, evidence, and consent requirements.
256	14	5.2.2	Are there any additional scoring/weightage available for vendors who are not SB/DVBE certified, but willing to partner with a SB/DVBE certified firm? If yes, please provide the details, and scoring.	CQ-M-20	CQ-M-20 — SB/DVBE participation and scoring: Please clarify how SB/DVBE certification and participation through certified subcontractors affect evaluation or scoring, including any preferences, weights, evidence, and consent requirements.
257	11	5.2.3	Does CalHFA have a required or preferred date for first operational use of the eDiscovery module following the January 11, 2027 service start, and is a phased implementation with an earlier limited-use or pilot release acceptable?	CQ-M-09	CQ-M-09 — Implementation, migration and go-live schedule: Please clarify the meaning of the January 11, 2027 service-start date, required or preferred rollout sequence and milestones by module, target dates for first operational use and migration off SharePoint 2016, completion deadlines, and whether physical scanning or backfile digitization labor is in scope.
258	XXVI	28	For a named subcontractor included in a proposal, at what point is CalHFA's prior written consent under Exhibit D, Section 28 required: before proposal submission, before contract execution, or before the subcontractor begins performance?	CQ-M-07	CQ-M-07 — Subvendors list and named subcontractor disclosures: Please provide the official Subvendors List and clarify the required scope and timing of disclosures and Agency consent for named subcontractors, technical partners, and alternative partner options.
259	XXVII	33	Please confirm whether the insurance requirement in Exhibit D, Section 33 applies to technology and professional-services subcontractors and, if so, identify the required coverage limits and carrier-rating requirements.	CQ-M-22	CQ-M-22 — Insurance requirements: Please identify the insurance coverages, limits, endorsements, carrier ratings, and applicability to technology and professional-services subcontractors, and confirm whether construction-specific language in Exhibit D Section 33 will be omitted.
260	IV (Exhibit A)	Exhibit A II.H	Where can respondents obtain the official CalHFA Subvendors List required by Exhibit A II.H?	CQ-M-07	CQ-M-07 — Subvendors list and named subcontractor disclosures: Please provide the official Subvendors List and clarify the required scope and timing of disclosures and Agency consent for named subcontractors, technical partners, and alternative partner options.
261	16	Exhibit A "Organizational Structure and Key Details	Our understanding is that Vendor can put a section by name "Exhibit A "Organizational Structure and Key Details" in the Proposal, copy the questions from pages 16 to 22 of the RFP and answer them in the proposal directly. Please confirm.	CQ-M-06	CQ-M-06 — Proposal forms, formatting, file naming and submission: Please identify the required response forms, point-by-point compliance format, page and file-size limits, use-case-mapping placement, file naming, number of submission files, and other proposal formatting and submission instructions.

262	17	Exhibit A I.G	Where a vendor was acquired during the last fiscal year, should the three years of annual company revenue requested in Exhibit A, Section I.G, reflect the acquired vendor's revenue or the acquiring company's revenues?	CQ-M-24	CQ-M-24 — Corporate financial information and capacity: Please clarify the revenue-reporting basis following an acquisition, the working-capital period contemplated by Exhibit F, and the supporting documents and financial-capacity criteria CalHFA may require.
263	XXII-XXIII, XXV	Exhibit D | Exhibit D 19 | Exhibit D 25	How will Exhibit D §§19 and 25 apply to pre-existing contractor tools, third-party software and SaaS services supplied under license rather than developed specifically for CalHFA?	CQ-M-23	CQ-M-23 — Pre-existing tools, third-party software and intellectual property: Please clarify how Exhibit D ownership, work-product, and intellectual-property provisions apply to project-specific deliverables, vendor pre-existing tools, reusable materials, third-party software, and SaaS services.
264	XIV, XXVII	Exhibit D | Exhibit D 1(c) | Exhibit D 33	Beyond workers' compensation under Exhibit D §1(c), what insurance coverages, limits and endorsements will apply to this procurement, given the optional wording in §33?	CQ-M-22	CQ-M-22 — Insurance requirements: Please identify the insurance coverages, limits, endorsements, carrier ratings, and applicability to technology and professional-services subcontractors, and confirm whether construction-specific language in Exhibit D Section 33 will be omitted.
265	XXVI (Exhibit D)	Exhibit D 28	At what stage must Agency written consent under Exhibit D Section 28 be requested and obtained for a subcontract identified before award?	CQ-M-07	CQ-M-07 — Subvendors list and named subcontractor disclosures: Please provide the official Subvendors List and clarify the required scope and timing of disclosures and Agency consent for named subcontractors, technical partners, and alternative partner options.
266	XIV–XV	Exhibit D | Exhibit D 4(b)	Which expense reimbursement alternative in Exhibit D, Section 4(b) applies to this engagement, so vendors can consistently price any required travel and incidental expenses?	CQ-M-04	CQ-M-04 — Delivery location, remote work and travel reimbursement: Please clarify which activities, if any, must be performed on-site, the expected frequency of on-site presence, whether remote or blended delivery is acceptable, and how travel and incidental expenses must be priced or reimbursed.
267	XXVII	Exhibit D | Exhibit D 33	Is the optional construction-related insurance language in Exhibit D, Section 33 applicable to this software and professional-services engagement, or should it be omitted from the resulting agreement?	CQ-M-22	CQ-M-22 — Insurance requirements: Please identify the insurance coverages, limits, endorsements, carrier ratings, and applicability to technology and professional-services subcontractors, and confirm whether construction-specific language in Exhibit D Section 33 will be omitted.
268	XXXII	Exhibit F item 5	What period of operating expenses is intended by the requirement for sufficient working capital to perform without reliance on contract payments?	CQ-M-24	CQ-M-24 — Corporate financial information and capacity: Please clarify the revenue-reporting basis following an acquisition, the working-capital period contemplated by Exhibit F, and the supporting documents and financial-capacity criteria CalHFA may require.
269	1, 4–5	1.1 | 3.2	Recognizing that vendors must propose the work plan and services must begin January 11, 2027, does CalHFA have required initial-rollout capabilities, implementation milestones or completion deadlines that vendors must accommodate?	CQ-M-09	CQ-M-09 — Implementation, migration and go-live schedule: Please clarify the meaning of the January 11, 2027 service-start date, required or preferred rollout sequence and milestones by module, target dates for first operational use and migration off SharePoint 2016, completion deadlines, and whether physical scanning or backfile digitization labor is in scope.
270	1 and 4	1.1.2 | 3.2	For the optional POC of up to 14 days, what sanitized sample content, source and destination metadata dictionaries, permission information and test-environment access will CalHFA furnish?	CQ-M-02	CQ-M-02 — Short-list demonstrations and optional proof of concept: Please describe the short-list demonstration and optional 14-day POC process, including selection and timing, cost responsibility, participants, sample data and environment, scenarios, functionality, and acceptance criteria.
271	1 and 4	1.1.2 | 3.2	What pass/fail acceptance scenarios will CalHFA use for the optional POC?	CQ-M-02	CQ-M-02 — Short-list demonstrations and optional proof of concept: Please describe the short-list demonstration and optional 14-day POC process, including selection and timing, cost responsibility, participants, sample data and environment, scenarios, functionality, and acceptance criteria.

272	1, 4, 10	1.1 | 3.2 | 5.1.1	With reference to Sections 1.1, 3.2, and 5.1.1, please confirm whether January 11, 2027 is the required project kickoff date or a production go-live date, identify the desired production milestones by module, and clarify whether vendor-performed physical scanning or backfile digitization labor is included in scope.	CQ-M-09	CQ-M-09 — Implementation, migration and go-live schedule: Please clarify the meaning of the January 11, 2027 service-start date, required or preferred rollout sequence and milestones by module, target dates for first operational use and migration off SharePoint 2016, completion deadlines, and whether physical scanning or backfile digitization labor is in scope.
273	1, 10-11	1.1 | 5.1.1 | 5.2.3	Are there required go-live or migration-completion dates beyond the January 11, 2027 service start, or should vendors propose these milestones?	CQ-M-09	CQ-M-09 — Implementation, migration and go-live schedule: Please clarify the meaning of the January 11, 2027 service-start date, required or preferred rollout sequence and milestones by module, target dates for first operational use and migration off SharePoint 2016, completion deadlines, and whether physical scanning or backfile digitization labor is in scope.
274	4	2.1 | 3.1 | 3.2	Has CalHFA already selected, standardized on, or committed funding to a target document-management or eDiscovery product for this project, including SharePoint Online or Microsoft Purview, that bidders must retain or implement?	CQ-M-05	CQ-M-05 — Platform neutrality and prior procurement involvement: Please confirm whether any vendor assisted with or is precluded by development of this procurement, and whether CalHFA has selected, standardized on, funded, or prefers any target platform, product, publisher, or technical approach.
275	1–3	2.1 | 3.1	How many internal users (and roles, e.g., Legal, Multifamily, Single Family, Records) will use the document management and eDiscovery modules, and approximately how many external parties (developers, lenders, partners) require External Collaboration access?	CQ-M-15	CQ-M-15 — eDiscovery and content sizing assumptions: Please provide the user, collaborator, role, storage, content-growth, matter, custodian, ingestion, processing, OCR/barcode/AI extraction, reviewer, administrator, and other capacity assumptions vendors should use for comparable three-year licensing, hosting, performance, and pricing.
276	2, 8, and 10	2.3 | 4.2.1 | 4.2.5 | 4.2.6	Is the CalHFA Response Form referenced by the RFP the embedded Exhibits A-C, or must respondents use a separate official editable form supplied by the Agency?	CQ-M-06	CQ-M-06 — Proposal forms, formatting, file naming and submission: Please identify the required response forms, point-by-point compliance format, page and file-size limits, use-case-mapping placement, file naming, number of submission files, and other proposal formatting and submission instructions.
277	2, 8, and 10	2.3 | 4.2.1 | 4.2.5 | 4.2.6	What exact file-naming convention and number of submission files are required for the completed proposal and response forms?	CQ-M-06	CQ-M-06 — Proposal forms, formatting, file naming and submission: Please identify the required response forms, point-by-point compliance format, page and file-size limits, use-case-mapping placement, file naming, number of submission files, and other proposal formatting and submission instructions.
278	2, 8, IV	2.3 | 4.2.1 | Exhibit A II.H	Please provide the referenced Subvendors List and any additional proposal-response forms or proposal file-naming instructions beyond Exhibit A and §4.2.2.	CQ-M-06	CQ-M-06 — Proposal forms, formatting, file naming and submission: Please identify the required response forms, point-by-point compliance format, page and file-size limits, use-case-mapping placement, file naming, number of submission files, and other proposal formatting and submission instructions.
279	3, 7	3.1 | 4.1.1	May a vendor propose one or more, but fewer than all, functional modules?	CQ-M-10	CQ-M-10 — Modular proposals, multiple awards and module-specific requirements: Please confirm whether vendors may propose one or more independently deployable modules, pilots, services, or multi-publisher solutions rather than the complete suite; how such proposals will be evaluated and awarded; and which common forms, use-case mappings, cross-module requirements, and three-year pricing obligations remain mandatory.
281	4 and 9	3.2 | 4.2.4	Could CalHFA clarify which Microsoft 365, SharePoint, Microsoft Purview/eDiscovery, storage, and related software licenses are currently available or will be provided by the Agency, and which licenses or	CQ-M-14	CQ-M-14 — Existing licenses and incremental subscription costs: Please identify the existing Microsoft 365, SharePoint, Purview/eDiscovery, government-cloud, storage, and related entitlements CalHFA will provide or expects vendors to reuse, and

			subscription costs must be included in the vendor's proposed pricing?		which incremental licenses or subscriptions must be included in proposed pricing.
284	4, 9	3.2 | 4.2.4	Please identify the existing Microsoft licenses, government-cloud subscriptions and storage entitlements that CalHFA expects vendors to reuse, and the additional software licenses or subscriptions that vendors must include in their proposed pricing.	CQ-M-14	CQ-M-14 — Existing licenses and incremental subscription costs: Please identify the existing Microsoft 365, SharePoint, Purview/eDiscovery, government-cloud, storage, and related entitlements CalHFA will provide or expects vendors to reuse, and which incremental licenses or subscriptions must be included in proposed pricing.
285	7 and 3	4.1.1 | 3.1	Since CalHFA reserves the right to make multiple awards for individually deployable DMS, eDiscovery and retention modules, may a respondent propose only one module with its relevant implementation services?	CQ-M-10	CQ-M-10 — Modular proposals, multiple awards and module-specific requirements: Please confirm whether vendors may propose one or more independently deployable modules, pilots, services, or multi-publisher solutions rather than the complete suite; how such proposals will be evaluated and awarded; and which common forms, use-case mappings, cross-module requirements, and three-year pricing obligations remain mandatory.
286	7 and 3	4.1.1 | 3.1	If a proposal for one module is permitted, which common proposal forms and cross-module requirements remain mandatory for that proposal?	CQ-M-10	CQ-M-10 — Modular proposals, multiple awards and module-specific requirements: Please confirm whether vendors may propose one or more independently deployable modules, pilots, services, or multi-publisher solutions rather than the complete suite; how such proposals will be evaluated and awarded; and which common forms, use-case mappings, cross-module requirements, and three-year pricing obligations remain mandatory.
287	8-9 and 3	4.2.2 | 3.1	For a module-specific respondent, is the five-page Use Case Mapping required to address all five DMS use cases with separately disclosed out-of-scope dependencies, or only the use cases provided by that module?	CQ-M-10	CQ-M-10 — Modular proposals, multiple awards and module-specific requirements: Please confirm whether vendors may propose one or more independently deployable modules, pilots, services, or multi-publisher solutions rather than the complete suite; how such proposals will be evaluated and awarded; and which common forms, use-case mappings, cross-module requirements, and three-year pricing obligations remain mandatory.
291	3-4 and 9	3.1 | 3.2 | 4.2.4	What source sizing, processing-capacity and usage details will CalHFA provide for comparable three-year pricing of OCR, barcode recognition and AI metadata extraction?	CQ-M-15	CQ-M-15 — eDiscovery and content sizing assumptions: Please provide the user, collaborator, role, storage, content-growth, matter, custodian, ingestion, processing, OCR/barcode/AI extraction, reviewer, administrator, and other capacity assumptions vendors should use for comparable three-year licensing, hosting, performance, and pricing.
292	6-7; 12	3.1 | 3.2 | 4.2.4	What initial and three-year projected counts of internal users and external collaborators should vendors use for document management licensing and implementation sizing?	CQ-M-15	CQ-M-15 — eDiscovery and content sizing assumptions: Please provide the user, collaborator, role, storage, content-growth, matter, custodian, ingestion, processing, OCR/barcode/AI extraction, reviewer, administrator, and other capacity assumptions vendors should use for comparable three-year licensing, hosting, performance, and pricing.
293	7-8; 12	3.1 | 3.2 | 4.2.4	What available annual content-growth estimate should vendors use for the three-year document storage and licensing baseline?	CQ-M-15	CQ-M-15 — eDiscovery and content sizing assumptions: Please provide the user, collaborator, role, storage, content-growth, matter, custodian, ingestion, processing, OCR/barcode/AI extraction, reviewer, administrator, and other capacity assumptions vendors should use for comparable three-year licensing, hosting, performance, and pricing.

294	6; 8; 12	3.1 | 3.3 | 4.2.4	What available annual matter counts, typical/peak custodian counts and data-ingestion volumes should vendors use for eDiscovery capacity and pricing?	CQ-M-15	CQ-M-15 — eDiscovery and content sizing assumptions: Please provide the user, collaborator, role, storage, content-growth, matter, custodian, ingestion, processing, OCR/barcode/AI extraction, reviewer, administrator, and other capacity assumptions vendors should use for comparable three-year licensing, hosting, performance, and pricing.
295	8, 12	3.3 | 4.2.4	What initial and projected concurrent reviewer/administrator counts should vendors use for eDiscovery licensing and performance sizing?	CQ-M-15	CQ-M-15 — eDiscovery and content sizing assumptions: Please provide the user, collaborator, role, storage, content-growth, matter, custodian, ingestion, processing, OCR/barcode/AI extraction, reviewer, administrator, and other capacity assumptions vendors should use for comparable three-year licensing, hosting, performance, and pricing.
296	8; 12	3.2 | 3.3 | 4.2.4	For the three-year support cost response, should vendors include an initial stabilization period followed by ongoing support, and what planned duration should be used for that stabilization period?	CQ-M-12	CQ-M-12 — Post-migration support, managed services and service levels: Please define the required stabilization and post-migration support duration, any ongoing managed eDiscovery services, help-desk coverage, and minimum service levels for uptime, incident response, indexing, search latency, and related support measures.
298	3, 6, 12	3.1 | 4.1.1 | 5.3	With reference to Sections 3.1, 4.1.1, and 5.3, may vendors propose one or more independently deployable modules rather than the complete suite, and if so, will module-specific proposals be evaluated and awarded independently without being disadvantaged for not supplying all modules?	CQ-M-10	CQ-M-10 — Modular proposals, multiple awards and module-specific requirements: Please confirm whether vendors may propose one or more independently deployable modules, pilots, services, or multi-publisher solutions rather than the complete suite; how such proposals will be evaluated and awarded; and which common forms, use-case mappings, cross-module requirements, and three-year pricing obligations remain mandatory.
300	3; 12	3.1 | 5.3	Will CalHFA evaluate proposals covering only specified modules permitted under the multiple-award provision, or must each bidder propose and price all four modules?	CQ-M-10	CQ-M-10 — Modular proposals, multiple awards and module-specific requirements: Please confirm whether vendors may propose one or more independently deployable modules, pilots, services, or multi-publisher solutions rather than the complete suite; how such proposals will be evaluated and awarded; and which common forms, use-case mappings, cross-module requirements, and three-year pricing obligations remain mandatory.
301	3; 11	3.1 | 5.2.2	Please provide the evaluation weights or relative priorities for the five DMS use cases, eDiscovery, AI/GenAI, security, implementation approach and three-year cost.	CQ-M-19	CQ-M-19 — Evaluation criteria, weights and procurement discretion: Please provide or clarify the evaluation scoring matrix, relative weights or priorities, treatment of single- versus multi-publisher solutions, and the procurement mechanism associated with CalHFA's reserved selection discretion.
302	5, VI	3.3 | Exhibit A V.B	What minimum service levels, if any, must vendors meet for uptime, support coverage, incident response, indexing and search latency?	CQ-M-12	CQ-M-12 — Post-migration support, managed services and service levels: Please define the required stabilization and post-migration support duration, any ongoing managed eDiscovery services, help-desk coverage, and minimum service levels for uptime, incident response, indexing, search latency, and related support measures.
303	9; 11	4.2.4 | 5.2.3	What approved budget or planning range is available for the three-year solution, including implementation, migration, hosting, software, eDiscovery and support?	CQ-M-03	CQ-M-03 — Project budget and funding range: Please identify any approved budget, planning range, funding allocation, anticipated three-year contract value, or not-to-exceed amount that vendors should use to scale their proposals.
304	9-11	4.2.3 | 4.2.6 | 5.1.1 | 5.2.1	Are the requirements for three years of relevant service, five distinct like-service clients and at least three implementation reference contacts evaluated for the	CQ-M-17	CQ-M-17 — Vendor and team minimum qualifications: Please clarify how the minimum experience, like-service client, implementation-reference, and technical-credential qualifications apply to a prime contractor, proposed module, and disclosed

			specific proposed module, the bidding prime overall, or the prime plus named subcontractors?		subcontractor or teaming partner, including whether team experience may be combined.
305	9; 11; XIV-XV	4.2.4 | 5.2.3 | Exhibit D 4	Will CalHFA permit vendors to clarify pricing assumptions and dependencies during contract negotiations, or must pricing submitted in proposals be treated as final regardless of scope clarifications?	CQ-M-16	CQ-M-16 — Compensation, billing, acceptance and pricing assumptions: Please reconcile the Exhibit D hourly not-to-exceed compensation terms with the requested three-year itemized cost proposal, clarify whether fixed-fee or milestone pricing is permitted, and state how pricing assumptions, acceptance, invoice approval, payment timing, and negotiation adjustments will be handled.
306	9, XIV-XV	4.2.4 | Exhibit D | Exhibit D 4	For the billing arrangements proposed under §4.2.4, what acceptance, invoice-approval and payment timelines will apply under Exhibit D §4?	CQ-M-16	CQ-M-16 — Compensation, billing, acceptance and pricing assumptions: Please reconcile the Exhibit D hourly not-to-exceed compensation terms with the requested three-year itemized cost proposal, clarify whether fixed-fee or milestone pricing is permitted, and state how pricing assumptions, acceptance, invoice approval, payment timing, and negotiation adjustments will be handled.
307	9; XIV	4.2.4 | Exhibit D 4	Exhibit D §4 provides for an hourly rate with a not-to-exceed amount, while Section 4.2.4 asks for itemized costs including software, storage tiers, and training over three years. Is there a required cost template? May vendors propose fixed-price deliverables for implementation and annual subscription pricing for software and storage, and should the three-year period begin on the January 11, 2027 start of service?	CQ-M-16	CQ-M-16 — Compensation, billing, acceptance and pricing assumptions: Please reconcile the Exhibit D hourly not-to-exceed compensation terms with the requested three-year itemized cost proposal, clarify whether fixed-fee or milestone pricing is permitted, and state how pricing assumptions, acceptance, invoice approval, payment timing, and negotiation adjustments will be handled.
308	12; XIV–XV	4.2.4 | Exhibit D | Exhibit D 4	For implementation pricing, should vendors use Exhibit D's hourly not-to-exceed structure, a fixed deliverable/milestone structure, or separately identified alternatives?	CQ-M-16	CQ-M-16 — Compensation, billing, acceptance and pricing assumptions: Please reconcile the Exhibit D hourly not-to-exceed compensation terms with the requested three-year itemized cost proposal, clarify whether fixed-fee or milestone pricing is permitted, and state how pricing assumptions, acceptance, invoice approval, payment timing, and negotiation adjustments will be handled.
309	10; XXII–XXIII	4.2.7 | Exhibit D | Exhibit D 19	For the Work/IP assignment provisions, is CalHFA's intended scope project-specific deliverables, with vendor pre-existing software, reusable tools and third-party SaaS governed by their separately identified license terms?	CQ-M-23	CQ-M-23 — Pre-existing tools, third-party software and intellectual property: Please clarify how Exhibit D ownership, work-product, and intellectual-property provisions apply to project-specific deliverables, vendor pre-existing tools, reusable materials, third-party software, and SaaS services.
310	10 and XII (Exhibit C)	5.1.1 | Exhibit C	Exhibit C contains four numbered reference-client slots, although Section 5.1.1 requires five distinct like-service clients. May respondents attach a clearly labeled fifth like-client evidence page without altering the original Exhibit C?	CQ-M-18	CQ-M-18 — Reference-client forms and contact requirements: Please reconcile the number of like-service clients and reference contacts required by Sections 5.1.1 and 5.2.1 with Exhibit C, and clarify whether an additional attachment is permitted and which clients require consented contact details.
311	10-11 and XII (Exhibit C)	5.1.1 | 5.2.1 | Exhibit C	What arrangement does CalHFA prefer between the four original Exhibit C slots and any separate appendix covering five like-service clients and at least three implementation reference contacts?	CQ-M-18	CQ-M-18 — Reference-client forms and contact requirements: Please reconcile the number of like-service clients and reference contacts required by Sections 5.1.1 and 5.2.1 with Exhibit C, and clarify whether an additional attachment is permitted and which clients require consented contact details.
312	10-11 and XII (Exhibit C)	5.1.1 | 5.2.1 | Exhibit C	Which of the five like-service clients require consented reference-contact details, and which may be represented by evidence-only descriptions?	CQ-M-18	CQ-M-18 — Reference-client forms and contact requirements: Please reconcile the number of like-service clients and reference contacts required by Sections 5.1.1 and 5.2.1 with Exhibit C, and clarify whether an additional attachment is permitted and which clients require consented contact details.

313	14; XII	5.2.1 | Exhibit C	Section 5.2.1 requests contacts for at least three relevant implementations, while Exhibit C requests four references; should vendors provide four references to satisfy both instructions, or three references would be sufficient for getting the required Evaluation Criteria point?	CQ-M-18	CQ-M-18 — Reference-client forms and contact requirements: Please reconcile the number of like-service clients and reference contacts required by Sections 5.1.1 and 5.2.1 with Exhibit C, and clarify whether an additional attachment is permitted and which clients require consented contact details.
314	10–11; XXVI	5.1.1 | 5.2.1 | Exhibit D 28	May the experience and references of a disclosed subcontractor or teaming partner be counted toward the minimum qualification of three years' experience and five clients, and toward the three required references? Will disclosure of subcontractors in the proposal satisfy the prior written consent requirement of Exhibit D §28?	CQ-M-17	CQ-M-17 — Vendor and team minimum qualifications: Please clarify how the minimum experience, like-service client, implementation-reference, and technical-credential qualifications apply to a prime contractor, proposed module, and disclosed subcontractor or teaming partner, including whether team experience may be combined.
315	10; XXVI	5.1.1 | Exhibit D | Exhibit D 28	For an early-stage workflow specialist proposed as a subcontractor under a qualified prime, do the minimum experience and client-history requirements apply independently to the subcontractor or to the prime vendor?	CQ-M-17	CQ-M-17 — Vendor and team minimum qualifications: Please clarify how the minimum experience, like-service client, implementation-reference, and technical-credential qualifications apply to a prime contractor, proposed module, and disclosed subcontractor or teaming partner, including whether team experience may be combined.
316	11, XXXII	5.1.2 | Exhibit F item 5	What supporting documents and financial-capacity criteria will CalHFA use if it requests substantiation of Exhibit F, item 5?	CQ-M-24	CQ-M-24 — Corporate financial information and capacity: Please clarify the revenue-reporting basis following an acquisition, the working-capital period contemplated by Exhibit F, and the supporting documents and financial-capacity criteria CalHFA may require.
317	VI; XV	Exhibit A V | Exhibit D 4b	The RFP does not specify place of performance. Does CalHFA expect on-site presence at 500 Capitol Mall, Sacramento, and if so, for which activities and how frequently? Will travel be reimbursed under Exhibit D §4b statutory rates, or should travel be included in rates?	CQ-M-04	CQ-M-04 — Delivery location, remote work and travel reimbursement: Please clarify which activities, if any, must be performed on-site, the expected frequency of on-site presence, whether remote or blended delivery is acceptable, and how travel and incidental expenses must be priced or reimbursed.
318	IV (Exhibit A) and XVIII (Exhibit D)	Exhibit A II.H | Exhibit D 10	What scope information must be included in the proposal for each named technical subcontractor?	CQ-M-07	CQ-M-07 — Subvendors list and named subcontractor disclosures: Please provide the official Subvendors List and clarify the required scope and timing of disclosures and Agency consent for named subcontractors, technical partners, and alternative partner options.

COVER SHEET
SAMPLE RETENTION SCHEDULE

The schedule is provided solely as a representative example of the record-series descriptions, retention periods, event-based triggers, exemption indicators, and disposition requirements that the selected solution may be required to support. It is not an exhaustive compilation of CalHFA retention schedules, does not define the complete implementation scope, and does not supersede any current or subsequently approved schedule.

Docusign Envelope ID: 2107A750-3B9B-49B7-848A-66CDD6733A90

STATE OF CALIFORNIA - SECRETARY OF STATE
RECORDS RETENTION SCHEDULE

STATE RECORDS PROGRAM

STD. 73 (REV. 12/2020)

(35) APPROVAL NUMBER											(36)
						RETENTION				PRA	
ITEM #	CUBIC FEET	CA. STATE	TITLE AND DESCRIPTION OF RECORDS *(Double spaces between items)*	MEDIA	VITAL	OFFICE	DEPT.	SRC	TOTAL	& IPA	REMARKS
(37)	(38)	(39)	(40)	(41)	(42)	(43)	(44)	(45)	(46)	(47)	(48)

FUNCTIONAL STATEMENT

Unit: Single Family Division

Function Statement: The Single Family division consists of three sections: Loan Administration, Secondary Marketing Systems Support, and Loan Production. The Loan Administration department is in charge of all functions related to CalHFA loans once they are closed, delivered, and purchased by CalHFA.The Secondary Marketing unit is responsible for managing CalHFA's loan programs from reservation through loan securitization and coordinating all correspondence with our Hedge Facilitator and Master Servicer, Lakeview Loan Servicing (LLS). Posting of interest rates, working closely with our lending partners to handle rate lock inquiries and discrepancies. Managing the overall Agency pipeline for loan closing and expired rate locks. Developing new programs as needed. The Loan Production Department monitors loans managed by outside servicers, conducts loss mitigation programs and manages the marketing and disposition of Real Estate Owned (REO) properties.

ACRONYMS

MAS	Mortgage Access System
MERS	Mortgage Electronic Registration System
SMU	Secondary Marketing Unit
FHA	Federal Housing Administration
HUD	U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
REO	Real Estate Owned

			Single Family Division- Lender Administration								
1			**Lender Certification File-** includes lender application, financial statements: These are used to determine if a lender is solvent to do business with CalHFA.	E		Active + 2 Years			Active + 2 Years	IX	Active until participating in CalHFA Programs. Then Retain for an additional 2 years. Then destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700 Electronic records are stored on H Drive.
2			**Rights and Responsibilities for Lenders:** Preferred loan officer agreement for new lenders.	E		Active			Active		Active until superseded. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on H Drive.

Docusign Envelope ID: 2107A750-3B9B-49B7-848A-66CDD6733A90

3			**Sales Presentation Power Point-** used to assist the trainer and visual aid while presenting CalHFA products.	E		Active + 20 Years			Active + 20 Years		Active until final presentation ends. Then retain for an additional 20 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on H Drive.
4			**Training Surveys**: feedback from the lender training sessions. Training for Lenders and other real estate professionals	E		5 Years			5 Years		Retain for 5 years from date of completion. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on H Drive.
5			**Training Webinar Report**: training report generated in GoTo Webinar. Training for Lenders and other real estate professionals.	E		Active			Active		Active until superseded. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on GoToWebinar.
6			**Wire Instructions**: provided from the lender for accounting purposes to wire funds to them.	E		Active			Active		Active until lender is no longer participating in CalHA programs. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on H Drive.
7	5		**Lender Agreement**: CalHFA and Lender MPMA (mortgage purchase master agreement) which allows them to do business with us.	P	X	Active + 7 Years			Active + 7 Years		Active until agreement expires. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on H Drive.
8			**Lender Correspondence**: Emails back and forth with lender for lender approval and recertification process. The function is for approval and recertification.	E		Active + 7 Years			Active + 7 Years		Active until agreement expires. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on H Drive.
9			**Event Request Form**: Lender requests to CalHFA for participation in Training and Outreach events and to be part of the event.	E		Active + 5 years			Active + 5 years		Active until the day after event ends. Then retain for an additional 5 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on H Drive.
10			**Records Inventory Worksheet-** Records inventories conduced internally within the Division to identify records in all formats in all locations. Includes inventory forms completed by staff and programs, correspondence between the Records Management Coordinator (RMC) and program staff as well as the final, completed inventory. Inventories completed every 5 years to inform the retention schedule development process.	E		Active			Active		Active until next inventory, then destroy Electronic records are stored on H Drive.

Docusign Envelope ID: 2107A750-3B9B-49B7-848A-66CDD6733A90

11			**STD Form 73, Records Retention Schedule** Form completed by the Division and approved by the CalRIM team every 5 years. Includes comments, edits, correspondence between California Records and Information Management (CalRIM), State Records Appraisal Program (SRAP) and the final approved retention schedule. Also includes the amendments made to schedules.	E		Active			Active		Active until revised, superseded or rescinded, then destroy. Electronic records are stored on H Drive.
12			**Destruction Authorization Form** - This form is sent to agencies who store with the State Records Center when their records at the facility have reached their retention period. The agency will then either a) confirm the records can be destroyed, or b) confirm a retention extension for those records.	E		Active			Active		Active until revised, superseded or rescinded, then destroy.
			Single Family Division- Lender Administration- Leads program								
13			**Preferred Loan Officer Profile Form**: form filled out by a Loan Officer to participate in leads program.	E		2 Years			2 Years		Retain 2 years from date of application. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on H Drive.
15			**Congratulations Letter**: CalHFA acceptance of the application of lender to do business with us.	E		Active + 2 Years			Active + 2 Years		Active until lender is no longer participating in CalHFA programs. Then retain for an additional 2 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on H Drive.
16			**Suspension Letter**: insufficient application requiring lender to forward further documentation.	E		Active + 2 Years			Active + 2 Years		Active until lender is no longer participating in CalHFA programs. Then retain for an additional 2 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on H Drive.
17			**Customer Inquiry Letter:** lead assignments triggered by inquiry in website. The inquiry comes in and we use it to refer the potential borrower to our Preferred Loan Officers.	E		Active + 2 Years			Active + 2 Years	XI	Active until lender is no longer participating in CalHFA programs. Then retain for an additional 2 years. Then destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on Leads tracking system.
18			**Leads Report:** report that captures loans and the loan officer that originated for purpose of updating preferred loan officer list.	E		Active			Active		Active until superseded. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on H Drive.
			Single Family Division- Loan Administration								

Docusign Envelope ID: 2107A750-3B9B-49B7-848A-66CDD6733A90

19			**Deeds of Trust:** a legal document between a home buyer and servicer.	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years		Active until loan is paid off and then retain for 7 years. Electronic records are stored in SharePoint.
20			**Loan Subordination File:** For Homeowner's who are refinancing with a hardship. It is used for homeowners who are refinancing and have a hardship.	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years	XI	Active until loan is paid in full or liquidated. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then Destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on SharePoint.
21			**Verification of Owner Occupancy-** Includes: - Owner Occupancy Certification -Borrower Affidavit -Lender Certification Verifies an existing loan term for a homeowner or third party.	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years	XI	Active until audit. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive
22			**Letter To Lender Requesting Repurchase of subordinate Loan:** An email/letter used to request the lender to repurchase the subordination loan completed by staff.	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years		Active until audit. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive
23			**Conventional Loan Underwriting Guidelines-**The conventional loan underwriting guidelines are issued by Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, which are government sponsored entities that buy and back mortgage loans on the secondary market. Lenders evaluate borrowers against a set of criteria to assess the creditworthiness and the risk of lending to that borrower.	E		Active + 10 years			Active + 10 years		Active until publication. Then retain for an additional 10 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on H Drive.
			Single Family Division- Loan Administration-Loss Mitigation								
24			**Appraisal/BPO/AVM:** document that provides a properties value-comparison to other properties in the area. (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File) It is a valuation of the collateral (the property) used by the Lender to determine the value of the property in order to mitigate its loss. It is also used in underwriting the collateral during origination.	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years		Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on H Drive.

25			**Bank Statement:** shows record of a bank account balance, transactions and deposits. We need this to see borrower assets to determine settlement amount. (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File)	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years	XI	Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
26			**Authorizations:** document gives us permission to discuss the account with someone other than the borrower, release payoff,etc. We use this for all communication types. (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File)	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years		Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
27			**Borrower's Payment:** amount due from the borrower on monthly basis (interest, principal, escrow,etc.). (Loss Mit Loan mod/ Short Sale File)	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years	XI	Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
28			**Collection Notes:** notes that are taken every time we talk with the borrower/auth 3rd party, updates to loan. (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File)	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years	XI	Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on SharePoint.
29			**Correspondence:** communication with borrower, internal departments, MI, outside servicer auth 3rd party, etc. Communication may be written, email, phone or via fax. (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File)	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years		Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive
30			**Credit Report:** statement that has information about credit activity and current credit situation (outstanding debt).The report is pulled by lender and provided to us in the request package. (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File)	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years	XI	Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Location: SharePoint and Shared H Drive

Docusign Envelope ID: 2107A750-3B9B-49B7-848A-66CDD6733A90

31			**Decision Letters:** letter that advises the borrower if they have been approved or denied for assistance requested. (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File)	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years	XI	Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
32			**Disclosures:** letters/documents that discloses information. (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File) State, Federal and Agency required information about program or the request.	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years		Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on H Drive.
33			**Affidavits:** a written statement(for example a hardship letter) from the borrower indicating a hardship which is part of the overall information (Loan Modification or Shot Sale package) used to determine settlement amount. (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File)	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years		Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
34			**Servicer Certificates:** document submitted by the servicer to certify the loan has been brought current in a loan modification. (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File)	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years		Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
35			**Financial Statement and Expenses:** statement that breaks down a borrower's income versus the bills they pay monthly. (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File)	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years	XI	Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
36			**Hardship:** statement from the borrower that explains why they are delinquent, what has changed financially. (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File)	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years	XI	Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.

Docusign Envelope ID: 2107A750-3B9B-49B7-848A-66CDD6733A90

37			**HUD Partial Claim Note:** legal document that is signed by the homeowner(s) for the partial claim amount of assistance received in a FHA-HAMP loan modification. (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File)	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years		Active until bond redemption. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
38			**HUD Partial Claim Deed of Trust:** a legal document between a home buyer and servicer for the subordinate lien in a FHA-HAMP loan modification. (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File)	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years		Active until bond redemption. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
39			**HUD Request for Extension of Time:** a request sent electronically to HUD requesting additional time to complete process, deadline extension. (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File)	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years		Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
40			**HUD Request for Variance:** a request sent electronically to HUD requesting special approval. (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File)	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years		Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
41			**Income:** document that provides personal information and details of total money borrower receives. Part of the overall information (Laon Modification or Short Sale package) used to determine settlement amount. (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File)	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years	XI	Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
42			**Invoices:** list of services provided with a statement of the sum due for those services.It is used to determine the fees that have been paid in association with the request, to determine if they are eligible or ineligible, and should be considered to determine settlement amount (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File)	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years		Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive
43			**Modification Agreement:** legal document between servicer/lender and borrower to change an existing loan's terms in a loan modification transaction. (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File)	E		Active+3 years			Active+3 years		Active until term of bond ends or refunded. Then retain for an additional 3 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.

44			**Note- copy of the first mortgage:** legal document signed by the homeowner(s) when closing on a mortgage. It defines the term of the loan for the borrower and lender. (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File)	E		Active+3 years			Active+3 years		Active until term of bond ends or refunded. Then retain for an additional 3 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
45			**Deed of Trust- copy of the first mortgage:** an agreement between a buyer and a lender at the closing of a property. (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File)	E		Active+3 years			Active+3 years		Active until term of bond ends or refunded. Then retain for an additional 3 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
46			**Prior Modification Agreements:** a prior document that provides a break down of a change in loan terms. Used to determine terms of prior modifications to be considered in new terms. (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File)	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years		Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
47			**Payment History:** a record of all past and present payments made on the mortgage loan. Used in all credit qualification determinations, at minimum, borrower must be making satisfactory payments for a minimum of previous 12 months to be considered for modification or loss mitigation. (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File)	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years	XI	Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
48			**Projections:** worksheet to forecast a mortgage payment for a loan modification. Usually a calculation spreadsheet to amortize loan payments and determine loan length and loan terms. (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File)	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years	XI	Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
49			**Reimbursements:** a statement that requests for payment for an out of pocket expense. (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File)	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years		Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
50			**Subordination Agreement:** a legal document that assign which debt holders get paid first for purpose of repayment in a loan modification or refinance. (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File)	E		Active + 3 years			Active + 3 years		Active until term of bond ends or refunded. Then retain for an additional 3 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.

Docusign Envelope ID: 2107A750-3B9B-49B7-848A-66CDD6733A90

51			**System Change Worksheet:** worksheet that gives changes that are to be made to loans such as, UPB, INT rate, term, payment amount, etc. (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File)	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years		Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
52			**System Screen Prints:** system screen prints of CalHFA first mortgage serviced by an outside servicer for a loan modification or short sale transaction. (Loss Mit Loan Mod. Short Sale File)	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years	XI	Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
53			**Title Report:** a document that outlines legal status of a property(shows county, taxes, liens,etc.). (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File)	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years		Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
54			**Tax Returns/ W-2's:** forms that reflect information about earned income for a loan modification. (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File)	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years	XI	Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
55			**Form 4506-T:** form used to request borrower's tax return transcripts. (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File)	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years	XI	Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on H Drive.
56			**Verification of Owner Occupancy:** form sent to borrower to confirm they occupy the property, borrower may provide utility bills as proof. (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File)	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years	XI	Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on H Drive.

57			**Waterfall Worksheet:** a worksheet with data from the loan & previous docs is entered to possibly re structure an existing loan. (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File)	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years	XI	Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
58			**1099C Letters:** letter provided to the borrower who has had debt cancelled. (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File)	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years	XI	Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
59			**Buyer's Pre- Approval Letter/ Proof of Funds:** letter that gives pre approval on amount we will accept, date to close by--proof of where funds are coming from. (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File)	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years	XI	Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
60			**Genworth Approval Letter:** Mortgage insurance approval letter used for approval process in a loan modification or short sale transaction. (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File)	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years		Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
61			**HUD Short Sale Forms:** FHA required forms for a short sale. (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File)	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years		Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
62			**Listing Agreement:** contract that grants an agent authority to sell an owner's property on their behalf in a short sale transaction. (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File)	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years		Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.

63			**Purchase Agreement:** contract between a buyer that agrees to purchase real estate from a seller for an agreed-upon sales price in a short sale transaction. (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File)	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years		Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
64			**Payoff of First Mortgage:** document that details the exact amount of money needed to fully pay off the first mortgage loan required in a short sale transaction. (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File)	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years		Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
65			**Investor of Short Sale Approval Letter:** document that reflect an approval of a short sale transaction for a CalHFA first mortgage. (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File)	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years		Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
66			**Settlement Statement/ HUD-1:** breakdown of all the closing costs involved in a real estate transaction required for a short sale transaction. (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File)	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years	XI	Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
67			**Subordinate Short Sale Approval Letter:** document that reflects an approval of a short sale transaction on a subordinate loan. (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File)	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years	XI	Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on H Drive.
68			**FNMA Short Sale Approval Letter:** document that reflects an approval of a short sale transaction on a FNMA subordinate loan. (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File)	E		Active + 7 years			Active + 7 years	XI	Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on H Drive.
			Single Family Division- Loan Administration Portfolio Management								

69			**Appraisal/BPO/AVM:** document that provides a properties value-comparison to other properties in the area. (Investor Loan Mod File)	E		Active + 7 Years			Active + 7 Years		Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
70			**Bank Statements:** shows record of a bank account balance, transactions and deposits. (Investor Loan Mod File)	E		Active + 3 Years			Active + 3 Years	XI	Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 3 years. Then destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
71			**Authorizations:** document gives us permission to discuss the account with someone other than the borrower, release payoff,etc. (Investor Loan Mod File)	E		Active + 3 Years			Active + 3 Years		Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 3 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
72			**Borrower's Payment:** amount due from the borrower on monthly basis (interest, principal, escrow,etc.). (Investor Loan Mod File)	E		Active + 3 Years			Active + 3 Years	XI	Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 3 years. Then destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
73			**Credit Report:** statement that has information about credit activity and current credit situation (outstanding debt). A letter from the borrower indicating their hardship, which is part of the overall information (Loan Modification or Short Sale package) used to determine settlement amount. (Investor Loan Mod File)	E		Active + 3 Years			Active + 3 Years	XI	Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 3 years. Then destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
74			**Decision Letters:** letter that advises the borrower if they have been approved or denied for assistance requested. (Investor Loan Mod File)	E		Active + 3 Years			Active + 3 Years	XI	Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 3 years. Then destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.

Docusign Envelope ID: 2107A750-3B9B-49B7-848A-66CDD6733A90

75			**Disclosures:** letters/documents that discloses information. (Investor Loan Mod File)	E		Active + 3 Years			Active + 3 Years	XI	Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 3 years. Then destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on H Drive.
76			**Affidavits:** a written statement(for example a hardship letter). A letter from the borrower indicating their hardship, which is part of the overall information (Loan Modification or Short Sale package) used to determine settlement amount. (Investor Loan Mod File)	E		Active + 3 Years			Active + 3 Years		Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 3 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
77			**Financial Statement and Expenses:** statement that breaks down a borrower's income versus the bills they pay monthly. (Investor Loan Mod File)	E		Active + 3 Years			Active + 3 Years	XI	Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 3 years. Then destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
78			**Hardship:** statement from the borrower that explains why they are delinquent, what has changed financially. (Investor Loan Mod File)	E		Active + 3 Years			Active + 3 Years	XI	Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 3 years. Then destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
79			**Income:** check stubs, award letter, unemployment statement, bank statements, bank statement showing deposits (verifies borrower's income received). (Investor Loan Mod File)	E		Active + 3 Years			Active + 3 Years	XI	Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 3 years. Then destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.

Docusign Envelope ID: 2107A750-3B9B-49B7-848A-66CDD6733A90

80			**Invoices:** list of services provided with a statement of the sum due for those services. (Investor Loan Mod File)	E		Active + 3 Years			Active + 3 Years	XI	Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 3 years. Then destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
81			**Modification Agreement:** legal document between servicer/lender and borrower to change an existing loan's terms in a loan modification transaction. (Investor Loan Mod File)	E		Active+3 years			Active+3 years		Active until term of bond ends or refunded. Then retain for an additional 3 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
82			**Note- copy:** legal document signed by the homeowner(s) when closing on a mortgage. It defines the term of the loan for the borrower and lender. (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File) *This is actually a Loss Mitigation document and used for reference here.*	E		Active+3 years			Active+3 years		Active until term of bond ends or refunded. Then retain for an additional 3 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
83			**Deed of Trust- copy:** an agreement between a buyer and lender at the time of closing-states borrower. (Loss Mit Loan Mod/ Short Sale File) *This is actually a Loss Mitigation document and used for reference here.*	E		Active+3 years			Active+3 years		Active until term of bond ends or refunded. Then retain for an additional 3 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
84			**Prior Modification Agreements:** a prior document that provides a break down of a change in loan terms. (Investor Loan Mod File)	E		Active + 3 Years			Active + 3 Years		Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 3 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
85			**Payment History:** a record of all past and present payments made on the mortgage loan. (Investor Loan Mod File)	E		Active + 3 Years			Active + 3 Years	XI	Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 3 years. Then destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.

Docusign Envelope ID: 2107A750-3B9B-49B7-848A-66CDD6733A90

86			**Projections:** worksheet to forecast a mortgage payment for a loan modification**.** (Investor Loan Mod File) Usally a calculation spreadsheet to amortize loan payments and determine loan length and loan terms.	E		Active + 3 Years			Active + 3 Years	XI	Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 3 years. Then destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
87			**Reimbursements:** a statement that requests for payment for an out of pocket expense. (Investor Loan Mod File)	E		Active + 3 Years			Active + 3 Years		Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 3 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
88			**Subordination Agreement:** a legal document that assign which debt holders get paid first for purpose of repayment in a loan modification or refinance. (Investor Loan Mod File)	E		Active + 3 Years			Active + 3 Years		Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 3 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
89			**Title Report:** a document that outlines legal status of a property(shows county, taxes, liens,etc.). (Investor Loan Mod File)	E		Active + 3 Years			Active + 3 Years		Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 3 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
90			**Tax Returns/ W-2's:** forms that reflect information about earned income for a loan modification. (Investor Loan Mod File)	E		Active + 3 Years			Active + 3 Years	XI	Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 3 years. Then destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
91			**Form 4506-T:** form used to request borrower's tax return transcripts. (Investor Loan Mod File)	E		Active + 3 Years			Active + 3 Years	XI	Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 3 years. Then destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on H Drive.

Docusign Envelope ID: 2107A750-3B9B-49B7-848A-66CDD6733A90

92			**Verification of Owner Occupancy:** form sent to borrower to confirm they occupy the property, borrower may provide utility bills as proof. (Investor Loan Mod File)	E		Active + 3 Years			Active + 3 Years	XI	Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 3 years. Then destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on H Drive.
93			**Waterfall Worksheet:** a worksheet with data from the loan & previous docs is entered to possibly re structure an existing loan. (Investor Loan Mod File)	E		Active + 3 Years			Active + 3 Years	XI	Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 3 years. Then destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on H Drive.
94			**1099C Letters:** letter provided to the borrower who has had debt cancelled. (Investor Loan Mod File)	E		Active + 3 Years			Active + 3 Years	XI	Active until the corresponding bonds or the most current refunding of the bonds are fully redeemed. Then retain for an additional 3 years. Then destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on H Drive.
95			**Buyer's Pre- Approval Letter/ Proof of Funds:** letter that gives pre approval on amount we will accept, date to close by--proof of where funds are coming from. (Investor Short Sale File)	E		Active + 3 Years			Active + 3 Years	XI	Active until approval process is complete. Then retain for an additional 3 years. Then Destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
96			**Genworth Approval Letter:** letter provided from mortgage insurer that breaks down approval of amounts we will accept-date to be received by. (Investor Short Sale File)	E		Active + 3 Years			Active + 3 Years		Active until approval process is complete. Then retain for an additional 3 years. Then Destroy. Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
97			**HUD Short Sale Forms:** FHA required forms for a short sale. (Investor Short Sale File)	E		Active + 3 Years			Active + 3 Years		Active until approval process is complete. Then retain for an additional 3 years. Then Destroy. Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
98			**Listing Agreement:** contract that grants an agent authority to sell an owner's property on their behalf in a short sale transaction. (Investor Short Sale File)	E		Active + 3 Years			Active + 3 Years		Active until approval process is complete. Then retain for an additional 3 years. Then Destroy. Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.

Docusign Envelope ID: 2107A750-3B9B-49B7-848A-66CDD6733A90

99			**Purchase Agreement:** contract between a buyer that agrees to purchase real estate from a seller for an agreed-upon sales price in a short sale transaction. (Investor Short Sale File)	E		Active + 3 Years			Active + 3 Years		Active until approval process is complete. Then retain for an additional 3 years. Then Destroy. Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
100			**Payoff of First Mortgage:** document that details the exact amount of money needed to fully pay off the first mortgage loan required in a short sale transaction. (Investor Short Sale File)	E		Active + 3 Years			Active + 3 Years		Active until approval process is complete. Then retain for an additional 3 years. Then Destroy. Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
101			**Investor Short Sale Approval Letter:** document that reflect an approval of a short sale transaction for a CalHFA first mortgage. (Investor Short Sale File)	E		Active + 3 Years			Active + 3 Years		Active until approval process is complete. Then retain for an additional 3 years. Then Destroy. Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
102			**Settlement Statement/ HUD-1:** summarizes all costs owed by or credits due to the home buyer and seller. (Investor Short Sale File)	E		Active + 3 Years			Active + 3 Years	XI	Active until approval process is complete. Then retain for an additional 3 years. Then Destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
103			**Subordinate Short Sale Approval Letter:** approval letter for the subordinate loan that gives the amount we will accept and date to be received by. (Investor Short Sale File)	E		Active + 3 Years			Active + 3 Years	XI	Active until approval process is complete. Then retain for an additional 3 years. Then Destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.
104			**FNMA Short Sale Approval Letter:** approval letter for the subordinate loan that gives the amount we will accept and date to be received by. (Investor Short Sale File)	E		Active + 3 Years			Active + 3 Years	XI	Active until approval process is complete. Then retain for an additional 3 years. Then Destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on SharePoint & H Drive.

Docusign Envelope ID: 2107A750-3B9B-49B7-848A-66CDD6733A90

105			**REO Sale File - Complete File-**includes: REO purchase contract, appraisal, sales and listing analysis, correspondence. (Marketing and sale documents, and management approvals.) Used to collect documents that pertain to the REO sale. An REO Sale, "Real Estate Owned" is the sale of a property that the lender owns as a result of a foreclosure or short sale in which the property was not transferred to another party but reverts back to that lender. The lender's REO Sale file includes all of the documents related to the sale of the property when the lender is the seller.	E		Active + 3 Years			Active + 3 Years		Active until property is in portfolio. Retain for 3 additional years after. Then Destroy. Electronic records are stored on H Drive.
106			**REO Financial File, includes**: REO expense ledger, mortgage insurance claims and settlement statements, tax documents and correspondence. (Receipts, expenses, MI settlements, tax documentation.) Used to collect documents that pertain to the REO sale.	E		Active + 3 Years			Active + 3 Years	XI	Active while property is in portfolio. Retain for 3 additional years after. Then Destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on H Drive.
			Single Family Division- Single Family Production								
107			**Modified Batch-Batch** report of the transfer of servicing of subordinate loans from our approved lender to CalHFA.	E		Active + 7 Years			Active + 7 Years		Active until audit. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on MERS.
108			**Monthly Billing Transaction Report:** Billing CalHFA will receive if we sell any subordinate loans.	E		Active + 7 Years			Active + 7 Years		Active until audit. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on MERS.
109			**Mortgage Loan Transfer Notices:** The transfer of servicing of subordinate loan from our approved lender to CalHFA.	E		Active + 7 Years			Active + 7 Years		Active until audit. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on MERS.
110			**Overdue Transfer Beneficial Rights:** Used when subordinate loan is delinquent on transfer in MERS system.	E		Active + 7 Years			Active + 7 Years		Active until audit. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on MERS.
111			**Overdue Transfer of Servicing Rights**: Used when subordinate loan is delinquent on transfer in MERS system	E		Active + 7 Years			Active + 7 Years		Active until audit. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on MERS.
112			**Paid in Full Verification:** When a subordinate loan is paid in full.	E		Active + 7 Years			Active + 7 Years		Active until audit. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on MERS.

Docusign Envelope ID: 2107A750-3B9B-49B7-848A-66CDD6733A90

113			**Past Due Foreclosure Termination:** Notification of foreclosure of the first loan.	E		Active + 7 Years			Active + 7 Years		Active until audit. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on MERS.
114			**Payoff Reject Report:** Report when payoff is not correct.	E		Active + 7 Years			Active + 7 Years		Active until audit. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on MERS.
115			**Physical Transfer of Beneficial Rights:** Report from MERS when the beneficial rights change.	E		Active + 7 Years			Active + 7 Years		Active until audit. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on MERS.
116			**Registered MINS for Same Primary Borrower SSN, Property, First Liens:** Report form with data fields with borrower pertinent information.	E		Active + 7 Years			Active + 7 Years	XI	Active until audit. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on MERS.
117			**Transfer of Beneficial Rights Rejects:** Report from MERS when transfer is rejected.	E		Active + 7 Years			Active + 7 Years		Active until audit. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on MERS.
118			**Transfer of Servicing Rights Rejects/Warnings:** Report from MERS when servicing rights are rejected.	E		Active + 7 Years			Active + 7 Years		Active until audit. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on MERS.
119			**Transfer to Non-MERS Servicer Verification:** Report of a non MERS loan Report when a loan is transferred to a non MERS member.	E		Active + 7 Years			Active + 7 Years		Active until audit. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on MERS.
120			**Pending Transfer of Servicing Rights:** Subordinate loan is pending transfer in MERS system.	E		Active + 7 Years			Active + 7 Years		Active until audit. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on MERS.
121			**Loan Origination File E-docs in MAS for review and subsequent approval or rejection:** Electronic subordinate loan file from our approved lender upload to MAS(CalHFA required loan compliance documents we request from our approved lenders).	E		Active + 7 Years			Active + 7 Years		Active until funded. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on MAS.

Docusign Envelope ID: 2107A750-3B9B-49B7-848A-66CDD6733A90

122			**Compliance File:** Electronic subordinate loan file from our approved lender upload to MAS(CalHFA required loan compliance documents we request from our approved lenders).	E		Active + 7 Years			Active + 7 Years	XI	Active until funded. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on MAS.
123			**Purchase File:** Electronic subordinate loan file from our approved lender upload to MAS(Includes copies of note, deed and cd).	E		Active + 7 Years			Active + 7 Years	XI	Active until funded. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then destroy. PRA/IPA Exemption: GC: 7927.700/ CC: 1798 Electronic records are stored on MAS.
			Secondary Marketing Unit								
124			**Program Handbooks:** Program handbooks released to the public. These are technically apart of the contract between approved lenders and CalHFA.	E		Active + 50 years			Active + 50 Years		Active until production is revised or superseded . Then retain for an additional 50 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on H Drive.
125			**Rate Lock Request:** MAS generated and is included in loan submission folder.	E		Active + 7 Years			Active + 7 Years		Active until secondary market loan is funded. Then retain for 7 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on MAS.
126			**Rate Lock Extension**. MAS generated and is included in loan submission folder.	E		Active + 7 Years			Active + 7 Years		Active until secondary market loan is funded. Then retain for 7 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on MAS.
127			**Proposed Programs:** historical data on all programs proposed and it includes research and reasons why it didn't move forward.	E		Active + 50 years			Active + 50 years		Active-until production is revised or superseded . Then retain for an additional 50 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on H Drive.
128			**Pricing Matrix :** rate setting Criteria form. Used as a daily guide for rate selection.	E		Active + 10 years			Active + 10 years		Active until publication is revised or superseded. Then retain for 10 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on H Drive.
129			**Bulletins:** Released yearly. Includes who approved them. Bulletins released by year, including who approved them and any political reasoning behind the bulletin. This has been used for historical purposes.	E		Active + 50 years			Active + 50 years		Active until revised or superseded. Then retaion for an additional 50 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on H Drive.

Docusign Envelope ID: 2107A750-3B9B-49B7-848A-66CDD6733A90

130			**Underwriting Matrix-** Conventional/Government including subordinate loans information. Program data that is historical released to the public.	E		Active + 50 years			Active + 50 years		Active until revised or superseded. Then retaion for an additional 50 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on H Drive.
131			**Program Procedures :** SMU desk manual.	E	X	Active + 7 Years			Active + 7 Years		Active until contract expires. Then retain for an additional 7 years. Then Destroy. Electronic records are stored on H Drive.
132			**Lender's Program Manual:** legal document which outlines the roles and responsibilities of lender in addition to guidelines they must follow in order to participate in our programs.	E		Active + 50 years			Active + 50 years		Active until production of manual is revised or superseded.Then retain for an additional 50 years. Then Destroy. Electronic records are stored in H Drive.
133			**Mark to Market Reports:** Excel spreadsheet received from Lakeview via email.	E		10 years			10 years		Retain for 10 years from date of received email. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored in Outlook.
134			**First Mortgage Settlement Reports:** historical information on all securities settled including loan level data.	E		Active + 50 years			Active + 50 years		Active from date report generated. Keep 50 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored in H Drive.
135			**First Mortgage Production Reports:** excel reports that are generated daily. Useful historical information and used daily to document the ebb and flow of production volume/fallout. These excel reports track the loan production data from MAS (mortgage accessing sysytem) database on a daily basis.	E		Active + 10 years			Active + 10 years		Active until publication. Then retain for 10 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored on H Drive.
136			**FSC Rate Sheets:** Received from Lakeview via email. Use for Historical information/ reference material. Rate sheets from Lakeview helps us decide on our daily rates for Loan production.	E		Active + 10 years			Active + 10 years		Active until publication. Then retain for 10 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored in Outlook.
137			**Rate Notification:** Manually updated email. Email notification to notify rates for rate locks. Email with the info of daily rates in production.	E		Active + 10 years			Active + 10 years		Active until publication. Then retain for 10 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored in Outlook.

Docusign Envelope ID: 2107A750-3B9B-49B7-848A-66CDD6733A90

138			**Cal30/CalHFA FHA Reports:** (securitization, pipeline, revenue, and commitments)excel reports show activity on now closed Cal30, CalHFA FHA prior to upgrades to MAS. Excel reports tracking secuuritized and loans that are in pipeline.	E		Active + 50 years			Active + 50 years		Active from date report generated. Keep 50 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored in H Drive.
139			**Cal30/CalHFA FHA Reports** (reservation and cancellation reports) excel reports show activity on now closed Cal30, CalHFA FHA prior to upgrades to MAS. Similar to the report in line 37 this report tracks all the cancelled loans	E		Active + 50 years			Active + 50 years		Active from date report generated. Keep 50 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored in H Drive.
140			**SMU Project Documentation Files--**excel reports show activity on now closed Cal30, CalHFA FHA prior to upgrades to MAS. A report on closed loans prior to upgrading it to MAS database.	E		Active + 50 years			Active + 50 years		Active from date report generated. Keep 50 years. Then destroy. Electronic records are stored in H Drive.
141			**SMU Contracts and Proposals**- Affinity Agreement and Master Servicers. Proposals received via email.	E	X	Active + 7 Years			Active + 7 Years		Active until contract expires. Then retain 7 years. Then Destroy. Electronic records are retained in H Drive.

Total 5

Docusign Envelope ID: 2107A750-3B9B-49B7-848A-66CDD6733A90

