

RFP N° PCD/08/048 – BIDDERS' QUESTIONS AND WIPO RESPONSES

1. Development: what are the existing current environments?
 - a) Design?
 - b) Pre-production?
 - c) Production

We are working with four environments: development, acceptance test, production and volume test. Volume test is available on demand with a copy of production data. We are however open to any new configuration made as part of the methodology for POC.

2. Do you use web servers or application servers? If Yes, which one?

We use open source Apache Tomcat. A true application, open source or not, may be proposed as part of the software solution.

3. Excepted “Adabas and Natural”, do you use other SoftwareAG softwares?

We own the EntireX license and make a limited use of it.

4. How is security implemented? SSO authentication? Reverse proxy? Users? Roles? LDAP? Firewall? Is there a map for the security organization? Do you use security tools compliant with the Basic Security Profile (WS-I)?

MAPS and use Natural security, both have an integrated “role management” as well. the network security is based on Novell NDS and LDAP though. There are plans to move to Active Directory.

5. In which language is the presentation layer currently codified? Is the presentation layer very dependant from the business layer?

If the question refers to the development tool used for the presentation layer the answer is: NATURAL Maps i.e mainframe block mode terminal screens.

If the question refers to internalization the answer is French and English. (communications with outside stakeholders are in Spanish as well. Localization is to become a challenge in the near future.

6. For business modelling, do you use UML2, DSL, BPM? if so with which tools?

Read pages 12 and 13 of Annex I “Terms of Reference”

7. What are the integration tools that you use? ESB? EAI? Others? In the future, do you have in mind any ERP systems integration?

No, we have neither ESB nor EAI. In the future we may consume services of our Peoplesoft ERP.

8. Which SOA skills will have WIPO consultants who will participate to the C2 and C3 projects?

C2 is for the supply and installation of the new SOA platform, C3 is to prove that the new platform fulfils WIPO's needs. The two are tightly related. Consultants proposed to man C3 must possess skills matching software and hardware proposed under C2.

9. What are the methodology tools used for WIPO projects? (RUP, Extreme programming ...etc...)

Read pages 12 and 13 of Annex I "Terms of Reference"

10. Annex I - Terms of Reference - page 8, section 2 "Sub Project Shedule" indicates that the RFP process will partly be conducted in December 2008, resulting in a short list of eligible suppliers in early January 2009. This seems to contradict the RFP deadline date of 16 February 2009 indicated in the RFP cover letter and procurement notice. Please clarify.

At the time of writing the deadline for RFP submission is March 13, 2009. If no further changes occur short listing should be completed during April.

11. What level of documentation is available for the MAPS/DMAPS/IMAPS applications?

There is reasonable documentation for the technical environment and workflow, but detailed program specifications are either missing or out of date.

12. Are there any load modules related to MAPS/DMAPS/IMPAS without the corresponding source? Please advise.

Not to our knowledge

13. Do we need to integrate the internal applications and external applications as part of the MAPS modernization?

If "external application" refers to applications or services provided by external stakeholders (national offices, representatives, etc.) then, yes, our medium term goal is to provide services fro consumption by our external partners, and to consume their services once they deploy them.

14. Would WIPO provide the infrastructure (SOA Tools and Products that we recommend) required for the development of PPOC?
- a) If yes, IS WIPO open to use Open Source SOA products (OR)
 - b) Leading vendor specific SOA platform products?

Open Source products will be considered. However, WIPO would expect such proposal to include how such tools will be supported in the long term. As vendor products would imply support contracts open source would require additional staff or services. This must be clearly shown in your proposal.

Proposed vendor tools must include a full binding quotation for licenses and support.

15. Could you please confirm our understanding that existing legacy application (MAPS) needs to be reused in one of these two ways
- a) Wrap the existing business functionalities into web services
(OR)
 - b) Convert the existing code to java business logic and expose the java business logic as web services

There are more options than that and in fact we might decide on a case by case basis.

- a. ***If we buy a session level web enablement tool (to expose mainframe emulation as Web Services) we shall apply it to the widest scale possible.***
 - b. ***For programs that cannot be converted as under a (possibly all) we shall try to restructure the natural code into a limited number (lest than 7 or 8) of subprograms (hence separating presentation from business logic). The resulting subprograms will be exposed as web services via a transaction level web enablement tool (probably EntireX).***
 - c. ***Remaining programs will have to be recoded (either using Natural or Java) they are likely to access the legacy Adabas database via Web Services exposed via a data level web enablement tool such as the Adabas SQL gateway, or any other.***
16. In the **PPOC**,
- a) How many functionalities are needed to be exposed as web services from a SIMPLE MAPS transaction
 - b) In the SIMPLE MAPS transaction, what is the number of programs, screens, ADABAS files involved?
 - c) Do we need to wrap the existing simple Maps transaction and expose as web service or Legacy migration (code conversion) needs to be done so that converted simple java maps transaction is exposed as web service

As far as questions a and b are concerned we haven't finalized yet the PPOC requirements, we understand that we have to be conservative with this regards.

For c, converting to java would be pointless as PPOC's objective is to prove that your tolls can expose our legacy Natural code as Web Services and orchestrate them. To be clearer: for PPOC WIPO will consider a conversion to Java as a failure.

17. Do we need to demonstrate the following in the **PPOC**?
- a) UI (Separating Simple Maps transaction screens)
 - b) BPM (Separating Simple Maps transaction workflow)
 - c) BAM (Separating Simple Maps transaction monitoring activities)

Yes, all of this and how legacy Natural can be exposed as Web Services.

18. In C2 POC, is WIPO open to use Open Source SOA products OR Leading vendor specific SOA platform products?

Open Source products will be considered. However, WIPO would expect such proposal to include how such tools will be supported in the long term. As vendor products would imply support contracts open source would require additional staff or services. This must be clearly shown in your proposal.

Proposed vendor tools must include a full binding quotation for licenses and support.

19. In C3, is WIPO open to use Open Source SOA products OR Leading vendor specific SOA platform products?

Open Source products will be considered. However, WIPO would expect such proposal to include how such tools will be supported in the long term. As vendor products would imply support contracts open source would require additional staff or services. This must be clearly shown in your proposal.

Proposed vendor tools must include a full binding quotation for licenses and support.

20. Does the Proposed WIPO system need to be locally hosted in each region or centralized?

Centralized, but aren't we looking for an SOA ?

21. At what level the generation of notification messages done (Region level / Office level/ User level)?

The stakeholder are: Office (national or regional), representative and applicant notifications are made to all stakeholders.

22. Please provide the details being communicated to IMAPS/ AIMS/PUBLICATION SYSTEMS?

MAPS/DMAPS are interfaced with IMAPS via a basic "screen scraping" technique. The data passed from MAPS/DMAPS to IMAPS is the Service Request ID, a 9 digit numeric key.

The publication system is fed from MAPS/DMAPS via an XML flow, extracted in batch mode. There are daily, weekly and monthly batches.

AIMS (Peoplesoft) interacts with MAPS/DMAPS in batch mode twice a day. These exchanges are ADABAS records on the MAPS side. On the AIMS side data transits via a flat file to and from ADABAS.

23. Please provide interface application documents/requirements as this may be required for RFP response (esp. solution definition architecture)

Annex I in conjunction with the Sogeti report, and possibly this document should provide sufficient background for this RFP. We would like to underline that this RFP focused on the SOA capacity building, we do not expect a quotation for any kind of full conversion of our applications.

24. What is the existing monitoring mechanism available for WIPO (e.g. Dashboard, Graphical presentation in the screen)?

No real-time monitoring. Statistics are available for the number of documents active at a give processing stage, average time taken to complete an action, actions completed per week/month etc.

25. Does existing WIPO system maintain a history of notification messages?

We are unsure about our definition of “notification messages”:

- ***A history is kept of completed actions.***
- ***Yes, irregularity letters and notifications are archived in the database.***

26. Does the existing WIPO System use any business rules mechanism to maintain and manage the business rules?

No.

27. Can you please tell us the average response times for critical transactions in the current system?

The Online systems aims for sub-second response time (which isn't achieved 100% of the time). We lack formal requirements with this regard.

28. As per our understanding the on line / batch process requirements are needed for the proposed system. Please provide more details about batch processing?

Are you certain that is pertinent to this RFP you are bidding for and SOA software and hardware platform and its proof of concept. You are not bidding for the full modernization of WIPO's trademarks and designs systems.

Further, SOA once deployed my obviate the need for some of our batch processes, for instance irregularities may be processed by means of Web Services instead of sending letters.

29. What are the types of interfaces/protocols that will be available between the WIPO system and the various supporting external systems that are in scope?

The essence of this RFP is to define our protocol foundation

30. At what level the configuration requirements of the WIPO system should be maintained?

-User

-System

Both, it is WIPO's understanding that successful SOA be founded on the ownership of of the business process by the business, who relies on IT to provide the services consumed during the process.

31. What are the WIPO system level dependencies? Please confirm

With regards to trademarks, both MAPS and DMAPS are dependent on IMAPS and AIMS. The unavailability of IMAPS would stop all processing. With regards of AIMS and unavailability of some days would create a backlog for certain processing steps.

32. What will be the approx number of data/message exchanges from/to each of the following applications: Publication System, IMAPS and AIMS

With AIMS MAPS and DMAPS exchange daily 1200 to 1600 messages in both directions. There are about 800 request per hour to IMAPS from the online users. Batch processes add another 3000 requests daily in a 3 hours window. The publication system receives 15 Mbytes of XML data weekly.

33. Are all the message interfaces online or are there any batch processes as well? Please provide information on number of batch processes.

There are no message online interfaces as such in MAPS/DMAPS. They interact with IMAPS passing a simple numeric token via terminal screen scraping and with AIMS by exchanging twice a day a batch of messages.

34. Are there any single sign on requirements for the proposed WIPO web based system?

This is one of the selection criteria of this RFP

35. What is the existing reporting mechanism in the current WIPO system? What kind of output format of the generated reports?

There is no printed reporting being part of the application as such. Statistical features are on-line. Paper is dedicated to notification and correspondence. A medium term objective will be to reduce paper in these areas as well.

36. What is the registration volume expected to pass through the MAPS/DMAPS per day/week/month?

There are 350000 to 400000 instances per year. For more details go to <http://www.wipo.int/madrid/en/statistics/>

37. What level of Disaster Recovery or and High Availability is required?

We should aim at the last completed transaction. But bear in mind synchronization with AIMS and IMAPS. The availability will become 24/7 for services consumed by offices in the Far East and North America.

38. Can you share the current WIPO systems performance/speed (benchmark) details?

WIPO hasn't such figures. At present the systems offers sub-second (< half second) response .

39. (What is the proposed response time and resolution time?

As far as response is concerned see the previous question. We are unsure about what you refer to with regards to "resolution time", issue resolution ?

40. We assume that response time will exclude network latency, browser rendering and external system response time. Is our assumption correct?

This is correct.

41. Have these external system been exposed as services? What is the Network protocol on which they Interact (HTTP/JMS) with Publication System? What are the availability and reliability constraints on each of these external systems? What are the security requirements for each of these systems?

None of our systems consumes web services at this stage. What is envisaged are SOAP/Http piles and/or for CRUD type of services a REST architecture, which implies HTTP, of course.

42. Should the solution be based on an enterprise style portal?

Yes, this is an acceptable option but this is not required because WIPO would like to minimize as much as possible the number of technologies / tools

43. In the proposed System, what must be audited? User operations? Data in general?

As far as data is concerned we must be able to retain the current create/update & user/program/time traces.

44. What is assembler object? Is it related to Assembly language?

Yes it refers to assembly language, but there are very few.

45. Does WIPO require an Effort / Pricing estimate along with the technical solution? If not, is WIPO planning for a staff augmentation with Time & Material model of billing?

WIPO requires under POC a proposal for a full life cycle project structure, with profiles of all participants. Bidders are invited to propose consultants, on a time and material basis, to fill the profiles they recommend. It is WIPO's plan to fill some the recommended profiles with its own staff.

46. What is the approximate project completion timeline WIPO has in mind?

For POC, the completion should be as close as possible to October 2009. But POC (Proof of concept) has two objectives: proof of concept, and acquisition of skills, methodology, etc. for WIPO. Hence POC's duration must be consistent with these objectives, the system deliverable will be chosen accordingly.

47. We understand that the developed code will be deployed in existing Data center used by WIPO. Is this correct or any hosting requirements are in scope?

No hosting requirement falls with the scope of this RFP.

48. Is there any third party involvement in the project?

Ideally C2, C3 would be carried out between WIPO and one external party, but this is not guaranteed there may 2 or 3 successful bidders, each being awarded a portion of the deal.

49. Is there any requirement to support languages other than English?

Yes, the Madrid system has three official languages, French, English and Spanish.

50. Are there any specific Development / Test Environments required for this project?

Yes, the proven concept has to be a life cycle concept. Therefore at completion of POC WIPO must be able to see how it is going to support the full life cycle of its applications. This implies multiple environments tailored to the various development and support activities. For instance: development, acceptance, volume, production, etc. Detail of which is left to the bidders.

51. What level of documentation do we have for these the interfacing systems?

Generally the available documentation is scattered and/or outdated; this is why the good integration of internal WIPO staff will by a key success factor of the whole modernization program.

52. What is the current Configuration management process followed by WIPO?

Inexistent there are daily updates of the production system

53. What is the current testing process? Does WIPO have any Architecture Review and Approval Team?

Other than system/unit testing by the developer followed by a (reluctant) acceptance test by users, there is no established process.

54. What level of documentation is expected from us for this project?

Consult requirements for POC. Otherwise, for software tools WIPO shall accept the documentation provided as it exists.

55. Does WIPO provide the required license / hardware / software for the requirement or expect us to include it in the scope?

Clearly yes, this is the purpose of the two first domains of the RFP (page 7 of annex I) C3_WSEnablement & C3_BPM&RIA).

56. Are there any specific connectivity (high-speed internet / VPN / etc.) requirements for offshore setup?

Network architecture isn't in scope.

57. As per our understanding the DMAPS/MAPS /IMAPS/ AIMS/PUBLICATION SYSTEMS are in-scope, please let us know any other external systems are in-scope?

No, but it is needless to say that we are building the capability of consuming and providing Web Services.

58. Does the current scope include capacity planning for hardware and database?

No.

59. We have not seen a reference that Vendor should own the sizing, procurement, installation and maintenance of hardware. Is the Hardware Solution in scope?

No.

60. We understand that Downsizing on UNIX is an on-going activity (Migration Natural/ADABAS code from Mainframe to UNIX). So can we assume that web services should be implemented on UNIX Natural/ADABAS code and not on Mainframes?

At the time of writing this issue remains open. WIPO hasn't finalized the decision to downsize its ADABAS/NATURAL application. But this should only affect the Web Services enablement component of this RFP. If your WS enablement solution requires a UNIX environment say so. For other components BPM/BAM and RIA simply state your hardware requirements.

61. By when are you planning to complete the project C4 – Downsizing on UNIX?

See previous question.

62. are the two illustrations that you are referring to: “one for the conversion and one for the production”? Could you please elaborate?

The conversion diagram would illustrate the factory that converts legacy programs into Web Services.

The production would illustrate the production deployment architecture, registration, versioning, publication, etc of the Web Service.

63. Please provide the worksheet: SOAAndTools_RFP_Criteria.xls.

This spreadsheet has been published with these answers.

64. Is implementation of functional subprojects (List A under chapter IV 4) to enhance internal production in scope of the project?

It isn't in the scope of this RFP.

65. Does implementation of eBusiness subprojects (List B under chapter IV 4) come under scope of the project?

No.

66. Does implementation of Adapted Technologies (List B under chapter IV 4) come under project scope?

No.

67. Under Data and Business logic conversion approach, clarification is needed on whether WIPO is concentrating on developing new business requirement or on converting the technology.

This RFP focuses on building the foundation of an SOA at WIPO. If successful the proof of concept (POC) of this architecture will be followed by the other projects of groups A, B and C. A and B cover new or outstanding business requirements C cover the technological migration. Of course there are dependencies groups.

68. Is there a known deadline to be taken in account for the end of use of the Natural code?

No. We expect Natural to be around for the next 5 to 6 years.

69. What is WIPO's politic about open source software?

The are no politics around open source software at WIPO. Neither has the organization adopted any policy regarding the use of open source.

70. Is the supplier suppose to define the production infrastructure (hardware and software) at this stage?

Yes, but sizing isn't required in this RFP..

71. How many business processes the legacy application provides today ? Have you got metrics for this aspect (average number of setps ...) ?

We don't have such metrics but we can give an order of magnitude: about 40 workflow classes with an average of 20 processing steps each. For POC we will choose, in consultation with the winning bidder(s), one possibly two representative classes to be implemented on the SOA platform. We shall limit the complexity of this exercise, so that it fits into an optimal lead time (6 months?).

72. Do you consider future business processes will only represent activites between human users? or a web service from the back office can be represented in the business process because of a factorising need ?

Yes, a web service from back office can be represented in the business process.

73. Is that clearly defined for Wipo that Web services extracted from legacy application (if a Transaction integration tools is used) have for objective to replace a user interface from legacy system ? A refactoring of the business logic at a lower granularity than user interfaces is not in mind ?

WIPO will apply refactoring techniques on a case by case basis. We anticipate that for many of our complex transactions a granularity lower than the existing UIs will be needed.

74. If a data integration tools is proposed by a bidder do you consider that business processes should directly call webservice to feed the data referential ? The impact for the business modelling team would be very important.

No, this would be a valid option only for CRUD type of services, which would be very few. WE would probably envisage "business logic level" services consuming "data level services". The business process would only see the "business" services.

75. Does Wipo have in mind any very specific RIA feature that must be provided in future interfaces ?

Please read Annex II "10 Form Management", pages 16 to 18.

76. In Annex 1 at page 11, Wipo talks about three distinct teams. Can Wipo confirm the way we understand these three teams :

- IT : Web Services deployment and life cycle management (and development of web services)
- IT : Development of rich web clients
- Business unit : Orchestration and Monitoring

This is correct.

77. Considering the possible complexity of modelling a business process, what is the business units computing level ? Does Wipo consider that Business Unit maintains Business processes that has been initiated by IT units ? Or does Wipo consider that Business units starts from scratch their modelling ?

It will be initiated by IT. Handing over the business process to the business unit will be on of the challenges of the modernization program.

78. Sogeti's report mentioned TQM one and several times "quality". Does WIPO have any Quality Management System? If yes, can you describe it please?

No Quality Management has been put into place as yet.

Queries on C3_BPM&RIA: Requirements

79. Give the scenario composition percentage split between the following scenarios:

Real-time data synchronization

Short running processes

Long running processes

Adapters

These figures are relevant at this stage as this RFP is intended for the selection of tools selection, not for application development.

There are no real-time streaming requirements “pseudo real-time” needs may appear

For short running processes interpret data on page 9 of annex I.

For long running processes interpret data on page 21 of annex I,

For adapter see annex I pages 19,22 and 23

80. Give the possible number of scenarios that could be required to be built for the following.

Short running processes

Long running processes

Real-time data synchronization

See previous question

81. What is the expected CPU utilization rate for the

No answer, as we consider this to be out of scope.

82. What is the percentage of the CPU processing power that we need to set aside for process contingency workload?

No answer, as we consider this to be out of scope.

83. What is the expected business transaction throughput per second (BTPS)?

We are not building amazon.com the throughput can be evaluated in transactions per minute.

84. What is the average number of human task composition per process?

This is not in the scope of this. This will be determined in detail during the POC phase

But please read Annex I to understand WIPO context but more specifically

- ***Facts and figures page 5,***
- ***Current program structures and volumes break down per process step page 9***
- ***Current technical architecture page 19***
- ***Business process page 21***

At this stage, limit your answer at describing the capabilities of your solution.

85. What is the average duration of a process execution?

See previous question.

86. What is the average number of synchronous interactions within a process?

See previous question.

87. What is the average number of asynchronous interactions within a process?

See previous question.

88. What is the average number of entities that each process deals with?

See previous question.

89. What are the numbers of adapters that are going to be used in the overall project?

See previous question.

90. What are the average numbers of parallel execution paths in a long running process?

See previous question.

91. What is the current version of EntireX middleware that's been deployed?

See previous question.

92. Is IMAPS in the scope of WIPO Modernization RFP? If yes, do we need to consider the Content/Document management package (such as Filenet) as a part of the technical solution?

Yes IMAPS is in the scope of the Madrid and Hague systems modernization. However with regards to this RFP (SOA and POC) it is only to a limited extend which could be described as de deployment of a service providing the content of a "Dossier".

93. Apart from the IMAPS system, is there any other C++ component(s)?

No.

94. Does the C++ component depend on any API/DLL/Shared library/etc?

No answer if this refers to question 93, otherwise.....

95. Is there any usage of a sorting-algorithm?

No answer if this refers to question 93, otherwise.....

96. Details of the databases it connects to, if any?

No answer if this refers to question 93, otherwise.....

97. Can you provide specific details related to the C++ code like: UML diagrams, Count of Classes, Count of Functions (Class-wise), etc?

IMAPS has been developed by an external firm, who has been supporting it since. Therefore we have very few technical information to provide regarding this system. IMAPS consists mainly of a file system where the scanned documents are stored in TIFF format. A basic Oracle index assists the retrieval of documents. For the sake of POC we will only need to develop a Java Web Service that will return the Document identified via a single numeric Document N°.

98. With reference to Annexure I, Section 4, "If the cost/speed/security benefits of this approach are not demonstrated during the preliminary POC, then the final POC implementation will be carried out using Java to replace the Natural code of interactive transactions." Could you please elaborate on the above, how you intend to handle the Natural batch and online programs?

We'll, if we can't refactor legacy code into Web Services, we won't rewrite it using Natural; Java seems to be a reasonable alternative. There would be probably no need to refactor batch programs. However by modifying some of the business process the deployment of Web Services may obviate the need for certain batch processes. For instance a service giving the current examination status could be an interesting substitute to the production of an irregularity letter, which is carried out currently via a batch process.

99. In Annexure 1, section 4.1, A7 IMAPS enhancements - In which language the enhancements for IMAPS should be done. In Java or C++?

The Web Service mentioned under question 92 would be (simple) a self contained java development.

100. What is the size of existing C++ code of IMAPS, in case it needs to be re-written in Java?

See question 97.

101. Currently, how does IMAPS integrate with MAPS system?

The document ID is passed from MAPS (or DMAPS) to IMAPS via a terminal screen scraping technique. Hence the Web Service under question 92, would receive the document ID and return the pages (next/previous methods) corresponding to the document ID.

102. Currently, how does Publication system integrate with MAPS / DMAPS systems?

The publication system receives, from MAPS, streams of YML data extracted in batch mode on a daily, weekly and monthly basis.

103. Does e-Billing & e-Payment integration solution come under the scope of this RFP?
Refer diagram for project scope in Annexure I Part IV on Page17.

No.

104. On p23 of Annex I, the part III of the Project C3_BPM&RIA is not highlighted as mentioned on p6 of Annex I p6. Please provide clarification on the scope.

The scope is: provision of the SOA software platform (including RIA) and Proof of Concept.

Page 23 is accurate.

105. Would there be cases when the MAP / DMAP (Natural code) becomes the client of Web Services?

This could be a possibility as we have to weigh carefully the granularity of the services orchestrated through the BPM tools. But there is a strong likelihood that the higher level services would be written in JAVA.

106. Please provide more detailed description of three functionalities mentioned on p. 3 of Annex I: Translation, Classification and Text processing functionalities.

Translation: trademark bibliographic data can be translated between English, French and Spanish. This is done currently on the block mode mainframe screen, with matches acting as a translation memory.

Classification; the scope of a trademark is define (on one hand) by the list of goods and services to which it extends its protection. The goods and services are place into 45 classes or headings hence requiring some text processing capability. In the present system this text handling capability is limited by the block more terminal.

107. What does the 'MATCHES' translation system do, as shown in the diagram on p.19 of Annex I? Please provide brief description.

MATCHES is part of the MAPS application, and acts as a translation memory. One of WIPO's expectations with regard to SOA is to be able to integrate commercial (or open source) translation tools (or services) but this isn't within the scope of this RFP.

108. Please provide brief description of the role of Holder / Representative / National and Regional offices.

A holder is the owner of the trademark.

A representative takes care of the interests of the holder when registering, modifying or transferring ownership of a mark. One could use the metaphor of a "notaire" or solicitor in the property market.

National Offices are national administrations who register the marks, their scope and ownership details ("cadastre" metaphor). Regional offices do the same but they have authority for a group of countries (Benelux, EU).

An international registration must be based on a national or regional registration an conveyed to WIPO by the relevant office..

109. Is modernization of IMAPS in the scope of C?

WIPO is unaware of any “WIPO Modernization RFP”.

IMAPS is in the scope of the Madrid and Hague systems modernization program. However with regards to this RFP (SOA and POC) it is only to a limited extend which could be described as de deployment of a service providing the content of a “Dossier”.

110. If yes, do we need to consider the Content / Document management package (such as Documentum or FileNet) as a part of the technical solution?

See above.

111. We understand that a PPOC (2-3 days) needs to be done to demonstrate the capability of the solution by applying them to the conversion of MAPS transaction. Also we understand if the cost/speed/security benefits of the approach are not demonstrated during the preliminary POC, then the final POC implementation will be carried out using Java to replace the Natural code of interactive transactions.

- a) Are you expecting us to demonstrate Natural to JAVA direct migration too during the PPOC?
- b) If so, does this need to be demonstrated in the same 2-3 days?

No “JAVA direct migration” has been envisaged. During PPOC you are expected to demonstrate that you are capable of exposing, with minimal modification, as Web Services, the legacy Natural code.

112. Annex 1: Chapter 4. In the target infrastructure the DB is Oracle. Does this has an influence on the current SOA/BPM project, which is mainly based on an ADABAS DB or ist it just an option for the future?

Oracle is not within the scope of this RFP.

113. Domain “C3_BPM&RIA

Requirement

Independent business logic (webservices) and presentation logic (RIA screen)
Integration thru BPM tool and BAM tool – Activities Monitoring

Question/Query:

Is any type of wizard to generate reports for BMP and BAM tools required for business Analyst?

It would be a plus if your solution provided reporting tools and wizards for business analysts

Does business analyst use the BPM tool for customization of business process/workflow (modeling of process)?

Yes, our main objective is to decouple the process orchestration and user interaction from the current monolithic mainframe Natural/Adabas transactions.

114. Domain “C2_POC”

Requirement: demonstrate the capability of their solution(s) by applying them to the conversion of a simple MAPS transaction

Question/Query:

Is infrastructure/Hardware and licenses for tools required for PPOC and POC provided by WIPO?

Wipo will provide hardware, but obviously not the software licenses which provision is part of this RFP

Annex II

115. Chapter 1.16. We are missing the mentioned Excel file SOAAndTools_RFP_Criteria.xls". Where is it available?

This spreadsheet has been published with this document.

116. Section 10 d) Form Type: Can you please explain how you understand the form type terms, particularly "shared forms".

- ***Individual : form used in only one specific context.***
- ***Shared : reuse the same form in more than one context. One definition and many uses.***
- ***Multi page : composition of different forms.***

117. Section 12 j) Please explain the difference between "user-based" and "ad-hoc" instance control ? Please explain the difference between "ad-hoc reset" and "ad-hoc cancel" ?

- ***Users : Event generated by human action***
- ***Ad-hoc : Event generated by application logic***
- ***Reset : delete instance history / temporary data***
- ***Cancel : stop current instance processing***

118. Section 13 i). Please explain what you mean exactly by ". Assigns a mandatory or optional status to a workflow or workflow step". What is the difference between items 7. and 12?

It is the concept of mandatory or optional step automated during design phase or logic should be implemented manually.

Mandatory = step must be done before continuing

Optional = step optional and could be completed until "end condition" or at end of current process if no specific end condition.

Item 12 = execution

Item 13 = design

119. Section 13 l) Can you please elaborate on the options for "business validation"

During design, are there pre-defined variables in the tools as well as controlling definition to be used within process definition.

Controls definition, Identify and monitor risks, Identify users, Read an audit score, Find relationship between process steps

120. Section 13 o) Please explain what you mean by "Controls and interacts with workflow instances: creation, activation, suspension, termination."

Is there a way to change the logic of the BPM tools when the status of an action. (scripting, pre-defined properties, ...). WIPO is looking for an optimal level of flexibility of the tools to manage instances.

121. Section 13 p). Please explain item 17) in this context.

What are the notification mechanisms when an instance step is not compelled and a condition is reached such as a milestone and no one reacts to the modification of the status.

Is it possible to automatically notify specific users, support as listed

122. Section 14

a) What do you mean by "licensed" in item 7) ?

Licensed users means "named user". When workflow tools requires named users, how is it possible to interact with external users within a workflow.

c) What do you mean by "User release" in item 4) ?

How is it possible to free specific user from its obligation and to reallocate new users without altering the current workflow instance ?

123. Section 15

a) What is the difference between "to-do" and "watch" lists, i.e. how to instances get into the "watch" list ?

To do = Must do it

Watch list = for information only

d+e+f) Please explain what you mean by "daily/weekly/monthly overdue tasks" exactly?

Is it possible to filter tasks with different criteria such as all tasks, overdue tasks, tasks overdue today, this week, this month.

124. Section 16.

b) Please explain "Workflow projection".

16.1 to 16.6: History.

16.7 : Projections, for instance: deadline to complete 100 remaining instances when allocating three more people, based on average processing time.

e) What type of "resources" do you mean ?

Human resources

125. Section 17

- a) Please explain "Just-in-time assignment" of roles/users.

Assign given role to user now, until the death of the current instance.

- b) Please explain "temporary role assignment", i.e. what should be the time window?

For example, role created for a “one off” purpose, such as processing files overdue by more than 6 month. This will be help to monitor “project type” of work assigned to operational people without altering usual daily work statistics.

126. Chapter 1.18. Please clarify the term "workflow documents" in the context of the development environment.

Workflow documents are workflow definition file / properties

127. Chapter 1.19. Section 21: Please explain what you mean by "scheduling" of the production environment.

Can we schedule administrative tasks such as the batch printing all tasks overdue?

128. In 2007 the MAPS and DMAPS review was conducted by Sogeti. This study gives of Sogeti a unique competitive advantage to win this RFP. Is Sogeti part of the bidders?

A bid from Sogeti for this RFP wouldn't be considered, WIPO has advised Sogeti of this situation.

129. Will MAPS Modernization need to be made available globally with UI in different languages?

For POC only French, English and Spanish will be required

130. To help with costing, can WIPO provide more information about the processes that need to be rebuilt to web enable a typical MAPS/DMAPS transaction?

See paragraph 1.27 at page 39 of Annex II and paragraph 6.2 at page 12 of Annex I.

131. Is it correct to assume that WIPO will directly handle any changes to the Legacy application to make it web services enabled or do you expect to have Natural experts as well?

This is true for POC, but we don't know yet the magnitude of the modifications that will be needed.

132. Will the Sw lic necessary for the WSEnablement , BPM and SOA purchased before the PoC is conducted or will the PoC results influence the decision of which tools to acquire?

It is WIPO's understanding that POC should affect the final decision. In other words temporary or evaluation licenses should be available until completion of POC.

133. Annex II, page 7, Scope of your offer: Should supplier only answer questions relevant to the scope of their offer and skip answers related to domains outside of the scope of their bid?

This is correct. But comprehensive well integrated and structured bids may have an advantage.

134. Annex II, page 7, Section 1.5: Differentiatinon between conversion and production?

The conversion diagram would illustrate the factory that converts legacy programs into Web Services.

The production would illustrate the production deployment architecture, registration, versioning, publication, etc of the Web Service.

135. Annex II, page 8, Section 1.8: "WIPO limits the migration approach with automatic code conversion for a Web Services implementation". Will WIPO consider hybrid solutions where migration will include a mixture of automatic & manual work? Requirements 1.8 seem to suggest "yes".

Yes, the aim is "minimization" of manual work. Now, if "manual" reaches unacceptable levels full recoding using Java may become the alternative.

136. Annex II, page 9, 1.9 a): What is WIPO's favorite environment /(current & future) in terms of Hardware and Software?

No decision has been reached yet. UNIX/LINUX any well know hardware brand may be retained in the near future. Software selection is the aim of this RFP.

137. Annex II, page 10, 1.9 h): Does WIPO already implement Single Sign On within its IT systems? Does it have a preference for a technology in this domain?

No, please make proposals.

138. Annex II, page 12, Section 1.11.9 a): Description of support for external security systems is for the environment proposed presumably - not generic?

Yes.

139. Annex II, page 15, Section 1.15: Is the illustration for the design meant to be for "the prototype"?

The first (design) illustration should illustrate the tools proposed for BP modeling (design) and their interactions.

The second should illustrate the tools proposed for versioning monitoring etc. Of course there are also interaction between the design tools and the WF engines, standards must be clearly visible.

140. Annex II, page 15, Section 1.16: Where can the file SOAAndTools_RFP_Criteria.xls be obtained?

This spreadsheet has been published with this document.

141. Annex II, Section 1.16.10: Is one of the goals for using a RIA interface to reduce the number of forms currently needed to support an existing MAPS/DMAPS transaction?

One of the goals is clearly to improve ergonomics, reducing the number of screens would indeed contribute to that.

142. Annex II, page 16 (see also 29), Section 1.16.10 d) and 1.16.17: Individualized forms: Do MAPS & DMAPS currently support different user roles each supporting different functionality and access rights? Is the expectation that the new system needs to provide this functionality? What kind of roles are expected?

Yes, roles will be defined based on various axis, data, workflow classes, workflow step etc. Please answer questions under part 17 "Security management" of Annex II.

143. Annex II, page 18, Section 1.16.11: Does optional Ad-hoc reporting form part of the POC?

"Is optional but would improve user experience" hence we shall decide when defining the deliverables of POC.

144. Annex II, page 20, Section 1.1.6.12: Is workflow reporting a compulsory requirement for the POC?

No.

145. Annex II, page 24, Section 1.16.13 p) : Do process notification mechanisms need to be implemented in POC?

Yes.

146. Annex II, page 25, Section 1.16.14: For collaboration features associated to workflow management, and links to other systems such as email, does WIPO expect compatibility with a given type of directory service?

As indicated in the RFP, WIPO relies on LDAP and doesn't have currently directory services. But this may change in the short medium term.

147. Annex II, page 26, Section 1.16.15: Does WIPO expect any linkages or integration between workflow and groupware/task management as it seems to be implemented at the moment in existing system?

Yes

148. Annex II, page 31, Section 1.17.18 b) : What is the meaning of mandatory in (Native connectivity, ODBC, mandatory)?

This question has two objectives :

- ***To understand which database connectivity you propose (tick Native or ODBC)***
- ***To understand if your solution requires one specific database (tick mandatory)***

149. Annex II, page 32, Section 1.17.18 m) : Does the solution need to provide a multi-languages interface? If so, will this need to be included in the proof of concept?

For POC only French, English and Spanish will be required

150. Annex II, page 34, Section 1.19.19: Is the production environment expected to support the same existing population or should it be scaleable to support a future growth in usage?

Production capacity planning is out of topic.

As rule of thumb one could plan for 5% annual growth, but large countries joining our treaties may trigger sudden sharp increases.

151. Annex II, page 38, Section C2_POC: As "WIPO may decide to purchase tools from different vendors under each of the three domains" is it correct to assume for the POC that a vendor may be selected for the Web Services Deployment part, another for the Rich Web clients and the BPM/BAM domains? If so confirm that information here is only needed for the teams required to support the scope chosen by a bidder for the POC.

This is correct.

152. Annex II, page 38, Section 1.23: What do the 6 months correspond to? The period estimated for the global effort to complete C3_WSEenablement, C3_BPM&RIA and

C2_POC ? If so what portion of the 6 months would reasonably be allocated to C2_POC?

The 6 months mentioned in Annex II are the duration we think is necessary to achieve our two objectives:

- ***Validate the selected SOA software platform,***
- ***Start building WIPO's skill base of SOA technology and methodologies.***

The first step of POC will be to agree on all deliverables.

The proposed team structure and staffing should take into account the stated objectives.

153. Annex II, page 39, Section 1.25: Where are paragraphs 5.1 & 5.2 ? In which document?

Paragraphs 1.23 & 1.24, page 38 of the same document.

154. 10.j, page 17. Can you describe more exactly what you understand by default values?

Is it possible to use a default value to override a missing value instead of stopping the process execution ?

155. 11.c, page 18. Can you be more precise ?

How can we access data to generate reports : from data requests, from web services, ...

156. 12.j, (number 6 to 11), page 20. Can you explain what you hear by ad hoc instance ?

- ***Users : Event generated by human action***
- ***Ad-hoc : Event generated by application logic***
- ***Reset : delete instance history / temporary data***
- ***Cancel : stop current instance processing***

157. 13.e, page 22. Can you be more precise?

Which representation do you use to design workflow ?

158. 13.l (2, 4, 5, 7 and 10), page 22 and 23. Can you better describe these various points?

During design, are there pre-defined variables in the tools as well as controlling definition to be used within process definition.

Controls definition, Identify and monitor risks, Identify users, Read an audit score, Find relationship between process steps

159. 13.j (10), page 23. Could you give an example for this reference?

More than one answer for a specific question. IE which colors do you like : 1) Red 2) Yellow, 3) Green (multiple choice) stored on a short 2 bytes field.

160. 13.k (3, 4 and 5), page 23. Could you clarify number 3 and explain the difference between points 4 and 5?

Third party engine means not included in the proposed software but must be added

Process data = data from application

Run-time data = data from workflow tools

161. 13.l (1, 3 and 5), page 23. Can you give a better description of these points?

During design, are there pre-defined variables in the tools as well as controlling definition to be used within process definition?

Controls definition, Identify and monitor risks, Identify users, Read an audit score, Find relationship between process steps.

162. 13.n, page 24. At what level do you want to generate these events? And for what purpose?

To be able to generate tasks from events generated in the Business process and reuse by external tasks manager.

163. 13.q (3) page 25. Can you better describe the terms “user profile” and “location” ?

Wipo will have named users (internal and external) and well as unknown external users participating in the same workflow. It's therefore important to physically locate them.

164. 15.e, page 26. What do you understand exactly by watch list ?

List of tasks assigned to a user “for information only”, not for action.

165. 15.h, page 27. Can you deepen the requirement term?

To us 15.h appears self explanatory. May be you could use Microsoft Outlook, task manager part for a better understanding.

166. 17.a (1), page 29. What do you understand by Process-specific roles?

Role refers to a process type, not a user.

167. 17.b (4, 5, 6 and 8), page 29 and 30. Can you deepen the temporary term? Temporary from when until when ? And can you give a precision onto the point 8?

For example, role created for a “one off” purpose, such as processing files overdue by more than 6 month. This will be help to monitor “project type” of work assigned to operational people without altering usual daily work statistics.

168. 17.e (3 and 4), page 30. Can you give more information concerning these two points?

Please find standard definition for more information.

Round-robin [http://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Round-robin_\(informatique\)](http://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Round-robin_(informatique))

For example, Round-robin could be helpful to reassign users in a job queue when deadlines are over and user is in holiday.

Resource leveling http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Resource_Leveling

For example, resource leveling can be very helpful to manage over allocation of one specific user.

169. 18.a (3 and 4), page 33. Can you better develop these two points?

For one given process, the level of detail is not the same for a business analyst focusing on business definition and for a developer focusing on technical implementation. Therefore, is it possible to display the same process with different layers, one top level for business users and one detailed for developers ?

170. 18.b (1 and 3), page 33. Can you clarify?

***In the shell integration implies extending seamlessly the set Eclipse functions/options
EMF: Eclipse Modeling Framework.***

171. 18.d, page 33. What do you understand exactly by versioning?

How do you manage versioning with your development environment? (CVS, etc.)

172. 18.e (3, 4 and 5), page 34. Can you give more details of these points?

Can you perform automatic checking to validate Business Process for example .

3) Is a process complete.

4) Are users able to complete the process.

5) If your solution propose Business modeling, is your software able to run what-if analysis.

173. 23.d (3 and 5), page 36. Can you better describe the point 3 and 5?

Please find complementary information on <http://dljtj.org/article/software-development-practice/>

Describe how your solution is able to manage the tests within different environments.

174. (Domain "C3_WSEnablement

Option A1 (Annex-II): Automatic code / database migration to other technology, then Web Service generation through wrappers or gateway;

Requirement

- Complete application migration is not preferable as per Architecture document Section 1.2 Alternatives and recommended strategy

http://www.wipo.int/export/sites/www/madrid/en/docs/wipo_maps_dmaps_report.pdf

Question:

Is WIPO open for above option?

This is long term objective of WIPO but not before 2010 (Section 7.3, point: C11 Architecture document)

No for the short and medium term being wholesale recoding in Java can only be a last resort solution. Therefore any proposal in that direction would be pointless.

175. Option A2 (Annex-II): (web service enablement of legacy application)

Requirement

Wrapper for Natural code with WSDL / Web Services (Java) generation ;(Option A2) JAVA can access either ADABAD through SQL gateway or Natural programs through SOA gateway (Section 10.2.2) in architecture documents (wipo_maps_dmaps_report.pdf)

UI (RIA based) -> Java Webservices -> (SQL/SOA)GateWay

Transaction integration tools: by using SOA Gateway for existing workflow in application

Data integration tools: by using SQL gateway for new feature developments.

Question/Query

Is any SOA or BPM or BAM tools currently used or available in WIPO?

EntireX.

Is WIPO preferred to use Software AG gateways as wrapper techniques to encapsulate Natural and ADABAS system?

We have no preference hence the WS enablement part of this RFP.

What are WIPO expectations from vendors regarding Natural and ADABAS code change?

WIPO will take care of Natural Code changes during POC. The policy regarding this activity will be defined subsequently to POC.

Is WIPO IT team involved for modification of Natural and ADABAS code?

See above.

Is new feature use the ADABAS application or Oracle?

Other than IMAPS, no Oracle for POC.

176. Annex II, page 15, chapter 1.16: Where is the file "SOAAndTools_RFP_Criteria.xls"?

This spreadsheet has been published with this document.

177. Annex II, page 8, chapter 1.7:

Could you please comment in more details the sentence : "WIPO limits the migration approach with automatic code conversion for Web Services implementation"?

Ignore this sentence.

Have you selected an identity management solution (IDM) and if yes, which one and which technology ?

No.

Have you selected a master data management solution (MDM) and if yes, which one and which technology ?

No.

Have you selected a Rule Engine solution and if yes, which one and and which technology ?

No.

Have you selected or defined an SOA Maturity model and if yes which one?

No.

Have you defined the WIPO 's Business Models (The key input for this process is a comprehensive, up-to-date set of business models and specifications (such as business process definitions, business entity models, logical data models, etc.).

No.

178. Annex II, page 38 : What is the basis is of the estimation, that the full project is done in approx. 6 months?

The 6 months mentioned in Annex II are the duration we think is necessary to achieve our two objectives:

- ***Validate the selected SOA software platform,***
- ***Start building WIPO's skill base of SOA technology and methodologies.***

The first step of POC will be to agree on all deliverables.

The proposed team structure and staffing should take into account the stated objectives.

179. Annex II, page 38

"7-8 resources of WIPO are dedicated to support and development"

What are the skillsets and levels of experience of these people?

To what percentage of working time, can they be used for the new development?

There should be one full time WIPO SM allocated to each team.

All available WIPO staff have strong Natural/Adabas skills. The average IT experience is over 20 years, average trademark business experience over 10 years. Some JAVA/XML/XSL skills are also available.

180. Annex II, page 39

Is there a MAPS/DMAPS/IMAPS system, workflow documentation?

If yes, will it be available in advance for accurate quotation purposes?

Workflow documentation will be available when defining POC's deliverables.

181. Annex II, page 15, chapter 1.16:
Where is the file "SOAAndTools_RFP_Criteria.xls"?

This spreadsheet has been published with this document.

182. Annex II, page 38
What is the basis is of the estimation, that the full project is done in approx. 6 months?

The 6 months mentioned in Annex II are the duration we think is necessary to achieve our two objectives:

- ***Validate the selected SOA software platform,***
- ***Start building WIPO's skill base of SOA technology and methodologies.***

The first step of POC will be to agree on all deliverables.

The proposed team structure and staffing should take into account the stated objectives.

183. Annex II, page 38
7-8 resources of WIPO are dedicated to support and development"
What are the skillsets and levels of experience of these people?
To what percentage of working time, can they be used for the new development?

There should be one full time WIPO SM allocated to each team.

All available WIPO staff have strong Natural/Adabas skills. The average IT experience is over 20 years, average trademark business experience over 10 years. Some JAVA/XML/XSL skills are also available.

184. Annex II, page 8, chapter 1.7:
Could you please to comment in more details the sentence : "WIPO limits the migration approach with automatic code conversion for Web Services implementation"?

Ignore this sentence.

Have you selected an identity management solution (IDM) and if yes, which one and which technology ?

No.

Have you selected a master data management solution (MDM) and if yes, which one and which technology ?

No.

Have you selected a Rule Engine solution and if yes, which one and and which technology ?

No.

Have you selected or defined an SOA Maturity model and if yes which one?

No.

Have you defined the WIPO 's Business Models (The key input for this process is a comprehensive, up-to-date set of business models and specifications (such as business process definitions, business entity models, logical data models, etc.).

No.

185. Annex II, page 39: Is there a MAPS/DMAPS/IMAPS system, workflow documentation? If yes, will it be available in advance for accurate quotation purposes?

Workflow documentation will be available when defining POC's deliverables.

186. Annex II, page 35: Do you need a quotation for support and maintenance ?
If yes, on which basis ?

Yes, if your solution is proprietary, indicate your standard conditions. If it is open source please estimate the yearly manpower (man days) needed to monitor its development and address issues and make a financial proposal for the supply of such services.

187. In Annex II Wipo precises that for the IDE choice, there is a very strong trend for the use of the open source Eclipse with a Concurrent Versions System (CVS). Subversion (SVN) which is an improvement of CVS is not considered ?

If you feel necessary to make a case for SVN, please do it. But it would be conservative to offer the CVS alternative.

188. Specific requirements for BPM, BAM, RIA and reporting (page 15 of Annexe II) . You mentioned an excel file "SOAAndTools_RFP_Criteria.xls" for the list of criteria for the evaluation. Could you please provide us with this Excel file ?

This spreadsheet has been published with this document.

189. Ad hoc User Reporting Management (page 18 of Annexe II).
On which data these reports are based : context of 1 process instance or consolidated ones across multiple instances (ie : BAM) ?
Who will use the report designer : IT people or Business people ?
Document integration : Do we have to add part of the workflow documents into the reports or just links to them ?

Links are sufficient.

190. Process orchestration engine (as of page 18 of Annex II)
In a-1 and a-2 (page 18), it's described that the processes are document oriented. Do we have to provide a Content document solution for the management of these documents or do we have to interface with an existing one (ie.: GED in which scanned documents are stored) ?

Interface with existing one. Please read annex I, page 19 to better understand current WIPO architecture

What do you mean by "Enriching documents" : add comments, add structured data, modify content ...

On an instance of process, users are validating and completing information by adding structured data..

In paragraph f (page 19) : do we well understand the "routing features" topic by considering the rights associated to the administrator of a process instance ? If yes, for instance, the point f-1 should mean : "The administrator of a process instance can re-assign a new administrator for this instance".

Yes on both questions.

191. Task and groupware management (as of page 26 of Annex II). In i-1 (page 27), what do you mean by “share”: Do the participants have to only view the documents and Do they have to update them ?
In i-2 (page 27), do you want to have a real collaboration mechanism for this comments/messages management (ie. : like a wiki with searching and answering capabilities) ?

Yes.

192. Development environment & collaboration (definition or change) (as of page 33 of Annex II).
In c-1 (page 33), as we are speaking about the development environment, we understand that "workflow documents" stands for "workflow specification elements" (ie : all the elements given during the process design : tasks, conditions, business objects, ...). Is it correct ?

Yes.

Application and Database Characteristics

193. Does documentation exist?

There is reasonable documentation for the technical environment and workflow, but detailed program specifications are either missing or out of date. With regards to the database we have a logical model and Predict.

194. Does this application share data or is it self-contained?

It is self contained.

195. Does this application interface with other applications via program calls?

No.

196. Does the application have test scripts?

No.

197. Are any I/O subroutines used to access the data?

No.

198. Can this application be out of the maintenance cycle? How long?

No.

199. Is checkpoint restart processing used in batch programs?

No.

200. Is a Data Dictionary (e.g. Predict) being used?

Yes.

201. Are there any customer written system level functions (database procedures, utilities, encryption, audit, accounting, security, etc.)?

No.

202. Estimate of what percent of the programs use report mode versus structured mode?

100%

203. What is the total number of on-line users? What is the peak number of concurrent users?

We have about 120 name users. The number of concurrent users can get close to this figure.

204. What is the largest batch window?

At present from 20:00 to 07:00.

205. Where is the source code stored (e.g., Librarian)?

Natural libraries: (Test, Acceptance, Production + Backlib 1,23)

206. Database conversion information:

What ADABAS file types are used (e.g., ADABAS, VSAM)?

Is ISN ever used as data to access information?

Number of ADABAS views?

Average number of fields per record?

Rough number of array occurrences - (Periodic Groups (PEs) & Multi-Value Fields (MUs)?

What are the database structures/relationships/dependencies?

Natural GDAs, PDAs, LDAs? Estimated number?

Natural Construct? Versions?

Predict CASE?

JCL procedures?

Assembler programs?

Other?

Database conversion is definitely out of the scope of this RFP. It is within the scope of project C4 –Downsizing to UNIX. Migration to Oracle not being on the books before 3 or 4 years we shall leave this question.

207. VSAM file information:

Number of VSAM files?

Average number of keys per file and type (KSDS, ESDS, RRDS)?

What is the largest file record size in terms of number of bytes, fields, and keys?

See previous question.

208. II; p.19, (12.g. point 1): what do you mean exactly with "reassign in real time"?

A step can be assigned forwards or backwards at any time.

Annex I

209. Annex I, page 4, Section 1: To what extent and level of detail bidders will be required to prove the viability of their solution/architecture? Is there an Acceptance Criteria List already defined for this?

Not at this stage.

210. Annex I, page 5, Section 4: Does the target infrastructure and SOA approach need to be in line with other WIPO and UN IT strategy / Enterprise architecture framework(s)? If yes what are those?

No.

211. Annex I, page 8, Section 2: What is the new timetable for the sub project- The current schedule appears to be out of date. At what time is the work estimated to start after selection of successful bidder?

Ideally, for POC, we should be looking at a May/June to October/November 2009 period.

212. Annex I, page 8, Section 2: Scope of POC? Is it to implement the full functionality of the registration of new trademarks? Will it down to the bidders to determine how much functionality will be included (see p.12)?

Yes, POC has two objectives:

- ***Validate the selected SOA software platform,***
- ***Start building WIPO's skill base of SOA technology and methodologies.***

The first step of POC will be to agree on all deliverables.

The proposed team structure and staffing should take into account the stated objectives.

213. Annex I, page 9, Section 3.2: How Many lines of legacy code and programmes will need to be modified/replaced for the POC?

See question 212.

214. Annex I, page 10, Section 4: What criteria will be used to determine if the cost/speed/security benefits of suggested approach are not demonstrated in preliminary POC?

They have not been established yet.

215. Page 7, next to last paragraph: Do we have to understand C3_BPM&RIA instead of C3_WSEenablement or that the C3_WSEenablement has to allow / prepare the next step?

C3_WSEnablement enables the decoupling, otherwise there would be nothing to orchestrate.

216. Page 5, in terms of metrics: Are the concurrent users all waiting for a response from the system or do we have to understand concurrent sessions?

We have (approximately) 120 named users, but their sessions can be concurrent. Be aware that this may change and that the new architecture but be scalable. i.e. cope with the consumption of web services from external users.

217. Annex I, page 11, chapter 4.3: There are a number of options to connect to an Adabas/Natural platform, whether on UNIX or Mainframe platform.
Has WIPO already tested any technology/software (like Adabas SOA/SQL Gateway) to do or test this on their side ?

No.

218. Annex I, page 19, chapter 2.1: What role does WIPO plays and will play in the future EntireX middleware from the Software AG?

WIPO wont play any role in the future EntireX, but as an outcome of this RFP, may decide to use it for transaction level Web Services enablement of its legacy code.

219. Annex I, page 4, chapter 3: Are there estimates of number of users growth over next 5 years If if yes what are they ?
If no, has WIPO designed specification of the recipient platform to accommodate unexpected growth ?

***No. WIPO doesn't have yet the SOA expertise to make such forecasts. We understand that in an SOA every exposed service contributes individually to the system load.
No, to the second question.***

220. Annex I, page 6, chapter 5: In a few places in Annex I and II is mentioned "Translation" activity. What exactly is meant with this project?

Translation isn't with the scope of this RFP however you may consult what has been said under questions 106 and 107.

221. Annex I, page 7, chapter 1: Which runtime environment for Adabas/Natural will be used for C2: PoC, Unix, zOS or connection to backed will be simulated?

At the time of writing this issue remains open. WIPO hasn't finalized the decision to downsize its ADABAS/NATURAL applications running under zOS. But this should only affect the Web Services enablement component of this RFP. If your WS enablement solution requires a UNIX environment say so. For other components BPM/BAM and RIA simply state your hardware requirements.

222. Annex I, page 19, chapter 2.1: Is 3270 terminal emulation available in MAPS/DMAPS/IMAPS environment, besides VT220?

See previous question, emulation will be 3270 if the applications remain on the mainframe, VT220 if we downsize.

223. Annex I, page 19, chapter 2.1: What is the current status of "C4:Downsizing on UNIX" (MAPS/DMAPS migration to UNIX)?
What is a dependency of C2:PoC to this part?

See the two previous question. As far as POC is concerned it should only affect the implementation of the Web Services.

224. Annex I, page 9, table: Table on this page shows that MAPS and DMAPS are made of 5124 programs. How this software is documented on the technical and business level?
Will be this documentation available before start of C2:PoC?

There is reasonable documentation for the technical environment and workflow, but detailed program specifications are either missing or out of date. Bear in mind however that this will be taken into account once deciding on the system deliverables of POC..

225. Annex I, page 5: "WIPO foresees that MAPS/DMAPS/IMAPS web enablement steps are as follows" "Conversion of interactive transactionsby splitting.." and "Rewrite the presentation logic" Does this mean all 1173 interactive programs and 5133 modules have to be modified ? Do they all have to be modified within 6 months?

No, for two reasons: a) see what has been answered to the previous question, POC will involve only a fraction of the existing modules. Further, WIPO expects the amount of rewriting ranging between 0 (for session level W.S enablement) to full rewrite (in JAVA9 in the worst cases. The objective of this RFP, especially POC is to assess what the situation really is.

226. Annex I, page 19, chapter 2.1: What role at WIPO plays and will play in the future EntireX middleware from the Software AG?

WIPO wont play any role in the future EntireX, but as an outcome of this RFP, may decide to use it for transaction level Web Services enablement of its legacy code.

227. Annex I, page 4, chapter 3: How many external MAPS/DMAPS/IMAPS (Web)user are expected in average and what is a grow rate?

We do not know at this stage (very early capacity building). The system will only be open to the wide public in limited areas such as trademarks renewals and some modifications. We expect the national offices systems to consume some of our Web Services.

228. Annex I, page 6, chapter 5: In a few places in Annex I and II is mentioned "Translation" activity. What exactly is meant with this project?

Translation isn't with the scope of this RFP however you may consult what has been said under questions 106 and 107.

229. Annex I, page 7, chapter 1: Which runtime environment for Adabas/Natural will be used for C2: PoC, Unix, zOS or connection to backed will be simulated?

At the time of writing this issue remains open. WIPO hasn't finalized the decision to downsize its ADABAS/NATURAL applications running under zOS. But this should only affect the Web Services enablement component of this RFP. If your WS enablement solution requires a UNIX environment say so. For other components BPM/BAM and RIA simply state your hardware requirements.

230. Annex I, page 19, chapter 2.1: Is 3270 terminal emulation available in MAPS/DMAPS/IMAPS environment, besides VT220?

See previous question, emulation will be 3270 if the applications remain on the mainframe, VT220 if we downsize.

231. Annex I, page 19, chapter 2.1:
What is the current status of "C4:Downsizing on UNIX" (MAPS/DMAPS migration to UNIX)? What is a dependency of C2:PoC to this part?

See the two previous question. As far as POC is concerned it should only affect the implementation of the Web Services.

232. Annex I, page 9, table:
The tables on this page shows that MAPS and DMAPS are made of 5124 programs. How this software is documented on the technical and business level? Will be this documentation available before start of C2:PoC?

Same as question 224.

233. Annex I, page 5
"WIPO foresees that MAPS/DMAPS/IMAPS web enablement steps are as follows"
"Conversion of interactive transactionsby splitting.." and "Rewrite the presentation logic".
Does this mean all 1173 interactive programs and 5133 modules have to be modified ?
Do they all to be modified within 6 months?

Same as question 225

234. Annex I, page 6
C4 – Downsizing on UNIX – On going“
A1 – Translation – Ongoing

and ref.: Annex I, Page 5
Current: IBM Mainframe/Z900“
Target: UNIX-LINUX“RFP

and ref.: Annex II, Page 8

Which conversion approach to you propose ?“
Could you specify the exact on going task and what platform (hardware + operating system) will be available at PoC time ?
If on UNIX, has WIPO already decided to re-host Natural/Adabas on UNIX with from Software AG ?

Will elements remain on the mainframe at PoC time ?

Will PoC participants access a unique test database, application and platform.

At the time of writing this issue remains open. WIPO hasn't finalized the decision to downsize its ADABAS/NATURAL applications running under zOS. But this should only affect the Web Services enablement component of this RFP. If your WS enablement solution requires a UNIX environment say so. For other components BPM/BAM and RIA simply state your hardware requirements. As far as POC is concerned it should only affect the implementation of the Web Services.

235. "Rewrite MAPS and DMAPS workflow using BPM and BAM tools" (page 5, Annex I).

Business layer approach using Service Oriented Architecture (SOA)" (page 11 of Annex I).

"WIPO would like to select the most integrated tools to reduce the learning curve and complexity. Business analyst should be able to build and maintain BPM, BAM and user interaction (screens and reporting)." (page 11 of Annex I)

Can you, please, clarify RFP position on BPM – sounds like a replacement of workflow or "business layer"?

Is WIPO also looking for a workflow tool ?

Yes.

236. "WIPO is a hub actor in the process of registering an international trademark; the other actors are holders, their representatives and the national/regional trademark offices. WIPO's Trademark and Industrial. Design system was developed in the early nineties when computerization was still focused on function instead of process, therefore, it lacks proper integration of external functions." (page 20 of Annex I).

"As expected, requirements expressed by WIPO's internal users point to large extent to a lack of alignment between the current IT systems and the business process." (page 20 of Annex I)

How do you plan to address this gap between current functionality of MAPS/DMAPS application and process orientation needs ?

Please (re) read this RFP and the Sogeti Report quote on page 6 of Annex I.

What is the WIPO's definition of eBusiness ?

WIPO has no such definition. However we may give a few indications on the nature of our current future "eBusinesses":

- ***Electronic Renewals,***
- ***Electronic modifications (limited scope),***
- ***Electronic examination status and correction of irregularities,***
- ***Integration with systems of national offices via Web Services and SOA.***

Does WIPO have an extranet?

No.

237. What is the complexity of the existing workflow maps (#templates, #activities, # roles, #instances/year, and average duration of an instance)?

We don't have such metrics but we can give an order of magnitude: about 40 workflow classes with an average of 20 processing steps each. Currently the definition of roles is under scrutiny following a reorganization of the business unit.

We estimate the number of instances per year at 350000 to 400000. The duration of an instance is quite high, 1 month gives an order of magnitude.

For POC we will choose, in consultation with the winning bidder(s), one possibly two representative classes to be implemented on the SOA platform. We shall limit the complexity of this exercise, so that it fits into an optimal lead time (6 months?).

238. Sub Project Schedule (page 8 of Annex I). Could you please provide us the updated table for the steps of this sub project of MAPS ?

Ideally, for POC, we should be looking at a May/June to October/November 2009 period.

239. Technical questions regarding the ADABAS/Natural Conversion
Describing the POC delivery, you mention p12 Annexe I "The data layer of the new application being the existing ADABAS Database". Do you mean that you keep the existing ADABAS Database by only changing the design Model? Do you mean that you will keep ADABAS during the migration process and convert to Oracle later?

Yes, this is correct.

240. Do you think we could break MAPS/ DMAPS / IMAPS in several pieces in order to ease the conversion process package by package? Do you think it should be possible to perform a migration process in several stages?

Yes this is exactly our plan

241. Database Gateways : Are gateway products between platforms used by application?
Yes/No

No.

242. Will the target gateway products be the same as the source gateway products? Yes/No.
If not, please describe.

No gateways are used currently.

243. Interfaces : Does the system interact with any other application systems?

Please read paragraph 2.4 of Annex I and answer to question 22.

244. Does this application interface with any external (secondary) databases ? List names of secondary databases:

No. but there are application level interactions (see question 243)

245. Does the application cross hardware/software platforms? Yes/No

See question 243

246. Does the application support OLTP (On-line Transaction Processing)?

No it runs under TSO.

247. Does the application support Decision Support? Yes/No

No.

248. Describe how the target application will CONNECT to the target database. What products will be used ?

The purpose of this RFP is to a large extent to provide the answer to this. At this stage there is no “target database” as we intend to keep ADABAS unchanged.

249. Annex I; p.9: could you please specify in more detail the meaning of each column shown in the tables? (Lines, Number of programs, Programs Graphic User Interface, Business Logic lines, Graphic User Interface lines, Interactive Lines?)

Lines:	lines of Natural code
Nb Pgm:	number of Natural objects
PgmGUI:	number of Natural maps (screens) or sequences of screens.
BL Lines:	Business Logic Lines.
GUI Lines:	lines dedicated to presentation of data.
Interactive lines:	lines dedicated to interactions with user (validation etc.)

250. Annex I; p.9: How is the number of screens calculated (with respect to the figures in the tables.

Some “Pgm GUI” involve sequences of screens.

251. Will the MAPS interface program (Programs that generate XML files or flat files) part of the process to be available as Web services?

Probably no as such, bust the deployment of some Web Services may obviate the need for some batches.

252. Are current EntireX performance satisfying in your environment?

Yes, but the scope of EntireX remains limited at this stage. If we decide to keep this product for our transaction level WS enablement we will have to pay more attention to its configuration and tuning.

253. If an EntireX-type solution was used for the legacy programs, would WIPO develop the eventual business natural services that would make sense? (Programs for the business services used as front end on the natural side by EntireX)

Isn't this exactly what we are aiming at ?

254. For the Web-enabling part of the project, do you rather have an approach that would make the full application available on the web quickly, as is, with limited possibilities of evolution or rather a slower, more incremental migration taking into account future needs ?

We are working and planning for the future.

255. Do you prefer a solution type “proxy” (for instance EntireX) converted into java over time whenever needed or a solution converting fully the code into java code in one go?

We have rejected the full “one go” conversion to java.

256. In the case of full migration of the natural programs in java, why do you wish to keep the adabas “database”? Are they shared by other applications?

See question 255.

257. What is the status of the migration project towards Unix?

At the time of writing this issue remains open. WIPO hasn't finalized the decision to downsize its ADABAS/NATURAL application. But this should only affect the Web Services enablement component of this RFP. If your WS enablement solution requires a UNIX environment say so. For other components BPM/BAM and RIA simply state your hardware requirements.

258. Do you already have a solution of identity management?

No.

259. Is the security of the MAPS/DMAPS/IMAPS application based on standard natural security?

Yes, in part. But there is also an application layer role management feature.

260. Can you estimate the percentage of business rules that are stored in GUI program?

MAPS/DMAPS don't have any GUI programs. Now, if the question refers to business rules imbedded in our interactive programs, a good “guess” would be 60 to 70 percent. It is very much driven by on line validations.

261. Are the current workflow logic and the program that manages the reference Table (MP-TBL-ACTN) only located in top level drivers programs and menu programs?

No the top level programs only drive the sequence of the screens for one action. The sequence of actions is controlled via one shared program called, at action completion, that selects the MP-SERV-ACTN the next action(s) to be performed.

Further 13 years of operation and maintenance have shortcuts have appeared in various places. These may hamper efforts when removing the existing workflow features.

262. How many processes will need to be orchestrated? How many instances will be executed per year ?

About 40 workflow classes with an average of 20 processing steps each. We estimate the number of instances per year at 350000 to 400000.

263. How many users (named, concurrent) will use the solution?

At this stage we have about named 120 users. At peak the number of concurrent sessions is likely to be similar.

264. Can portal be an option to aggregate new functionalities with existing ones?

We haven't evaluated such option yet. But why not.

265. Will the web-enabled applications be available on the internet / intranet / both?

Both. But with somewhat different scopes.

266. Which tools and infrastructure are already available for this project or should be taken into account when designing the architecture of the solution?

None. This RFP is for the provision of the tools.

267. Modernization of legacy application, SOA tools and Rich internet application tools can be seen as different sub project, will you consider only the bids that provide answer to the full RFP?

No you may bid for tools under one or more of the three categories. However the proposal for POC should be comprehensive. Further the level of integration of the proposed platforms may be one of our selection criteria.

268. Is it possible to have a demonstration of MAPS and DMAPS?

In any case not before PPOC, and than of course only the short listed bidders.

Application environment and data integration

269. Please confirm that the current RFP is regarding the application in the mainframe rather than on UNIX or LINUX.

270. Whenever, the system is ported to UNIX platform and during the phase that it remains implemented in NATURAL + ADABASs; then will the web enablement of that system be asked by WIPO in a separate RFP?

Will be decided after POC. The reactive or proactive W.S deployment tactic is indeed an issue.

271. The solutions suggested for the mainframe-based system might not be useful for the UNIX based system. Therefore, could you explain a bit further why porting to UNIX based system when the language is still NATURAL and database is still ADABAS? Porting to a UNIX system is understandable when the language is JAVA and the database ORACLE.

Absolutely not. ADABAS and NATURAL are Unix products, as well. Porting Natural V4 code to Unix requires only recompilation. The cost of downsizing is mainly due to converting the JCL to shell. But it is true that the decision to downsize is made almost exclusively on a cost/benefit analysis (Unix hardware being reputedly cheaper).

272. Does WIPO plan its NATURAL applications to be replaced by a SOA/J2EE/Java based solution thus eliminating the Natural run-time in the future? Is this a correct statement?

SOA now, but J2EE not before 4 to 5 years.

273. Does WIPO prefer solutions that will allow the existing production environment to be fully available during the modernization projects?

Yes.

274. Are the NATURAL based applications using some common or shared module(s) or is each application developed independent from the rest?

MAPS and DMAPS share many programs as well as many files.

275. Do the NATURAL applications use a common layout across all applications or the user interface is varying across the applications?

UIs are quite consistent but again after 13 years of maintenance some drift occurred but in a contained way.

276. Does WIPO foresee the development of the new functionality to still be done using NATURAL language or using only the new SOA/J2EE/JAVA based solution?

WIPO has a three step plan:

- ***Re-deployment of the existing application under SOA. Already at this stage some JAVA may be required but the flexibility inherent to SOA will allow us to better meet business requirements.***
- ***Leverage fully the potential of SOA by adding and integrating new services. These could be new “Java”, external services or services provided by commercial software.***

- ***Only in the last phase will the focus be on fully realigning the technology to state of the art J2EE, mainly to preserve our investment.***

277. Are the NATURAL applications using a common module for accessing the data in ADABAS database or each application performs its data access ad hoc or as needed.

Data access on ADABAS is fully "adhoc", program by program.

278. What is exact functionality of the translation process in WIPO? Does it mean translation from one natural language to another, for example, from English to French? Or does it mean translation from one data format to another, for example from Word document format into XML document format?

Translation: trademark bibliographic data can be translated between English, French and Spanish. This is done currently on the block mode mainframe screen, with matches acting as a translation memory.

279. Is WIPO's goal to phase out the ADABAS database in the future and replace it by a RDBMS, relational database system?

By itself I may not be goal, but yes to protect WIPO's investment we are likely to phase out at some stage a product which is becoming a "niche" technology.

280. Is the following statement correct? The goal of the WIPO MAPS/DMAPS system modernization is to allow the business experts/analysts to update/develop existing/new business process logic without the need of an IT expert?

No doubt that this is the essence of SOA, but it is also one of its main challenges as we have yet to fill the roles of "business experts/analysts". These skills exist at present scattered in IT and the Madrid business area but the need to dedicate them to "Business Analysis" hasn't been understood yet

User Interface

281. How many languages are expected?

At this stage (for POC) officially English and French. But Spanish and other languages may be required later.

282. What is the reference language?

English

283. Who does the translation in the other languages?

WIPO understands that IT services firms may not be equipped to perform multi-lingual translations. Therefore we may consider UI translation as a separate activity, which we may carry out ourselves or externalize. However the entering additional languages to the

UI will have to be a task that can be performed by a non IT staff. Adding a language must be done without changing any code (java, Natural).

284. there a WIPO presentation standard for web interfaces?

Unwritten yes. This situation may change.

285. Will it be provided to us?

One way or another we have to.

286. Is it a correct statement saying, the skipping or leaving out of some screens due to business process logic means that in the Web based user interface one uses only the actual screen inputs/outputs as one webpage? For example, an application having 4 screens can skip the screen number 3 if a data already exists in the database so the resulting Web interface will deal only with data/inputs/outputs for screen 1,2 and 4.

This is correct. An other example are limitations (to the scope of a trademark) where the screens are skipped when no limitation has been requested.

Non-functional Requirements

287. Who can access the application (internal WIPO users only)?

Currently external users, such as the Swiss office can access the system for data entry. The potential of SOA will allow the expansion of the external users community. Bear in mind that with SOA external users may not be only humans but also systems.

288. Where are the users located?

In future they may be anywhere in the world.

289. From which scope will the application be accessed (intranet, internet)?

Both.

290. Is there a requirement to enable access from Internet passing through a WIPO firewall?

Yes.

291. Is WIPO using a VPN or any other secured access infrastructure for Intranet access from Internet or such an infrastructure needs to be put in place?

Currently we use VPN to access MAPS from outside for translation and also support purposes. But it is doubtful that SOA security issues can be addressed through VPNs. In this context VPN would be more like bypassing the issue.

292. How many users are expected to use the application?

We have no projections at this stage, but the current figure of 120 is likely to expand significantly.

293. How many concurrent users are expected at maximum load?

See previous question. For POC retain the figure of 120 concurrent sessions.

294. What is the maximal response time accepted for 95% of the time?

WIPO hasn't yet internal SLAs hence no response time requirement. At present the online systems offer sub-second (< half second) .

295. What is the availability expected (for example 99.5% up time)?

With SOA we will be aiming at 24/7, probably with 99.+% up time.

296. an increase of the load expected in the future? Can WIPO provide a quantitative approximation?

We have no projections at this stage, but the current figure of 120 is likely to expand significantly.

297. there WIPO preferred database server vendor?

No, at present both ADABAS and Oracle are represented.

298. Is there WIPO preferred application server vendor?

No.

299. Does WIPO prefer the SOA software stack to be coming from a single vendor?

As this could help in terms of smooth integration this may be one of our selection criteria, but only one amongst many others.

300. Who will be responsible for maintaining these servers (application server & database server)?

This hasn't been decided yet, but there is some potential for outsourcing such services.

301. Is there a WIPO coding standards requirement?

WIPO has (had) some coding standards for Natural V2, they are obviously somewhat obsolete with V4. No standards exist yet for Java.

Business Goals

302. Is it a goal of WIPO to reduce the total costs of ownership by modernizing the MAPS/DMAPS applications?

Our goals to better meet business requirements by extending scope of the applications and improve responsiveness to new requirements. Protecting our investment by phasing out obsolete or niche technology is also one of our concerns.

303. Does WIPO plan to reduce/increase the IT staff for their applications services?

There are no such plans (additional budgeted posts) at this stage. However for the sake of the MAPS/DMAPS modernization program WIPO will mobilize the necessary resources for consulting services. For the production phase further outsourcing, of technical support, may be an option, with a mixture of internal staff if necessary.

304. What are the most desired benefits as seen by WIPO with regards to the projects asked for by this RFP?

Build WIPO's SOA platform, prove its viability and gain insight in running projects in an SOA environment.

305. Is there a WIPO Roadmap for IT-Technology? If so, what are the Mid-Term/Long-Term Targets of WIPO ?

No, but as far as MAPS and DMAPS are concerned the answers are in the SOGETI report.

306. Except “downsizing to Unix” are there any other platform (both in terms of Hardware and Software/COTS Products) decisions taken?

No.

307. Does WIPO intend to change and/or improve business processes or is the aim of the projects mentioned in the present RFP a purely technological upgrade?

WIPO has a three step plan:

- ***Re-deployment of the existing application under SOA. Already at this stage some JAVA may be required but the flexibility inherent to SOA will allow us to better meet business requirements.***
- ***Leverage fully the potential of SOA by adding and integrating new services. These could be new “Java”, external services or services provided by commercial software.***
- ***Only in the last phase will the focus be on fully realigning the technology to state of the art J2EE, mainly to preserve our investment.***

308. Are the existing business processes already documented and described? If yes how are they described and are the artifacts (documents, files, etc.) available for bidders?

Logical and physical data model, predict and xref, workflow diagrams, Trademarks & Designs regulations.

309. “Conversion PPOC”. What will be the input from WIPO for the PPOC?

Bidder(s) retained for PPOC will be given all available documentation, source code etc.. They will be invited for a demonstration of the live application. Part of PPOC will also to install the SOA tools on hardware provided by WIPO.

310. What would be provided or sent by WIPO to short listed bidders, in order to enable preparation works (i.e. the Natural/ADABAS modules) or are participants required to perform all preparations during PPOC on WIPO’s side?

See previous question.

311. Was there already a detailed business and requirements analysis conducted (i.e. non-functional requirements, regarding usability, maintainability, performance,) – if yes, are there any relationships between the conducted analysis and the requirements of the present tender ?

No, this is part of POC (“gain insight in running projects in an SOA environment”)..

312. Annex I, Page 10, Section 4: Does WIPO provide or are there any metrics available to measure possible cost/speed/security benefits?

No.

313. Annex I, Page 12, Section 6.1: “Mixed structure” – what would be the limits of authority for the WIPO experts in the structure ?

WIPO staff has a sound knowledge of the trademarks and design business, with the shortage of documentation of the legacy systems and the complexity of the business requirements their availability will be a key critical success factor. Further they will fulfill the role inherent to POC’s stated objectives. SOA platform validation and skill gathering.

314. What would be the goal for the WIPO experts in a “mixed structure”? To obtain full knowledge of the SOA expertise and continue on their own account, or serving as subject matter experts and peers?

Both, see answer to previous question.

315. What are the envisioned limits of duration of the projects C2 and C3?

POC should be completed by November/December 2009

316. Annex I, Page 17, Section 2: Are there any shared services, infrastructure, components or processes between Patents and Trademarks (existing or envisioned)? If yes, which are those ?

No.

Infrastructure

317. Is the C4 project “Downsizing on Unix” terminated?
If no, do we have to propose a solution for the Unix environment, the mainframe environment or both?

At the time of writing this issue remains open. WIPO hasn't finalized the decision to downsize its ADABAS/NATURAL application. But this should only affect the Web Services enablement component of this RFP. If your WS enablement solution requires a UNIX environment say so. For other components BPM/BAM and RIA simply state your hardware requirements.

318. How is architected this new Unix environment? (Virtualization, Clustering)
On which hardware does it run?

See previous question.

319. On which Unix did you migrate the MAPS and DMAPS applications?

See previous question.

320. Which environments are currently at your disposal for working? (Development + Testing + Pre-Production + Production)

We have test, acceptance test, volume test end production.

321. What's your security infrastructure for your Microsoft Windows connections?

We are unable to publish such information. Releasing data regarding our security infrastructure will not be considered before short listing. Please make provision in your bids for any potential issue.

322. Are all your agencies included in a World Wide VPN? If not how do you communicate between them in term of IT?

WIPO doesn't have agencies. We communicate with National and Regional trademark offices. Current we exchange XML data via FTP. One exception is the Swiss office who has a VPN connection to our applications on which they perform data entry.

323. Do you have multiple server sites?

No.

324. Do you expect to have the new MAP, DMAP application deployed on several sites?

Not in the near future.

325. Does the new application have to be accessible from the Internet?

Yes, at least some components of it.

326. Does the WIPO already use a BI solution? If yes which one?

Not within trademarks and designs. Other sectors of WIPO use or have used Business Objects.

327. Do we have to include in the proposition a CMS (content management system) or do we have to use an existing one?

You may if it is consistent with your proposal.

Natural/Adabas

328. In the “Annex II to RFP N° PCD/08/048 - page 8”, you ask a demonstration that the workflow functions, currently built into the legacy application, can be bypassed. To evaluate the work load to separate the workflow from the current transactions, we need to know how that workflow is imbricated in the Natural code.

This is a PPOC and POC issue you will be given this information at that time.

329. Is there an Adabas database, or other, in the behind to save the workflow states?

Yes one ADABAS file: MP-SERV-RQST-ACN

330. Is the workflow Natural code centralized?

To some extent, one common subprogram controls the selection of and transition to subsequent action(s) but on the basis of information provided by the program(s) performing the action. Over the year inconsistency have appeared in various places of the application.

331. Is each interaction with the workflow done by a unique entry point on a precise Natural “module”?

See previous question.

332. Did you define a common way to pass parameters to the Natural transactions?

Yes, there is a good consistency in that area.

333. Are the returned values uniformly formatted between the several transactions?

Yes, there is a good reuse of PDAs (Parameter Data Areas)

334. Are the current applications internationalized? If yes, Do the transactions return codes or translated strings?

Where are stored the translated strings?

Is it possible to extract them?

For each screen the application selects the MAPs corresponding to the language environment variable i.e each screen has a map in English and one in French. Hence strings aren't isolated they are embedded in the map.

Error messages are in two languages, their extraction is probably possible.

335. Is the current Natural code versioned and is the corresponding Adabas database also versioned. If yes, in which way and on which product?

No on both accounts, versioning is inexistent.

Tools

336. Annex II to RFP N° PCD/08/048 - page 10”. You speak about other WIPO tools that have to be integrated in the proposed IDE. Which are those WIPO tools?

XML Spy at this stage. Natural plugging may become a requirement as well.

Organization

337. “Annex II to RFP N° PCD/08/048 - page 38”. We have to propose a training plan for the WIPO’s people integrated in the different teams. What’s their actual profile and what’s their level in BPEL, J2EE, Java, Natural, RUP?

Base your proposal on Natural Adabas / Structured methodologies Experts with 15 to 20 years experience. WIPO would deal with the tuning of the requirements as some staff may already have received some exposure to the target technologies.

Please separate requirements into three areas:

- ***Web Services and their life cycle,***
- ***BPM & BAM,***
- ***RIA***

338. “Annex II to RFP N° PCD/08/048 - page 15”. Where is the excel file, SOAAndTools_RFP_Criteria.xls?

This spreadsheet has been published with this document.

339. Are you waiting for an inclusive project concerning the “C2 POC” proposition?
Or do you only expect estimation?

We only expect an estimation for the overall POC. However the daily rates quoted for your proposed experts will be binding.

340. Is it right that the three teams are dispatched between Madrid, Hague and Geneva?

No, the three teams would be separated into the following domains:

- ***Web Services and their life cycle,***
- ***BPM & BAM,***
- ***RIA.***

341. How many people will you provide in each Team?

It will be difficult to provide more than one in each team.

New application specifications

342. Do the application users need to print out locally the current screens or do they only need to print mass reports?

Both MAPS and DMAPS are paperless systems. All notification are mass printed. There are a few exceptions though, such as the re-printing of isolated letters, or, for translators who prefer to work on paper the printing of lists of goods and services.

343. Which is the sizing of the printings, per locations, per applications?

Currently we print 1.5 to 2 million pages per month nearly all of which is produced in our central printing facility. But this issue isn't within the scope of POC.

344. Do the current application subsystems will take in charge the whole printings?

Yes.

345. Or do we have to include a complete printing solution proposition?

No, this is definitely not within the scope of this RFP. During POC we will have to show

346. We need a more precise idea of how many concurrent users will access each application?

At present 120, but S.O.A is likely to change this dramatically.

347. Where is currently stored the security information for the DMAP, MAP applications?
Is it possible to access it via the ldap protocol?

If not is it possible to extract the data from the current data repository?

The security information in MAPS/DMAPS is somewhat scattered around the environment and the application:

- **TSO & RACF at the mainframe OS level,**
- **Natural Security with the SAG environment,**
- **The application has its own user roles and prerogatives definition,**
- **Rights to the workstations are controlled via LDAP.**

Some, if not all of this information may be retrieved but, as we may rethink as part of the modernization program the way we protect our applications, its pertinence will be limited.

348. For the C2 (POC) project, what's the number of Adabas table implicated in the transactions, the number of transactions and the number of screens per transactions?

This will be decided at the onset of the project please se answers to similar questions, 152 for instance, throughout this document.

349. Do you have a complete description of the trademarks management for the part concerning the POC?

See previous question.

350. Are the applications MAP and DMAP running on a CICS subsystem?

No.

351. Can you provide us a low level schema of the DMAP and MAP applications? How the applications are hosted in the operating system between the several subsystems.

The information provided in annex one, on page 19 particularly should be adequate for this RFP the SOGETI report may provide more details.

352. In the “Annex II to RFP N° PCD/08/048 - page 18”, Do the reports access data from the current process instance context (documents, business objects and running context data “active tasks, timers, users, status ...”) or from several process instances (BAM like)?

In our evaluation Ad Hoc reporting will have a low weight, simply respond to the questions under this heading.

353. In the “Annex II to RFP N° PCD/08/048 - page 18”, Do we have to include the documents in the process instances.

See previous question