

ADDENDUM #2

Question 1:

Regarding page 12 of 61, Section 1.13 Delivery Lead Times, specifically *"All work in this project is to be completed 90 days from the date of award which will include exterior and site inspection reports"* Please clarify what the City means by "exterior and site inspection reports". Could this be legacy text from an unrelated procurement?

AV: This is a part of the RFP that is not something I created. It looks like it had something to do with a previous RFP for building / construction work.

Question 2:

Regarding page 15 of 61, Section 2.2 Background, specifically *"...the City has convened a SharePoint Working Group to represent the business needs of its departments."* Please provide the number of members in this working group, their roles and the departments that they represent.

AV: We have 2 employees in this working group.

Question 3:

Regarding page 15 of 61, Section 2.2 Background, specifically *"...the vendor must not use Microsoft Visual Studio..."* Please advise if the City's expectation is that branding of SharePoint 2016 is in scope for this project.

AV: The city is expecting the vendor to use "Out Of The Box" functionality only including Team Sites.

Question 4:

Regarding page 17 of 61, Section 2.3.1 Physical Architecture, please advise if the City's expectation is that Test or Development Environment's should be included in scope for this project.

AV: No Test or Deployment environments are required. The Vendor will develop a prototype for review that will subsequently be put into production.

Question 5:

Regarding page 18 of 61, Section 2.3.1 Physical Architecture, 2.3.1.1 Vendor Requirements, please confirm that the infrastructure analysis and recommendations are requirements for the project and not expected as part of each Vendors proposal.

AV: The Vendor is to confirm that the infrastructure is sufficient for the proposed implementation and advise the city if they feel it is not.

Question 6:

Regarding page 27 of 61, Section 2.3.1 Documentation, 2.3.11.1 Vendor Requirements, specifically *"...as well as SOP guidelines..."* please clarify the SOPs that the City is referring to.

AV: The city is referring to Microsoft Best Practices for SharePoint Standard Operating Procedures as outlined on Microsoft's website.

Question 7:

Regarding page 22 of 61, Section 2.3.5 Site Collections Hierarchical Structure, 2.3.5.1 Vendor Requirements, specifically "...the following diagram details the requested approach however the Vendor is encouraged to make additional recommendations to the proposed Site Collection hierarchy." Please advise if the City expects recommendations will be made as part of the project rather than included as a part of each Vendor's proposal.

AV: Yes, the city is expecting the vendor to review the proposed Site Collection hierarchy and made additional recommendations for improvement if required as part of the project once the vendor has reviewed more detail about the city's environment and desired use of SharePoint.

Question 8:

Regarding page 24-25 of 61, Section 2.3.8 Records Management Environment, 2.3.8.1 Vendor Requirements. In terms of expectations for records management, many of our customers with a similar list of requirements find that SharePoint 2016 functionality OOTB is not sufficient for their needs:

- a) Does the City have a belief or understanding that these OOTB features will meet their requirements and expectations?

AV: The RFP makes it very clear that the initial implementation is to use OOTB features only because the city does not have the expertise nor the budget to manage a highly customized environment.

- b) How did the City decide on this list of functionality?

AV: The City decided on this functionality based on a review of its requirements and its ability to support a SharePoint environment.

- c) Does the City have any expectations for how these requirements would be met in SharePoint 2016 without customization?

AV: Yes, the City believes its initial implementation requirements will be met without customization.

- d) Would the City consider a SharePoint 2016 Add-in that would give a significantly improved records management experience?

AV: The City believes that the SharePoint OOTB Records Management capabilities should be sufficient to accomplish its stated requirements. However, the vendor may wish to make recommendations for any Add-Ins that it believes helpful under a separate proposal or appendix additional offering outside the scope of the RFP requested response.

Question 9:

Regarding page 56 of 61, Appendix C – Reference Form, specifically "Each Proponent is required to provide three (3) references from organizations similar in size and scope to the Purchaser's for which the Proponent has provided the same or similar Deliverables within the past three (3) years." and page 57 of 61, Appendix D – Rated Requirements, A. Proponent's Corporate Qualifications and Experience, second bullet point, "A minimum of three (3) client references, including client contact information from projects

of a similar size and scope completed for social housing groups within the past three (3) years. For each reference, provide a detailed project description/example including scope of work, budgets, photographs and project locations.”. These instructions are not identical. Can the City please confirm that references should be constructed in accordance with the Appendix C – Reference Form description?

AV: This is a cut and paste section of the RFP I was not responsible for. The city should clarify “social housing” actually means “SharePoint implementations”.

Question 10:

Regarding page 57 of 61, Appendix D – Rated Requirements, M1. Please clarify if this requirement is for (a) a Microsoft Gold Partner with a specialization in SharePoint and not with a specialization in on-premises solutions. There are no SharePoint-specific Microsoft Gold Partner certifications for “on premise solutions” specifically. The current Microsoft Gold Competency, associated with a specialization in SharePoint, is “**Microsoft Gold Partner - Collaboration and Content**” Can the City confirm that this is the expected level of Microsoft Gold Partnership required to meet this mandatory criteria? If not, can the City please provide the name of the Microsoft partner level desired?

AV: The City requires the vendor to be a Microsoft Gold Partner with demonstrated SharePoint experience and SharePoint certified personnel.

Question 11:

Regarding page 57 of 61, Appendix D – Rated Requirements, M2, second bullet, specifically “...*between its proposed two consulting members...*” please advise on the roles that the City is expecting and if the City will allow Vendors to present additional “members” for the project if deemed necessary by Vendors at the time of bidding?

AV: The City is expecting the vendor to have Microsoft Certified Personnel with SharePoint certifications and verified SharePoint experience on similar projects.

Question 12:

Regarding page 58 of 61, Appendix D – Rated Requirements, B. Proponent’s Project Lead’s Qualifications and Experience, specifically “*The City reserves the right, at their sole discretion, to reject a Proponent’s Proposal if it is determined by the RFP Evaluation Team that the proposed Project Manger lacks the required qualifications to perform the task of Project Manager.*” We have a choice of Project Managers that we could assign to this project. Can the City please provide a more specific Project Manager criteria that would allow us to best align our resource to the City’s needs?

AV: The Project Management must be able to demonstrate that they have worked on a number of similar sized Microsoft SharePoint implementations.

Question 13:

Regarding page 59 of 61, Appendix D – Rated Requirements, E. Project Schedule and Work Plan:

- a. Please clarify what the City means by “*staff review*” in this context.

AV: The SharePoint Working Group staff will review the vendor's proposed SharePoint implementation project plan.

- b) Would an MS Project Plan with resources included be sufficient for this requirement?

AV: The MS Project Plan should outline the implementation of the various SharePoint stated requirements as well as the resources that will implement them and the time frame.

- c) Please advise on the resources that the City intends to dedicate to this project.

AV: Several resources from the IT and RM departments will be involved in the project at various parts of the implementation.

Question 14:

Please advise if anyone from outside of the City was involved in the formation of this RFP. If yes, kindly disclose the name of the individual/company. If an outside individual/company was used, are they precluded from bidding on this RFP?

AV: Yes, an outside consultant helped the City prepare the RFP. This individual will not be bidding on the RFP and they will not be participating with any vendor who bids on the RFP. They will be participating in the review of the RFP and vendor evaluation. They will be working with the city to ensure oversight in the SharePoint implementation on behalf of the city. No, their contact information will not be shared with any vendor.

Question 15:

Please advise if any external assessments (of SharePoint or Records Management) were completed prior to the formation of this RFP. If yes, kindly disclose the name of the individual/company. If an outside individual/company was used for this activity, are they precluded from bidding on this RFP?

AV: Yes, an outside consultant helped the City prepare the RFP. This individual will not be bidding on the RFP and they will not be participating with any vendor who bids on the RFP. They will be participating in the review of the RFP and vendor evaluation. They will be working with the city to ensure oversight in the SharePoint implementation on behalf of the city. No, their contact information will not be shared with any vendor.

Question 16:

Please advise if the City would allow Vendors to modify Appendix B – Bid Form by adding additional pricing descriptors, without modifying or removing any of the City's prescribed text.

AV: The vendor must meet at a minimum the Pricing descriptors the City has specified. It may add more pricing options outside of the city's minimum expectations as detailed in Appendix B.

Question 17:

Please provide the approximate number of City employees that the winning Vendor is expected to liaise with during the project.

AV: Two

Question 18:

Please provide the number of people currently working in the City's Records Department.

AV: The Records Management department has two employees.

Question 19:

Is it the expectation of the City that document migration from legacy content repositories should be considered in scope for this project?

AV: No

Question 20:

SharePoint 2019 is meant to be released in this calendar year. Does the City have plans to upgrade when the newest version is available?

AV: No has the City does not want to use RTM solutions.

Question 21:

The RFP document appears to contain links (appear in the document as "[here](#)"). These links do not work. Please provide vendors with working links or provide an updated RFP document which contains the information that was linked to.

AV: Please press the CTRL button and click on the left mouse button, you will be sent to the document linked to the internet.