



Board of Directors
Joseph L. Campbell
President
Lisa M. Borba
Vice President
Bette Boatman
John A. Burgh
Connstance Holdaway

ADDENDUM 1

General Manager
Jerry Brown

Request for Proposal #1624 SharePoint Implementation and Training Services

The District draws your attention to the following changes to Request for Proposal #1624, dated March 22, 2016 (via addendum). The original proposal documents have been modified in the following ways. 1) Proposed schedule has been revised. 2) Questions submitted by multiple perspective contractors are listed with the applicable answers.

PROPOSED SCHEDULE

| | <u>Original</u> | <u>Revised</u> |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Release of Request for Proposal | March 7, 2016 | |
| Written questions due | March 15, 2016 | March 18, 2016 |
| Response to questions | March 22, 2016 | |
| Proposals due | March 25, 2016 | March 29, 2016 |
| Evaluation and selection of finalists | March 30, 2016 | April 1, 2016 |
| Interviews of finalists | April 4-8, 2016 | April 11-15, 2016 |
| Selection of provider | April 15, 2016 | April 20, 2016 |
| Contract to be approved | April 30, 2016 | May 11, 2016 |
| Commence implementation | May 9, 2016 | May 18, 2016 |
| Anticipated project completion | September 16, 2016 | |

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. Q – Implementation of software solutions can vary widely depending on project budget. Our firm has successfully delivered projects across various budget ranges. To help us best meet the goals of your solicitation, can you please approximate a budget range (i.e. if there is a solicitation following the RFI process) for a typical implementation (e.g. based on average number of users, etc.)? For example is the anticipated budget range: a. Less than \$50,000 b. \$50,000 – \$75,000 c. \$75,000 – \$100,000 d. \$100,000 – \$150,000 e. \$150,000 – \$250,000 f. \$250,000+)

A – The District cannot provide budget estimates at this time.

2. Q – Can you please detail the required or desired vendor qualifications related: a. Microsoft Competencies b. Staff Certifications (e.g. we have 2 SharePoint Certified Masters) c. Vendor location / Proximity to the District d. Any other material vendor qualification

A – a) The District would expect a qualified vendor to have competencies in SharePoint Server, SQL, Windows Server, and Office applications as applicable for the effective leveraging of InfoPath, etc., as needed.

b) Microsoft certifications would fall under the "Firm's Experience" and "Additional Information" sections. Certifications are not required, but certainly desired.

c) The District expects a fair amount of onsite meeting and training, so reasonable proximity would be desired, though not required.

d) Include any additional qualifications in the "Firm's Experience" and "Additional Information" sections.

3. Q – Our typical delivery model is a mix of remote and onsite services. Are you open to such a delivery model?

A – Yes.

4. Q – Do you have any Microsoft Software Assurance vouchers that might be applied to the planning phase of the project?

A – No.

5. Q – Will certified California Small Businesses receive any special consideration in this procurement?

A – No.

6. Q – The RFP mentions a proof of concept; was this done internally or by an external vendor? a. If the latter, is this vendor eligible to bid on this solicitation?

A – An external vendor worked on the proof of concept. Any vendor that meets the qualifications put forth in this RFP is eligible to bid.

7. Q – Is Active Directory properly configured with the fields, users, groups, permissions and roles anticipated to be used in the solution?

A – Partially; the District would rely on the winning vendor to inform us of any additional configuration needed.

8. Q – Regarding your current use of SharePoint, if you are using it: a. how are you currently using SharePoint? b. What, if any, problems or dissatisfaction have you experienced with SharePoint?

A – The District is using SharePoint on a very limited testing/pilot basis.

9. Q – As it relates to training; on a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 represent "None" and 5 represents "Expert", can you please indicate what SharePoint skills you currently have in house in terms of: a. SharePoint Infrastructure, Administration and Maintenance b. Information Architecture Design and Implementation c. Knowledge and use of SharePoint's innate ECM/ERM facilities (e.g. configuration and deployment Records and eDiscovery Centers, Information Management Policies, etc.) d. Content Owner/Authorship e. PowerShell and C# Development

- A – a) 2
- b) 1
- c) 1
- d) 2
- e) 2

10. Q – How many users do you anticipate using this system?

A – Approximately 300.

11. Q – Can you please provide information/estimates for the following: a. Number of Documents and breakdown of their respective types (PDF, Word, Excel, etc.) b. Number of Pictures and/or Video and breakdown of their respective types (WMV, etc.) c. Approximate average and combined size (in GB) of all documents including multimedia files

A – The **District** file share consists of approximately 50,000 documents (43 GB), and 9,500 multimedia files (32 GB), for a total of approximately 75 GB. These numbers are likely higher than what will actually be migrated into SharePoint due to current duplication. Approximate document types are as follows: 16,000 doc(x), 3,800 ppt(x), 14,000 xls(x), 16,000 PDF, 1,800 rtf, 180 avi, 41 mov, 27 wmv, and 9,305 jpg.

The **Information Systems** file share consists of approximately 30,000 documents (20 GB).

12. Q – Will the system be used to store Engineering, Architectural or GIS-based documents at some point in the future as these have certain special requirements?

A – Possibly in the distant future.

13. Q – How developed is your information architecture and can you please quantify the number of content types and term-sets?

A - It is currently not developed at all.

14. Q – Is disaster/recovery planning within the scope of the project and if so, what disaster / recovery software (products, versions, etc.) do you currently use?

A – Yes, the District currently uses Symantec NetBackup 7.6.

15. Q – With regard to the workflows mentioned in the RFP, can you provide flow diagrams for each of the required workflows (e.g. the one related to the proof of concept)? Although flow diagrams are strongly preferred, if this is not possible, can you please provide a table of metrics indicating the level of complexity (e.g. 1-5) in your own estimation? Complexity rankings should consider: a. the number of steps in the workflow b. The number of participants (people or systems) involved in the workflow c. If it is sequential or parallel d. The source(s) of data involved in the workflow

and the complexity in accessing them e. Any requirements for long running or cross application workflows f. Any requirements for callouts to custom code g. The requirements, rules and policies for the execution of the workflow h. Escalation and/or remediation requirements i. Requirements for administration and reporting of workflow performance j. Any other requirement that may contribute to the complexity of the workflow development, execution, or administration

A – Master Project Authorization (MPA) – Currently a document set that is worked on collaboratively and routed internally, through workflow, for review and formal approval. Once final approved, the document should be locked for editing. The District is open to recommendations for process improvement.

Check Request – Currently a simple draft form, routed internally for review and approval, through workflow, then printed to be submitted in hardcopy. This form requires additional design and feature development. The District is open to recommendations for process improvement.

Approval levels for both workflows vary by department and dollar amount. On average, the number of people reviewing and/or approving an MPA is 6-8, a check request is 2-4.

The two workflows within the scope of this phase of the project have been developed and tested in the POC environment. Both workflows are designed to be sequential and would rank between a 1 and a 2 given the 1-5 complexity rating example (1 being simple and 5 being complicated). The expectation is that both workflows could be easily implemented with some additional work to finalize the design, etc.

16. Q – What, if any, online/electronic forms do you anticipate having the selected vendor create? Please quantify the number of forms, average number of fields for each form, relative complexity (e.g. validation required), and provide samples and/or mock-ups if possible Do you have an existing taxonomy that is suitable for the solution?

A – As part of the scope of work for this project, there is one specific workflow that is a form. The next phase (which is covered with the extension option) has additional form workflows.

17. Q – What, if any, Enterprise Social capabilities do you anticipate as in scope for this endeavor and do you currently use an Enterprise Social technologies/products?

A – The District is open to the possibility of social capabilities on team/department sites, where beneficial to collaboration and productivity. Currently, no enterprise social technologies are being used at the District.

18. Q – Will content in the solution need to be accessible by external parties and if so: a. what audiences will require external access (e.g. vendors, employees accessing the system remotely, the public at large) and how many users comprise each audience? b. Will audiences that need external access have AD accounts? c. Will all external audiences need to login/authenticate in order to access the system or does anonymous access need to be supported as well? d. What features of the

system will external access users be permitted to use (e.g. access to certain documents only, all features, etc.)? e. is mobile support a requirement?

A – The District has not identified any external users at this time. However, as part of the email spam filter, licensing for Axway DropZone, which has a SharePoint interface, may be leveraged at some point for sharing files outside of the domain. At this time, full mobile support is not required, but the ability to view documents, approve workflow items, etc. is desired.

19. Q – The RFP mentions the development of a “team site template”; how different do you anticipate this template will be from the built-in SharePoint Team Site Template? Please provide additional details.

A – The District does not anticipate significant deviations from the existing SharePoint templates. The goal for the entire environment is enough uniformity that staff can join different "teams" or departments and not have to relearn how SharePoint works. The hope is that with a template set up to specific specifications, team sites can be deployed with minimal effort, and still provide the usability staff expects.

20. Q – Are you interested in pricing for auto-classification product(s), which can be used to enhance the IA and significantly contribute to content findability, workflow, retention and disposition, etc.?

A – Possibly, the District is not familiar enough with these products to give an informed answer at this time, but is open to the use of third party tools to enhance functionality.

21. Q – With regard to training: a. Do you desire Curricula Based Onsite Training and if so: i. How many students for Admin Curricula Based Training? (5 days) ii. How many students for Beginner Curricula Based Training? (4 days) iii. How many students for Advanced Curricula Based Training? (2 days) b. Custom Training (onsite) i. How many students for Step by Step Custom Training? (3 days)? c. Instructor Led Training (remote)

A – The current plan is to have one SharePoint administrator, approximately 10 "power users" to assist staff in their departments, and the remaining 290 be general users. Approximately two to three staff members would require the full admin training; the 10 power users, and possibly additional IS helpdesk staff, would require advanced training; the remaining 290 employees would receive shorter, task/function specific training. The District would like to have customized (to our environment) documentation for staff to refer to for basic SharePoint usage.

22. Q – With regard to estimating the cost of post-implementation support: a. What is your vision for post implementation support in terms of a Service Level Agreement, i.e. turnaround time, number of hours per month, hours of coverage, etc.? b. Do you have internal resources to handle post-project Level-1 support (e.g. training questions, hardware or network problems, etc.)? c. Should we price post-project support into our proposal and what quantity (e.g. 40 hours per month for 6 months)?

- A – a) The District expects to have reasonably responsive support, i.e. Monday to Friday during District business hours, one business day response for questions or minor issues, same day/four hour response for support in case of a failure/disaster recovery scenario, brought to the vendor through our assigned administrator.
b) Yes.
c) Pricing for post-implementation support should be included separately in this proposal, per 5.a of the Required Services portion on page 5 of the RFP.

23. Q – What is the target completion date for the entire project?

A – Anticipated completion of the first phase (the scope included in the RFP) on or around 9/16/16. The second phase (covered by the extension option mentioned in paragraph 1 on page 2 of the RFP, and item 8 of the cost evaluation form) has the approximate expected completion date of 1/25/17. Two additional phases have been identified, to be covered by a future procurement, with anticipated completion in the summer of 2017.

24. Q – As an environmentally-friendly/Green company, we strive to reduce our consumption of paper; to that end, can respondents submit proposals electronically via email in lieu of hardcopy proposals?

A – No, the purchasing department requires strict adherence to the submission guidelines listed in the RFP.

25. Q – Would you require additional UX artifacts or design elements required for the branding process?

A – The District would like the SharePoint portal to visually emulate ("look and feel", not navigation) the existing employee website. www.ccwd-staff.com.

26. Q – Will there be a library of acceptable/approved team site logos? If not, can users with permissions add a logo/icon of their choice?

A – The desire is to have relative uniformity across the environment, the number of available logos, etc. would be limited.

27. Q – Who is responsible for managing the navigational architecture for the solution?

A – The expectation is that the winning vendor would provide expertise/best practices in the design and management of navigation elements.

28. Q – Would enterprise social networking elements be part of the branding implementation?

A – Potentially, the District is not familiar with these elements at this time, and would need additional information to answer confidently.

29. Q – Who is responsible for branding decisions within the organization?

A – The Public Affairs department handles any branding for the district currently; however, for this project, the SharePoint governance committee would be responsible (as the portal will be entirely internal).

30. Q – Are there policies and standards defined for the branding process?

A – The existing employee website (www.ccwd-staff.com) will be a basic visual guide, there are no other specific requirements regarding branding at this time.

31. Q – What are the deliverables required for Brand Identity?

A – The portal should visually emulate ("look and feel", not navigation) the existing employee website.

32. Q – Would you require the firm to provide the best practices leveraged for SharePoint branding?

A – The District is open and interested in hearing from experts, as our experience is limited.

33. Q – Can users with permissions change the theme for a team site?

A – No, uniformity is an important factor. All changes to sites would need permission from the SharePoint administrator.

34. Q – Does the layout of each site home page have to be consistent? Can owners of sites make changes to the layout and lists and libraries on the site?

A – Yes, uniformity is important. All changes to sites would need permission from the SharePoint administrator.

35. Q – Are there guidelines about placement of certain types of content on pages?

A – Not at this time, however, uniformity is desired.

36. Q – What is the SQL server version being leveraged within your environment?

A – MS-SQL Server 2012-R2 Standard Edition.

37. Q – Would you be looking for SQL Cluster setup /Availability group setup/Mirroring setup?

A – No, MS-SQL Server will be installed to a host within a VM-Ware based server farm. The SQL-Server host is to be operated within a high availability VM Host "stretch" cluster with actively mirrored Storage Array Network (SAN).

38. Q – What is the version of SharePoint in your current environment?

A – SharePoint 2013.

39. Q – What is the purpose of the portal?

A – The portal, if executed correctly, will be a strong driver in acceptance of SharePoint within the organization. The portal should provide dashboard elements to help facilitate distribution of District-wide information.

40. Q – What are the primary goals of the sites?

A – The sites should enhance and encourage collaboration, security, uniform document management, and the centralization of information.

41. Q – Who will be responsible for managing the portal?

A – The District assigned system administrator, Programmer Analyst Stephen Sandberg.

42. Q – Would the portal be leveraged for internal or external usage or both? Describe your target audience.

A – The portal will be for internal users only; the target audience is approximately 300 employees, including executives, engineers, administrative staff, and field workers.

43. Q – Authentication type?

A – AD single-sign-on.

44. Q – Do you need to be able to track the following?

- a. Specific site collections where external access has been enabled
- b. Specific sites where external users have been given access
- c. Specific documents that have been shared with external users, both authenticated and anonymously
- d. Which external users have access to your SharePoint environment?

A –
a) No.
b) No.
c) Possibly, as part of the email spam filter, licensing for Axway DropZone, which has a SharePoint interface, may be leveraged at some point for sharing files outside of the. That tool may or may not have tracking capabilities.
d) None currently.

45. Q – How is the type of site collection matched to the business need?

A – The District welcomes recommendations from the contracted vendor.

46. Q – Is the use of InfoPath permitted?

A – Yes.

47. Q – Who determines which sites are promoted to which audiences on the Sites page?

A – A governance committee, made up of staff from across the District, will be assembled to help determine things like this. The committee will also identify "power users" in each department who can assist.

48. Q – Describe the current network infrastructure being leveraged within your organization.

A – This question cannot be effectively answered in a reasonable amount of time, or space.

49. Q – Do you have a virtualized environment or actual physical boxes?

A – Virtualized (VMWare).

50. Q – Would you be open to leveraging One Drive (integrated with SharePoint) for document storage?

A – Possibly, the District is not familiar enough with One Drive's integration with SharePoint to answer confidently at this time.

51. Q – What is the total size of the file share data district wide that the customer wants to migrate?

A – In the initial phase, approximately 75 GB in the District file share and 20 GB in the Information Systems file share. These numbers are likely higher than what will actually be migrated into SharePoint due to current duplication.

52. Q – How many files are there in total district wide?

A – Approximately 60,000 on the District file share.

53. Q – What are the largest file sizes district wide?

A – There are some large multimedia files (1 GB) that likely would not be migrated to SharePoint; most of the documents to be migrated are Office/PDF and images.

54. Q – How deep are the folder structures nested district wide?

A – It is common on the District file share to have five to six levels of nested folders.

55. Q – Is there any content that is not being used anymore district wide?

A – Yes.

56. Q – What file types district wide are there?

A – Most of the documents to be migrated are Office/PDF and images

57. Q – Can you share some details as to what the previous POC on workflows entailed?

A – Please see response to question #15.

58. Q – What is the total size of the file share data department wide that the customer wants to migrate?

A – Approximately 20 GB on the Information Systems file share.

59. Q – How many files are there in total department wide?

A – Approximately 30,000 files on the Information Systems files share.

60. Q – What are the largest file sizes department wide?

A – The largest is approximately 10 MB.

61. Q – How deep are the folder structures nested department wide?

A – It is common on the Information Systems file share to have five to six levels of nested folders.

62. Q – Is there any content that is not being used anymore department wide?

A – Yes.

63. Q – What file types department wide are there?

A – Most of the documents to be migrated are Office/PDF.

64. Q – What about the metadata? If so, please specify.

A – Brining existing metadata with the migration would be preferred. The expectation is that metadata will be used to organize all files being migrated to SharePoint (no folders).

65. Q – Can you elaborate on the additional workflow specified on page 2 of the RFQ document?

A – Please see response to question #15.

66. Q – Can you provide some details as to what the previous POC on the workflow entailed on page 2?

A – Please see response to question #15.

67. Q – As per Page 5 of the document – Antivirus recommendation has been mentioned. Is this for the overall environment or just for the SharePoint server?

A – The mentioned antivirus recommendations are only related to the SharePoint server. The District uses McAfee VSE/ePO on the existing file server.

68. Q – Could you elaborate on the “disseminate information” on page 1 -Introduction?

A – The method currently used to communicate across the District is either email or the existing employee website. The vision for the SharePoint portal and department sites to be a method of improving communication of important and useful information.

69. Q – Would you require assistance in procuring licenses for third party tools/software to be leveraged?

A – Potentially.

70. Q – Would you require assistance in procuring hardware resources?

A – No.

71. Q – Unable to view attachment 3 specified on Page 1.

A – Attachment 3 is a screen shot of the existing employee website (www.ccwd-staff.com).

72. Q – Have you received SharePoint training in the past?

A – Three members of the project team received limited, informal training as part of the proof of concept project. Some additional staff also received hands-on training on basic SharePoint usage while workflows produced in the proof of concept were tested.

73. Q – Are there prior SharePoint installations? If yes, is it SharePoint Standard and Enterprise?

A – Yes, only as a proof of concept/pilot system. No current production system. The production system will be SharePoint Enterprise.

74. Q – Is it SQL Standard or Enterprise?

A – The District’s existing SharePoint proof of concept implementation uses SQL 2012 Standard. The intent is that the production environment would use the same.

75. Q – What version of SQL Server will be used?

A – 2012.

76. Q – What version of Windows Server will be used?

A – 2012 r2

77. Q – Will CCWD be providing direction on what will be migrated from the existing file share?

A – Yes, however, the District welcomes expertise/best practices on the best way to facilitate pruning of superfluous and unused files.

78. Q – Does CCWD require that the consultant do the data migration off the existing file share itself, or is CCWD open to the purchase and use of a third party migration tool?

A – The District is open to cost effective third party tools.

79. Q – Regarding the “front-end”; is CCWD providing the branding itself or does the consultant need to create the branding along with the look and feel? Specifically, who is to do the marketing/art for the page?

A – The District will provide art. The SharePoint portal should visually emulate (“look and feel”, not navigation) the existing employee website (www.ccwd-staff.com).

80. Q – Under 2.b., the RFP mentions that members of the project team must be permanent employees of the submitting firm. That would seem to eliminate any responses where a contracted SharePoint expert might be used. Please clarify.

A – The RFP requires that the primary project team be permanent employees of the submitting firm.

81. Q – Is CCWD willing to consider a “hosted” SharePoint environment (Cloud deployment) so that on-prem equipment is not necessary?

A – No, not at this time.

82. Q – With regards to migrating data from file shares into SharePoint, there are several very critical considerations.

- a. Has CCWD completed a formal analysis of the public shared drives to determine what data will be migrated into SharePoint? In a typical scenario an organization may have thousands of folders and subfolders on their shared drive. A migration is an excellent

opportunity to clean out old/duplicate data and restructure it in SharePoint using metadata. Does CCWD plan on a structured migration of data or a “just bring it all over approach. If an analysis has been done may we see the results to better estimate the level of effort?

- b. Approximately how many gigabytes of data will be migrated?
- c. Is CCWD open to the purchase of a migration tool which will greatly enhance the speed and efficiency of migration? Cost for such tools is based on the amount of data (see b). A cost of 10-20K is a baseline. Is there a budget for tools?

- A –
- a) A formal analysis has not been performed. It is expected to be performed during the structured migration (to metadata without folders), and would done based upon expertise/best practices from the contracted vendor.
 - b) Approximately 100 GB in the scope of the first phase (considerably more in the extension phase).
 - c) The District is open to third party tools. The District cannot provide budget details at this time.

83. Q – Will a development or staging environment be made available for the creation of the new SharePoint site? Please define your expectations for this.

A – This District does not foresee a need for this, as there is no current SharePoint in production. However, the District is open to suggestions and recommendations.

84. Q – Regarding the “front-end” look and feel, can CCWD provide complete graphic designs and layouts of the desired look and feel? Branding in SharePoint can be very complex depending on the desired results. In order to provide an accurate estimate of branding we would need clearly defined graphic mockups of the desired end state.

A – Please see responses to questions #25, #30 and #79.

85. Q – With regards to forms and workflow development, is CCWD open to the purchase of a third party workflow and forms tool, such as Nintex or K2. Or should all forms be built with out-of-the-box functionality. Tools of this type can be expensive. Is there a budget for tools?

A – The District is open to third party tools. The District cannot provide budget details at this time.

86. Q – With regards to subcontractors, certain portions of any successful SharePoint project often require SME’s to be brought in, i.e. SharePoint designers specializing in SharePoint branding. Does 2.b. say this will not be allowed?

A – This RFP requires that the primary project team be permanent employees. Specialists can be subcontracted as needed.

87. Q – Which version of SharePoint will be implemented? 2013? 2016? Standard or Enterprise?

A – SharePoint Enterprise 2013.

88. Q – What is the proposed server farm configuration? Number of servers? Versions of software?

A – The District would rely on the expertise of the selected vendor. The farm will be virtualized and have sufficient room for various configurations. The District anticipates Windows Server 2012r2 would be the OS, and SQL Server 2012.

89. Q – How many users will be accessing/using the system?

A – Approximately 300.

90. Q – Will the district's IT department be taking care of installing and configuring the physical and virtual machines operating systems?

A – Yes.

91. Q – Will the district's "Portal" be accessed from mobile devices?

A – The possibility has been brought forward to the project team, specifically from a workflow approval standpoint. It is not a requirement at this time, but would be an option to explore as time and budget allow.

92. Q – Does the district's "Portal" need to be responsive/mobile friendly?

A – Not necessarily, but it would be desirable for some workflows and approvals.

93. Q – Can the district provide a rough estimate on the amount of data that needs to be migrated (100mb, 2terabytes etc.)?

A – Approximately 100 GB.

94. Q – Will the district's portal need to be externally accessible?

A – No, not at this time.

95. Q – Would the district be interested in customizing "Search" (i.e. Search results and display templates etc.)?

A – Possibly, the District is open to recommendations for enhanced capabilities.

96. Q – Can the district provide a brief description of the (2) workflows proposed?

A – Please see response to question #15.

97. Q – Does the district have a preference on using the SharePoint 2010 or SharePoint 2013 workflow engine?

A – The District does not have enough information to answer this confidently.

The original submittal date has been extended to Tuesday, March 29, 2016 at 4:00 P.M. Optional interviews of finalist firms are now scheduled for the week of April 11, 2016. Contract approval and execution is now slated for Wednesday, May 11, 2016.

This document is available online at www.ccwater.com, and is hereby made an official part of Request for Proposal #1624.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.



Brian K. Jackson
Purchasing Officer
Contra Costa Water District

I acknowledge receipt of the foregoing Addendum 1.

Date: _____ Signature: _____

Please sign and return with your proposal submittal package.