

Sharepoint Server Build

Request for Proposal: Questions & Responses

April 7, 2008

The following questions were recorded during the pre-bid conference held April 2, 2009 at the State Bar of California's San Francisco Offices. The answers to these and any additional write-in questions can be found below.

1. How many local users (I.T. and Web content developer/publishers)?

Between 25 and 50 State Bar staff.

2. Plan to use for collaboration?

Out of scope -- eventually perhaps this may occur. Currently the bar uses Hummingbird Collaboration for various internal and external groups via a secure Web site.

3. Does the Bar use AD (Active Directory)?

Yes.

4. Attorney Search mechanism?

It's an Asp.net application (.Net 2.0) using SQL Server and runs on our members.calbar.ca.gov (our SF site/server location) applications subsite.

5. Would SharePoint "forklift" (replace) Hummingbird?

Out of scope of this RFP. However, SharePoint's Document Mngt and Document Retention functionality will be reviewed once the WCM implementation completes.

6. Current Infrastructure of our SF site?

We are moving many applications and server hosts into our VM Ware installation... large network shares are carved out for departments (e.g., V: and H: drives that get backed up by IT Operations); also, we are moving to Blade Servers as our standard.

7. Entertain multiple hosting options from a single vendor?

No. We are looking for an internally hosted solution only (see next question and #12).

8. What if we provide only one option—would we be dinged?

No – currently we want an on-site implementation -- here in our SF facilities as the solution.

9. Number of hits to the Public Web site?

Average daily numbers: 1.4M hits, 310K page views, and 35K unique visits.

10. Use current SQL Instance or new one(s) needed?

A new SQL Server and license will be purchased by the State Bar if required for the implementation; otherwise, our current SQL instance may suffice.

11. Equipment, facilities the Bar provides?

The State Bar will provide working and meeting spaces and network hookups during all phases of this implementation project.

12. Costing – how will we compare? (like to like)

All proposals will be aimed at setting up the MOSS 2007 WCM environment o our SF location at 180 Howard Street (also see Q #8).

13. What is the Proposed Budget for the project?

RFPs are created when the State Bar anticipates most bids for services to be at least \$50K.

14. Overall functionality--list of key features, or should we just check and “go on our own”?

There are no Web applications running on the public site itself, www.calbar.ca.gov – so no application functionality is required to be migrated. Granicus is being used for streaming content.

15. Current Teamsite workflow?

Many departments have their Teamsite content publishing experts that know how to get their department’s Web pages updated and published to the Public site. This involves a VPN logon and some FTP use for file transfer.

16. Web site branding?

Not in scope. We do have efforts underway for future redesign of our Public site. We also have in-house Web developers fluent in asp.net/SQL/C# for Web apps. The State Bar controls the calbar.ca.gov domain.

17. Proposal costing – Time and Materials basis vs. fixed cost or a blend?

Time & Materials (with a not-to-exceed cap) would be the preferred method of costing your proposal. A firm fixed-cost bid is also acceptable.

18. Vendor able to work on-site?

Yes, most or all of the work should be performed here in San Francisco, at 180 Howard St. Should VPN access prove advantageous we can consider it when best needed. There are no other projects constraining this one – I.T. “owns” this SharePoint project. Knowledge transfer to designated I.T. staff will be an important aspect of this project.

19. Open to 3rd party recommendations?

Only if recommendations contained in your proposal reply make their case, yes. Include your recommendation(s) if it makes sense for this proposed SharePoint 2007 WCM environment. Ideally, the more out-of-the-box implementation, the better.

20. Any digital media on the current Public site?

This may crop up in the future but all we link to on the public site are standard PDF files. Ecommerce is pushed to other commercial Websites or constructed on our application Web sites such as members.calbar.ca.gov – so this is not in the current scope of moving static content to a SharePoint managed Web site. However, we do host some streaming (see #14). We do link to Granicus and Sections’ vendor for some streaming webcasts for the public site.

21. Browser compatibility support?

We aim for compatibility with perhaps the top 80% of the browser market share, e.g., IE 6, IE 7 (IE 8 is brand new), Firefox 2, Google’s Chrome, and Apple Safari.

22. Migration fidelity and Revision control?

Just the top level, most current version of each Web page will be moved into SharePoint, starting with a “1.0” version of all the static content. It is not in scope to be concerned with prior content within Teamsite. It will be up to the bar’s departments to refer back if needed to older content, on their own, and within their own document repository. What is important is to track the “when” the pages get migrated from the one old CMS to the new proposed SharePoint WCM.

23. Audit Trails – can they be lost during the migration?

We will archive our old Web logs and audit trails ourselves before the actual migration and implementation, go-live of the new SharePoint hosted Web site.

24. OK to lose metadata?

We expect all pages' internal metadata tags and content to be preserved when it moves into the SharePoint WCM environment.

25. Security model for public site?

Anonymous logons are permitted for the vast majority of the publically accessible static content Web pages.

26. What/how do we login with now (Teale, workflow) to publish?

There are four staff at the bar who can approve and see something gets published to the production public Web page using the Teamsite tool. We anticipate SharePoint WCM to spread out the responsibility of publishing content once we have the new workflow established.

27. Once published, are all pages available? Sections?

Yes, some though are restricted via internal (application driven) members-only logon before static content can be accessed (e.g., Sections & Meetings specific content for their 16 Sections for their paid sections members/subscribers).

28. Number of current counted Web templates on www.calbar.ca.gov?

There are five templates used, plus about 25 xml-based presentation templates.

29. Number of sub-sites – separate domain names, sub-domains?

The sub domains are (and already hosted in our SF site): members, collab, sections, apps, statebarcourt, secure, lawstudents, and apps.statebarcourt is a special case.

30. Proposal is for static (content) only?

Yes.

31. Google/Search tool used in the public site?

The Public site's search function utilizes members.calbar.ca.gov to host the search and its results, which is Google Appliance powered.

32. Do we want to use SharePoint Search instead, starting out?

Yes.

33. Any ADA requirements now, in the scope of this project?

Not in the scope of this project.

34. Outsource – Co-location or managed services? Why does the managed service need to be in a 50-mile radius of SF?

No, it's been decided the implementation will be in SF (see #8).

35. Four 9's of uptime? Hosted offsite v. on-site in SF a difference?

On-site only. State Bar I.T. will maintain and manage the SharePoint.

36. Content volume (PDF) – how many static pages to convert into the new SharePoint managed WCM?

Start with the homepage at www.calbar.ca.gov, and then a couple of static page layers below that. We would like enough content to have moved so we know our implementation works and can sign off.

37. Do we have space (disk capacity? server room real estate?) at our SF site?

Yes.

38. You have requested the most recent year's annual report or comparable document, including detailed current profit and loss, assets and liabilities, and other relevant financial data—for privately held companies is it OK to submit this only after an NDA has been signed by the Bar/Project Manager?

A signed NDA can be had and executed in order for your financials to be disclosed and be compliant with our request.

39. The RFP mentions Workers Compensation coverage with limits of not less than One Million Dollars. As a company we have Workers compensation coverage of \$500,000, is that non-responsive and will not meet your minimal requirements for the RFP response?

The statutory requirement is \$1M.

40. Due to the questions raised at the pre-bid conference, will there be any additional allowed for preparation of the proposals?

The due date has been extended from the original 4/20/09 until 5pm, Monday, April 27, 2009.