



Eric Garcetti *Mayor, City of Los Angeles*

Board of Harbor
Commissioners

Jaime L. Lee
President

Diane L. Middleton
Commissioner

Lucia Moreno-Linares
Commissioner

Anthony Pirozzi, Jr.
Commissioner

Edward R. Renwick
Commissioner

Eugene D. Seroka *Executive Director*

DATE: October 17, 2019

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR SHAREPOINT ONLINE MIGRATION CONSULTING SERVICES

Pursuant to the Request for Proposals (RFP), all proposers were to submit any questions regarding this RFP by no later than October 3, 2019. Questions were to be answered in writing, and all questions and responses were to be posted on the Department's website.

Below is a list of questions received from proposers and the Department's response:

1. Q: Are companies located outside the United States (such as India or Canada) allowed to submit proposals?

A: All companies who have the required experience can submit a proposal. However, please refer to question 3.

2. Q: Do companies outside the United States need to come for meetings?

A: Please refer to question 3.

3. Q: Can companies perform the tasks outlined in the RFP from outside the United States (such as from India or Canada)?

A: Some tasks may be performed offsite, depending on the nature of the task and subject to approval by the Harbor Department.

4. Q: Can we submit proposals via e-mail?

A: Refer to Section 3.1 of the RFP, which states that "**Electronically transmitted proposals will not be considered**".

5. Q: Is this opportunity only open to SBE's (\$5M or less) or are SBA small business certified under the SBA (\$27.5M) companies allowed to bid?

A: All companies are allowed to respond to the RFP. However, please refer to Section 3.3.8 of the RFP, "Business Enterprise Programs and Contract Administrative Requirements". There is a mandatory 25% Small Business Enterprise participation requirement, including a 5% Very Small Business Enterprise participation. Please also refer to Exhibit B, which describes the Small and Very Small Business Enterprise Program thresholds and requirements.

6. Q: Is there an established budget for this contract?

A: Budget figures will not be disclosed. In response to this RFP, proposers should state assumptions about the project cost.

7. Q: Will the Port of Los Angeles Harbor Department provide the Attachments/Exhibits from the RFP PDF document in an editable format (MS Word)?

A: Attachments 1 and 2 ("Firm Skills Assessment" and "Staff Skills Assessment") have been uploaded as fillable PDF documents.

8. Q: We are interested in becoming a subcontractor for this project. Who are the current prime contractors?

A: There is no current prime contractor. The Harbor Department encourages those businesses that desire contract opportunities to register with the Los Angeles Business Assistance Virtual Network (LABAVN) at www.labavn.org. LABAVN provides access to an industry specific contractor directory for researching, sourcing, and managing contract opportunities for large and small businesses, and for identifying potential subcontracting opportunities associated with contract awards issued by the City of Los Angeles.

For your reference, a list has been uploaded of all registered LABAVN users who have viewed this Harbor Department opportunity.

9. Q: Is the [Harbor Department] already on Office 365 or do [you] also need help migrating [your] users to Office 365? If [you] are on Office 365, what type of licenses are being used? What other workloads such as Teams, PowerApps, Flow, Forms, etc. are [you] using?

A: Yes, the Harbor Department is already on Office 365. All SharePoint Online licenses have already been procured.

10. Q: Would the migration be an as-is migration?

A: Please refer to the RFP. Proposers should state assumptions for their solution.

11. Q: Would [you] like InfoPath Forms and Nintex workflows to be migrated to SharePoint Online?

A: InfoPath Forms and Nintex workflows should be migrated to SharePoint Online using SharePoint Online out-of-the-box tools. Please refer to Section 2.2.7 of the RFP.

12. Q: What type of files or documents are being used and will be uploaded to SharePoint?

A: Standard file types (.doc, .xdoc, .xls, .xlsx, .csv, .txt, .pdf, .ppt, .mpp, etc.) are currently being used.

13. Q: Are there any custom solutions that you know [you] want to implement?

A: Proposers should state assumptions for their solution based on the requirements listed in the RFP.

14. Q: Is there a need to integrate SharePoint with any external application or database?

A: No, not at the current moment.

15. Q: Do we need to implement custom branding and theme?

A: An out-of-the-box solution is desired. However, if this does not meet the needs of the Harbor Department, then we will consider customization. Please refer to Section 2.2.4 of the RFP. Proposers should state their assumptions for their solution.

16. Q: For how many functional groups / departments do we need to setup the intranet?

A: There are approximately 25-30 Divisions.

17. Q: Are the departments being shared across different regions or each region needs its own department?

A: No. However, external sharing in SharePoint Online will be required.

18. Q: What type of documentation is required?

A: Please refer to the RFP. Documentation shall include but is not limited to the following: project, design, migration plans; technical and functional training; Information Architecture; a Governance Policy, etc.

19. Q: What type of training is required?

A: Please refer to Section 2.2.16 of the RFP.

20. Q: For requirements gathering with different departments, do we need to travel to where they are located or will the sessions be conducted remotely?

A: Requirements gathering shall be held on-site.

21. Q: How many different groups do we need to interview to capture the business and functional requirements?

A: Proposers should state assumptions for their solution.

22. Q: Do [you] have any files on network drive? Do those files need to be migrated?

A: Files stored on the network drive or file shares will not be migrated.

23. Q: Do you already have the relevant licenses for SharePoint Online implementation? If yes, please specify your Office 365 license type (e.g. E3, E5, G3, G5 etc.). If no, do you want us to provide tool licensing cost?

A: Yes, all SharePoint Online licenses have already been procured.

24. Q: Who is the Port's primary IT Partner (VAR) for O365?

A: This information is not required to respond to the RFP.

25. Q: Do you need a custom responsive UI design for the new Intranet solution? Is there a separate design requirement for mobile and tablet devices?

A: An out-of-the-box solution using modern experience with a responsive UI design is desired. If this is not possible, or does not meet the needs of the Harbor Department, then we will consider customization. Please refer to Section 2.2.4 of the RFP.

26. Q: Would you like us to completely redefine branding for the Intranet Solution?

A: An out-of-the-box branding solution is desired. However, if that does not meet the needs of the Harbor Department, we will consider customization. Please refer to Section 2.2.4 of the RFP.

27. Q: Currently, do you have any 3rd party SharePoint migration tool which can be leveraged for this project?

A: We currently do not own a migration tool. Proposers should state which migration tools they have experience with and make their recommendation.

28. Q: Do you have integration with any other application (ERP, CRM, etc.)? If yes, please specify the applications and how are they integrated.

A: No, our current SharePoint environment does not have any integration with any other applications.

29. Q: Are there any extranet or public facing sites hosted on this farm that need to be migrated?

A: No. However, external sharing in SharePoint Online will be required.

30. Q: What kind of customization is present at Root and Site collection level, master pages, event receivers, custom timer jobs, etc.?

A: Master pages are customized in the current on-premise environment.

31. Q: Please share the number of web applications and number of site collections.

A: Please refer to Section 2.1 of the RFP. As for the number of web applications, we currently have 4.

32. Q: What exactly what do you mean by “migrate workflows to SharePoint Online using native SharePoint Online tools”? What native tools are you referencing? Also, does this migration include upgrading the forms from InfoPath to another type of form, and if so what type of form? (PowerApps, OOB SharePoint list forms, Nintex Forms, etc.)

A: An out-of-the-box solution is desired using such forms as PowerApps or OOB SharePoint list forms as well as Flow for workflows. Proposers should state assumptions for their solution.

33. Q: In the RFP, only one existing Roll up Announcement web part is mentioned. Are there any other web parts that we need to migrate from SharePoint 2013 to SharePoint Online?

A: Proposers should assume that each Division may roll up announcements to the portal page, with 5-10 specific Divisions having a dedicated web part solely for their announcements. There are also search web parts configured for specific libraries.

34. Q: For the 5 workflows, which ones are InfoPath vs Nintex? Provide numbers of forms, fields and workflow stages in each.

A: All 5 workflows use Nintex Workflows. There are currently 2 InfoPath forms being used for 2 of the workflows with approximately 10-15 fields each. The other 3 remaining workflows are based off an email receipt to a list or an entry to a list library.

35. Q: Please provide expected timelines for the project execution/completion.

A: The anticipated start date for the project is the second quarter of 2020, with the expected timeline of 3-6 months for the project execution. Proposers should provide a project schedule timeline based on the RFP's Scope of Work.

36. Q: Will you be setting up Development, Test/Staging and Production environments with appropriate configuration, or is it assumed to be the vendor's responsibility?

A: We currently only have one tenant. Proposers should provide their recommendation, including the setup of the environment, in their proposal.

37. Q: Can you provide remote access for some of the work that can be done offsite/offshore?

A: Remote access may be provided for approved offsite work. Please refer to question 3.

38. Q: If shortlisted, is it mandatory for the proposed candidate to be available for in-person interview or can it be done remotely also?

A: The core team is expected to be present for in-person interviews. Any deviation is subject to Harbor Department approval.

39. Q: Is there a NTE (Not to Exceed) budget for this project?

A: Please refer to question 6.

40. Q: Is there a need for personalized or role-based content?

A: Yes.

41. Q: How many vendors does Port of LA expect to submit to this RFP?

A: There is no expectation of how many vendors will respond to the RFP. Any vendor who has the required implementation experience may submit a proposal.

42. Q: Does Port of LA own or prefer a specific migration tool?

A: Please refer to question 27.

43. Q: How many stakeholders would be involved in discovery sessions about look and feel?

A: Proposers should state assumptions for their solution.

44. Q: Is onsite [presence] required for discovery sessions?

A: Yes.

45. Q: How many stakeholders are expected in discovery sessions?

A: Proposers should state assumptions for their solution.

46. Q: Are offshore resources permitted to be used on this project?

A: No. Please refer to question 3.

47. Q: Is Port of LA wanting to rebuild existing forms in PowerApps or a 3rd Party Form technology?

A: Please refer to question 32.

48. Q: Is Port of LA wanting to rebuild existing workflows in FLOW or a 3rd Party workflow technology?

A: Please refer to question 32.

49. Q: Are all 763 OneDrive sites provisioned? Or do they need to be provisioned?

A: Proposers should state assumptions for their solution.

50. Q: From a design perspective, is Port of LA open to using a 3rd Party tool like ShortPoint?

A: An out-of-the-box solution using modern experience with a responsive UI design is desired. If this is not possible, or does not meet the needs of the Harbor Department, then we will consider customization. Please refer to Section 2.2.4 of the RFP. Proposers should state assumptions for their solution.

51. Q: Is the goal to keep the current architecture method? Or to convert all subsites into logical site collections linked through the main Hub Site?

A: The goal is to convert subsites into logical site collections linked through the main Hub site.

52. Q: Is Search currently customized using custom Display Templates?

A: Yes.

53. Q: Since Port of LA currently uses a 3rd Party backup solution, would you like the vendor to make recommendations for a new backup solution or is Ave Point the preferred tool?

A: Proposers should state assumptions or make recommendations for their solution.

54. Q: What kind of training do you envision? Live instructor lead, video tutorials, [etc.]?

A: Training should include written user manuals and hands-on overview training with live instructor-led training on-site.

55. Q: Is onsite training required?

A: Yes.

56. Q: How are you using metadata to improve content searchability?

A: Metadata is configured throughout, including in libraries.

57. Q: Is there a pre-defined metadata structure that Port of LA has come up with or does this need to be discovered in the planning phase?

A: There is a pre-defined metadata structure that is currently used; however, proposers are encouraged to make their recommendations.

58. Q: Has Port of LA worked with any of the vendors expected to submit before?

A: Please refer to question 41. There is no expectation of who will submit a proposal for this opportunity.

59. Q: Is there a specific methodology that Port of LA uses for Content Strategy and Planning?

A: Proposers should state what methodologies they use and recommend.

60. Q: What is the current analytics measurement platform? Is there a reasonable expectation to provide an analytics tool? Is the goal to use purely SharePoint analytics or a 3rd party?

A: We currently do not have an analytics program for SharePoint. Proposers should state assumptions or make recommendations for their solution.

61. Q: Is the expectation to use OOB Modern functionality where possible?

A: Yes.

62. Q: If there is a need for customization, is leveraging SPfX custom components approved?

A: An out-of-the-box solution is desired without losing functionality. If this is not possible, then the Harbor Department will consider customization. Please refer to Section 2.2.4 of the RFP. Proposers should state assumptions for their solution.

63. Q: Will there be a method to update and revise the wireframes if the content plan determines an opportunity for improvement?

A: An out-of-the-box branding solution is desired. However, if that does not meet the needs of the Harbor Department, we will consider customization. Please refer to Section 2.2.4 of the RFP. Proposers should state assumptions for their solution.

64. Q: Will the content strategy include the governance elements for User Generated content?

A: Yes.

65. Q: Is there a plan to also roll out MS Teams within the scope of this RFP? If so, is there a need for a Change Management Team to be in place to handle that roll out?

A: No, not at this time.

66. Q: Does the City have an estimated/desired budget for this project? Is there a Not to Exceed Budget?

A: Please refer to question 6.

67. Q: Does the City prefer a Time & Materials contract, or Fixed Bid?

A: The Harbor Department is looking at both, depending on the tasks and requirements needed. Please refer to Section 3.3.7 of the RFP.

68. Q: Does the City already have an incumbent vendor providing SharePoint services, or IT services?

A: The Harbor Department currently does not have an incumbent vendor providing SharePoint services.

69. Q: Is there an incumbent? If so, could you please provide the incumbent name, contract # and current contract value? Additionally, will the incumbent be allowed to recompetete?

A: Please refer to question 68. All vendors who have the required experience may submit a proposal in response to this RFP.

70. Q: Sec 2.1 Background and Project Objectives – last Paragraph states – “This project is critical to Port operations. Therefore, only proven and experienced implementers will be considered. Proposers must have experience with implementing three (3) SharePoint Online Migrations, including at least one (1) Government Cloud Migration.” Will a vendor that meets all of the past performance and skill set requirements, but does not have “at least one (1) Government Cloud Migration” in their experience be considered for the project?

A: No. The language in the RFP (referenced above) clearly states that proposers must have experience with implementing “**at least one (1) Government Cloud Migration**”. A proposer lacking this implementation experience does not meet all of the past performance and skill set requirements, and therefore will not be considered, as stated in the RFP.

71. Q: For this specific SharePoint project with the Port, is it mandatory to have 25% Small Business Participation, including 5% VSBE? Or are these just general terms?

A: Please refer to Section 3.3.8A of the RFP. There is a mandatory participation for this project. Proposers who fail to demonstrate that they will meet or exceed the SBE (and VSBE) requirements will be deemed non-responsive. Refer to Exhibit B for detailed information relative to these programs and instructions on completing the forms.

72. Q: Please share details on the tenant configuration:

1. Is the current tenant is a vNext Dedicated Tenant or a public tenant?

2. How many tenants [has] Port of LA procured?

3. What is the current O365 Subscription plan?

A: This information is not required to respond to the RFP. Proposers should state their assumptions.

A: We currently have one tenant.

A: This information is not required to respond to the RFP.

73. Q: Please confirm, apart [from] Custom master pages, are there any other unique pages and Custom page layouts that have designed in the Intranet? Please also share the volumetric numbers.

A: We have customized sites and templates. Proposers should state assumptions for their solution.

74. Q: Please share more information on the below inventory items:

- What are the custom Roles defined for user authorization?
- Are there any custom permission levels defined for any of the sites?
- Are there any sites [that] are Internet facing sites?
- What is the total percentage of OOTB (out of the box) templates used in the farm (Team site, blank site, publishing site, etc.)?
- What is the content Size for the 763 MySites?
- How many Infopath Forms are implemented?
- Are there any Sandbox Solutions?
- [What are the] total [number] of custom webparts?

A: Proposers should assume the default role is used.

A: Custom permissions levels are configured on sites.

A: There are no internet facing sites.

A: Please refer to question 30 and 73.

A: The Content Database size for MySites is less than 10 GB.

A: Please refer to question 34.

A: Yes.

A: We have customized sites, templates and webparts. Proposers should state assumptions for their solution.

75. Q: Please provide more details on the existing search implementation on On-premise SharePoint farm: Custom Search components and number of components? Display templates?

A: Search is customized with scope, refiners and custom web parts. Proposers should state assumptions for their solution.

76. Q: Mention the access mechanism for users from different location[s] for accessing SharePoint (Internet, VPN, etc.).

A: Proposers should state assumptions in their proposal.

77. Q: Mention the authentication mechanism (NTLM/Kerberos/FBA/Site minder, 3rd party providers etc.) and the access type (form based/Integrated/Anonymous).

A: Proposers should state assumptions in their proposal.

78. Q: Are there any integrations or interfaces with any line of business or any external systems currently? For example: Workday, Cronos, HRMS, SAP? If yes, then please provide details for the same.

A: No.

79. Q: From the RFP, we observe that Nintex workflows have been used. Please confirm if SPD (SharePoint Designer) workflows or Visual Studio workflows have been used. Please also confirm if any [other] Nintex forms have been used.

A: Please refer to question 34.

80. Q: Could we use the present DocAve tool for this migration, or [do we] need to propose a new migration tool for migration?

A: Please refer to question 27.

81. Q: Could the Current DocAve backup tool [be used] for Online backup, or [does the] vendor need to propose any other suitable backup tool?

A: Please refer to question 53.

82. Q: Are there any 3rd party webparts present in the system (Bamboo, Quest, Amrein etc.)? Please list if any.

A: No.

83. Q: Are there any third party components that are expected to be moved to cloud? If yes, please provide details.

A: No.

84. Q: Are there any console based applications (developed on SharePoint SDK)? If yes, please provide functional outline of these console applications.

A: No.

85. Q: Are there any web services are hosted on the SharePoint farm?

A: No.

86. Q: We assume that Port of LA will provide Office 365 compatible versions of the existing third-party solutions (where available) and the cost of procurement is not part of the scope of this RFP. Please confirm.

A: Proposers should state assumptions or make recommendations for their solution.

87. Q: Please confirm is the following are in scope or not: Performance Testing, Browser Compatibility Testing, Security Testing, Device compatibility Testing–Mobile/Tablet, and Multilingual Testing.

A: Performance, usability, browser capability, security testing and mobile device testing is within the scope of the RFP. Proposers should state assumptions for their solution.

88. Q: Is there a user profile customization done with 3rd party providers (e.g. People directory, Websphere, Schema logic etc.)?

A: No.

89. Q: How many WSP have been hosted in the 2013 Farm?

A: There are currently between 5-10 solutions deployed in 2013, including those for Nintex.

90. Q: Kindly confirm if any 3rd party BI Tools are being used.

A: We do not have any 3rd party BI Tools currently being used with SharePoint.

91. Q: Please list the technical or business user roles and indicative numbers for the individuals that need to be trained.

A: This is addressed in Section 2.2.16 of the RFP.

92. Q: Do you have any existing Learning Management System (LMS) (for example - SumTotal, Saba etc.)?

A: No.

93. Q: Do you have a preference for the mode of training? (e.g., e-learning modules, classroom training, webinars, demo nuggets etc.)

A: Please refer to question 54 and Section 2.2.16 of the RFP. However, proposers should state assumptions for their solution.

94. Q: In case of e-learning, does the training have to be multiple device compatible? (e.g., PC/Laptop, iPads, Tablets, Smartphones etc.).

A: Please refer to question 54.

95. Q: Is there a need to provide training and documentation in any language other than English? If yes, please provide the list of languages.

A: No. However, all documentation related to this project must be provided in both hard copy and electronic formats.

96. Q: Please specify any particular pain points that need to be addressed as part of the training solution.

A: Proposers should state assumptions for their solution.

97. Q: Are there any existing test suites available for [the] iPOLA intranet system? If yes, what is the total count of existing test scripts and test cases available? Are there Regression Test packs available? Are there any classification[s] of test cases by complexity (if so, please share the details)? Are there any existing QA automation test suites available for iPOLA?

A: We have our QA test validation procedures, but they are not automated. Proposers should state assumptions or make recommendations for their solution.

98. Q: We understand that the Sharepoint Server on-premise to cloud migration for iPOLA intranet system is in scope of QA testing. [Are there] any interfacing

systems to iPOLA also in scope for testing? [Are] third party software applications viz InfoPath, Nintex, AvePoint is in the scope of our testing?

A: Proposers should state assumptions for their solution.

99. Q: Please confirm the different types of devices and browsers for which the iPOLA system need[s] to be tested during the migration (for example: iPad Pro, iPhone XS, Samsung Galaxy S10, S9, IE 11.0, Edge, Firefox, Chrome, Safari, etc.).

A: Yes, at minimum IE 11.0, Edge, Chrome, Firefox, Safari as well as iOS and Android devices need to be included for testing.

100. Q: Please confirm whether disaster recovery testing (Develop backup and recovery procedures for SharePoint Online) would be in scope of this engagement.

A: Disaster recovery testing is not in scope of the RFP.

101. Q: Kindly confirm if The Port of LA is fine if the vendor provides some FTEs of the project team from Offshore location (outside of North America).

A: Please refer to question 3.

102. Q: Kindly confirm if the cost needs to be provided in a specific template. If yes, please share the template.

A: There is no template. Proposers should ensure that all of the pricing and cost information requested in Section 3.3.7 is addressed in their proposal.

103. Q: Kindly confirm the challenges/pain points in using the existing system.

A: This is not required to respond to the RFP.

104. Q: This is with reference to the following RFP requirement - "Proposers must have experience with implementing three (3) SharePoint Online Migrations, including at least one (1) Government Cloud Migration." Kindly confirm if cloud migration for government entity qualifies the above requirement. Else, kindly elaborate on the requirement.

A: No. The migration must have been to the SharePoint Online Government Cloud.

105. Q: Kindly confirm if Attachment 2 and resumes need to be provided only for Key Personnel.

A: Please refer to Section 3.3.3 of the RFP. The instructions state, "Provide a completed Staff Skills Assessment Form for **each** proposed member of your firm that will be working on the project (Attachment 2)".

106. Q:Kindly confirm if Organizational Change Management is in scope.

A: Yes. Please refer to the Section 2.2.11 and 2.2.16 of the RFP.

107. Q:Would the Harbor Department be open to part of the work on the contract being performed outside of the United States, if we are able to demonstrate significant benefits such as cost advantage, accelerated deliverables and/or other benefits?

A: Please refer to question 3.

108. Q:Regarding the migration of workflows, is the expectation to redevelop the existing Nintex workflows to the native O365 workflow tool (Flow)? Or are we migrating as-is to Nintex Online in the destination?

A: Please refer to question 32 and Section 2.2.7 of the RFP.

109. Q:InfoPath forms was also mentioned together with the workflow migration (scope #7). Are the InfoPath forms just used to capture the content and Nintex workflow are used as the underlying workflow engine, or are there any business process logic coded in the InfoPath forms? If it's the former (just to capture content), is it the intent to migrate the InfoPath forms as-is, or is the scope to redevelop the InfoPath forms to the new native O365 forms tool (PowerApps)? If there are any business process logic coded in the InfoPath forms, this will not be compatible in O365 and will need to be redeveloped using another workflow/forms tool.

A: There are no business process logic coded in the InfoPath forms. Please refer to question 34 and Section 2.2.7 of the RFP for additional details.

110. Q:Can we get more details of the workflows and InfoPath forms (functional specs or sample/screenshot of how it is currently built)?

A: Please refer to question 34 and Section 2.2.7 of the RFP.

111. Q:SharePoint Designer 2013 and Visual Studio development tools were mentioned in the Background and Project Objectives section. However, we did not see any mention of SP Designer or Visual Studio customizations in the scope. Can we assume that any customizations build using SP Designer or Visual Studio is not in scope to be migrated or rebuilt in this project?

A: An out-of-the-box solution is desired without losing functionality. If this is not possible, then the Harbor Department will consider customization. Proposers should state assumptions for their solution.

112. Q:Are there any other O365 services that need to be considered in the architecture design, migration, or governance such as O365 Groups or Teams?

A: Proposers should state their assumptions and provide recommendations for their solution.

113. Q:What is the expected on-site presence during the engagement?

A: Please refer to question 3.

114. Q:Is there an expected breakdown of how the end user training should be performed? i.e. One large session? Multiple breakout sessions? Does it need to be an [instructor] led session or can we use a recorded session that will be delivered virtually and on demand?

A: Please refer to question 54 and Section 2.2.16 of the RFP. However, proposers should state assumptions for their solution.

115. Q:Is it safe to assume that the previously migrated data and any other content currently in the SharePoint Online POC testing will be blown away during this migration effort?

A: No, there is some content that will need to be preserved.

116. Q:Pages in Classic Sites are not compatible in modern sites. We can migrate the contents (lists and libraries) from classic site to modern site, but the new modern site will use the OOTB default modern pages. If the users want to further customize the default modern page to mimic what they had in the Classic site, this has to be done manually. Is the expectation the rebuild of the modern pages [is] out of scope and will be handled by the business users?

A: The development of the sites with modern pages is within the context of the Scope of Work to be performed by the selected proposer.

117. Q:Has Exchange Online been implemented?

A: Yes.

118. Q: Is Azure AD being leveraged as the primary authentication method or is it being synced from on-premise?

A: Proposers to state assumptions in their proposal.

119. Q: What key capabilities are currently being leveraged in on-premise SharePoint search?

A: Please refer to question 75.

120. Q: Are there customizations that have been performed for on-premise search?

A: Yes. Please refer to question 75.

121. Q: Are "last 5 versions" acceptable for version history migration?

A: All versions need to be migrated.

122. Q: Is the permission mapping the same in SharePoint Online?

A: Permission mapping should be the same in SharePoint Online.

123. Q: Is it possible to leverage a Discovery Tool pre-migration to help refine the scope?

A: Yes, during the discovery session of the engagement.

124. Q: What is the current O365 license? i.e. G3, G5

A: Please refer to question 9.

125. Q: Are there citizenship requirements?

A: No.

126. Q: Are MySites primarily leveraged for file storage, or are there other features being leveraged, such as Blogs?

A: MySites is primarily leveraged for file storage.

127. Q: Will any customizations related to master page or css be expected to be present/recreated in the target environment?

A: An out-of-the-box branding solution is desired. However, if that does not meet the needs of the Harbor Department, we will consider customization. Please refer to Section 2.2.4 of the RFP.

128. Q: Will existing external users be migrated as part of the migration?

A: No.

129. Q: [Regarding Section 2.2.2] Has a determination of Hub and Spoke or Classical information architecture been determined?

A: The intent is to use a Hub-and-spoke model.

130. Q: [Regarding Section 2.2.4] Have a list of needed customizations been established via the POC?

A: Proposers should state assumptions for their solution.

131. Q: [Regarding Section 2.2.5] Have you evaluated any third party migration tools? The size of the migration precludes an OOTB migration in that window.

A: Yes, we have evaluated third party migration tools. Please refer to question 27 for additional details.

132. Q: [Regarding Section 2.2.7] Will these workflows remain in Nintex in the new environment?

A: Please refer to question 11.

133. Q: [Regarding Section 2.2.7] Has Nintex already been provisioned in the new environment? If so what product level?

A: No.

134. Q: [Regarding Section 2.2.9] Does the existing announcement system utilize a custom content type and a search result webpart?

A: Yes.

135. Q: [Regarding Section 2.2.10] This functionality does not exist natively in SharePoint online but can be accomplished via a Microsoft Flow. How many lists require this functionality?

A: There are approximately 2-5 lists that require this functionality.

136. Q:[Regarding Section 2.2.12] Will site branding be enforced via site branding scripts? Will those scripts need to be developed as part of the engagement?

A: Proposers should state assumptions and provide recommendations for their solution.

137. Q:[Regarding Section 2.2.17] Are there known development activities that need to be completed? This is a vague requirement.

A: Proposers should state assumptions in their proposal.

138. Q:Has a Microsoft SMAT been run against the existing, on-prem farm?

A: Yes, the Microsoft SMAT has been run in our Staging Environment which is a replica of our Production environment.

SharePoint Online Migration Consulting Services

[Summary](#) [Views](#) [Bookmarks](#) [Documents](#) [Forms](#) [Links](#) [Reports](#) [Opportunity](#) [History](#)

Registered Users Who Viewed This Opportunity

Name	Company	Location	View Count
Account Team, Microsoft	Microsoft	Redmond, WA 98052	1 time(s)
Anthony, Paulie	Aquiire	Cincinnati, OH 45242	1 time(s)
Appalaneni, Vas	Ardent Technologies, Inc.	Dayton, OH 45459	1 time(s)
Arora, Priyanka	Elegant Enterprise-Wide Solutions, Inc.	Chantilly, VA 20152	1 time(s)
aswath, Nagendra	SRS Consulting Inc	Fremont, CA 94538	1 time(s)
BAGLIEN, JOEL	High Monkey	Minneapolis, MN 55413	1 time(s)
Barrera, Pedro Andrew	AB Consulting Strategies	Los Angeles, CA 90042	1 time(s)
Bernardo, Nick	Net Gain Marketing	Conshohocken, PA 19428	13 time(s)
Bhaskar, Ravi	Infostride Inc	San Jose, CA 95128	4 time(s)
Bichsel, Daniel	AvePoint Public Sector, Inc.	Arlington, VA 22201	1 time(s)
Bjornsson, Ron	SmartProcure Inc.	Deerfield Beach, FL 33441	38 time(s)
Boatright, Don	Mantek Solutions Inc.	Huntington Beach, CA 92647	1 time(s)
Boyles, Diana	Dodge Data & Analytics	New York, NY 10121	29 time(s)
Brandmire, Michael	AVI Systems, Inc.	San Diego, CA 92121	2 time(s)
cao, baocheng	Tomas Unit 300,Rancho Santa Margarita	CA, CA 30021	1 time(s)
Chapin, Mark	bidprime	Austin, Tx 78701	1 time(s)
Chen, Liang	Stellar Services, Inc.	New York, NY 10018	1 time(s)
Cherukuri, Vijay	Infolob Solutions Inc	Irving, TX 75039	1 time(s)
Chitiprolu, Jagan	C2S Technologies Inc.	Bellevue, WA 98007	1 time(s)
Colmenares, Cynthia	Jack Frost Design	Sacramento, CA 95834	1 time(s)
Davis, Chad	Avineon, Inc.	McLean, VA 22102	1 time(s)
de Asis, Lyra	North America Procurement Council, Inc. PBC	Grand Junction, AL 81504	1 time(s)
Desai, Mihir	3Di INC	BREA, CA 92821	1 time(s)
Do, TC	8 Cubed Technologies, LLC.	Covina, CA 91722	2 time(s)
Dowling, Natasha	Capgemini America, Inc.	New York, NY 10003	1 time(s)
Errichetti, Zachary	Bloomberg LP	New York City, NY 10022	125 time(s)
Estrada, Rafael	Estrada Consulting Inc	Sacramento, CA 95811	1 time(s)
Furman, Marc	BAYEN GROUP	TORRANCE, CA 90502	2 time(s)
Furman, Marc	BAYEN GROUP	TORRANCE, CA 90502	1 time(s)
Gaddam, Sree	Celer Systems, Inc	Folsom, CA 95630	1 time(s)
Garrahan, Pablo	The Garrahan Group, Inc	El Segundo, CA 90245	1 time(s)
Ghods, Davood	Direct Technology	Roseville, CA 95661	3 time(s)
Gomberg, Sherman	Scrum Adventures	Long Beach, CA 90808	4 time(s)
Grabowski, Brian	Applied Technology Services	BUCKEYE, AZ 85396	3 time(s)
Gull, Krystn	Burns & McDonnell	Brea, CA 91710	1 time(s)
Gutierrez, Jacob	Presidio Networked Solutions	Irvine, CA 92618	5 time(s)
HARRISON, ZELDA	ZELDESIGN	CULVER CITY, CA 90230	1 time(s)
Hess, Spencer	Taborda Solutions, INC.	Folsom, CA 95630	2 time(s)
Hinson, Mark	Graphics of Distinction	Los Angeles, CA 90015	2 time(s)
Hunter, Debra	Information Design Consultants, Inc.	San Pedro, CA 90731	4 time(s)
Iqbal, Ahmad	BPM Advisors, LLC	La Canada, CA 91011	2 time(s)
Jackinsky, Mary Sue	Eastern Capital Technologies, LLC	San Rafael, CA 94901	2 time(s)
Jennings, Ryan	ArdentMC	Arlington, VA 22209	4 time(s)
Kaul, Ajay	AgreeYa Solutions LLC	Folsom, CA 95630	1 time(s)
Kelling, Lindsay	Catapult Systems, LLC	Austin, TX 78746	1 time(s)
Khamkar, Ash	Sybyte Technologies Inc.	Chatsworth, CA 91311	1 time(s)
Kinthali, Manikanta	Miracle Software Systems, Inc.	Novi, MI 48374	1 time(s)

Kodancha, Natesh	Satwic Inc.	Pasadena, CA 91105	3 time(s)
Kohler, Jens	Urgent Beauty Squad LLC	Los Angeles, CA 90027	1 time(s)
Kristan, Jordan	PA Group	Chattanooga, TN 37408	2 time(s)
Kucheria, Harshada	Trinus Corporation	Pasadena, CA 91101	3 time(s)
Kulinski, Mike	SADA Systems, Inc.	North Hollywood, CA 91601	1 time(s)
Lakakula, Nanda Kishore Kumar	Burgeon IT Services LLC	Somerset, NJ 08873	2 time(s)
Lapid, Rene	Key Information Systems	Agoura Hills, CA 91301	1 time(s)
Laux, Chris	Affirma Consulting	El Segundo , CA 90245	6 time(s)
Leadthem, Scott	Leadthem Consulting	Gresham, OR 97030	1 time(s)
Lee, Stephanie	Navigant Consulting, Inc.	Los Angeles, CA 90071	1 time(s)
Long, Kim	Saigan Technologies, Inc.	Kansas City, MO 64108	1 time(s)
Management, Source	Onvia	Seattle, WA 98101	17 time(s)
Mazza, Kristen	Spruce Technology, Inc.	Clifton, NJ 07012	1 time(s)
McNamara, William	Quest Software	5 Polaris Way, Aliso Viejo, CA 92656	1 time(s)
Melnick, Laurie	Prime Vendor, Inc.	Wilmington, NC 28403	41 time(s)
mendonsa, alia	E.Republic	Folsom, CA 95630	1 time(s)
Mendonsa, Brian	ABcl ltd	Noida, 4545	2 time(s)
Mercado, Sergio	Sam Moving Inc	santa fe springs, CA 90670	1 time(s)
Michael, Thomas	Cloud Navigator	Tallahassee, FL 32309	1 time(s)
Modi, Maulik	Datavail Corporation	Broomfield, CO 80021	1 time(s)
Mohammed, Mudessir	AQL Technologies Inc	Park Ridge, IL 60068	9 time(s)
Mookerjee, Sam	3S Global Business Solutions	Canoga Park, CA 91304	2 time(s)
Mushkatblat, Virginia	Firm Solutions Inc	Las Vegas, NV 89107	1 time(s)
Nair, Manoj	ClarusTec, Inc	Edison, NJ 08817	1 time(s)
Nair, Prem	MERP Systems, Inc.	Herndon, VA 20171	1 time(s)
Nashipudi, Nazim	Enterprise Pals Inc	Overland Park, Kansas 66212	2 time(s)
Nelson, Aaron	Forrester Research, Inc	Cambridge , MA 02140	1 time(s)
Ng, Tom	Collabware Systems Inc.	Cambridge, MA 02138	1 time(s)
Nortelli, Nick	CodeSmart, Inc.	olympia, WA 98516	1 time(s)
Olea, Manny	OpenText	Pasadena, CA 91106	1 time(s)
Pfaff, Coby	Sunrise Integration	Los Angeles, CA 90028	1 time(s)
Pricher, Darlene	DynTek Services, Inc	Irvine, CA 92617	2 time(s)
Richland, Claire	Upper Diamond	Los Angeles, CA 90036	1 time(s)
Rivers, Nancy	Bidnet	ALBANY, NY 12205	1 time(s)
Roberge, Stephanie	Innovative Technology Engineering	Houston, TX 77090	2 time(s)
Rodriguez, Mary	Avocet Environmental, Inc.	Irvine, CA 92618	1 time(s)
Rodriguez, Robert	Cambria Solutions, Inc.	Sacramento, CA 95811	1 time(s)
Rogers, Edward	VirtualSPS	Aliso Viejo, CA 92656	7 time(s)
Rosenbaum, Navah	Deloitte Consulting LLP	Los Angeles , CA 90013	1 time(s)
Santa, Ashley	EXTREME SAFETY Inc.	CARSON, CA 90746	1 time(s)
Santhana, Lakshmi	Business Integra Technology Solutions, Inc.	Bethesda, MD 20817	1 time(s)
Saxena, Nidhi	DatamanUSA LLC	Centennial, CO 80112	1 time(s)
Sciacca, tony	Catapult Systems, LLC	Austin, TX 78746	1 time(s)
Scott, Brittny	Infiniti Consulting Group	Folsom, CA 95826	1 time(s)
Sehgal, Sanjeev	Satwic Inc.	Pasadena, CA 91105	1 time(s)
Shah, Aashna	Exygy Inc.	San Francisco, CA 94110	1 time(s)
Sharma, Priyank	Trinus Corporation	Pasadena, CA 91101	1 time(s)
Shekhar, Shardendu	Technovert Solutions, Inc	Seattle , WA 98121	2 time(s)
Shiffer, Scott	Red River Technology	SACRAMENTO, CA 95814	1 time(s)
Sidhu, Angad	American Association of Airport Executives	Alexandria, VA 22314	1 time(s)
Singh, Kulpreet	22nd Century Technologies Inc	Somerset, NJ 08873	1 time(s)
Singh, Randy	Vidhwan, Inc.	San Jose, CA 95113	1 time(s)
Singletary, Lakeisha	Elevate Digital Media Inc	Woodland Hills, CA 91303	3 time(s)
Smith, Jack	Fortuna BMC	McClellan, CA 95652	1 time(s)
Soyemi, Sanya	The Soyemi Group	Riverside, CA 92506	2 time(s)
Steins, Chris	Urban Insight, Inc.	Los Angeles, CA 90010	1 time(s)
Stephens, Kelsie	CJIS GROUP	Crawfordville, FL 32327	1 time(s)
Steven, Ryan	RFx Analyst, Inc.	Dana Point, CA 92624	1 time(s)
Thi, Janaki	DevCare Solutions	Columbus, OH 43215	2 time(s)
Thirumalai, Vijay	GenSigma LLC	San Francisco, CA 94114	2 time(s)
thomas, charles	Amazon Web Services, Inc.	Seattle, WA 98109	2 time(s)
Vataliya, Haresh	vTech Solution Inc.	Washington, DC - District of Columbia 20036	2 time(s)

Villa, Jose	Sensis	Los Angeles, CA 90014	1 time(s)
wachter, adam	datalink	sherman oaks, CA 91403	1 time(s)
WACHTER, adam	NTT DATA INC	Los Angeles, CA 90013	1 time(s)
walse, steve	SEVENOUTSOURCE	Newark, DE 19711	1 time(s)
Watson, Frank	Advanced Starlight International	Los Angeles, CA 90007	9 time(s)
Westlund, Veronica	Natoma Technologies, Inc.	Sacramento, CA 95814	3 time(s)
Wheeler, Kim	Intratek Computer, Inc.	Irvine, CA 92618	1 time(s)
White, Ed	EVOKE NEW YORK CORP.	POUGHKEEPSIE, NY 12601	1 time(s)
Wilson, Savoy	Click-Pro, Inc.	Long Beach, CA 90802	1 time(s)
Winborne, Blanton	TekStream Solutions, LLC	Atlanta, GA 30338	1 time(s)
Woronowicz, Bo	Zones LLC	Cerritos, CA 90703	1 time(s)
Wyche, Danielle	Information Design Consultants, Inc.	San Pedro, CA 90731	6 time(s)
Yalamanchi, Madhuri	Lotus USA, Inc	Santa Clarita, CA 91351	6 time(s)
Yunus, Imran	Zones LLC	Cerritos, CA 90703	2 time(s)
Yunus, Imran	Zones LLC	Cerritos, CA 90703	1 time(s)