



**SUMMARY LIST OF QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS  
RFP N°03/2013**

N°	QUESTION	ANSWER
1	<p>The RFP clearly plans for an "ITCOM Pilot" will take place one month after the winning bidder is announced. According to our experience, to design, build, test and finalize the migration solution strategy, tools and processes takes between 3 and 4 months. Therefore, if ILO plans a start date of the project in May 2013, the pilot should take place in August/September 2013. Please note that it will be very challenging to do the pilot in a shorter timeframe. Would this timeline change be acceptable for you ?</p>	<p><b>The ILO anticipated the pilot to finish in September 2013 which is compatible with your proposed timeline.</b></p>
2	<p>The RFP doesn't give information about a defined tool to perform the migration. Indeed, there are many solutions available on the market, all with pros and cons. Our local expertise has been set up with the Quest Software tools, however other alternatives are possible with solutions validated by our company at the group level such as BinaryTree and CloudMigrator.</p> <p>Would you please tell us if any migration solution has been tested by ILO and if there is any preferred tool to use?</p> <p>If there is no tool chosen by ILO, does ILO want the bidder to assess the different solutions and identify pros and cons of each according to the ILO context? As a matter of fact, one solution may be more suited for ILO than another one.</p>	<p><b>The ILO does not have a preferred tool for this migration. It is expected that the bidders will propose what they consider the most suitable tool to fit ILO's requirements. Please note however that, as indicated in the requirements, no data should be sent outside of the ILO, which excludes cloud-based migration tools.</b></p>
3	<p>The RFP clearly states that the Directory and File&amp;Print services have already been migrated. What about the workstations migration? Are they already member of the AD or do we have to plan for a migration process including the Novell client removal, the Windows users profile migration and the domain join action. If the migration process includes such actions, please indicate us the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) What is the current ILO strategy regarding Windows local users mapping with Novell NDS users accounts? In other words, is there a unique Windows local user account shared by all Novell users or is there one local Windows user account created on the workstation for each user opening a Windows session?</li> <li>b) What is the Novell client version?</li> <li>c) Do we have to remove the Novell client? (Zenworks can work without the Novell client in a certain way)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Workstations have been migrated and they already joined the domain in Active Directory. The Novell client removal is not the responsibility of the provider.</b></p> <p><b>Rollout of the Outlook and Lync clients will have to be planned together with the ILO and can be done by leveraging ZenWorks.</b></p> <p><b>The client workstations will be running a mix of Windows XP &amp; 7. We do not foresee any change on the network client.</b></p>



	<p>d) Do we have to design and build a rollout plan for the Outlook client? Or, is the current release of Office installed on the client machines already includes Outlook?</p> <p>e) Do we have to design and build a rollout plan for the Lync client (IM access through the Outlook client interface is related to the Lync client)?</p> <p>f) Is Windows XP the only current OS version or do we have to plan for a mix of Win7/Win XP machines?</p> <p>g) What is the current network client configuration? Do we have to plan for any network client configuration change to perform on the client side?</p>	
4	Where are the mail archives currently stored? Locally on the client sides or on a network share?	<b>The archives are currently stored in 9 different network shared drives organized alphabetically by first letter of surname.</b>
5	<p>What do you mean by "The ILO ITCOM staff will &lt;...&gt; only have limited availability for the migration project"? As a matter of fact, in such projects, the involvement of the ITCOM is necessary for:</p> <p>a) sharing with us all the information regarding the ILO environment</p> <p>b) designing and building an image of the production (HQ and at least one FO) into an isolated lab environment in order to build and test the migration solution</p> <p>c) validating the migration solution with all tools and processes just because there are so many possible situations to handle with sometimes, no way to detect them proactively</p>	<p><b>The ILO staff dedicated to this project also provides support for ongoing operation of the current infrastructure including GroupWise and Microsoft AD and File and Printer services. Most of the information can be provided by more than one staff member. The planning and implementation will need to consider this.</b></p> <p><b>a) ILO staff will share the information required for this project.</b></p> <p><b>b) Part of this infrastructure is already in place and was previously used to migrate recently to AD and File and Print environment. It will have a GroupWise environment for testing purposes. The Exchange infrastructure configured in the test environment will be as close as possible to the architecture proposed for production.</b></p> <p><b>c) ILO staff will participate during the process of migration and will help with the validation.</b></p>
6	The current migration planning only includes a "ITCOM Pilot". However, in order to validate the FOs migration, a FO migration pilot is mandatory. Would you agree to include such a pilot in the services proposal or, does ILO consider this pilot as part of phase B of the project?	<b>Migration of Field Offices is part of phase B. Please refer to requirement PC-FO-1.</b>
7	We would suggest to have a pre pilot limited to the project team users + main project stakeholders before moving to the "ITCOM pilot". This is a best practice according to our experience because there are always things that we discover during the first migration batches. Having such a pre pilot will allow us to fine tune the migration process before migrating the whole ITCOM team	<b>It is up to the bidders to propose the best approach based on their experience. However, the ILO encourages this pre-pilot.</b>



8	What is the nature and number of applications currently relying on the Novell Groupwise system? What is expected from the bidder regarding these applications?	<b>With the exception of BlackBerry Enterprise Server, all other applications rely on GroupWise via the SMTP gateway. It is expected that some, if not all applications, are migrated progressively to use SMTP with TLS.</b>
9	What is the type of Exchange CALs ILO plans to purchase? Does ILO plans for using the online archives feature? Does ILO prefer to use a third party solution such as Enterprise Vault?	<b>The ILO has purchased Exchange Server 2010 Standard user CAL. Implementation of an Archiving solution is out of scope. Existing GroupWise archives will be migrated to the Exchange server itself.</b>
10	At another Geneva based UN an alternative to BES was implemented (NotifyMDM for BlackBerry). Is such a solution possible for ILO? Or is a new BES infrastructure mandatory?	<b>BES services should be offered. Alternatives can be also offered as optional, indicating in the technical bid the difference in features and implementation. The commercial bid should indicate the costs for both options and the licensing implications</b>
11	What is ILO current policy/strategy regarding anti-spam and anti-virus online based solutions especially Microsoft ForeFront online solutions? Should we plan for a pure on premises technology?	<b>The anti-spam and anti-virus is not part of this migration process and should not be considered. However, the architecture proposed for Exchange should interact with the current existing solution in ILO.</b>
12	Do we have to plan for additional services such as reverse proxying features for web publishing (OWA and Outlook Anywhere) and firewalling? Could we imagine that Microsoft UAG be used for such services? Who is in charge of designing, building and testing these services?	<b>The ILO has Microsoft UAG in place. The integration of reverse proxy in the ILO environment is however the bidders responsibility.</b>
13	How many distinct NDS Trees in HQ and in FOs are there today in production? Please provide a list of all NDS Trees to consider.	<b>HQ has only one NDS tree. Each FO has it's own independent NDS tree. There is no link between any of these NDS trees. Before the migration of each FO the users in the corresponding tree will be migrated to the current and central AD before the migration of the GroupWise mailboxes is done in that particular FO. The architecture proposed should consider mobility of users between HQ and FO in both ways.</b>
14	What is the acceptable target for the migration to be considered as successful? There will inevitably messages and items that won't be migrated because of different issues such as corruptions? We have to set together such acceptable ratio. We suggest adopting a ratio of 95%. A higher level such as 98% would require a very significant additional testing and reporting. Please confirm that this proposal of 95% is acceptable to you.	<b>The provider is fully responsible to migrate all data (100%) that could correctly be read from the source systems (i.e. by opening the data in GroupWise).</b>
15	Among all items to be migrated, ILO specified in the RFP that Free/Busy information must be migrated. However, based on our experience, these items are typically very difficult to handle especially regarding the coexistence. We would suggest considering not managing Free/Busy coexistence although it's not the ideal situation especially a long coexistence	<b>The ability to handle difficult migration cases, such as Free/Busy, will be a key criteria in deciding for a proposal. Bidders are required to provide comprehensive details about their approach to meet this requirement in their proposals.</b>



	period. Would you please tell us your point of view regarding this specific item to migrate?	
16	Of all the migration tools we can suggest to ILO, none of them is allowed for a data encryption during and after the migration process as asked by ILO (SE-3). Would you please tell us if this is really a mandatory requirement? If yes, we will have to investigate for other solutions and perform additional testing thus impacting the timeline and cost of the project.	<p><b>This is a desirable requirement. If encryption is not possible it should be stated clearly in the proposal the extension of the unencrypted part during the process (ie. if the unencryption process happens inside the migration tool, if it traverses the network, if it traverses Internet in the case of FO, etc.)</b></p> <p><b>Please note that the ILO initially required that no unencrypted email should be transferred over the network.</b></p>
17	It seems to us that the RFP statements "no interruption during ILO working hours (8h00-18h00)" and "migration of devices must be done during ILO working hours" could be contradictory. Would you please clarify this point ?	<b>There is no contradiction. The first statement refers to the email service that must be available during ILO working hours. The second statement is specific to the migration of mobile devices which will require a end-user interaction and therefore take place during working hours.</b>
18	The RFP comprises a significant effort regarding training (analysis, plan, material, delivery). This is not in our core business to deliver trainings, even though we have the skills to provide these services. Would it be possible to consider these training activities aside of the RFP or is it an activity we could subcontract ?	<p><b>Subcontracting is allowed, please however note that in this case, a single bidder must be responsible for the overall delivery of the services as a prime contractor.</b></p> <p><b>The same background information must be provided for any subcontractors the bidders would leverage. The ILO will only coordinate directly with the bidders, coordination with any sub contractors in entirely under the responsibility of the bidders.</b></p>
19	We would like to request a 2-weeks time extension for the preparation of the proposal (i.e.March 18th 2013 16:00).	<b>No, this is not possible due to the tight timeline.</b>
20	Are any changes to the SMTP relay/routing infrastructure at ILO HQ in scope?	<b>The ILO would like to implement TLS as much as possible. It's mandatory between GroupWise and Exchange environment, within HQ as well as with the FOs. It will be the preferred option for the satellite services outside GroupWise.</b>
21	Are any changes to the message hygiene systems at ILO HQ in scope?	<b>The current message hygiene system will be upgraded. It is foreseen that the architecture and technologies used will remain the same.</b>
22	Regarding reference T-MS-7 at page 8, what does Group chat mean? Does it mean Instant messaging Conferencing or Lync Group Chat service? Group Chat Service is in fact a separate role based on IRC protocol used for Chat Rooms.	<b>Yes, Lync Group Chat is a requirement.</b>
23	Is Lync 2013 also accepted as a platform of the service?	<b>Lync 2010 should be offered. As an option, Lync 2013 can be also offered stating advantages and disadvantages. In the commercial bid it should be</b>



		clearly stated if there are functionality, interoperability and cost implications of adopting one or the other version.
24	Does ILO already have a Lync Platform deployed on premises?	No, the ILO does not have a Lync environment already deployed.
25	Is ILO willing to test Lync Audio Video capabilities?	Audio Video capabilities are out of scope (T-MS-10). However the architecture must be flexible to potentially accommodate them at a later stage.
26	Which main mail client and version needs to be used in this project on the workstations (Outlook/Lync)?	The ILO will use Outlook 2010 and Lync 2010 client.
27	Which languages do we have to provide for the mail clients (Outlook and Lync) ?	The ILO accommodates the needs of very diverse end-user population and therefore allows them to install software packages in their native languages, as long as they are provided by Microsoft.
28	In several places in the document it is stated that the migration of the Field Offices will be done in a later project. In other places pricing and requirements are asked for. We assume then that any answer to requirements are also only indicative. OK?	Migration of the Field Offices will be done in a later phase of this project. We are already asking for firm answers to requirements and indicative prices, so that we can select the best provider to execute both the HQ and Field Offices migration.
29	Page 3: You wrote "Performing the migration of GroupWise services at the field offices is not in scope for this RFP." Reading the rest of the RFP and the Annex IV, we assume this sentence has to be rephrased. Is it a correct assumption?	Yes. This sentence should be rephrased as:  Performing the migration of GroupWise services at the field offices is in scope for this RFP (Phase B).
30	Is there any interference between the HQ Windows 7 migration and the HQ GroupWise migration to be expected (specifically in terms of Outlook Client version used, AD version used etc.)?	The ILO expects the HQ Windows 7 migration to be limited to workstations environment (i.e. AD version will remain unchanged, the Outlook client may then be upgraded to 2013). Please state any anticipated version requirements / limitations in your proposal.
31	At the top of page 4 it is mentioned that Synchronization of Directory data between NDS and AD through Oracle IDM is already in place and out of scope. Does this mean the coexistence tooling does not need to perform any mail user directory sync and that ILO will perform all required actions through the Oracle IDM instead?	Yes, all synchronisation actions between NDS and AD will be carried through Oracle IDM.
32	We would like to understand better the need for the V7.04 GW servers. What are these legacy systems?	GroupWise v 7.04 servers are kept at some Field Offices for stability reasons.
33	We can only respond in a FP way to requirements known at the time of bidding. Page 7, section 5.1 seems to indicate that extra requirements might be outlined in Microsoft architecture documentation. This can create an issue and might generate a change request. Do you agree? If not, we would like to receive the extra requirements before bidding.	Key requirements from the Microsoft architecture document have been transferred to this RFP.  The rest of the Microsoft architecture document is indicative (e.g. naming conventions).





34	Page 8, requirement T-MS-7: Access to the IM service through mobile devices: which ones are you considering using?	The ILO will use iOS, Android, Windows Mobile and Blackberry.
35	Page 9, requirement T-IN-5: "Any extension of the schema should be performed in a separate forest". Exchange always requires a schema extension on AD. Does this mean ILO wants to go for a Resource Forest model? Note that this would mean extra cost and extra infrastructure... or is the standard Exchange schema extension accepted?	<b>The ILO in collaboration with Microsoft has decided to implement an Exchange resource forest using a single forest and a single domain. This is the optimal solution and the solution that Microsoft recommends.</b>  <b>The reason for this choice is that the ILO wants to keep its Active Directory clean and open for future e-mail deployment options (e.g. cloud based).</b>
36	Page 9, Task "Changes to the end-users workstations to integrate with target infrastructure" is assigned to the vendor. What changes are you thinking about specifically?	<b>Expected changes relate to deployment of software package and configuration changes. The ILO has software package deployment capabilities in place (Novell Zenworks). It is expected that the vendors will leverage those to deploy any software and changes required on the client workstations. The ILO will assist in creating the required Zenworks packages.</b>
37	Same question for page 12, requirement MI-FO-3.	<b>Expected changes relate to deployment of software package and configuration changes. The ILO has software package deployment capabilities in place (Novell Zenworks). It is expected that the vendors will leverage those to deploy any software and changes required on the client workstations. The ILO will assist in creating the required Zenworks packages.</b>
38	Page 12, requirement MI-FO-3: what is currently present on the workstations in the field offices concerning software and OS?	<b>By the time of the project Phase B, Field Offices workstations will mostly be running Windows 7 and Office 2010.</b>
39	The RFP indicates that the goal is to centralize the mail infrastructure. We assume that in this case, the field offices will receive bandwidth updates if required. Agreed?	<b>The ILO is in the progress of upgrading its Wide Area Network to support the centralized email services. If additional capacity was required at a particular site, the ILO would be ready to upgrade the link, assuming such an upgrade is possible. It is however expected that vendors do their best to limit the need to upgrade network links (e.g. use of Exchange 2010 protocol optimisations).</b>
40	How much bandwidth is available for Exchange/Outlook traffic? Or should we instead include required bandwidth?	<b>Please indicate bandwidth requirements.</b>
41	The diagram in page 32 indicates a Digital sender device - we are assuming that this can be integrated using SMTP protocol?	<b>Yes, Digital sender devices can be integrated using SMTP.</b>
42	Listed values of mailbox and archive size are gross values, meaning by that without compression, single instance?	<b>The values are meant without compression and single instance.</b>
43	For the server sizing and bandwidth requirements it is required to have more information about message profile (average # of messages (total internal + external) per user per day per location and average message size for those messages) - or should we calculate with Microsoft standard values 100messages with 75KByte?	<b>A Microsoft calculation sheet has been used to estimate the traffic and is included in Appendix.</b>



44	How much growth should be included in number of additional mailboxes and increase of mailbox and archive sizes? Is a PKI infrastructure available - if not must it be included in proposal? Is a reverse proxy environment already established (for Exchange and Lync)?	<b>Growth data is not available at this stage. Please however note that the ILO will be responsible to provide sufficient space. The ILO recently increased mailbox size from 500MB to 1GB excluding GroupWise archives.</b>  <b>No PKI infrastructure is available. If your solution requires an internal Certificate Authority, please include its deployment using the existing Active Directory systems.</b>  <b>The ILO has Microsoft UAG in place. Documenting requirements for integration of reverse proxy in the ILO environment is the bidders responsibility, the ILO will then implement the required changes.</b>
45	Page 12: SE-2 The work for the offices can be done remotely (i.e. from ILO Geneva)?	<b>It is up to the bidders to propose an approach. The ILO however prefers to avoid remote work in general.</b>
46	Page 15: How many users have to be trained? You are providing the number of mailboxes, but there is not necessarily the same number of users. Is it correct?	<b>Please use the “Users” column in Appendix 1 and 2.</b>
47	Page 25: Beirut does show a value 56TB of data. Please, can you confirm or correct?	<b>The value is indeed not correct. This should be read 56 GB.</b>
48	Do you think the Web-based trainings is an option for some categories of employees?	<b>Web based training has to be seen as a complement and not a replacement of traditional training sessions.</b>
49	Can you, please, share with us the rationale to deploy Exchange in the resource forest instead of user forest?	<b>The ILO in collaboration with Microsoft has decided to implement an Exchange resource forest using a single forest and a single domain. This is the optimal solution and the solution that Microsoft recommends.</b>  <b>The reason for this choice is that the ILO wants to keep its Active Directory clean and open for future e-mail deployment options (e.g. cloud based).</b>
50	In case of a resource forest for Exchange: Does the necessary AD server infrastructure (DC, GC servers, DNS setup), already exist or does the forest still need to be created from scratch?	<b>The Exchange forest will need to be created by the vendor.</b>
51	Which tooling would you expect to use for the synchronization between GroupWise and Exchange? And between the AD Exchange forest and the AD user forest?	<b>The tool for synchronization between GroupWise and Exchange is to be proposed by the bidders.</b>  <b>We expect to have a trust between the AD User and Exchange forests.</b>
52	Does the BES service need to be highly available?	<b>High availability will be provided by the underlying VMWare infrastructure.</b>
53	Does IM / presence / group chat need to be highly available?	<b>High availability will be provided by the underlying VMWare infrastructure.</b>



54	Are external connections for Lync / group chat required (for ex a remote user connecting to Lync over the Internet without VPN)?	<b>Yes, external connections for Lync are required.</b>
55	Do we need to install the Lync client and group chat client software? If yes, using which tools?	<b>Yes, using Novell Zenworks for deployment. The ILO will assist in creating the required Zenworks packages.</b>
56	Providing and configuring the required network infrastructure (VLANs, routers, switches, firewalls, load balancers, and so on) will be ILOs responsibility – is that correct?	<b>Yes. Please refer to table outlining the responsibilities for typical tasks during the integration page 9 (vendor documents required changes to existing infrastructure, ILO implements them).</b>
57	Which is the Microsoft Active Directory version?	<b>The Active Directory version in place is based on Windows Server 2008 R2.</b>
58	Which is the Active Directory forest and domain functional level?	<b>The Forest / Domain functional level is Windows Server 2008.</b>
59	Do you have any kind of preference about the migration tool? Quest, Oracle, The cost of the migration tool should include the branch offices (Phase 2)?	<b>The ILO does not have a preferred tool for this migration. It is expected that the bidders will propose what they consider the most suitable tool to fit ILO's requirements.</b>  <b>The cost of the tool for Phase A (HQ) and B (Field Offices) must be indicated separately.</b>
60	Which version of Office are installed at the client side?	<b>Multiple versions of MS Office up to 2010 are in place. Please specify which minimal version should be used.</b>
61	All the Milestones of the Project, should be execute 100% on premise or could be execute remotely?	<b>The ILO expects work be executed 100% on premises - please refer to security requirements SE-1, SE-2, SE-3.</b>
62	Is there any kind of archiving solution? Should we propose? Enterprise Vault?	<b>Implementation of a third party Archiving solution is out of scope. Existing GroupWise archives will be migrated to the Exchange server itself using the In-Place Archive functionality.</b>
63	Which are the Award Criteria for the decision?	<i>No details to be communicated on this item</i>
64	Would you please give more details regarding the selection criteria ILO shall be applying in evaluating the proposal responses?	<i>ditto</i>
65	Will you apply a weighting system for the above mentioned selection, and if yes would you please describe it?	<i>ditto</i>
66	T-MS-1 / T-MS-6 / Do you have in your infrastructure a load balancing facility that we can use it for Exchange and Lync ? If yes which Vendor, type and version? If no should we propose a solution?	<b>Yes. Please indicate any specific requirements.</b>
67	T-MS-1 / T-MS-6 / Do you have in your infrastructure a backup facility that we can use it for Exchange and Lync ? If yes which Vendor, type and version? If	<b>The ILO uses HP Data Protector 7.01 as backup software. Please indicate if any specific agents will be needed - ILO will be responsible for their purchase</b>





	no should we propose a solution?	<b>and implementation.</b>
68	T-MS-1 / T-MS-6 / T-IN-5/ Do you have already an internal Certificate Authority that we can use for any forest? Or should we include it in the proposal? Should we include the price for the Public signed certificates in the proposal?	<b>No PKI infrastructure is available. If your solution requires an internal Certificate Authority, please include its deployment using the existing Active Directory systems.</b>
69	T-MS-2 / Do you have a reserve proxy infrastructure for remote access like TMG or UAG than we can use for Lync and Exchange? If yes could we have the vendor, type, version and configuration (Unihomed, 2 zone or 3 leg)? If no should we propose a solution?	<b>The ILO has Microsoft UAG in place. Documenting requirements for integration of reverse proxy in the ILO environment is the bidders responsibility, the ILO will then implement the required changes.</b>
70	T-MS-4 / As we need to build a new blackberry infrastructure should it be highly available at the application level or would the High availability provided by the virtualization layer be enough?	<b>High availability will be provided by the underlying VMWare infrastructure.</b>
71	T-MS-4 / T-MS-6 Do you already have an SQL infrastructure that is available for us to use respectively for Lync, Blackberry and the migration ? If not should we include this in our proposal?	<b>Yes. The ILO will provide the necessary servers and licences. Deployment is however the bidders responsibility. Please also indicate any specific requirements.</b>
72	T-MS-5/ Do you plan to use the native archiving functionality of exchange (Online Archive) to replace the GroupWise Archive? If yes, should the online archive be High available (multiple database copy)? Or should we propose an archiving solution since pst are banned?	<b>Implementation of a third party Archiving solution is out of scope. Existing GroupWise archives will be migrated to the Exchange server itself using the In-Place Archive functionality.</b>
73	-MS-5/ Do you plan to use the native archiving functionality of exchange for the GroupWise archive migration?	<b>Implementation of a third party Archiving solution is out of scope. Existing GroupWise archives will be migrated to the Exchange server itself using the In-Place Archive functionality.</b>
74	Are there any GroupWise libraries that have to be migrated?	<b>No. GroupWise libraries are not used by the ILO.</b>
75	Are there any applications with GroupWise interaction (via SMTP, MAPI, SOAP)	<b>With the exception of BlackBerry Enterprise Server, all other applications rely on GroupWise via the SMTP gateway. It is expected that some, if not all applications, are migrated progressively to use SMTP with TLS.</b>
76	T-IN-5/ As schema extension is not allowed on the current Forest, do you already a Resource Forest in place? Or is the Exch2010 schema extensions not included in this restriction?	<b>The ILO in collaboration with Microsoft has decided to implement an Exchange resource forest using a single forest and a single domain. This is the optimal solution and the solution that Microsoft recommends.</b>  <b>The Exchange forest will need to be created by the vendor.</b>
77	T-IN-5/ Do you have already the required licenses to for Oracle synchronization or should we propose a solution?	<b>Yes, this tool is already in place.</b>



78	T-IN-5/ Do you have separate domain or forest for the field office or they are integrated in the HQ forest /domain?	<b>Field Offices will be integrated in the HQ Forest / Domain.</b>
----	---	--