



QUESTIONS & RESPONSES #1

RFP or RFQ / TITLE

070080 Seaport Alliance Website

CONTACT

Michael Keim, CPPB, Sr. Contract Administrator

EMAIL

procurement@portoftacoma.com

PHONE NUMBER

253-428-8608

SUBMITTAL DUE DATE

Tuesday, February 17, 2015 @ 4:00 P. M.

Q&A ISSUE DATE

February 10, 2015 @ 2:00 P.M.

PROPOSER QUESTIONS

PORT RESPONSES

Can you confirm that the Seaport Web Alliance RFP is initially solely focused on maritime operations (i.e. air and/or rail not within this scope)?

As stated in the RFP, the intended audience for a Seaport Alliance website includes prospective customers, current customers and supply chain stakeholders - including rail. The Seaport Alliance facilities include the marine terminals and intermodal rail yards. At this time, the ports expect to keep information about environmental initiatives on their individual websites. Please see Addendum #1 for a draft information architecture for the information the ports expect the new website may include.

The RFP requirements indicate that the new site would either be SharePoint 2013 or Drupal 7. Please let us know which way the balance tilts today – is it 80/20 or 20/80 respectively. (Note: with the Port of Seattle being on SharePoint 2010 and if the new SWA site were to be on SP 13 and there is a two year upgrade plan then you will likely be looking at a very significant upgrades on both the SWA site the Port of Seattle and that technology choice is not only not advisable but a non-starter for R2i)

There isn't a balance to report. The Port of Seattle and Port of Tacoma are separate entities and currently manage their individual websites independently. The ports expect the Seaport Alliance website will operate separately from their individual sites.

<p>Consultant prides itself in our analytical capabilities to identify, segment and define personas to best serve online audiences. These engagements can be very deep in scope based on clients expectations and we would appreciate some indications as to the depth of research the Alliance has already performed to date and an assessment of how deep is the additional research necessary to obtain information and feedback on how the Seaport Alliance can best serve its primary audiences online.</p>	<p>The Seaport Alliance has not performed any research at this point. The Port of Tacoma's website redevelopment included surveys of customers and current users, and the ports' commercial teams understand the needs of the target audiences. The vendor will determine what additional research is necessary.</p>
<p>Has the SWA (Seaport Web Alliance) already identified a partner to help define and develop brand identity? If not, has the process to select an partner started? Should we offer/propose to undertake that efforts either directly or through a strategic local partner? Has budget been set aside for that phase of work? When would you anticipate the work to be completed?</p>	<p>The Seaport Alliance has already contracted with a vendor to develop the brand identity. The work is expected to be completed by the end of March.</p>
<p>The RFP indicates that the two port commissions are in a due diligence period and a detailed agreement is to be submitted to the Federal Maritime Commission (FMC) by the end of April 2015. Based on the current state of discussions, input and feedback from the FMC:</p> <p>a. What insights could you offer as to risk factors that could impact the course of the project?</p> <p>b. With contract execution on the RFP March 17th and a launch deadline of June 15th the project will be well advanced by the end of April. What issues/concerns might be anticipated so as to identify early on so mitigation strategies?</p> <p>c. Has the funding for the organization and specifically this RFP already been earmarked?</p>	<p>a. As with any due diligence period, either side could conclude that a step in the process is insurmountable or unfeasible, or the Federal Maritime Commission might have questions that delay or interfere with the approval of a final agreement. Both port commissions, however, have stated publicly their commitment to form the Seaport Alliance. They believe it offers our best option to address the competitive challenges facing the shipping industry. Staff teams are well into the work necessary to flesh out the final agreement.</p> <p>b. We recognize the development period is aggressive. We also know that the website is a priority marketing tool to have ready at launch. We have dedicated a team from both ports to facilitate the project. We also will look to the firm we select to develop the website to create a work plan with a schedule that will meet that deadline.</p> <p>c. Yes, the money for website development has been identified.</p>
<p>How many qualified firms do you anticipate will respond to the RFP?</p>	<p>The ports haven't specified the number of expected proposals.</p>

<p>The RFP references a “one-time migration of data” from the various sites: Has the content needing to be migrated been identified? Will the content be migrated “as is”? What is the plan for updating content on the main site when the migrated content has been updated on one of the ports’ sites?</p>	<p>Part of the requirements definition work will be to determine the specific content for the Seaport Alliance website. See Addendum #1 for a draft information architecture that identifies the high-level content the ports expect the new site will include. While some of this content may be migrated as-is, the ports expect to write new or combine current content to communicate the regional focus of the Seaport Alliance. The ports anticipate that content on the Seaport Alliance website will not also be on the individual ports sites, though information may be linked between the sites. The ports expect to update the content on the Seaport Alliance website through the proposed content management system. Each port will continue to maintain their own websites through their CMS.</p>
<p>Consultant is a nationally recognized agency and we have local presence in Seattle (SODO) as we actively support many groups at Microsoft. We noticed that there is no weight given to location/proximity... Is this correct?</p>	<p>Yes, that is correct. No preference will be given to local firms.</p>
<p>I am providing below a quick outline of Consultant and would appreciate if you felt we fall in the Totally Qualified, Qualified, Non-Qualified firm.</p>	<p>All proposals will be evaluated in accordance with the evaluation plan stated in the RFP.</p>
<p>Will other CMS’ (not Drupal 7 or Sharepoint 2013) be considered?</p> <p>On page three of RFP No. 070080, the Scope of Services states that Bidders must specify which Content Management System (CMS), SharePoint 2013 or Drupal 7, in which they will design and build the Seaport Alliance website. Are these the only two CMS platforms the Alliance is accepting, or will the Port consider an alternative CMS, such as Orchard, if the Bidder makes a strong case for using it?</p>	<p>The two ports strongly prefer SharePoint or Drupal, but other systems will be considered. Proposers should clearly state why the proposed CMS is recommended instead of SharePoint or Drupal.</p>
<p>Why have the Ports used Drupal 7 and Sharepoint in the past?</p>	<p>The Port of Tacoma completed a competitive bidding process in 2013 to select a new content management system and redevelop its website. The Port of Seattle selected SharePoint based on business need and support resources.</p>
<p>What is the budget for this project?</p>	<p>Please refer to the Background section of the RFP.</p>
<p>What languages are the technical staff of each Port familiar with?</p>	<p>See the Combined Technology and Product Standards in the RFP.</p>
<p>What was the cost for the services the last time this was out for bid and how can I obtain a copy of the current contract?</p>	<p>As stated in the RFP, the Seaport Alliance website is a new site, so this is the first time it will be developed.</p>

Can this work be done remotely or in house?	The ports assume "in house" refers to where the work is completed, either at the ports or at a remote site. The ports prefer the work be completed remotely, though as stated in the RFP, the ports require at least one in-person meeting with the selected vendor during the requirements definition work.
How much of this work do you anticipate can be done remotely and how much do you anticipate can be done in house?	The ports assume "in house" refers to where the work is completed, either at the ports or at a remote site. The ports prefer the work be completed remotely, though as stated in the RFP, the ports require at least one in-person meeting with the selected vendor during the requirements definition work.
How many staff members is the current contractor using at this time?	As stated in the RFP's background section, the Seaport Alliance website is a new site, so there isn't a current contract.
Is there any form of bonding or bid security required with your bid? (other than the insurance requirements)	No.
Is there a prebid conference being held for this solicitation? if so is it mandatory to attend?	There is no prebid conference.
How will award be determined? Will it be "lowest responsible offeror or will it be most advantageous"?	Please refer to the RFP's evaluation criteria.
Whether companies from Outside USA can apply for this ? (From India or Canada)	Yes, companies outside the USA may apply for this work.
Whether we need to come over there for meetings ?	As specified in the RFP, the ports require at least one in-person meeting with the selected vendor during the requirements definition work.
Can we perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside USA? ((From India or Canada)	Yes, companies outside the USA may apply for this work.
Can we submit our proposals via email ?	Please refer to the RFP for instructions on how to submit your proposal.
The RFP states that the Port of Seattle's website is hosted on SharePoint 2010. Will that SharePoint environment be upgraded to 2013 in time to host the Seaport Alliance website?	The Seaport Alliance site is currently expected to be hosted separately from the existing port sites. There are no plans to upgrade the Port of Seattle site's platform in coordination with this effort.
If the new website will require a new hosting environment, would the Ports consider a cloud hosting environment to reduce the Ports' IT overhead?	Yes, the ports will consider a cloud-hosting environment.

<p>Microsoft has been encouraging customers to use Microsoft partner technologies for public websites and CMS capabilities. For example, Microsoft no longer offers public website hosting in their SharePoint Online environment (http://support.microsoft.com/kb/3027254). In fact, for new Office365 customers, Microsoft states “they’ll have the option to subscribe to third-party solutions.”</p> <p>Microsoft partners provide 3rd party CMS solutions that fully embrace the Microsoft technology stack. These solutions require much less IT overhead, reduce the cost of development, and provide simple cloud or on-premise hosting options. Examples of these options include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kentico Orchard Umbraco <p>Would the Ports consider moving in the same direction? Redtech could offer a much more competitive proposal based on the Microsoft technology stack, if a dedicated CMS platform was selected.</p>	<p>The two ports strongly prefer SharePoint or Drupal, but other systems will be considered. Proposers should clearly state why the proposed CMS is recommended instead of SharePoint or Drupal.</p>
<p>The RFP states that the Ports will provide branding guidelines. Will the branding guidelines includes specifications for the look and feel of the website, or will the website vender be asked to develop the website’s visual design based on high-level brand direction (e.g. fonts, logos, color palette).</p>	<p>The selected vendor will be expected to develop the website's visual design based on the branding guidelines, which will include logo, fonts, color palette and brand platform.</p>
<p>Will the newly created site carry the exact same content as the two existing sites, or only repurpose select content? Who will be responsible for selection of final content to be migrated?</p>	<p>As stated in the RFP, the new site will primarily market the facilities and services of the Seaport Alliance to current and prospective customers. See Addendum #1 for a draft information architecture of the new site. The content on the Seaport Alliance website is not expected to also be on the individual port sites. The ports will be responsible for selecting the final content to be migrated.</p>
<p>Is the creation of any original content part of the scope for this project?</p>	<p>No. Any original content that is required will be created by the ports</p>
<p>Does the port have any objection to the use of a third party hosting provider such as Amazon Web Services?</p>	<p>No.</p>
<p>Is WCAG 2.0 level AA acceptable in terms of ADA compliance?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
<p>Is there a plan for how customer form submissions would be best handled? Would something like email routing to assigned individuals be acceptable?</p>	<p>Form requirements will be defined during the requirements definition phase. At a minimum, form submissions must be able to be routed by email to one or more assigned port staff.</p>
<p>Can the Port facilitate access to appropriate end users for usability testing (e.g. supply chain stakeholders).</p>	<p>Yes.</p>

We are assuming that you want the vendor to help define the To-Be Process and Solution for the consolidated portal. Have you had any assessment prior to this project (kaizen workshops) on a vision new portal? If so, can you describe the outcomes.	No prior assessment has been performed.
What is a typical training approach for end users?	Vendors should provide their recommended training approach.
Do you prefer train the trainer approach or want us to train the entire staff ?	Vendors should provide their recommended training approach.
Please specify ballpark number on many resources your expect to be trained and their roles.	The ports expect to train 2 website administrators (non-technical), up to 6 technical staff and up to 6 content editors.
Can you describe your current marketing strategy and expectations from this implementation?	The website will serve as the main repository for information about Seaport Alliance facilities and services. All other marketing materials will drive back to it for more detailed information. All Web pages should complement marketing materials and messages, be visually appealing and easy to use.
What are the pain points of the current website on Sharepoint 2010 and Drupal7 from a business/operation perspective?	The ports expect the requirements definition work to identify business process improvements.
What is the main business driver behind taking on this project?	Please refer to the background section of the RFP.
Can you give us an estimate of the amount of data to be migrated? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of sites /sub-sites • Number of tables , rows etc or • Size of databases 	Please see Addendum #1 for a draft information architecture. The amount of data to be migrated will be better understood after the requirements definition work.
What is the typical hits/visits on the current website on a daily basis?	A Seaport Alliance website does not currently exist. Please see Attachment D for the expected number of visits to the new site.
Who would be typically involved in testing other than Business SMEs?	The primary testing work will be done by the vendor. A port resource may be assigned to oversee, review and accept test work.
Do you have a IT testing practice or third party vendor who would be involved?	The primary testing work will be done by the vendor. A port resource may be assigned to oversee, review and accept test work.
Is the vendor expected to provide testing resources.	The primary testing work will be done by the vendor. A port resource may be assigned to oversee, review and accept test work.
How frequently would you like to engage during the execution of project? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Daily 2. Weekly 3. Monthly 	The ports expect at least weekly status meetings. Daily interactions may be required during phases of the work.
What Project execution methodology are your employees attuned to Scrum, Agile or Waterfall?	Port employees are attuned to the listed methodologies.
Are you willing to work with consultants remotely with limited onsite travel (within USA)?	As specified in the RFP, the ports require at least one in-person meeting with the selected vendor during the requirements definition work.

Do you want to make this fixed bid project or Time and material with Cap?	The ports have no preference.
Can you please indicate which vendors built the current Port of Seattle and Port of Tacoma website? Or if they were built by internal teams? Will any of the work documents from those efforts be available to review for the successful bidder?	The Port of Tacoma website was built by Interpersonal Frequency. The Port of Seattle website was built by Blue Rooster and internal teams. The work documents can be made available to the selected vendor if necessary.
Were any companies engaged to create the current website requirement document or RFP? If so, you could you please provide their names. Are they allowed to participate in the response?	No vendors were engaged to create the RFP or requirements.
Can you please indicate which personnel/titles/resources will be available from the Ports to support this project? What is their background and capabilities? Also, what percentage of their time will be made available?	Non-technical staff with experience using CMS systems will be supporting this project and creating any original content. IT staff will available to support any connections to internal data sources. Staff time will be allocated accordingly to meet project deadlines.
Responsive layout is mentioned as an essential function for the site. What use patterns do you see for mobile and tablet users? Are their specific use cases where you see mobile as the primary platform for access? Are there specific table or mobile platforms you are looking to target?	The requirements definition work is expected to better define mobile use. The ports expect mobile and tablet access to follow the patterns of growing mobile use among all Web users, and the new website should support common mobile platforms and devices.
Responsive design and mobile experiences are best supported by Modern browsers such as IE 10.0, Firefox 33, Safari 7.0, and Chrome 39. Can we assume the primary target of the new site design will be these browsers? If not, what is the oldest browser version the site's new experience must support?	Refer to Attachment D of the RFP.
Can you please expand upon your data migration needs? Do you see the migration as content loading (i.e. loading an initial set of data into CMS) or content migration (i.e. one-for-one copying of existing content into the new site)? Does the migration include data beyond html such as PDF documents, video, or audio files? When do you think this data will be available for migration? How much content will be migrated (number of files and MB)?	Data migration may include content loading, copying existing content and migrating content beyond HTML. The requirements definition work will define the amount and types of content. See Addendum #1 for a draft information architecture.
Has Seaport Alliance identified a CRM platform? If so, will there be requirements to integrate with the website immediately or in the future?	A CRM platform has not been identified. No immediate integrations are expected.

What kind of automation do you expect the new site to support? Have the Ports done an assessment of the automation that may be currently handled by SharePoint workflows or custom web parts that it would like to see on the new site?	The ports expect some database tables may be automatically updated from internal systems. Any automation will be defined during the requirements definition work.
Beyond maps, what kind of interactive features are the Ports planning for the site? Is audio, video, or flash content an expected type of content for the site? If so, are you planning on hosting this content internally or using external hosting (e.g. YouTube or Vimeo)? Are live chat, knowledge management functionality of interest for future phases?	Other interactivity will be defined during the requirements definition work and may include filterable, searchable databases, the ability to compare providers or request quotes.
The ability to import Excel files is mentioned in the essential functions section, can you expand upon this requirement? Do you see Excel being used as a data transfer tool on an on-going basis or just during the initial data migration? What kind of import interface are you looking for?	The ports expect Excel files will be an ongoing data transfer tool to update database tables on the website. Import interfaces may include the ability to directly upload CSV files to update databases and automatically upload CSV/XML files via FTP.
How often do you see users needing to create new forms for customers? Do you see this as an administrator only function limited to a subset of users?	The ports expect that website administrators will have the ability to create new forms as necessary. Form creation should be geared to the non-technical user.
Will the created forms have any workflow associated with them? If so, please describe.	Form requirements will be defined during the requirements definition phase. At a minimum, form submissions must be able to be routed by email to one or more assigned port staff.
Are the Ports planning on integrating data from social media sites, such as Twitter or Facebook, on the new site? If so, can you describe what capabilities you are looking for?	Potential integrations with social media will be defined during the requirements definition phase.
How much interaction and/or linkage do you see between the Seaport Alliance websites and the individual Port websites? Is there a needed for content from the Port Sites being linked to the new site through technologies like iframes?	The connection between the Seaport Alliance website and the individual port sites will be defined during the requirements definition work.
Are the answers to Attachment D to be included within the 15 page limit indicated in the RFP?	The responses to Attachment D may be included as an appendix.
1. Please further define the additional research that will be required of this engagement. Will Seaport Alliance identify and make available representatives from the primary audiences or will the vendor be responsible for finding them? How much interaction with the primary audiences will be required?	The vendor will be expected to determine what additional research is required. The ports can help make available key audience members if necessary.

The conclusion of the requirements definition phase shall include a cost estimate for the development of the website. Given that, how will the preliminary costs be scored under the Compensation section of the response?	All costs will be normalized. The lowest cost will receive all the points for cost and the remaining costs will receive a proportionate amount. For example, if three cost proposals are received - \$10,000, \$12,000 and \$14,000, the lowest cost proposal would be awarded 10 points, the \$12,000 proposal would be awarded 8 points ($10,000/12,000 = .83 \times 10 = 8.3$) and the \$14,000 proposal would be awarded 7 points ($10,000/14,000 = .71 \times 10 = 7.1$).
How many individuals will need to be trained and what are their skill levels? Are there any other roles than those defined already?	The ports expect to train 2 website administrators (non-technical), up to 6 technical staff and up to 6 content editors.
Will the 'additional development and design work' be outside the scope of these cost estimates? If not, please define the work required.	The budget includes any additional development that may be required in the future.
How many templates do you anticipate needing developed as part of this process?	The number of templates will be determined during the requirements definition phase. See Addendum #1 for a draft information architecture.
Items within the Project Approach Narrative such as the draft work breakdown structure, typical test plan, and sample test scripts can be quite large in size. Can they be delivered in an appendix outside of the 15 page response limitation?	No.
Does the Seaport Alliance or ports have a standard set of resource types associated with Attachment C – Rate Sheet? If so, please provide the title and detailed descriptions of all resource types. Doing so will ensure that we are able to provide fully burdened hourly rates for those resources as appropriate.	Neither of the ports have a standard set of resource types associated with Attachment C - Rate Sheet. In as much as the Seaport Alliance does not yet officially exist, there is not a standard set of resource types available nor envisioned at this time.
Attachment D notes expected traffic less than 3,000 page views a day. Do you have information on the expected storage requirements of the site? How many downloads are expected a day and how large (in MB)? Will users be able to upload files? If so how large (in MB) and how often is this expected?	The Seaport Alliance website is a new site and the ports do not have information on the expected storage requirements, expected downloads or file sizes. See Addendum #1 for a draft information architecture.
We understand the Ports are looking for website hosting and maintenance support through the contract. Are the Ports open to hosting on public clouds such as Amazon Web Services, Microsoft Azure, or Rackspace? Are they contractually obligated to using any cloud hosting vendor? Do they have experience with any of the company's listed above? If others apply, please identify.	The ports are open to public clouds and are not obligated to use a specific hosting vendor. The Port of Tacoma's website is uses both AWS and Rackspace Cloud. The Port of Seattle's website is hosted on dedicated servers at Rackspace.

What elevated roles, or types of users do you see The Ports staff needing for the new site (e.g. Administrators, Content Editors, Regular Users)? How many users do you see in each group? Do you see any requirements for advanced authentication features such as Single-Sign-On or two-factor authentication?	The ports expect to have up to 6 technical and 2 non-technical administrators and up to 6 content editors. The exact number is unknown. The ports do not expect single sign-on or two-factor authentication, but the ports do expect a robust password policy is in place.
The new site will require ESRI GIS data integration, do the Ports have a preferred mapping data vendor or one they have experience with (e.g. Google, or Mapbox)? Does the map example from Port of Tacoma meet all of needs you are expecting within the Alliance website? Can you describe any additional requirements you see for the map functionality?	No, the ports do not have a preferred mapping vendor. Requirements for maps on the Seaport Alliance website will be defined during the requirements definition phase.
We know that information about Ports can be considered sensitive from a security and business perspective. Do you expect the site to host data that might be considered sensitive or that could not be hosted on a shared or cloud infrastructure? If so, please describe the portion of the site that is sensitive and the specific hosting needs.	At this time, the ports don't expect to host sensitive information on the Seaport Alliance website.
Reference RFP Section D: <i>Proposals are limited to 12 numbered pages including the cover letter and all appendices</i> . Question: Are any of the Exhibits A through D required with the submittal of the proposal and, if so, are they exempt from the page limitation?	Refer to section D of the RFP. Responses to Attachment D may be included as an appendix.
How much data/content is expected to be migrated to the new site (# of pages, data size etc.)?	See Addendum #1 for a draft information architecture. The requirements definition work will further define the number of pages and data to be migrated.
As part of the migration effort, is content mapping required?	Content mapping is not expected to be required.
What systems is the new website required to integrate with?	Potential integrations with social media will be defined during the requirements definition phase. No system or application integrations with internal port systems are anticipated at this time. Data in XML format will be transmitted to the website via FTP for specific data sets that require publishing. Further integration requirements may be defined during the requirements definition work.
Are hosting / maintenance services required as part of the bid or can these be provided separately to the bid by a 3 rd party not related to the bidder?	Pricing for these services must be included with the bid.
Would Port of Tacoma recruit/specify the users required for usability testing, or is this required by the bidder?	The vendor will be responsible for all aspects of the usability testing.
Page 24 of the RFP document seems to be blank. Would you clarify if this was simply a mistake or if additional information is supposed to be on the page?	This was a mistake and will be published as Addendum #1 to the RFP on the Port's website.

Page 5, Section 2, "Migrate Data." Please elucidate what content may migrate from the Ports of Tacoma and Seattle website.	See Addendum #1 for a draft information architecture.
<p>Page 6, Section D, "Proposal Elements." The RFP states that it is limited to 15 numbered pages excluding the cover letter, compensation information, and all appendices.</p> <p>1. Do responses to Attachment D, "Technical Architecture and Hosting/Maintenance Services" count toward this requirement? We believe that properly responding to each of the areas defined in Attachment D will require several pages, including at least one technical architecture diagram that will be a page on its own (item 1.a. on page 17).</p> <p>2. Does the cover page and table of contents page count toward the 15 page requirement?</p>	<p>1. Responses to Attachment D may be included as an appendix.</p> <p>2. Refer to section D of the RFP.</p>
Pages 20 - 23 of the RFP (24 is blank), "Combined Port of Seattle/Port of Tacoma Technology Products and Standards." Would you please help us understand why this list is provided in the proposal, and does it require a specific response?	See Attachment D, question 1.