

Proposers' Teleconference
Thursday, 16 October 2014 at 9:30am

1. **Globalization:** Do you currently tie into any third-party translation services such as Translations.com.

No, we do not currently tie into any third-party translation services.

2. **Videos Content:** Do you still utilize Brightcove for your video content? Do you have any other video content providers we should consider?

Brightcove is our main video hosting provider and we are using CQ5/AEM-Brightcove integration extensively. We are also using other video hosting providers (Youtube, Vimeo) but with no specific integration with our system, embedding them via standard widgets

3. In Section 7 of the RFP, a CDN is mentioned alongside a Data Transfer estimate. Does the current System Reference use a CDN or does our architecture introduce this CDN?

Currently we are not using CDN, however we are looking into this possibility closely and, most probably, will work with vendor on integrating CDN with our system

4. RFP Section 3 Page 31 - Summary of Services 9: Maintain technical documentation related to technical architecture, maintenance plans integration points and escalation procedures. Is this currently done? What is the format and based on what does it happen?

We use Microsoft Office products (Visio, Excel, Word) to record the technical documentation related to technical architecture (IPs, network traffic and layout, server capacity). In addition, we update a runbook of escalation procedures and detailed description of maintenance scripts in the form of a Microsoft Word document that is distributed to technical staff who manage the environment. We are not of course married to this structure and look forward to seeing what suggestions can be made in this area. We will need to count on the vendors to document integration points with our infrastructure services and have experience documenting these type of escalation procedures.

5. RFP Section 4 Page 35 - Handling spikes in traffic: Vendor needs to add more Dispatcher instances to cache more content and handle the traffic or incorporate the use of a content delivery network to handle the load of traffic for periodic short period of time. Will the content generally be static and able to be handled simply by adding more dispatchers or do you ever anticipate needing to add publishers?

We will work closely with vendor to identify bottlenecks and lay out the best architecture to mitigate that risk. We count on vendor's experience with handling of such issues and looking forward to seeing suggestions.

6. RFP Section 4 Page 35 - Handling spikes in traffic: Vendor needs to add more Dispatcher instances to cache more content and handle the traffic or incorporate the use of a content delivery network to handle the load of traffic for periodic short period of time. Has the UN procured the services

of a CDN? Does the UN prefer Akamai or are they open to other CDN providers with similar service quality and features?

Please see the answer to Question #3.

7. RFP Section 4 Page 36 - Service Level Agreement: The service availability and reliability will be collected via New Relic Monitoring and portal accounts will need to be created and distributed to UNDP. Is this what you currently use? Do you currently have accounts or do those need to be created? Are you open to other tools?

We currently use New Relic Monitoring and portal accounts that were created and distributed to us. The cost of the New Relic Monitoring subscription is included in the current support agreement. We are open to other monitoring tools as long as it provides transparency in the monitoring and reporting of SLA metrics to us and the cost for the subscription is included in the financial proposal.

8. RFP Section 4 - Page 38 Support Structure: The ticket categories, the priorities assigned to them and target SLA's for completion are guidelines to the vendors. Are those already defined or part of discovery?

What we have included into TORs is our vision of the communication framework, but we are pretty open to the suggestions if vendor could propose better scheme. We are certainly flexible in terms of categories or similar details as part of discovery once the contract is signed.

9. RFP Section 6 Page 41- Migration from Current Environment: Create new Development Environment from a copy of the Production Environment and reduce the DAM asset data on both Authoring and Publisher instances by 95%. What if over 5% of assets are being referenced in the current content? What to do with the broken links that will arise?

The Development Environment is not intended to be synchronized with Production or Staging Environments. It's been only used for smoke tests and only needs to be populated with representative sample of the content during initial setup and will not require getting a constant update from the most current Production Environment.

10. RFP Section 6 Page 41- Migration from Current Environment: Setup of a Disaster Recovery Environment in a different geographical area from the Production Environment. Assuming the latest backup file is loaded here regularly? At the start, gets same content as the Production Environment? CDE/JIRA need to be included? If we can ensure similar results with an alternative method, can we avoid the Disaster Recovery Environment?

The intent of the Disaster Recovery Environment is for an environment to be located in the different geographical area from the Production Environment and to be a clone of the Production Environment with a very recent copy of Production Environment data. How that is achieved and implemented can be left up to the vendor to architect and provide with a recommended Recovery Time Objective and Recovery Point Objective that is close and similar to what was provided in the TOR.

The backups of the CDE/JIRA environment should be loaded regularly in the different geographical area from the Production Environment as well.

11. RFP Section 6 Page 42- Architecture Improvements: The UNDP user base for the AEM Authoring Environment is distributed in all geographical regions around the world. All continents? What is an acceptable response time?

We have users based in the Africa, Americas, Asia, Europe, and Oceania. See <http://millenniumindicators.un.org/unsd/methods/m49/m49regin.htm> for specific details.

Our goal is to provide all UNDP authors with fast and productive user experience regardless their actual location. In order to achieve this page loading times should not exceed 2 sec. In general, we are following Adobe recommendations from

<http://docs.adobe.com/docs/en/cq/current/deploying/performance.html#Basic Performance Guidelines>

12. Section 6 - Page 50 - Approaches to Service Provision: A list of recommended architecture improvements and suggestions that would improve the authoring experience for users who live in high latency and low bandwidth areas. What is considered low bandwidth/high latency? What are the factors contributing to that?

What we consider for low bandwidth/ high latency is if users use an Internet connection with 0.5 – 1 Mbps bandwidth with over 500ms latency (typical VSAT connections).

Regarding factors contributing to low bandwidth/high latency, this should be identified as a part of the exercise as we expect vendor to be able to assess such factors and work with UNDP technical staff in order to find the optimal architecture.

13. Are they married to SVN, JIRA and Bamboo or are they open to other systems?

Even though we have certain system in place which includes JIRA, Bamboo and Subversion, we are not "married" to any specific system on the development side and so we are open, within limits, to suggestions if there any better alternatives.

In case the new system does not involve using JIRA, then we would need the vendor to host our archived JIRA project data.

14. Page 32 (#3) - Manage content syncing between Production Publisher instances. How is this managed currently? via Reverse replication? Do they want to continue using Reverse replication or open to suggestions to improve UGC data management (via MongoDB)? What types of content is being synced between publishers - "comments", "ratings"? Are they using any other Social Collaboration components – forums, user profiles etc on Publish instances?

We do not use any social collaboration components from AEM at the moment. And we are certainly open for discussion on architecture improvement.

15. Page 41 – Migrate the UNDP Subversion repository and Maven configuration in its entirety (previous code, branches and commit history) to the proposed technical architecture. How critical is it to migrate commit history, branches etc. if we move to the new tool like Git? Are they married to SVN, JIRA and Bamboo or Are they open to other systems? Does UNDP plan on continuing to manage video

assets in third party tools or would there be interest in managing all assets in single AEM DAM repository? Is other 3rd tools that integrated into AEM solution that we need to be aware of?

The main 3rd party component tightly integrated into the system is Brightcove video hosting. In the case of a migration to AEM DAM repository or to another provider, then the process of migration should take into account moving all videos from one provider to another and update of all integration hooks for upcoming and legacy videos.

Other 3rd party components that we integrate with are LDAP, Messaging system (Office 365) and number of external Java libraries used for services integration - flickr4java and alike.

Our subversion commit history and branches are important for archiving but in case of deciding to switch into another version control system such as Git then we can start from the scratch. Obviously only in case when the benefits of using new system will overweight the hassle of moving from the original, so it requires solid justification.

Please also see our answer to question #13 regarding the archiving of JIRA project data.

16. In the Bidder conference, the bidders were also informed the followings:

- **Price Schedule:**

The Price Schedule is divided into two options where Bidders have to submit for both options. The Price Schedule is also included line items for Main Service as well as Additional Support. The Additional Support is case by case service which will be requested based on needs during the contract period. The quantity stated under additional support here is only an estimation. The contract shall not guarantee an estimate volume of sales on the part of UNDP.

The evaluation process of the financial proposal is as followed:

First, UNDP will evaluate Option 1 price proposal from all technically qualified bidders to determine the highest combined score of technical and financial proposal and to be awarded the contract.

However, if UNDP budget cannot cover the proposed price of the highest combined score of proposal under Option 1, UNDP has the right to evaluate Option 2 price proposal from all technically qualified bidders and determine the highest combine score of technical and financial proposal under this Option 2.

The bidder under Option 2 then will be awarded the contract unless there is a technically qualified proposal under option 1 whose total technical and financial score is higher but the price proposal is lower than the bidder with the highest combined score of technical and financial under option 2. In this case, the bidder with higher total combined score but lower price under Option 1 will be awarded the contract.

- **NDA (ANNEX A)**

Information on the current environment context (Appendix A and B) will be shared with a Proposer upon submission of signed the MUTUAL NON-DISCLOSURE AGREEMENT and before the deadline of the proposal submission.

- **Proposal Submission**

Bidder may choose to submit their proposals by e-mail to cpu.bids@undp.org. In this case the Proposer shall send separate proposals for: 1) technical proposal; 2) financial proposal as separate attachments to the message(s).

Having prepared the Technical Proposal in paper formats as specified in Sections 4, 5, and 6. The entire Technical Proposal should be scanned or otherwise converted into one or more electronic .pdf (Adobe Acrobat) format files and attached to one or more E-mails. Same should be done for Section 7 – Financial Proposal.

The Subject line of the E-mail(s) should state: “Technical proposal RFP/UNDP/OIST/024/2014– Adobe CQ Managed Services”; and separate email “Financial proposal for the RFP/UNDP/OIST/024/2014– Adobe CQ Managed Services - DO NOT OPEN”

To secure your financial offer please SET-UP A PASSWORD for the Financial Proposal which will be requested from the Bidders if they are successful in the Technical Proposal evaluation. Only those who achieved the minimum score on the technical evaluation will be requested to provide the password to the financial proposals.