



THE PORT AUTHORITY OF NY & NJ

**THE PORT AUTHORITY OF NEW YORK & NEW JERSEY
PURCHASING SERVICES DIVISION
ONE MADISON AVENUE 7TH FL.
NEW YORK, NY 10010**

Date January 23, 2007

ADDENDUM #1

TO PROSPECTIVE PROPOSERS ON RFP # 12016 FOR HOSTED MICROSOFT EXCHANGE E-MAIL AND ADMINISTRATION SERVICES.

Due back on February 15, 2007, no later than 2:00 PM

The following changes are hereby made in the documents:

- 1. Page 3, Paragraph D entitled “Submission of Proposals” shall read as follows: “One reproducible original (containing original signatures and clearly designated as such) and fifteen (15) copies of the proposal.....”**
- 2. Page 12, Subparagraph G.1 entitled: “Management Proposal” shall read as follows: “The Proposer shall describe in detail its experience, including relevant contracts performed during the last two (2) years, its financial capability.....”**
- 3. Page 14 Paragraph G.1.2 subparagraph a shall read as follows: “That within two (2) years preceding.....”**
- 4. Vendors who wish to receive a CD containing the Cost Proposal sheets, pages 133 –145, as well as Attachments C1 and C2, pages 79 and 80, may do so by requesting it via e-mail from Nadine Aziz at naziz@panynj.gov. THE AUTHORITY WILL PROVIDE ONLY ONE CD COPY PER COMPANY. This is for convenience purposes only.**

PROPOSER QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

The following information is made available in response to questions submitted by prospective proposers. It should not be deemed to answer all questions, which have been submitted by proposers to the Port Authority. It addresses only those questions, which the Port Authority has deemed to require additional information and/or clarification. The fact that information has not been supplied with respect to any questions asked by a

proposer does not mean or imply, nor should it be deemed to mean or imply, any meaning, construction, or implication with respect to terms.

The Port Authority makes no representations, warranties or guarantees that the information contained herein is accurate, complete or timely or that such information accurately represents the conditions that would be encountered during the performance of the Contract. The furnishing of such information by the Port Authority shall not create or be deemed to create any obligation or liability upon it for any reason whatsoever and each Proposer, by submitting its proposal, expressly agrees that it has not relied upon the foregoing information, and that it shall not hold the Port Authority liable or responsible therefor in any manner whatsoever. Accordingly, nothing contained herein and no representation, statement or promise, of the Port Authority, its Commissioners, officers, agents, representatives, or employees, orally or in writing, shall impair or limit the effect of the warranties of the Proposer required by this RFP or any resulting contract and the Proposer agrees that it shall not hold the Port Authority liable or responsible therefor in any manner whatsoever.

Note: Similar and related questions have been consolidated. Therefore, you should carefully read all questions and responses, as your questions may be answered in a slightly different format than submitted. Responses to questions will be provided through this Addendum to the RFP. All potential proposers will receive the same comprehensive list of questions and responses.

Please note that the vendors in most cases did not specifically include a referenced section and/or page number. We have referenced related section(s) of the RFP where possible. The vendor(s) should not assume that these referenced sections are the only ones that apply to the question or response. As many of the questions may relate to the current technical environment and Attachment E, MS Exchange 2003 & Outlook 2000 Technical Environment, beginning on page 115, we have mentioned this section here.

The Proposers should submit their proposals with all technical requirements, issues, and solutions stated. This may include addressing issues, making known any problems they foresee and especially providing solutions to these issues or problems. These may serve to increase the Authority's understanding of the technical issues involved in this RFP. However, these proposals must conform to all of the provisions of the RFP. The Proposers should assume that the Scope of Work has not been modified by any of the answers herein.

1. Will the Port Authority grant an extension to the RFP submission date?

ANSWER: At this time, the Port Authority is not planning to grant an extension to the RFP submission date. Proposals are due on February 15, 2007.

2. Will the Authority grant exceptions to the Proposer Pre-Requisites (Section 3, pages 5-7)?

ANSWER: No.

3. Can the vendor receive a summary of the questions and answers from the Pre-Proposal Meeting held on 1/12/07?

ANSWER: No. Vendors were instructed to submit all questions to Nadine Aziz in writing. The questions and answers contained herein will be e-mailed to vendors and will also be posted on the Port Authority's public website.

4. What companies received the RFP?

ANSWER: The Authority will not disclose this information.

5. What are the business reasons for submitting the RFP at this time?

ANSWER: The current contract will expire at year-end 2007.

6. What are the Authority's service level agreement requirements?

ANSWER: Please refer to Attachment B - General Contract Provisions - Item 10 - Required Service Levels and Damages for Non-Performance, pages 44 – 47, as well as Attachment D, Section 2.2 - Service Level Agreement (SLA) Standards, pages 102 – 106 in the contract document.

7. Are all recipients of the RFP SAS 70 Type II Certified?

ANSWER: The Authority does not have this information. Please refer to Section G – Proposal, pages 15 and 20 for specific references to SAS 70.

8. Is the Port Authority willing to execute a mutual Non-Disclosure Agreement (NDA) with the vendor as part of this RFP?

ANSWER: No. Each vendor is required to sign the Port Authority's Agreement on Terms of Discussion for their proposal to be considered. This agreement should provide sufficient safeguards for the Proposer.

9. Does the Authority require a dedicated hosted MS Exchange environment? Is this what your current provider has in place today?

ANSWER: The Authority currently has a dedicated hosted Exchange and BlackBerry server infrastructure. The Authority requires a hosted MS Exchange environment on non-shared servers with no co-mingling of data with other clients. Please refer Attachment D – Scope Of Work, page 93, referencing “non-shared servers”. Please refer to Attachment F – Cost Proposal Forms and Instructions, page 129, including Attachment F.3 - Start Up and Termination Costs, page 131, for specifying costs related to a dedicated hosted Exchange environment.

10. Do you require a one-way domain trust between the Authority’s AD (Active Directory) and the service provider's AD?

ANSWER: We require continued use of the Authority’s AD corporate user accounts domain for authenticated access to hosted Exchange mailboxes. Please refer to Attachment E – Technical Environment, page 116 - paragraph 3, and pages 126 and 127 for further information about the AD environment and LDAP data interchange between the Authority and the service provider.

11. How many domain controllers and global catalog servers are in the current hosted environment?

ANSWER: The service provider has two AD controllers dedicated to the Authority. These controllers both act as Global Catalog servers.

12. The RFP mentions that at the end of the contract term the provider will turn over tools, processes, etc. to the PA. Can you elaborate on this please?

Answer: Please refer to Attachment D, Section 3 - Transitioning Services at Start of Contract and Termination of Contract, pages 113-114.

13. Can you provide more details on your Unified Messaging requirements? Does the current environment offer Microsoft or other Unified Messaging Services, allowing Port Authority users to retrieve voice mail via their Outlook and e-mail via their phone mailboxes?

ANSWER: The Authority has not yet defined its plans for Unified Messaging. The demand for this particular value-added service is not currently known. Refer to Attachment F, item F.1.3, page 130. We do not currently have the requirements for this value-added service, but would like the Proposers to respond to item F.1.3 if they may offer this or other value-added services as part of this contract.

14. Can you provide more details on your archiving requirements? Is the requirement compliance based?

ANSWER: The Authority has not yet defined its plans for e-mail archiving. The demand for this particular value-added service is not currently known. Refer to Attachment F, item F.1.3, page 130. We do not currently have the requirements for

this value-added service, but would like the Proposers to respond to item F.1.3 if they may offer this or other value-added services as part of this contract.

15. Can you provide more details on your encrypted e-mail requirements? Is this client-to-client or server-to-server encryption? Is this in place today with your current provider?

ANSWER: The Authority has not yet defined its plans for encrypted e-mail. The demand for this particular value-added service is not currently known. Please refer to Attachment F, item F.1.3, page 130. We do not currently have the requirements for this value-added service, but would like the Proposers to respond to item F.1.3 if they may offer this or other value-added services as part of this contract.

16. Does the current environment offer any collaboration tools other than core Exchange services? For instance SharePoint portals and team rooms, Microsoft Identity Integration Server for directory synchronization, Microsoft Provisioning Server, Microsoft Live Communications Server Instant Messaging, etc?

ANSWER: We are not currently utilizing these mentioned collaboration options. The Authority has not yet defined its plans for them. The demands for these particular value-added services are not currently known. Please refer to Attachment F, item F.1.3, page 130. We do not currently have the requirements for these value-added services, but would like the Proposers to respond to item F.1.3 if they may offer these or other value-added services as part of this contract.

17. Are there any Microsoft Mobile devices in the environment?

ANSWER: The Authority is not currently utilizing these devices with our hosted e-mail service. The Authority has not yet defined its plans for them. The demand for this particular value-added service is not currently known. Please refer to Attachment F, item F.1.3, page 130. We do not currently have the requirements for this value-added service, but would like the Proposers to respond to item F.1.3 if they may offer this or other value-added services as part of this contract.

18. How many mailboxes, resources, conference rooms, distribution lists, etc. and what services are in the current environment?

ANSWER: Please refer to Attachment E – Technical Environment, including pages 118, 120, and 125.

19. Which version of Exchange is currently being used?

ANSWER: Please refer to Attachment E – Technical Environment, section labeled Current Server Software, page 120.

20. How many Exchange servers are currently in the environment?

ANSWER: Please refer to Attachment E – Technical Environment, pages 118 and 121-123.

21. How many storage groups and information stores are being used?

ANSWER: Each of the three Exchange back-end mailbox servers has one storage group with two mailbox information stores and one replicated public folder store. The replicated public folder store is on all three Exchange servers.

22. What is the configuration of the storage for Exchange in the current environment?

ANSWER: Please refer to Attachment E – Technical Environment, pages 119, 121, and 122.

23. Is connectivity to storage devices built on a fully redundant fabric?

ANSWER: Please refer to Attachment E – Technical Environment, page 122, section labeled SAN Storage.

24. What is the total data in Gigabytes?

ANSWER: Please refer to Attachment E – Technical Environment, pages 119 and 121.

25. Are public folders being used in the environment and what is the total data size in the public folder store(s)?

ANSWER: Yes. Please refer to Attachment E – Technical Environment, pages 119 and 121.

26. The RFP states the Authority has approximately 550 Blackberries in the environment. Will more be issued? Over what period?

ANSWER: Yes, more BlackBerry will be issued. The Authority does not have specific information on the expected growth rate for BlackBerry service. At this time, we do not anticipate the Authority's requirements to grow beyond Research In Motion's 2,000-user specification for one BlackBerry Enterprise server. Please refer to Attachment E – Technical Environment, pages 118, 121, and 125 for additional BlackBerry service information.

27. Are there any individual mailbox storage limits and thresholds for warnings surrounding mailbox storage limits enforced in the environment?

ANSWER: Please refer to Attachment E – Technical Environment, page 119.

28. Is the Port Authority currently leveraging any remote access protocols to access Exchange, for instance IMAP4, POP3, RPC over HTTP or Outlook Web Access? Are the OWA servers secured via SSL?

ANSWER: Protocols IMAP4, POP3, RPC over HTTP are not currently used for remote access. The substantial majority of e-mail access is via Outlook MAPI client. Outlook Web Access (SSL-secured, load balanced, and firewall protected) is also being used by Authority staff. Please refer to Attachment E – Technical Environment, section labeled Remote Access to Mailboxes and Administrative Tools, page 121 and page 118.

29. Are the OWA servers using forms-based authentication?

ANSWER: Yes.

30. Are there different “tiers of service” in the current environment? For instance, premium mailboxes which could leverage more storage, multiple access methods and a remote device such as a Blackberry, versus a lower tier of mailboxes that have less storage and fewer feature sets? If so what approximate percentages of each tier comprise the organization? Does the current environment allow Port Authority IT staff to view and adjust tiered service mailbox blend to maximize messaging and collaboration budgets?

ANSWER: Please refer to Attachment E – Technical Environment, page 119.

31. Does the current offering provide for any real-time monitoring services or real-time availability statistics?

ANSWER: Please refer to Attachment E – Technical Environment, section labeled Required Monitoring of E-mail Services, page 120.

32. How much participation does the Port Authority IT staff envision in the migration from the current environment to a new vendor’s hosted environment?

ANSWER: Proposers are expected to provide detailed transition plans and any associated costs. Please refer to section 7.G.2.4 – Technical Proposal - Detailed Start and End of Contract Transition Plans, page 24, and Attachment D – Scope of Work, section 3.1 – Transition Planning from Current Contractor, pages 113 -114. The Proposer should refer to Attachment F3 – Start Up and End of Contracts Costs form, page 140, and if needed, Attachment F –Section 1 – Cost Structure Assumptions, page 145.

33. Does the current environment allow the Port Authority to provision new mailboxes into the environment directly or is the vendor needed for provisioning?

ANSWER: In the current environment, user mailboxes are created by the Authority’s IT staff through an automated procedure when the user’s Novell account is created via a Novell tool in the Authority’s Novell directory environment, which is linked to the Authority’s AD domain and the vendor’s AD domain via Novell’s Identity Manager (DirXML) software for creation of the AD accounts and the

mailbox. Also refer to Attachment E – Technical Environment, section labeled Help Desk User Account, Mailbox, Conference Room, Recipient, Public Folders and Distribution Management, page 126.

34. Is the data center where the Exchange data resides fully redundant? In other words, in case of a loss of the data center is there a geo – cluster solution to failover the Port Authority Exchange services to another data server for real-time business continuance?

ANSWER: The current hosted e-mail environment has numerous redundant components. However, it is not currently clustered for server failover nor provisioned for real-time failover to an alternate data center. If the Proposer offers a disaster recovery capability, they should provide details on the disaster recovery service and additional costs, if any, of such services.

35. Has the Port Authority re-evaluated Total Cost of Ownership on an individual mailbox in the current environment?

ANSWER: The Authority is concerned with all costs including technology costs.

36. When was the last offline defrag of the Exchange information stores completed?

ANSWER: The last offline defrag was completed in July 2005.

37. Does the daily Exchange online defrag complete successfully?

ANSWER: The daily online Exchange defrag completes successfully.

38. When was the last time the Microsoft Exchange Best Practices Analyzer was run?

ANSWER: This utility was run last in March 2006.

39. Is the current environment leveraging the front-end/back-end architecture prescribed by Microsoft best practices?

ANSWER: The service provider designed and supports the current environment's front-end and back-end architecture based on acceptable industry standards and best practices. The Proposer should propose their solution.

40. Attachment E – Technical Environment - Will the Port Authority continue to use MX Logic for anti-Spam filtering for all incoming and outgoing e-mail? If so, who will be responsible for managing it? Will the Port Authority continue to accept e-mail from MX Logic via your Trend Micro (IMSS) gateway solution on the front-end servers? Does the Port Authority currently utilize any whitelists (allow) or blacklists (deny)?

ANSWER: This anti-Spam service option is currently provided through our hosted

e-mail service provider in conjunction with the e-mail service provider's front-end Trend Micro (IMSS) SMTP gateway servers at a competitive price. Our experience with the service and security offered by this outsourced service has been very positive. The service has kept considerable hostile/spam e-mails away from users' mailboxes and offered positive self-service functionality that has been well received by end users. This is the service provider's solution and servers. The service provider is our contact point for any hosted service issues. Please refer to Attachment E – Technical Environment, page 118 and section labeled Anti-Spam and Anti-Virus Services, page 125. The Proposer should propose their anti-spam solution and communicate any additional costs and outline the features/services provided.

41. Attachment E – Technical Environment - What Anti-Virus solution is currently being leveraged in the current environment? Where are messages screened for anti-spam/anti-virus in the current environment?

ANSWER: In addition to the MX Logic anti-spam and anti-virus service and the Trend Micro server anti-virus products that are provided by the service provider, the Authority has anti-virus protection on its desktops. Please refer to Attachment E – Technical Environment, page 118 and sections labeled Current Server Software, page 120 and Anti-Spam and Anti-Virus Services, page 125.

42. How does the Port Authority control proprietary messaging data?

ANSWER: The Port Authority handles incoming and outgoing SMTP and MAPI formatted e-mail. The PA does not utilize proprietary messaging protocols through our Exchange environment.

43. Are there any federal or state governmental, legislative, legal, and financial, or HIPPA concerns for the retention of Port Authority mail data?

ANSWER: The Port Authority does not impose any unique requirements. The Contractor will be required to comply with all legal requirements. Email is not used for HIPPA data.

44. Does the Port Authority IT staff have access to the Event logs from their Exchange servers?

ANSWER: The Authority requires the hosted service provider to provide required information from Event logs as needed. All servers are configured for event logging.

45. Is the Port Authority using any Outlook Forms?

ANSWER: Currently the Authority has two Authority-created forms in its Outlook Organizational library that are infrequently used. We do not currently have further requirements for use of Outlook forms, but would like the Proposers to respond to Attachment F, item F.1.3 if they may offer this or other value-added services as part of this contract.

46. Does the Port Authority Exchange server organization connect to any legacy messaging systems such as Exchange 5.5, Lotus Notes, GroupWise or any other?

ANSWER: No. There are no legacy e-mail system connectors in the Authority's Exchange environment.

47. Is there full-text indexing of Exchange data in the current environment?

ANSWER: There is full-text indexing in the current environment.

48. Attachment E – Technical Environment, E-mail Message Traffic, page 123. How was the data collected? What are peak usage levels like?

ANSWER: Message traffic information is collected by the service provider and provided to the Authority in the service provider's web-based reporting system that the Authority has access to. The information provided on page 123 represents typical Authority e-mail traffic. Peak usage message traffic data is dependent on numerous factors and are not representative of typical daily traffic.

49. What is the current growth trend in percentage for the current Exchange environment?

ANSWER: Since 2001, the Authority has experienced growth in the Exchange environment as follows: the number of user mailboxes increased from approximately 5,000 to approximately 5,500; the associated overall mailbox and public folder storage used increased from approximately 100 GB to approximately 300 GB; and the regular user mailbox storage limits for Issue Warning, Prohibit Send, and Prohibit Send and Receive changed from 35 MB, 40 MB, and 45 MB, respectively to 45 MB, 55 MB, and 85 MB, respectively.

Based on industry experience with the growth in e-mail usage, the types of e-mail messages and message sizes, we are anticipating growth.

We have requested vendors supply costs for 100 MB mailboxes as well as incremental costs for 50 MB increments to handle the growth of mailbox sizes as required (see Attachment F1, page 133, Attachment F5, pages 142, and Attachment F- Section 1 – Cost Structure Assumptions, page 145).

For example, using historical experience of roughly 300% growth in overall storage used, we would anticipate vendors to have the capacity over time to utilize the incremental costs for 50 MB increments and provide capabilities for a 300 MB mailbox over the course of the contract.

50. Attachment E – Technical Environment - What is the Deleted Items Retention Policy in the current environment?

ANSWER: Please refer to Attachment E – Technical Environment, section labeled 120-Day E-mail Retention Policy, page 121.

51. How many Recipient Policies are currently in force in the current environment?

ANSWER: There are five Recipient Policies in the current environment. Of the five policies, most of the e-mail is enforced by 2 recipient policies; (1) the default domain policy for SMTP and X400 and (2) a mailbox manager recipient policy controlling the Exchange Mailbox Manager process and Deleted Items retention.

52. Attachment E – Technical Environment - Is there a need to support secondary SMTP addresses from legacy environments in the current environment?

ANSWER: Yes. Please refer to Attachment E – Technical Environment, page 119.

53. Would the Port Authority be willing to provide a high-level architecture document laying out your environment and how you connect to the current hosted vendor?

ANSWER: Please refer to Attachment E – Technical Environment, and specifically reference the diagram on page 117.

54. Will the Port Authority be implementing the same Backup/Storage solution (EMC SAN storage)? If yes, who will implement and manage this?

ANSWER: The Authority is not planning to implement a backup/storage solution for hosted e-mail. This hosted e-mail service is utilizing the vendor's off-site server/network/datacenter infrastructure that is implemented and maintained by the vendor. Please refer to Section 1.B - Brief Summary of Scope of Work, pages 1-2, and Attachment D – Scope of Work, beginning on page 84. The Proposer must propose their solution for a hosted e-mail environment including backups and storage and how it relates to disaster recovery as part of their proposal.

55. What Security templates if any are used on the Exchange servers? Are there currently any additional registry hacks, or Boot.ini edits in place? If so, please specify.

ANSWER: The current e-mail environment is secured based on their security and platform teams' requirements and best practices for all hosted servers. The Proposer is expected to propose their solution, including security-related matters as detailed in the RFP.

This communication should be initialed by you and annexed to your proposal upon submission.

In case any proposer fails to conform to these instructions, its proposal will nevertheless be construed as though this communication had been so physically annexed and initialed.

THE PORT AUTHORITY OF NY & NJ

**LARRY WAXMAN, MANAGER
PRIORITY PROCUREMENTS DIVISION**

PROPOSER'S FIRM NAME: _____

INITIALED: _____

DATE: _____

**QUESTIONS CONCERNING THIS ADDENDUM MAY BE ADDRESSED TO
NADINE AZIZ, WHO CAN BE REACHED AT (212) 435-3934.**