October 31, 2019  (emailed to all proposers on this date)

ADDENDUM # 1
RFP 082001

MANAGED CLOUD-BASED WEB HOSTING SERVICES

Please note the following answers to questions that were asked prior to the deadline for inquiries date of October 23, 2019 (3:00 p.m. MST).

1) Are there any security considerations that should be taken into consideration for platform provisioning? (HIPAA, FERPA, PII)
   ANSWER: Proposed solutions that aim to meet hosting requirements for Sensitive information (see Exhibit A, Table 3 for the Data Classification definitions) should at least provide for encryption of data in transit and at rest, access controls to prevent unauthorized access, system logging for auditing, and evidence of industry standard attestations for information security compliance. HIPAA data is considered Highly Sensitive data, which is outside the scope of this solicitation.

2) Outside of WordPress, are there any other CMSs to be taken into consideration beyond what are provided in Exhibit A?
   ANSWER: For the purposes of this solicitation ASU is not currently taking other CMSs into consideration outside of WordPress and Drupal. However, being cognizant that the technology landscape continues to evolve at an ever-increasing pace ASU is interested in proposals that illustrate the art of the possible and can accommodate advances in this space, including new CMS solutions.

3) Section V.2.f.- Would ASU be comfortable with the positioning of multiple Transition In/Out plans? There are opportunities of varying levels of engagement from the ASU team that may be of interest.
   ANSWER: Yes, ASU is open to reviewing multiple Transition In/Out plans.

4) Will the existing designs and layouts be brought over, or will there be a redesign of the sites as a part of this initiative?
   ANSWER: There is an internal initiative that may lead to the redesign of sites, but it is not directly tied to this initiative. The assumption for this initiative is that some of the existing designs and layouts may be brought over as they are while
others may be redesigned. The decision whether to move as is or redesign a site will be made by the group or unit that sponsors it.

5) What level of site access is granted to content editors currently?
   ANSWER: That depends on the site and in turn it depends on the University department, group, or team that manages it.

6) Would there be any consideration to consolidate all sites into a common CMS as a part of this initiative?
   ANSWER: ASU is open to review such a CMS consolidation proposal as a value-add service (Section V, sub section 8).

7) Can you please specify the average page views (uncached) for the Drupal and WordPress sites separately?
   ANSWER: We can provide the average page views for a subset of the sites. The estimated average daily page views for the combined Drupal sites is 238,565\(^1\). The estimated average daily page views for the combined WordPress sites is 34,097\(^2\).

1. For the Drupal sites, the estimate is based on Google Analytics data for a sample of 322 (about 88%) of the sites currently hosted on Pantheon looking at a one-year time period.
2. For WordPress sites, the estimate is based on Google Analytics data for a sample of 176 (about 74%) of the sites currently hosted on Pantheon looking at the same one-year period.

8) Can you please provide a high-water mark for monthly page views?
   ANSWER: We can provide an estimate of the high-water mark for monthly page views: 9,200,000.

9) Does ASU leverage a Content Delivery Network? If so, what level of customization is required?
   ANSWER: Yes, ASU leverages at least two Content Delivery Networks. ASU uses Cloudflare for the web hosting environments that it manages. Websites hosted on Pantheon leverage Pantheon Global CDN. ASU is unsure what is being asked in regards to the level of customization required.

10) Does ASU currently leverage a Web Application Firewall? Would this be a requirement?
    ANSWER: Yes, ASU leverages a Web Application Firewall. Yes, this is a requirement.
11) What are the metrics of success for this initiative? How will they be quantified or tracked? How great of a level of improvement over today’s baseline are you expecting?
   ANSWER: ASU will measure the success of this RFP by how closely the awarded response(s) align with the requirements outlined in the RFP document.

12) Other educational institutions have stated business goals to reduce organizational cost and to provide a digital experience to maximize user engagement throughout the lifecycle. Does ASU plan to use personalization and/or any value-add components of a future platform in the coming 1-3 year plan?
   ANSWER: ASU is interested in leveraging personalization solutions to augment its user engagement initiatives and is open to review a personalization proposal as a value-add service (Section V, sub section 8).

13) What platform functionality is most important to ASU?
   ANSWER: An API and/or CLI functionality that has feature parity with the graphical console/dashboard and can be used for automation and scripting.

14) What do you like/not like about the current platform? What is working/not working?
   ANSWER: Like – The developer experience through the dashboard (including but not limited to: integration with New Relic, delivery of upstream updates, and “three-click” deployment of code updates), technical support, platform documentation, CLI tool with feature parity with the dashboard (and features the dashboard lacks) that allows for scripting, CDN solution baked-into the stack, and the continuous improvement of the platform offering. We also like that we pay for what we use – within the constrain of the service level plan pricing structure – rather than having to pay for a chunk of “resources” upfront whether we use them or not.
   Lack – A baked-in solution for storing Sensitive information (see Exhibit A, Table 3 for the Data Classification definitions) on the platform, the ability to export access metrics or make server access logs for our “high value” sites available for intake into our data repository, a low-cost / simpler-setup offering for “small” low-traffic sites below the “Basic” service plan, and in addition to the current way to add individual users to a site team (see https://pantheon.io/docs/team-management for details) a way to create a team of users from within the Org that can be assigned to multiple sites.

15) How is site experience/branding governed today? What gaps/problems exist with the governance model that you would like to see addressed?
ANSWER: This falls outside of the scope of this solicitation.

16) What determines the platform that is used for new site creation (WordPress vs. Drupal)?
ANSWER: The unit or group sponsoring the website decides which platform to employ. Due to the semi-decentralized nature of the university and the degree of autonomy granted to its units, there isn’t a common set of criteria for platform selection used across the enterprise.

17) Section IV.8.- Outside of pricing, what other factors will be considered as important to the ASU evaluators?
ANSWER: Please see Section VII – Evaluation Criteria (p. 22).

18) Section IV item 3 states that “documents should be clearly marked to indicate that they are printed on recycled content.” Can you please provide an example of this marking?
ANSWER: Typically, Respondents indicate this in the footer of their response to the RFP. We have also seen where they include the wrapping from the ream of paper that the response is copied on. Either of these options are acceptable.

19) Section VII item 7 states that the “proposer must provide a statement of their review and acceptance of ASU’s Terms and Conditions.” Does the contract have to be executed before awarding the RFP?
ANSWER: The contract would be executed after The Intent to Award is sent out to all Respondents and negotiations have been completed.

20) In Exhibit A you provided a current total of sites hosted in 2017 vs 2018 partially to show growth rate. Are you looking for fixed-cost pricing based on current number of sites and predicted growth rates, or are you looking for a per-site tier cost?
ANSWER: ASU is interested in a best in class solution at a competitive price that will scale to meet our web hosting needs and provides us with price stability and predictability. ASU is also interested in both per-site tier pricing and overall total cost, but is not prescribing one approach over the other.

21) Can we get a copy of the previously awarded proposal?
ANSWER: There is not a previously awarded proposal to share for this RFP.

22) Is it possible to get a current usage estimate expedited by tier?
- Average visits per day
- Most concurrent users at a time
ANSWER: “Most concurrent users at a time” usage information is not readily available. Please see the following table for average daily page views*.
### Table 1. ASU Plans 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Sites (total 623)</th>
<th>Average daily page views*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>52,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>103,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>61,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Not readily available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Upstream CMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CMS</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Webspark (Drupal 7)</td>
<td>311</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drupal 7</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WordPress</td>
<td>238</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drupal 6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drupal 8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panopoly (Drupal 7)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atrium (Drupal 7)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OpenScholar (Drupal 7)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The reported page views account for 498 (about 80%) of the sites currently hosted on our managed web hosting environments looking at one-year period.

23) What is the current size of database storage being used?
   ANSWER: That information is not readily available to ASU.

24) What is the current size of document storage being used?
   ANSWER: That information is not readily available to ASU.

25) When filling out the VPAT 508 Edition, will Level A Success Criteria satisfy the RFP requirement?
   ANSWER: ASU has over 5000 students who are registered with our office that have some type of disability. We anticipate there are at least 5000-10,000 more that could potentially register with us, but don’t for various reasons. National statistics show that about 15%-19% of a population have some type of a disability. That said, when it comes to web accessibility, there is an increasing need and legal responsibility to ensure that these tools are accessible.

As a part of the University’s Charter, “…we are measured not by whom we exclude, but rather by whom we include and how they succeed;” it is important that we keep that in mind as we consider the products we choose to go with. Although Level A is conforming, I would recommend understanding what entities are doing to demonstrate they are working on and progressing towards higher levels of conformance rather than looking to do the bare minimum to be accepted as the vendor of choice.

Our own ASU website has the following statement (https://webaccessibility.asu.edu/)

Accessible websites welcome people of all abilities to our university. University policy and federal and state law require that ASU's programs and services be available to persons with disabilities. All people and departments that post university or instructional
web content are responsible for ensuring its compliance with conformance level AA of the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.1.

To learn more about web accessibility and how to test your site for compliance, check out the links below. Let us know anytime how we can help you!

- For us to stay consistent, I would also recommend that we ask for AA conformance. The policy referenced above is ACD 405: Individuals with Disabilities. It actually lists out the criteria:

  Web Accessibility

  ASU offices and departments creating Web sites, including course Web sites, should consider the following guidelines and aim for compliance, as feasible:

1. provide alternative texts for images, applets, and image maps
2. provide descriptions for important graphics, scripts, or applets if they are not fully described through alternative text or in the document’s content
3. provide textual equivalents for audio information (captioning)
4. make verbal descriptions of moving visual information available in both auditory and text form
5. make text and graphics perceivable and understandable when viewed without color
6. make moving, blinking, scrolling, or auto-updating objects or pages so they can be paused or frozen
7. make pages using the newer HTML features that transform easily into an accessible form
8. make features that enable activation of page elements via input devices other than a pointing device (e.g., via keyboard, voice) available
9. provide sufficient information to determine the purpose of frames and how they relate to each other
10. make tables (not used for layout) that have the necessary markup to be properly restructured or presented by accessible browsers and other user agents
11. indicate structure with structural elements and control presentation with presentation elements and style sheets
12. provide supplemental information needed to pronounce or interpret abbreviated or foreign text
13. build accessibility into elements that contain their own user interface
14. use interim accessibility solutions to assure that assistive technologies and older browsers will operate correctly
15. group controls, selections, and labels into semantic units
16. create good link phrases
17. provide mechanisms that facilitate navigation within your site

18. create a single downloadable file for documents that exist as a series of separate pages.

Methods for complying with the standards above may be found at http://www.w3c.org.

If you have any questions regarding this notice, please contact me at 480-727-5177 or Catherine.thart@asu.edu.

Thank you,
Catherine Thart, C.P.M.
Purchasing Manager
Arizona State University
Purchasing & Business Services
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