

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA**

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

**General**

1. When "Recommendations" are requested, what is sufficient to meet the requirements (links to MS resources or detailed task list based on assessment)?

**Answer:** We would like detailed task lists wherever possible that include the links.

2. What O365 services require configuration and does the Court's have documented business policies to determine the necessary service settings, specifically:
  - o Message Hygiene
  - o Message Lifecycle
  - o eDiscovery
  - o Administrative isolation
  - o Address Book visibility
  - o Message encryption
  - o Data Loss Prevention

**Answer:** Most/all of the features listed above are new to us. We do not currently have policies defined for these features. We would be looking for professional guidance on the configuration and ongoing use of the service settings.

3. Administrative auditing

**Answer:** We would be looking for professional guidance on the configuration and ongoing use of administrative auditing.

4. What SharePoint Online and OneDrive for Business settings are within/out of scope?

**Answer:** We do not currently make use of SharePoint but are looking for professional guidance. We would like to eventually replace our aged file servers with SharePoint sites to replace our existing "Shared Data" infrastructure. It is assumed that OneDrive would be configured as a part of the incorporation of SharePoint for each of the Court's users.

5. Are all Outlook 2013 ProPlus installations MSI or C2R based? If MSI, does the Court's maintain an existing, robust and well-known software lifecycle system to apply updates and configuration changes? If C2R, are updates delivered directly to clients using Microsoft or are they delivered in a phased environment maintained by the Court's?

**Answer:** We currently distribute Office 2013 Pro Plus using SCCM and MSI installations. We only do highly critical patching and not very often but we'd like to improve upon that given that fact that we have SCCM to do this.

6. What, if any, training or knowledge transfer is requested or required by the Court's?

**Answer:** We have two NetAdmins that deal with the Exchange system, both minimally trained using training credits under our previous EA program. We were under the impression that O365 Admin training was a lower priority for MS but we would like to take advantage of any available training and knowledge transfer opportunities for both Exchange Admins.

7. What, if any, documentation is required by the Court's?

**Answer:** Standard project management documentation (Project Plan (tasks, resources, timeline, etc.) is requested. Project close-out and recommendations documentation would also be helpful.

## Identity

8. Do users' User Principal Names (UPN) addresses match their primary email addresses?

**Answer:** UPNs at the Court are configured to reflect the internal domain sbcourts.net while the email addresses associated with our user accounts reflect our external email domain sbcourts.org.

- If not, is the Court willing to make the change (after understanding pros and cons)?

**Answer:** We would need to have a greater understanding of the pros and cons to change this setup we've had in place for over 15 years.

9. How many Active Directory sites are there in the forest where Exchange resides?

**Answer:** We currently only have a single site configuration but would like to expand upon this and make greater use of the AD system, especially since we anticipate a large-scale increase in intrasite bandwidth in the coming months.

10. How many Active Directory domains comprise the Courts AD forest

**Answer:** We have only one AD domain/forest; sbcourts.net.

11. How many objects are in the forest?

- Users
- Contacts
- Distribution Groups (including mail-enabled Security Groups)
- Dynamic Distribution Groups

**Answer:** Users: Under 500; Contacts: Under 100; Distribution Groups: Under 200; Dynamic Distribution Groups: Under 50.

12. How are AD users and mailboxes provisioned (what is the process, and what personnel and/or systems are responsible for requesting, creating, and verifying the creation of a user).

**Answer:** Court HR provides new user's details to Court IT. Court IT creates new AD account on domain controller using ADUC. Mailbox is then created for user on mailbox server. Further user configuration is coordinated with the new user's supervisor/manager.

13. Is true single sign-on desired (e.g. ADFS), or is same sign-on (password hash synchronization) sufficient?

14. **Answer:** True SSO is desired, but we need more information to be able to make that determination.

## Exchange

15. Does the Court wish to maintain Exchange infrastructure on-premises indefinitely or decommissioning on premise servers.

**Answer:** We originally thought we would be entirely doing away with on premise Exchange servers by moving to O365. We understand that may not be possible and still have the level of control we desire. We'd like to discuss this in more detail to make a more informed decision.

16. How many Exchange servers comprise the Court's Exchange organization?

**Answer:** We have one physical Windows Server 2003 R2 server with Exchange 2007 running the mailbox role. We have another physical Win2K3R2 server running the Exchange 2007 CAS role (lives in Court's DMZ - faces public for EAS/OWA access). We have another physical Win2K3R2 server running the Exchange 2007 Edge Transport role (lives in DMZ – configured as SmartHost facilitating mail flow from outside-to-in and vice versa).

17. What roles are installed on each of these servers?

**Answer:** See previous question for detailed answer.

18. Where are the Exchange servers located in terms of physical location and Active Directory sites?

**Answer:** All Exchange servers are located in our Santa Barbara Datacenter. We currently have only one AD Site defined that all Exchange servers live within

19. Is Threat Management Gateway (TMG) or Internet Security Appliance (ISA) deployed in front of the CAS servers?

**Answer:** We no longer use ISA, we now use Incapsula's hosted service.

20. Is Multi-Factor Authentication currently enabled for Exchange services (OWA, ActiveSync, etc.)?

**Answer:** Not at this time.

21. Does the Exchange organization host any linked-mailboxes (mailboxes that are associated with another forest's user accounts)

**Answer:** Not at this time.

22. Are there existing federated relationships with other Exchange organizations (for free/busy and contact sharing)?

**Answer:** Not at this time.

23. What other integration-points are configured with Exchange (e.g. telephony, unified communication, unified messaging, fax, programmatic access (CDO, MAPI, EWS), Sharepoint)?

**Answer:** Not at this time.

24. Is there a Blackberry Enterprise Server connected to Exchange? (Only iOS and Android were specifically included in the RFP).

**Answer:** Not at this time.

25. Are there any Archiving and/or e-Discovery systems integrated with Exchange?

**Answer:** Not at this time.

26. How much data exists in the PSTs?

**Answer:** This is not known at this time but it is under 100GB total.

27. Where are PSTs located?

**Answer:** Most PST files live in an AD-mapped network drive called the "U" drive, which are stored on file servers in our SB and SM Datacenters.

28. What is the Court's initial desire for handling PSTs (e.g. move into users primary mailboxes, archive mailboxes, other)?

**Answer:** Given the 50GB size of the standard user mailbox under O365, it seems sensible to just plan on moving the PST data into the users' primary mailboxes.

29. Is there a mobile device or application management (MDM/MAM) system in place for mobile devices?

**Answer:** Not at this time.

30. Are there any versions of Outlook older than Office 2013 deployed?

**Answer:** Not at this time.

## OneDrive and SharePoint

31. What custom configurations are planned as in-scope of the project?

**Answer:** This issue would be discussed with the winning bidder.

32. Does the Court need assistance with migration of data into SharePoint and OneDrive, and is that considered to be in-scope?

**Answer:** Yes, and these items should be considered in-scope.

33. What is the quantity and total size of PSTs to be ingested?

**Answer:** At least 1 PST file associated with every mailbox and under 100GB total.

34. We recommend migrating PSTs directly to Exchange Online archive mailboxes rather than rehydrating to the mailbox (a common tactic). Is this tactic okay to recommend?

**Answer:** This may work for some of our users, but not all. But this is another example of a question that requires discussion with the winning bidder.

35. A "two-hop" migration (2007 > 2013 > Exchange Online) is a common tactic but not the least intrusive for end users.

**Answer:** No question posed - We'd like the least intrusive tactic to be taken wherever possible.

36. The RFP calls for the "development of a migration plan, assisting with the environment setup, and making recommendations" but does not make a request for the actual migration of mailboxes. Does this mean that the Court plans to execute the migration procedures themselves?

**Answer:** We have experienced Exchange Admins on staff that can take care of repetitive busy-work tasks such as mailbox migrations. We will require assistance with this at first but, once we have a handle on how to do it properly, we shouldn't require any further assistance with that particular aspect of the project.

37. If the above question is in the affirmative, may we propose a turnkey complete migration service which also executes the migration procedures and handles the coordinated communication with end users?

RFP Title: *Microsoft Office 365 System Integration and Implementation Services*

RFP Number: *2017-03*

Wednesday, February 22, 2017

**Answer:** It would be helpful to learn more about this service so we can better weigh our options. But it is important that our Exchange Admin staff have a clear understanding of as much of this new system as possible. Again, a discussion is needed with the winning bidder.

38. Other than burden of support after a migration, what is preventing the Court from considering a "big bang" migration?

**Answer:** Again, a discussion is needed with the winning bidder.

39. For clarification purposes, who should be my main contact? Would that be you or Darrell Parker?

**Answer:** As per the instructions in the RFP, bidders are only to contact the Court's Procurement Specialist at the provided email, phone or mailing address to ensure impartiality in the review of submitted proposals.