



ADDENDUM #1

Intranet Platform Modernization and Staff Portal Solution

Request For Proposals #2026-002

Date: October 6, 2026

This Addendum No. 1 is issued to provide Fort Vancouver Regional Library District's (FVRL) responses to questions received regarding RFP No. 2026-002.

Question 1 (as submitted):

Could you confirm the anticipated first-year budget range for licensing, implementation and support?

Answer 1:

Please bid your best price.

Question 2 (as submitted):

Whether an India-registered firm may bid if we obtain any required Washington business registration before award.

Answer 2:

International proposers may participate, subject to the RFP requirements and applicable law. The following applies:

- The selected provider must hold any legally required registrations and licenses before award.
- Hosting must be in the United States.
- Implementation and support must cover the majority of our business hours (8:00 AM - 5:00 PM Pacific Time) at a minimum.
- All implementation, support, documentation, and communications must be available in English.

Question 3 (as submitted):

Whether custom development is acceptable versus only commercial intranet SaaS products.

Answer 3:

Proposals for a custom-built platform will be evaluated using the same criteria as for a commercial, off-the-shelf product.

Question 4 (as submitted):

Could you please confirm whether an international supplier based in Ukraine is eligible to participate, and whether any U.S. or Washington State entity registration, local presence, insurance or other domestic requirement is mandatory?



Answer 4:

International proposers may participate, subject to the RFP requirements and applicable law. The RFP does not require a separate U.S. legal entity or a local office and does not specify insurance coverage requirements. The following applies:

- The selected provider must hold any legally required registrations and licenses before award.
- Hosting must be in the United States.
- Implementation and support must cover the majority of our business hours (8:00 AM - 5:00 PM Pacific Time) at a minimum.
- All implementation, support, documentation, and communications must be available in English.

Question 5 (as submitted):

Could you please confirm whether a Pakistan-based international technology company is eligible to respond to this RFP, provided it satisfies all technical, security, contractual and support requirements?

Answer 5:

International proposers may participate, subject to the RFP requirements and applicable law. The following applies:

- The selected provider must hold any legally required registrations and licenses before award.
- Hosting must be in the United States.
- Implementation and support must cover the majority of our business hours (8:00 AM - 5:00 PM Pacific Time) at a minimum.
- All implementation, support, documentation, and communications must be available in English.

Question 6 (as submitted):

Are there any additional integrations or platforms currently used by FVRL that are not listed in the RFP and would need to be integrated with the new intranet?

Answer 6:

1. The proposed platform must integrate with Microsoft Entra ID or Google Workspace for authentication.
2. The proposed platform must integrate with Google Drive apps such as Google Docs and Google Sheets for content linking.
3. Documented REST APIs, secure event-driven webhooks, and standard single sign-on (SSO) integration (e.g., SAML 2.0 or OAuth 2.0) are highly desirable.
4. Integrations with ADP, PerformYard, AbsorbLMS, Atlassian Jira Projects, Wrike, and air.com are desirable.



Question 7 (as submitted):

Has FVRL established a budget for this project?

Answer 7:

FVRL is not publishing a project budget. Please bid your best price.

Question 8 (as submitted):

What is the anticipated contract term, including any renewal options?

Answer 8:

Please provide a one-year cost, including startup and one-time costs, and costs for years two through five.

Question 9 (as submitted):

Can FVRL provide an estimate of the volume of data/content to be migrated from Intranet Connections, including the types of content expected to be migrated?

Answer 9:

For the purposes of this procurement, assume migration of active/current content amounting to 300 pages in CFM, HTML, and PDF format, plus associated images and forms. The legacy system has about 30,000 files, the vast majority of which won't be migrated.

Question 10 (as submitted):

Will the new intranet be intended exclusively for FVRL employees, or will external users, or other non-employee users also require access?

Answer 10:

FVRL staff only. Access inside and outside the wide-area network will be required.

Question 11 (as submitted):

Does FVRL currently use any employee engagement tools or processes other than the LMS (Absorb)?

Answer 11:

None that are relevant to this procurement.

Question 12 (as submitted):

Who will be the primary point of contact for the project, and which FVRL teams or stakeholders are expected to be involved in the implementation, content migration, testing, and approvals?

Answer 12:

The project contact and stakeholder roles have not yet been finalized.

Question 13 (as submitted):

What's the approximate volume and type of content in the current Intranet Connections environment, and should migration cover the full historical archive or just active/current content?



Answer 13:

For the purposes of this procurement, assume migration of active/current content amounting to 300 pages in CFM, HTML, and PDF format, plus associated images and forms. The legacy system has about 30,000 files, the vast majority of which won't be migrated.

Question 14 (as submitted):

Do all FVRL locations run under one Google Workspace domain, or are there multiple domains or organizational units we should design authentication and directory sync around?

Answer 14:

One Google Workspace domain.

Question 15 (as submitted):

Roughly how many content owners or department admins, across your locations, will need training and governance access?

Answer 15:

Assume 30 individuals for the implementation phase.

Question 16 (as submitted):

Do you have an existing cooperative purchasing vehicle (OMNIA Partners, Sourcewell, etc.) you'd like referenced in our proposal, or should we propose this as a direct contract?

Answer 16:

FVRL welcomes proposals submitted directly under this RFP or identifying an eligible cooperative purchasing agreement or piggybackable public contract.

Question 17 (as submitted):

On data residency: would EU-hosted data be acceptable for this solution, or does FVRL require hosting to stay within the US given public-records requirements?

Answer 17:

Data hosting in the United States is required.

Question 18 (as submitted):

Do all FVRL staff, including part-time and hourly staff, have individual corporate Google Workspace accounts, or are there employees who would need another form of access?

Answer 18:

Every staff member has an individual enterprise Google Workspace account.

Question 19 (as submitted):

I have years of experience building internal systems for companies, including work I cannot share because of confidentiality. Are three named, independently contactable references for comparable implementations mandatory for a proposal to be considered responsive?

Answer 19:

Yes, three named references are required.



Question 20 (as submitted):

Where prior internal projects cannot be shared because of confidentiality, could anonymized project descriptions together with a working demonstration satisfy the requirement? Alternatively, is there an acceptable confidential reference arrangement, subject to the organizations' permission and FVRL's disclosure obligations?

Answer 20:

Three named references are required. As a government agency in the State of Washington, we cannot guarantee confidentiality. Submitted information may be disclosed under Washington's Public Records Act.

Question 21 (as submitted):

For a vendor-configured open-source platform, will a current publisher VPAT, together with documented testing and remediation of identified base-theme issues, satisfy the proposal-stage accessibility documentation requirement, with the full FVRL configuration and integrations assessed against WCAG 2.1 AA before acceptance? Please identify any additional solution-specific assessment required with the proposal.

Answer 21:

Yes.

Question 22 (as submitted):

Which of the listed third-party applications currently have API access licensed for FVRL, and which live data integrations are priorities for the initial rollout? We understand that the demonstration must include Google Drive plus at least one core integration, and that every named application's method, dependencies and costs must be described.

Answer 22:

Microsoft/Google SSO authentication and Google Workspace are the only required integrations and both are fully licensed for integrated access. Vendors are not responsible for API licensing of external applications.

Question 23 (as submitted):

Can FVRL provide an approximate content/file inventory and storage volume for the existing intranet, together with the available Intranet Connections export formats? FVRL-led content selection, cleanup, and migration are understood; this will help us size the included tooling, technical assistance, and storage accurately.

Answer 23:

For the purposes of this procurement, assume migration of active/current content amounting to 300 pages in CFM, HTML, and PDF format, plus associated images and forms. The legacy system has about 30,000 files, the vast majority of which won't be migrated.

Question 24 (as submitted):

May shortlisted providers use segregated vendor test tenants for the Google Drive and core application demonstration, and will FVRL provide or authorize any test access needed to validate its tenant-specific requirements?



Answer 24:

Yes, upon validation of security and privacy requirements.

Question 25 (as submitted):

Could you clarify whether the three comparable implementation references may include verified work delivered by the proposed project lead at previous firms, with the lead's exact role identified, or whether all three must be engagements contracted by the bidding firm itself?

Answer 25:

References must be for engagements by the bidding firm or its named, contracted vendor partners.

Question 26 (as submitted):

Is there a planning budget range for initial licensing/configuration and ongoing support that prospective vendors should use when assessing fit?

Answer 26:

FVRL is not publishing a project budget. Please bid your best price.

Question 27 (as submitted):

Which of the listed integrations - Google Workspace, Atlassian, Wrike, AIR, Springshare, BiblioCommons, PerformYard, Absorb LMS, and ADP - must be configured and operational for the March 2027 rollout, and which are being evaluated only as future integration capabilities?

Answer 27:

Microsoft/Google SSO authentication and Google Workspace are the only required integrations and both are fully licensed for integrated access. Vendors are not responsible for API licensing of external applications.

Question 28 (as submitted):

Please provide the approximate number and total storage volume of pages, documents, media files, metadata records, and permission-controlled content currently maintained in Intranet Connections, together with the export formats or APIs available from that system.

Answer 28:

For the purposes of this procurement, assume migration of active/current content amounting to 300 pages in CFM, HTML, and PDF format, plus associated images and forms. The legacy system has about 30,000 files, the vast majority of which won't be migrated.

Question 29 (as submitted):

Which Google Workspace directory attributes are currently available to drive role-, department-, location-, and workgroup-based personalization, and does FVRL expect automated provisioning and deprovisioning exclusively from Google Workspace or from another authoritative employee system?



Answer 29:

Microsoft Active Directory or Entra ID is the preferred authentication and user provisioning source, and all standard attributes are available.

Question 30 (as submitted):

What minimum functions, configurations, and integrations must be available in the December 31, 2026 sandbox for FVRL to consider the installed or provisioned platform accepted and permit the initial subscription term and billing to begin?

Answer 30:

All required functionality, configurations, and integrations should be available in the December sandbox. Later deadlines are intended to allow for additional migration and training support.

Question 31 (as submitted):

For the requirement to demonstrate named viewers for designated content, what content categories require individual readership tracking, and what privacy, retention, access-control, or employee-notification rules should the proposed solution apply to that data?

Answer 31:

Describe what is possible in the standard product.

Question 32 (as submitted):

The RFP references native integration with Google Workspace. Can FVRL clarify whether "native integration" requires a vendor-developed, prebuilt connector, or whether a standard-based/API-driven integration with Google Workspace would satisfy this requirement?

Answer 32:

Standard-based, API-driven integration is sufficient and preferred.

Question 33 (as submitted):

Regarding Google Drive and Shared Drives, does FVRL expect Google Drive content to be indexed and returned directly within the intranet's search experience, or would linked or embedded access to Google Drive content from within the intranet satisfy the requirement?

Answer 33:

Linked access to Google Drive content is required; the ability to index content from linked Google Drive content, and embedded view of Google Drive content is highly desirable; additional interaction with Google Drive content is interesting but not required.

Question 34 (as submitted):

Does FVRL envision the intranet emergency notification capability primarily as targeted in-platform alerts and notices, or are external channels such as SMS, push notifications, or email expected as part of the core solution?



Answer 34:

Integration with Google Workspace services (email and chat) are highly desirable; integration with external channels is interesting but not required.

Question 35 (as submitted):

Who is the incumbent vendor currently providing similar services?

Answer 35:

SQBox IC Thrive (aka Intranet Connections).

Question 36 (as submitted):

Is the incumbent vendor allowed to participate in this RFP?

Answer 36:

Yes.

Question 37 (as submitted):

Does FVRL expect proposers to offer an existing Commercial Off-the-Shelf (COTS)/SaaS intranet platform that is already commercially available, or will FVRL also consider a custom-developed intranet solution built specifically to meet FVRL's requirements?

Answer 37:

Any solution that meets the minimum requirements will be reviewed.

Question 38 (as submitted):

If a custom-developed solution is acceptable, can FVRL confirm that such a solution will be evaluated equally with COTS/SaaS platforms, provided it meets all functional, technical, security, accessibility, integration, support, and SLA requirements identified in the RFP?

Answer 38:

Yes, we confirm that FVRL will use the same evaluation criteria for custom-developed and out-of-the-box solutions.

Question 39 (as submitted):

If a SharePoint Online-based solution is proposed, would FVRL accept integration with its existing Google Workspace environment for authentication/SSO, Google Drive/Shared Drives, Google Calendar, Google Groups, and other identified Google services, rather than requiring the intranet platform itself to be native to Google Workspace?

Answer 39:

Yes, integration with Google Workspace is acceptable and required.

Question 40 (as submitted):

What are the major limitations or pain points with the current intranet that FVRL wants the new solution to address first?

Answer 40:

N/A.



Question 41 (as submitted):

Please identify the current version/edition of Intranet Connections and any available export or migration capabilities currently available to FVRL.

Answer 41:

Given the small amount of live content to be migrated in the contracted phase, assume mechanical migration through standard export and import features.

Question 42 (as submitted):

Please provide the approximate volume of content, pages, documents, metadata, users, and other content types currently residing in Intranet Connections that FVRL anticipates migrating.

Answer 42:

For the purposes of this procurement, assume migration of active/current content amounting to 300 pages in CFM, HTML, and PDF format, plus associated images and forms. The legacy system has about 30,000 files, the vast majority of which won't be migrated.

Question 43 (as submitted):

Please clarify whether Google Workspace is the authoritative identity provider and directory source for all approximately 300 employees and whether Google Cloud Identity/Google Groups are currently used for role or department-based access management.

Answer 43:

Microsoft Entra ID is the authoritative identity provider. We will accept Google directory authentication and access management as well.

Question 44 (as submitted):

Of the identified third-party systems, which integrations are required for initial launch and which may be implemented in later phases?

Answer 44:

Microsoft/Google SSO authentication and Google Workspace are the only required integrations and both are fully licensed for integrated access. Vendors are not responsible for API licensing of external applications.

Question 45 (as submitted):

Are there existing customizations, workflows, integrations, scripts, or APIs in the current environment that need to be replicated?

Answer 45:

No.

Question 46 (as submitted):

Are there any existing information architecture, taxonomy, metadata, navigation, or content-governance standards that must be retained?



Answer 46:

None other than any specifically named in the procurement document.

Question 47 (as submitted):

Are all users maintained in Google Workspace/Google Cloud Identity?

Answer 47:

Every staff member has an individual enterprise Google Workspace account.

Question 48 (as submitted):

Does FVRL currently have an existing Microsoft 365 tenant and SharePoint Online environment, or would SharePoint Online be introduced specifically for this intranet initiative?

Answer 48:

FVRL has a Microsoft 365 tenant but does not use SharePoint Online.

Question 49 (as submitted):

If Microsoft 365 is currently available, what Microsoft 365 licensing is assigned to the approximately 300 employees who will use the intranet?

Answer 49:

FVRL currently licenses Microsoft Entra ID P1 and Office 365 A1 for faculty for all staff.

Question 50 (as submitted):

If SharePoint Online is proposed, would FVRL consider purchasing any required Microsoft licensing in addition to its existing Google Workspace environment?

Answer 50:

FVRL currently licenses Microsoft Entra ID P1 and Office 365 A1 for faculty for all staff. Additional Microsoft licensing should be reflected in cost scenarios.

Question 51 (as submitted):

Does FVRL have an existing Microsoft Entra ID environment, and if so, is it currently synchronized or federated with FVRL's Google Workspace identities?

Answer 51:

Yes. Microsoft Entra ID synchronizes with Google Workspace.

Question 52 (as submitted):

Since Google Workspace is FVRL's primary productivity platform, is Google Workspace authentication/SSO mandatory, or would FVRL consider Microsoft Entra ID authentication for a SharePoint-based intranet?

Answer 52:

Microsoft Entra ID authentication is preferred; Google Workspace authentication is acceptable.



Question 53 (as submitted):

What is the authoritative source for employee identity and profile information such as department, job role, branch/location, manager, and workgroup?

Answer 53:

Microsoft Entra ID.

Question 54 (as submitted):

Are these employee attributes currently maintained in Google Workspace, ADP, another directory, or multiple systems?

Answer 54:

Microsoft Entra ID, with supplemental attributes in Google Workspace and ADP.

Question 55 (as submitted):

How frequently does FVRL expect employee profile information and group memberships to synchronize with the intranet?

Answer 55:

When manually synchronized, or if there is no mechanism for manual synchronization, at least daily.

Question 56 (as submitted):

What level of Google Drive integration is expected: simple links to Google Drive content, embedded documents, search/discovery of Google Drive content from the intranet, or full cross-platform content access?

Answer 56:

Linked access to Google Drive content is required; the ability to index content from linked Google Drive content, and embedded view of Google Drive content is highly desirable; additional interaction with Google Drive content is interesting but not required.

Question 57 (as submitted):

Should the intranet's enterprise search return Google Drive and Shared Drive documents directly within the same search results as intranet pages and content?

Answer 57:

Not required.

Question 58 (as submitted):

When Google Drive content is surfaced through the intranet, should the solution enforce the existing Google Drive permissions in real time?

Answer 58:

Permissions should be controlled by the intranet solution.



Question 59 (as submitted):

What specific Google Calendar functionality is expected—for example, displaying organizational calendars, branch calendars, employee calendars, or allowing employees to add intranet events to Google Calendar?

Answer 59:

Describe what is possible.

Question 60 (as submitted):

How does FVRL currently use Google Groups, and what level of integration with those groups is expected in the new intranet?

Answer 60:

Google Groups are used for email distribution and access/security. Describe what is possible.

Question 61 (as submitted):

Does FVRL expect AI/natural-language search at initial go-live, or would traditional keyword/metadata-based enterprise search satisfy the initial requirement?

Answer 61:

Traditional search satisfies requirements.

Question 62 (as submitted):

Which employee attributes should control personalized content—branch/location, department, job role, workgroup, or other attributes?

Answer 62:

Describe what is possible.

Question 63 (as submitted):

Does FVRL expect the entire homepage layout to change based on the employee, or primarily for specific components such as news, alerts, quick links, events, and resources to be targeted?

Answer 63:

Describe what is possible.

Question 64 (as submitted):

Approximately how many branches, departments, roles, and audience groups need to be supported for personalization?

Answer 64:

Sixteen branches, thirty departments, thirty roles, ten audience groups.

Question 65 (as submitted):

What channels should emergency notifications use—intranet banner only, email, mobile notification, SMS, or a combination?



Answer 65:

Describe what is possible.

Question 66 (as submitted):

Should emergency alerts be targeted by individual branch/location, department, or employee group?

Answer 66:

All of the above.

Question 67 (as submitted):

Does FVRL have an existing emergency notification system that the new intranet should integrate with?

Answer 67:

N/A.

Question 68 (as submitted):

What platform does FVRL currently use for virtual Town Hall meetings—Google Meet, Microsoft Teams, Zoom, or another platform?

Answer 68:

Google Meet, Zoom.

Question 69 (as submitted):

Should Town Hall recordings be stored directly within the intranet environment or surfaced from an existing video/storage platform?

Answer 69:

Within the intranet environment and/or written to Google Drive.

Question 70 (as submitted):

Does the "Submit a Question" capability require moderation, approval, anonymous submission, or workflow functionality?

Answer 70:

Describe what is possible.

Question 71 (as submitted):

For frontline employees, is a responsive browser-based SharePoint experience sufficient, or does FVRL expect a dedicated mobile application?

Answer 71:

A responsive browser-based experience is sufficient and preferred.

Question 72 (as submitted):

How are employees expected to authenticate from shared library workstations, and are there specific session timeout, logout, or security requirements for shared devices?



Answer 72:

SSO to Microsoft Entra ID or Google Workspace. No special requirements but industry standards and best practices should apply.

Question 73 (as submitted):

What are the expectations and timeline for ongoing support and maintenance after the system is implemented?

Answer 73:

Fully functional sandbox established by 12/31/2026; intensive migration support through March 31, 2027; routine and on-demand support thereafter.

Question 74 (as submitted):

Do you expect the vendor to perform any tasks on-site, or can all work be performed remotely?

Answer 74:

All tasks to be performed remotely.

Question 75 (as submitted):

Do you accept offshore resources?

Answer 75:

Yes, with the exception of data storage, which must be within the United States.

Question 76 (as submitted):

What is the approved budget or range allocated for this project?

Answer 76:

FVRL is not publishing a project budget. Please bid your best price.

Question 77 (as submitted):

The pricing requirements request implementation/setup costs along with annual software/subscription, maintenance, and support costs over a five-year period. If a proposer offers a custom-developed solution without a standard per-user or annual software subscription fee, may the proposer provide the one-time development/implementation cost and separately identify applicable hosting, maintenance, support, enhancement, and other recurring costs for Years 1-5?

Answer 77:

Yes.

Question 78 (as submitted):

For a custom-developed solution, will FVRL evaluate the five-year total cost based on the actual applicable cost components, even where certain requested pricing categories, such as commercial software subscription or licensing fees, are not applicable?

Answer 78:

Yes.



Question 79 (as submitted):

The RFP requests a current VPAT or equivalent accessibility conformance documentation. If the proposer offers a new custom-developed solution that does not have an existing VPAT at the time of proposal submission, will FVRL accept an accessibility compliance approach describing how the solution will be designed, developed, tested, and validated against WCAG 2.1 Level AA, with formal accessibility conformance documentation provided prior to production deployment?

Answer 79:

Yes.

Question 80 (as submitted):

For a proposed custom solution that is not yet in production, would FVRL accept a prototype or proof-of-concept environment to satisfy the sandbox/test-access requirement during evaluation?

Answer 80:

No.

Question 81 (as submitted):

If a custom-developed solution is proposed, can FVRL confirm whether the December 31, 2026 milestone requires only a working initial platform/sandbox environment, with remaining configuration, functionality, integrations, testing, and content activities continuing through the March 31, 2027 rollout target?

Answer 81:

All required functionality, configurations, and integrations should be available in the December sandbox. Later deadlines are intended to allow for additional migration and training support.

This Addendum No. 1 is hereby incorporated into and made part of RFP No. 2026-002. All other terms and conditions of the RFP remain unchanged.