LM01_KDD006 - Google Sites migration strategy

Status	DECIDED
Owner	Gautier Todeschini
Stakeholders	James Kyndt, John Donovan, Frank Bolata, Boris Foiselle

Decision: Option 3: Hybrid 1 + 2: Rebuild of most used & critical Sites by CoE, and rebuild of other Sites by their owners with guidelines

Decision made by: Frank Bolata

Date: 27 Nov 2025

Online Meeting: LEAP - M365 - Key decisions review prior to steerco #3

Issue

Google Sites are not migrated by Fast Track, so another migration scneario has to be determined to transfer them to the M365 environment.

Recommendation

Option 3: Rebuild of most used & critical Sites by Center of Excellence, and rebuild of other Sites by their Syensqo owners with guidelines & light support of the CoE.

Rationale: 3rd party migration tools for Google Sites do not remediate underlying customized elements around the Sites which will require manual remediation anyway. Some tools also don't support the migration of all types of sites.
A hybrid manual rebuild seems the most balanced approach to address customized elements and limit UX & support impacts, with a medium cost.

Background & Context

Google sites have a direct alternative in the office 365 ecosystem: SharePoint Communication sites
Since there is a direct migration path, 3rd party tools are available on the market to faciliate the migration of Google Sites towards Sharepoint Sites.

There are around 1800 Google Sites existing at Syensqo today, many of them duplicated at the separation as they were "shared resources" between Solvay and Syensqo.

Assumptions

- Google sites have a 90 % compatibility with the components in SharePoint sites.
- 350 to 400 Google Sites are **estimated** to be highly used and important for business operations (20% of the scope)

Constraints

N/A

Impacts

N/A

Options considered

Option 1: Manual Rebuild by Center of Excellence

Option 2: Manual rebuild by Site Owners, with guidelines and support from the Center of Excellence

Option 3: Hybrid 1 + 2: Rebuild of most used & critical Sites by CoE, and rebuild of other Sites by their owners

Option 4A: Migrate with 3rd party tooling - Bit Titan
Option 4B: Migrate with 3rd party tooling - Cloudiway

Evaluation

Options	**Option 1:** Manual Rebuild by Center of Excellence	**Option 2:** Manual rebuild by Site Owners, with guidelines and support from the Center of Excellence	**Option 3:** Hybrid 1 + 2: Rebuild of most used & critical Sites by CoE, and rebuild of other Sites by their owners with guidelines	**Option 4A:** Migrate with 3rd party tooling - Bit Titan	**Option 4B: Migrate with 3rd party tooling - Cloudiway**
Technical Feasibility	**(Easy)** ➕ Rebuild by a team of skilled technical experts who master the M365 solutions	**(Easy)** ➕ Sites visuals and interfaces can be recreated by end users / editors after training or knowledge materials ➖ Application-enabled files surfaced on the site might be complex to rebuild and require assistance of the COE (underlying Apps Script, Appsheet ...)	**(Easy)** ➕ Rebuild by a team of skilled technical expers who master the M365 solutions ➕ Simple Sites visuals and interfaces can be recreated by end users / editors after training or knowledge materials	**(Complex)** ➖ Tooling only supports the automated migration of "Public" sites (shared to all Syensqo), "Restricted" sites still need to be recreated manually ➖ Incremental execution is not possible, limited rollback possibilities ➖ No remediation of underlying customization (application-enabled files ...)	**(Medium)** ➕ Cloudiware supports the automated migration of "Public" AND Restricted sites ➕ Incremental execution possible ➖ No remediation of underlying customization (application-enabled files ...)
User Impact	**(Medium)** 🟡 Some involvement necessary from owners to give specifications and perform testing ⚠️ Possible coexistence if a site is ready & used in the target environment before migration of users (case-by-case depending on Sites characteristics and owners' decision)	**(High)** ➖ High rebuild workload for Site owners / editors and their users ⚠️ Possible coexistence if a site is ready & used in the target environment before migration of users (case-by-case depending on Sites characteristics)	**(Medium)** ⚠️ Possible coexistence if a site is ready & used in the target environment before migration of users (case-by-case depending on Sites characteristics)	**(High)** ➖ Freeze period necessary to perform the platform switch ➖ Links pointing to Google drive files remain unchanged in in the target Sharepoint sites	**(Low)** ➕ No coexistence required as a synchronization is possible between Google Sites and target Sharepoint Sites ➕ Low involvement necessary from owners ➕ Links pointing to Google drive files are replaced
Support Impact	**(Small)** ➕ Manual recreation has the best end result ➕ Less questions to the support team, as rebuilt sites are tested and demoed to their owners	**(High)** ➖ Users might reach out for the known support lines if they fail to recreate the sites	**(Small)** ➕ Balanced scenario with CoE-led precise recreation of complex sites, and minor support impact expected for the manual recreation of simple sites by the users (based on guidelines)	**(High)** ➖ One-shot migration of all Google Sites leading to potential spike of tickets ➖ High amount of non-remediated elements (wrong URLS, customized elements ...) will generate incidents & hypercare needs	**(Small)** ➕ Bulk migration with a good feature replication + implication of CoE to remediate customized elements in advance = Moderate impact on support
Time to Implement	**(High)** ⚠️ Sites must be assessed, rebuilt, tested and demoed	**(High)** ⚠️ Risk of delay if some site owners do not rebuild their site on time, especially for sites with customized artifacts in their ecosystem.	**(High)** ➕ Combination of option 1 & 2 with both watchpoints mitigated (less sites to remediate by CoE, and user-led rebuild is not on critical Sites so no risk of business disruption at migration if some sites are not yet rebuilt.	**(High)** ➖ Procurement & SIP delay ➖ Tooling setup and testing required ➖ Non-remediated elements still require anticipated manual rebuild by CoE/users	**(High)** ➖ Procurement & SIP delay ➖ Tooling setup and testing required ➖ Script-enabled files still require anticipated manual rebuild by CoE/users
Security & Compliance	➕ Security & Compliance guidelines can be checked as part of the Sites rebuild (on functionalities and usage)	🟡 Soft reinforcement of security guidelines via awareness within the rebuilding guides	➕ Security & Compliance guidelines can be checked as part of the Sites rebuild (on functionalities and usage) + integrated in the rebuilding guides	SIP required for 3rd party tool ➖ Domain Wide Delegation necessary ➖ Network/firewall exceptions necessary	SIP required for 3rd party tool ➖ Domain Wide Delegation necessary ➖ Network/firewall exceptions necessary
Operational Efficiency	➕ Assessment and rebuild will bring rationalization opportunities and standardization of some customized components.	➖ High change management and awareness efforts to engage site owners in the rebuild of their sites	➕ Assessment and rebuild will bring rationalization opportunities and standardization of some customized components. 🟡 Moderate change management and awareness efforts to engage site owners in the rebuild of their sites	➖ All sites are copied, including unused or un-necessary sites, and without rationalization.	➖ All sites are copied, including unused or un-necessary sites, and without rationalization.

Cost	**(High)** CoE resource costs (roughly 12 FTEs over 4 months)	**(Low)** Small CoE resource costs for support & guidelines content creation	**(Medium)** CoE resource cost (4 to 6 FTEs over 4 months)	**(High)** Similar CoE workload as for scenario 3 (without light support efforts) Tool setup & connection to GWS Tooling costs (25k€ + additionnal support)	**(Very High)** Similar CoE workload as for scenario 3 (without light support efforts) Tool setup & connection to GWS Tooling costs (200-300k€ + additionnal support)

See also

The following section describes relevant documentation:

Description	Repository
Google Sites Export	Google Sites

Version	Published	Changed By	Comment
CURRENT (v. 16)	**Feb 19, 2026 11:48**	**CHUDZIAK-ext, Aleksander**	
v. 15	Feb 19, 2026 11:09	**CHUDZIAK-ext, Aleksander**	
v. 14	Feb 13, 2026 15:05	**CHUDZIAK-ext, Aleksander**	
v. 13	Nov 27, 2025 16:54	**TODESCHINI-ext, Gautier**	
v. 12	Nov 27, 2025 16:37	**TODESCHINI-ext, Gautier**	

Go to Page History