



PURCHASING SECTION
13450 – 104th Avenue, Surrey, BC V3T 1V8
Tel: 604-590-7274 Fax: 604-599-0956
E-mail: purchasing@surrey.ca

ADDENDUM No. 2

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) NO.: 1220-030-2018-038

TITLE: CITY OF SURREY WEBSITE REDESIGN & CMS REPLACEMENT

ADDENDUM ISSUE DATE: SEPTEMBER 10, 2018

CLOSING DATE: OCTOBER 4, 2018 @ 3:00 P.M.

INFORMATION FOR PROPONENTS

This Addendum is issued to provide additional information and clarifications to the RFP for the above named project, to the extent referenced and shall become a part thereof. No consideration will be allowed for extras due to the Proponent not being familiar with this addendum. This Addendum No. 2 contains four (4) pages.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

- Q.1. What are the key performance indicators --- the measures of success -- that will be used to evaluate the results of this project?**
- A.1. We will be measuring the success of this project based on the ability of the successful vendor (in partnership with the CoS) to meet or exceed all the project requirements listed in the requirements document, on time and on the agreed budget. Additional goals will also be provided to the selected vendor during the discovery phase.**
- Q.2. Do you have any initial sites that you want to share that are inspirational in terms of look/feel, messaging, usability, etc.?**
- A.2. There are elements from multiple sites that appeal to us, the features of which we have tried to describe in the requirements. We want a fresh, new look and feel so don't have one site we would use as a template for what we want. We are leaving this open to encourage creative ideas from our vendor. We will also be happy to provide and discuss sites and features that align look, feel, messaging and usability during the discovery phase with the selected vendor. Please also review the Scope of Services in the RFP for further context.**

Q.3. Do you have an asset library (photography, illustrations, videos) available for our use? If not, do you require vendors to create visual assets?

A.3. Yes. The vendor will not be required to create visual assets. We also welcome suggestions on assets, but all assets will be created and provided internally.

Q.4. Who are the primary audiences for your website, and what are their goals? Can you provide personas, user journeys, or other audience documentation to your RFP responders? If not, you should plan for user research as a part of your project.

A.4. Yes, this documentation will be provided to the selected Proponent.

Q.5. Do you want to perform user testing on any of your project deliverables prior to launch, such as wireframes or designs?

A.5. All elements of the new site will require user testing. Please see Schedule A-1 for the list of requirements.

Q.6. How much training and documentation will you want for the non-technical team administering content? What about for the technical team and those who administer the site's functionality, rather than its contents?

A.6. We expect to receive training documentation primarily for the technical team that we can leverage to create our own user guides for the non-technical editors. Basic training requirements are outlined in the RFP Schedule A-1. In terms of training time and amount of documentation required, this would be a discussion with the team and vendor during the execution phase.

Q.7. What tools will you want to integrate with your site as part of the project? Think about analytics, email, CRM, content personalization, or other third-party or proprietary systems that need to work with the site for the project to be successful. Please list out all third party integrations in detail.

A.7. Please see Schedule A-1 for the list of integration requirements (#2032-2043).

Q.8. What are your expectations on training?

A.8. Please see question 6 response.

Q.9. How many internal stakeholders will be approving designs & strategies?

A.9. Please see RFP Addendum 1.

Q.10. How long do decisions typically take?

A.10. Decisions for each procurement process can take various lengths of time depending on a number of factors. Factors include, but are not limited to, the number of Proposals received, clarity of the Proposals and number of follow up questions or clarifications required, complexity of the procurement, and the availability and size of the evaluation team.

Q.11. Will there be a dedicated point of contact (a “product owner”)?

A.11. Please see RFP Addendum 1.

Q.12. Is there another set of stakeholders, who are not directly making decisions, which we will all need to keep in the loop with extra deliverables?

A.12. Please see RFP Addendum 1.

Q.13. How many content pages are there on the website?

A.13. Approximately 4300.

Q.14. In what state is your content? Has it been audited? (i.e.: you know what’s good as is, what’s being updated, what’s being archived?)

A.14. Content auditing is in progress internally, and is out of scope for this project.

Q.15. Are you looking for migration assistance?

A.15. Yes.

Q.16. Are you looking for copywriting assistance?

A.16. No.

Q.16. How do your editors manage content? Are there approvals or other workflows that should be considered in this RFP? If you have a matrix of roles and permissions for content management and editing, or an overview of your workflows, please share.

A.16. Yes. We have a complex workflow that will require various levels of permissions and access. For the majority of our 150 content authors, all content must be submitted for approval before it is published to the site. Please see the Admin & Workflow requirements in Schedule A-1 under Technical Requirements.

Q.17. Do you have an editorial guide in place? If not, do you require one?

A.17. Please see RFP Addendum 1.

Q.18. Do you have any accessibility requirements beyond base-level WCAG 2.0 compliance?

A.18. Please note that we are aiming for WCAG 2.0 AA, as per the RFP requirements. However, from an editorial perspective, we are focused on Plain Language.

Q.19. What central authentication service (CAS) are you using for MySurrey? What are your current standards for SSO? Are there other sites that facilitate SSO for the city?

A.19. MySurrey is a portal that links to other web apps. Our Customer Identity and Access Management (CIAM) platform is Login Radius. It is an OAuth based solution. The Surrey.ca website must be able to save and pass these credentials as users flow through it. As we roll out more applications, they will all share the same account.

Q.20. Given your large number of content editors with varying roles, what does your content governance and publication workflow look like? Do you have approval and notification states that the CMS should support? Please share an outline of your editorial process.

A.20. While we have a large number of content editors, we only have a few key personnel on the Web and New Media Team and embedded within the business units that approve all web content for publishing. Notification and approval states will need to be visible to both the content editor, and the approvers. Full governance documentation will be available for the selected vendor.

Q.21. How tightly do you wish to integrate your key external systems? Are you looking exclusively for clear pathways to access them, or are you looking to bring them into the main Surrey.ca site experience via API integrations, etc.?

A.21. We are looking for the most consistent experience across Surrey.ca. In the few true integrations we have, API integrations are our first choice. That being said, many of our external systems are simply presented within iFrames (including the widgets which are really just presentation containers) with limited ability to modify the experience or CSS.

Q.22. With regards to multisite -- your event sites have some consistency in their architectural and presentation needs. Are you looking to manage these in a single, more replicable instance long term?

A.22. We are looking for options to make the maintenance of our microsites easier. Drupal multi-site could be one solution, and one events instance could be another option.

Q.23. What is the scale of sites for your short-term marketing initiatives? If these are simple landing pages, they may be better served within the architecture of surrey.ca than as standalone properties. Can you tell us more about the vision for these campaign sites?

A.23. We do not have campaign sites at the moment, but it is something we are exploring. They could be static, standalone, or integrated into Surrey.ca. We are looking for the successful vendor to provide recommendations on the best way to implement this.

END OF ADDENDUM