

Website Design RFP
Solicitation # 072216-WBDSGN
Q & A – Addendum #2
July 14, 2016

Below is a summary of the key information from the pre-submittal meeting held at the Council's offices on 07/08/2016. The summary below is not meant to be a transcript of the meeting and the information provided in this Q & A document may expand upon topics that were discussed at the pre-submittal meeting.

*A recording of the meeting is available on the Council's website at: <http://www.ewgateway.org/RFPs/rfps.htm>. Please refer to the recording to hear important information about the projects, the submittal process, and the Council's expectation for the work and deliverables. **The Q & A session begins at 8:30 in the recording.** Other materials from the meeting including the presentation and the sign-in-sheets are also available on the Council's website.*

The information in this Q & A – Addendum document will have precedence over any information contained in the solicitation documents.

1. Mapping Feature:

In the pre-submittal meeting presentation there is a slide that shows an example of a mapping feature; however, the purpose of this slide was to demonstrate that the CMS selected by the Consultant must support the embedding of web content generated by an external process. As stated in the RFP, the Consultant will **not** be responsible for creating the mapping feature.

2. Section 508 Compliance:

The Council understands that there are multiple Section 508 compliance checkers that are currently available. The Council has not yet determined which checker it would like to employ for the new website. The Council's expectation is that it will work with the Consultant to identify which compliance checker will be used for the new website. Once the checker has been identified it will be used to determine whether the new website meets Section 508 compliance. The Council also understands that it may not be possible for the new website to meet every single specification for Section 508 compliance; however, the Council's new website must be accessible, so the Council will work with the Consultant to identify the most important specifications and these specifications will be used to determine whether or not the new website is Section 508 compliant.

3. Language Translation:

The Council's current need is for English only pages. The CMS used by the Consultant must have the ability to manage and display translated pages by language.

4. SEO:

The Council goal related to SEO is to make the website and the information it contains easily available and accessible to the public. The Council does not need to performed detailed analysis of the website's analytics or to encourage any specific actions (e.g. visit specific pages once on

Website Design RFP
Solicitation # 072216-WBDSGN
Q & A – Addendum #2
July 14, 2016

the website). The new website SEO should emphasize making the Council's various plans, documents, and notifications findable from a web search.

5. Goals:

The primary goal for the website is for it to be easily accessible for the Council's users / constituents and for the website to provide the other key features that are identified in the RFP. The Council also needs a website that is easy for staff to maintain using open source tools.

6. Website Content & Pages:

The Council will provide the content for the new website. If content revision is necessary, then the Council will provide the revised content. The Consultant will have the opportunity to provide feedback / make recommendations regarding the content – for example, what changes would improve Section 508 compliance or SEO.

The Council has not specified a particular number of pages for the new website. The Consultant will not be relying upon the site map for the Council's existing site, as the site map for the new website will be based on the design created during the project. The Council has provided Appendix 1 which describes the information that the Council expects to see on the new website – the number of pages required to display this content is yet to be determined. The Council expects that the Consultant will make recommendations about the number of pages needed to display the information in Appendix 1.

7. Review Process:

The Council's review process will consist of a small group of staff that will review project deliverables during the design phase. This group may be expanded during the testing phase; however, the Council has not yet made this decision. The Council does not want to prescribe a particular review process for the Consultant; rather, the Council expects the Consultant's submittal to clearly explain the process that the Consultant uses and the time frame associated with this process (e.g. Consultant typically provides 2 weeks of review time).

8. IIS System:

The Council's staff will set up the host environment which will be a Windows 2008 R2 based system with IIS 7.5 as the web server. The CMS selected by the Consultant will need to be compatible with that environment. Council staff will install the appropriate scripting language (e.g. PHP 5.6), database (e.g. MySQL 5.5.3), and CMS in this environment, based upon the Consultant's recommendation.

Website Design RFP
Solicitation # 072216-WBDSGN
Q & A – Addendum #2
July 14, 2016

9. Updates / Roles:

The Council expects that the website will be updated by multiple staff persons. To this end, the Council expects that the new website will have multiple levels of access. The Council wants a role-based security model with a level of granularity that supports defining permissions by menu item. Note, the selected CMS must support the ability to assign an account to one or more roles.

10. Submittal Requirements – Project Examples / Client Budgets (RFP, Section III, Sub-Part 1, #3(d)):

The Council understands that responding firms may not be able to disclose client budgets from prior projects. In these situations, the Council expects the responding firm to provide as much information as possible so that the Council can ascertain whether or not the responding firm has a history of exceeding project budgets, project deadlines, etc. For example, rather than provide a dollar amount for the client budget, the responding could indicate “project completed within budget” or “project exceeded budget by 10%” along with an explanation (e.g. over budget due to client add-ons).

Additionally, the Council expects the responding firm to provide as much budget information as possible so that the Council can ascertain whether the prior project is similar in magnitude to the Council’s project. For example, the responding firm could provide a range rather than an actual dollar amount (e.g. project value less than \$100,000, project value \$100,000 - \$200,000). If providing a dollar range is not possible, then the responding firm should ensure that its project description indicates that the prior project was similar in magnitude to the Council’s project and why (e.g. project included creation of 20 pages).

*Below is a list of questions that the Council has received regarding the above captioned solicitation. The Council’s answers are noted below (in **bold, italic text**). Note that the questions may have been modified for clarity or to correct grammatical, syntax, and other errors. The information in this Q & A – Addendum document will have precedence over any information contained in the solicitation documents.*

1. Does the Council have a vendor that you’re leaning toward?

The Council does not have a vendor in mind for this project. The Council’s solicitation process is based upon fair and open competition; therefore, all submittals that are responsive to the RFP and that are from responsible firms will be evaluated using the process described in the RFP.

Website Design RFP
Solicitation # 072216-WBDSGN
Q & A – Addendum #2
July 14, 2016

2. The RFP references Joomla twice and our team solely builds on DNN CMS, is the Council committed to another platform?

The Council is not committed to any particular CMS platform. The RFP's references to Joomla were illustrative and were not an indication that the Council prefers Joomla above other CMS platforms. The Council is open to considering any CMS platform that will provide the features that Council needs and that is not proprietary in any way. The CMS platform recommended by a responding firm must adhere to the specifications which are described in Section I of the RFP as follows:

The new website must also meet the following requirements:

- ❖ Windows hosting platform (IIS 7.5 minimum)***
- ❖ Open source, Content Management System***
- ❖ No custom developed plug-ins; however, the Council will consider a limited number of well-maintained third-party plug-ins if it will give the Council the features it needs (e.g. CCK forms).***

The Council does not want third-party plug-ins that have been customized by the Consultant.

The Council does not want and will not consider a SaaS (software as a service) solution. The Council will host and maintain its own website.

A responding firm's submittal should provide a good analysis behind its CMS recommendation with a list of pros and cons.

Website Design RFP
Solicitation # 072216-WBDSGN
Q & A – Addendum #1
June 23, 2016

*Below is a list of questions that the Council has received regarding the above captioned solicitation. The Council's answers are noted below (in **bold, italic text**). Note that the questions may have been modified for clarity or to correct grammatical, syntax, and other errors. The information in this Q & A – Addendum document will have precedence over any information contained in the solicitation documents.*

1. Can companies from outside the USA (i.e. Canada or India) apply for the project?

The Council does not have a prohibition against non-U.S. companies submitting a proposal for this project; however, please keep the evaluation criteria in mind. Part of the evaluation process considers whether a company is familiar with the Council, the St. Louis area, etc. and also considers whether a firm is familiar with local conditions (see Section IV, Sub-Part 4, #2).

Also, a firm that is selected for a contract award will be required to be registered to do business in Missouri (See Attachment B).

Finally, the Council will pay for services in U.S. dollars only and will not adjust the contract budget to account for fluctuations in the exchange rate. Also, travel expenses are limited to the Council's travel rates, which are tied to the U.S. General Services Administration rates for the St. Louis metropolitan area, and the Council may not make adjustments to these rates to account for the costs of foreign travel.

2. Is a company required to come to St. Louis for meetings?

Please refer to Section II, Part A, Task #1 and Task #2 of the RFP, where it states that a firm is required to attend in-person meetings with the Council. These meetings will be held at the Council's office in St. Louis.

3. Can a firm perform the tasks (related to the RFP) outside of the USA (i.e. in Canada or India)?

Please refer to the answer to question #1.

4. Can a firm submit its proposal via e-mail?

Please refer to Section IX, Part C of the RFP, where it states that proposals cannot be submitted via e-mail.