

Q.18 . In regards to the Annex A, Statement of Work, Section D Contract Timeline states:

‘The work is to commence on July 1, 2015 with a non-negotiable go-live date of September 1, 2015. The sites (Connect2Canada and Lien Canada) must be fully functional and pre-tested prior to September 1, 2015.’

Can we confirm this timeline, particularly the go-live date? The RFP submission date is presently defined as July 17, which will then require a period of time for vendor evaluation, selections, reference checks and contract award. This does not leave much time for a completed, pretested and functional site for September 1, 2015. The feasibility will depend on the time to contract award, and a compressed timeline unfortunately does generally result in increased costs with additional resources being required.

Please see amendment made in the RFP with the date updated

Q.19. Can the details on the existing hardware, software and firmware be provided – for migration and/or maintain, support and update requirements. Product names and versions, or for any customized software – the underlying language, technology and vendor. This will assist us in identifying the workload requirements and requisite skillsets, allowing a more accurate (and lower) estimate for both the fixed cost and task based work.

- Website
- Existing CRM (customer relationship management system)
- Existing database containing contact information
- Database (or content management system, or in contact relationship management system) containing company information innovationscan)

The current customer relationship management system (CRM) is custom built by the current provider. Includes elements of Salesforce, ExactTarget, ExpressionEngine.

Q.20 .There are references to the ‘message delivery system’, the ‘email marketing management platform’ and ‘provide a vehicle to send information to members’. For the sake of clarity and understanding, can the specific product(s) being utilized to fulfill these functions be specified?

The current customer relationship management system (CRM) is custom built by the current provider. Includes elements of Salesforce, ExactTarget.

Q.21. The SOW refers to both support and maintain the message delivery system’ and ‘provide a vehicle to send information to members’. For the sake of clarity can we confirm that the intent is

to replace the current system in use, and provide full training and support, as well as newsletter setup.

If necessary, yes.

Q.22. If the intent is to replace the mail delivery system, is it necessary to migrate historical mailing statistics, or can this be archived, and left as is for any historical retrieval?

Migration would be ideal.

Q.23 . The project is comprised of a fix and task component, with the fix component being a fixed price bid, with no qualifications allowed. If the intent is to provide a replacement email system, we suggest using a Third party mail delivery system that has all of the tools necessary for campaigns with tracking of responses, opens and any follow-up or utilization (clicks). We would provide the management, integration and support for this service, providing a seamless integration for the users. These services generally are on a usage based model. Would it be possible to identify the email usage expected, with a cap of a maximum mails to be sent? Would it be acceptable to then set a per mail cost associated with any mailings over the cap? Specifically we request the total number of mailings expected, by year. This would be number of mailings, times the average number of mail recipients per mailing, for a total mail recipient count.

It is impossible to determine precise expected usage. We would not accept costs incurred due to mailings over any pre-identified number. In one fiscal year, the current platform sent out almost 610,000 emails to persons who subscribed to a weekly communication product from the Embassy alone. This number does not include the other non-regularly scheduled emails from the Embassy or the emails sent out via the 15 other Canadian offices across the US.

Q.24. The Annex A, Statement of Work, Section 3.2 contains an inconsistent numbering, with subsections a, b, c, d, e being followed by another subsection d). We are concerned that we may misunderstand or miss some of the requirements. Would it be possible to get clarity on this section? It would appear that the second subsection d – Project References- was overwritten by the Project Reference section from the Annex D- Evaluation Criteria preamble.

Subsection d – Project References, is used for section 3.2 Section 1 Technical Bid and for Annex D Technical Evaluation. It is the same paragraph but applies to both sections and offers instructions on how to submit your response.

Q.25 Annex A, Statement of Work, Section C, Scope of Work, under Services, contains a list of 12 service specifications. Most of these include a statement of ‘(this will be part of the fix requirement and not the task authorization part of the contract)’, Points 5 and 6 do not include the ‘fix stipulation’. Are these to be part of the fix requirements or the task requirements, as they are on an ‘as determined’ basis?

Correct – Points 5 & 6 (providing advice and technical support) should be provided on an as requested basis.