

Request for Proposal # 1000327102

This document consists of questions and answers and an amendment to the English version of the RFP.

PART 1 – QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Question 1:

M06 - Could CRA define in specific terms what they mean by "engagement activities", possibly including examples that illustrate desired outcomes?

Answer 1:

Engagement activities are engaging the public in topics of discussion and asking them to provide input into areas that may be of interest to them. For example, we have conducted consultations on Red Tape in dealing with the CRA. We talked to various businesses and tax intermediaries to find out the issues and come up with possible solutions. We would conduct this type of activity but in an online environment. With this tool we would like to conduct online consultations and engagement activities on various topics. Such activities would include discussion forums, discussion threads, Q&A's, polling for us to gauge how the public feels about a certain topic.

Question 2:

M16- CRA refers to rank/promote of comments but would they also not want upvoting and various other typical online engagement scoring functions?

Answer 2:

While any additional features would be a bonus, only the features listed in the RFP will be evaluated. In your submission, we encourage you to include a description of the functionality you are listing, as terms such as 'promoting' and 'upvoting' (for example) are similar and either could potentially meet the functionality required.

Question 3:

M21 - Could you please provide further details a "drag and drop interface". Is the intention that core modules would be able to be moved around by the Engagement Manager? Or would it include all inputs from participants? Or some other intention?

Answer 3:

The intention is that the administrator (engagement manager) will be able to set up/design/move around the core modules and subjects/questions as they see fit in the design phase.

Question 4:

M26- Does this Mandatory refer to polling and surveys only?

Answer 4:

No, this could also relate to any forms created where we ask a participant to fill in a field, for example – email, postal code, date.

Question 5:

M34- Please share some examples of qualitative summary report you expect to have generated.

Answer 5:

A qualitative summary would potentially include a summary of common themes, words or phrases mentioned throughout the engagement activity, possibly a word cloud. We have not set out any specific expectations in terms of a qualitative summary.

Question 6:

R10 - Please share further details around what is required in terms of form creation.

Answer 6:

Form creation may include individual submissions from participants on a certain topic or question. We may want the participant to identify themselves (i.e. background, profession, size of business) and we would have these fields created within a form for the participant to submit along with their response.

Question 7:

R18 - To clarify, the CRA administrator would like to add or edit keywords. If a participant used a keyword on the admin list, the admin would receive an email. Is this correct?

Answer 7:

Yes that is correct.

Question 8:

R 24 - In order to generate useful customized reports we would need to further understand the sort of online engagement activities and outcomes that CRA is expecting. Could you provide more details in this regard?

Answer 8:

The CRA plans to conduct online engagement activities on topics that are important to both the Agency and the public. Examples of what we would be engaging the public include: feedback and input on our online services, programs that we offer and various tax credits.

Question 9:

How is CRA planning to rate functions that we anticipate they will be keen to have that are not listed? Would they consider adding bonus points for functions not listed in the Rated that could/would be beneficial for online engagement?

Answer 9:

Only the functions listed in the RFP will be rated and evaluated.

Question 10:

Successful online engagement revolves around ensuring that the right strategy and approach, including details like intrinsic incentives, are in place for each engagement that you do. It seems that CRA, based on the 30% technical/70% financial evaluation model being used, is treating online engagement more like a commodity and very much tool-centric, something that is more aligned to surveys. Given that online engagement is not a commodity would CRA consider moving away from a "commodity" evaluation model for this RFP and flipping the evaluation model to be 70% technical and 30% financial?

Answer 10:

At this time we will stick to evaluating the bids we receive at 70% financial and 30% technical.

Question 11:

We believe that the ceiling of \$25,000 per subscription is low and that CRA will not get the returns on their investment that they are hoping for. CRA seems to have aligned the same value to online engagement as it has to a survey tool as they both have the same ceiling subscription of \$25,000 for their respective RFP's. Experts would acknowledge that online engagement is more complicated (but with higher rewards when done correctly) and in many ways completely different from surveys. Would CRA consider raising the ceiling of \$25,000 for a single subscription?

Answer 11:

The \$25,000 ceiling price for the yearly license subscriptions was part of the English version of the RFP in error. CRA does not have a ceiling price in this RFP. See part 2, RFP amendment.

Question 12:

What is the projects Kickoff date and desired live deployment date?

Answer 12:

There is no specific date for a specific project at this time as we expect the ongoing use of the tool for various projects.

Question 13:

What website are you considering managing with the new CMS?

Answer 13:

We expect the bidder to provide us with a website/hosting capabilities for the online engagement tool.

Question 14:

Under the Mandatory Requirements (page 29) – "Bilingual format" (Ref: M05): can you please elaborate if this requirement is exclusive to the website, the backend CMS platform or both?

Answer 14:

The bilingual requirement is for the website, including anything that is outward facing to the public as well as internal to the public service (i.e. the CRA employees with account access should be able to design engagement activities in either French or English). It is not required for the backend CMS platform.

Question 15:

Under the Mandatory Requirements (page 29) – “A publicly accessible web-based space for several separate consultation initiatives, each in both official languages” (Ref: M09): can you please provide examples of consultation initiatives as we are trying to visualize it.

Answer 15:

Examples of consultation initiatives that we have conducted in the recent past are – the Red Tape Reduction consultation (<http://www.cra-arc.gc.ca/gncy/rdtprdctn/menu-eng.html>) , the Registration of Tax Preparers Program Consultation (<http://www.cra-arc.gc.ca/gncy/cmplnc/rtpp-pipdr/cnslttnppr-eng.html>).

Question 16:

Under the Mandatory Requirements (page 30) – “Engagement activity access restrictions (as required, accessible by invitation only)” (Ref: M25): can you please elaborate on this or provide a use case/current example as we are trying to understand it.

Answer 16:

There are some instances where we would want to restrict access to the consultation and that it wouldn't be open to the public. We may only want to hear from businesses or accountants for example on a certain initiative. We would therefore require a customized URL that can be shared with invitees only and the engagement activity would not be visible elsewhere in a publically available web-space.

Question 17:

Under the Mandatory Requirements *sub-titled*: Analytics, Exports and Reporting (page 30 & 31) – “View Results in Realtime” (Ref: M29), “View Summary Statistics” (Ref: M30), “Generates qualitative summary reports” (Ref: M34) and “Generates quantitative summary reports” (Ref: M35) - can you please provide some example of the report as we are trying to visualize it.

Answer 17:

For example, we would be looking for reporting on things such as how many people have accessed the site, number of logins, number of comments, how many likes and dislikes on a comment. (This is not an exhaustive list). For quantitative summary reports, it would be dependent on the questions, but the generated report should include totals of measurable questions (multiple choice, yes/no, etc.). Regarding qualitative summaries, please see q.5 above.

PART 2 – RFP AMENDMENT

RFP 1000327102 is hereby amended as follows:

1. At page 33 of the RFP, Annex B: Financial Proposal and Basis of Payment

DELETE:

CRA has set a maximum ceiling annual price of \$25,000.00 for the yearly license subscriptions (excluding year 1 training, item 2, Table 1). Any bids in excess of this amount (Item 1 in Table 1 or all Items in Table 2) will be considered non-compliant.