



Request for Proposals (RFP)
NGC Website Redevelopment Project
Reference #: NGC107224
Buy and Sell Reference #: PW-16-00721283
March 9, 2016

ADDENDA # 4

This Addendum forms part of the contract documents and is to be read, interpreted, and coordinated with all other parts. The cost of all contained herein is to be included in the contract sum. Acknowledge receipt of this Addendum by inserting its number and date on the Tender Form, specifically Appendix F – Addenda. Failure to identify addenda issued by the NGC **will (M)** result in the immediate disqualification of your proposal.

1. Are the sub-sites static or in a CMS? If in a CMS, which one?
 - Some subsites are static, some are php files. Please see page 8 of the RFP on the range of sites and CMS currently being used. .
2. Is the Gallery retaining the GSA?
 - Refer to question #29.

NGC Team Structure, Capabilities & Background

3. Please elaborate on the size and structure of the NGC team that will be directly involved with the website redevelopment project. Specifically what departments will be involved and approximately how many stakeholders.
 - The Web Redevelopment initiative will be led by the Marketing and New Media team along with the Information Technology System team. All departments of the Gallery will conceivably be involved with the website, especially since the Gallery wishes to consider a distributed page ownership system with templates, assisted workflows and approvals. The Gallery's org chart is available in its Annual Report on the website. Furthermore, decisions related to overall information architecture and development of new sections of the web sites will require the support of overall senior management and management leading specific initiatives.
4. If required, is NGC open to assisting with the recruitment process for any user testing that would involve NGC gallery members?
 - Yes



5. Does the new site launch date correspond with any other strategic NGC initiatives? If so, please elaborate.
 - We have not provided a target launch date. Proponents are to provide a credible implementation strategy.
6. Approximately how many NGC stakeholders will be using/logging into the CMS? What are their key roles and activities?
 - This really depends of the attributes of the CMS and interfaces. We estimate that there might be about 20 individuals that will have page ownership/contribution rights.
7. Has any user research and formal testing been recently completed? If so, please elaborate on what research was conducted.
 - Yes there has been some user research and usability testing done. The results from this research will be provided to the successful proponent.
8. Based on NGC's current security policies, will the website need to undergo an external security review (ex: PEN testing) prior to go-live?
 - The site must have a Security Certificate (HTTPS) but there is no requirement for an external audit
9. Based on NGC's current accessibility policies, will the website need to undergo an external accessibility review (ex: AODA compliance review board) prior to go-live?
 - The site must adhere to WCAG AA accessibility but there is no requirement for an external audit.
10. Will there be a dedicated NGC project manager/representative who will coordinate with the selected agency throughout the partnership? Will there also be a dedicated NGC technical/information technology lead contact?
 - Yes

Technical
SharePoint 2013

11. Please state any mandatory requirements for the integration with SharePoint.
 - As stated in the RFP, the NGC has selected SharePoint as its document management information system. We expect the proponent to identify if their solution can integrate with SharePoint, and what advantages can be drawn from it. The proponent can also recommend no integration with SharePoint if not deemed necessary/useful.



12. Please state any preferred or optional benefits for the integration with SharePoint.

- Refer to Question 11

13. Has NGC attempted an integration with SharePoint before? If so, please elaborate on any issues or challenges that were identified.

- No we have not attempted to integrate our current CMS with SharePoint.

CMS, System Integration and Content Migration

14. In reference to 2.3.2 h) on page 12, how many different sites or sub-systems do we need to integrate search with? (i.e. CMS internal search, e-commerce site, Piction, SharePoint etc.) And do these sites or systems have existing search API?

- The answer to this question is dependent on the proposed CMS and the architecture of connectivity. It is nevertheless anticipated that any content and only the content that the CMS publicly releases should be searchable within the CMS. E.g., if for instance it links to an image hosted in Piction, that metadata should be searchable within the CMS.

15. In reference to 2.4.8.1 Multilingual on page 20, do you require IP detection or browser language detection for new visitors?

- Ideally the new site would leverage some detection of Browser language settings.

16. In reference to 2.2.2 on page 9, is there a redirect strategy/requirement for the 5,000 archived pages? What will happen to the 5,000 archived?

- A complete redirect strategy for archived content has not been developed at this time, and will be done through this project (2.4.5); however it would likely be limited to a folder level redirect and not one-to-one redirects.

17. In reference to 2.4.4 Content Migration on page 19, to help us better understand the effort required for the migration, please elaborate on what content you want migrated and approximately how much content needs to be migrated. What formats are the provided data source? (i.e. xml, Excel, text, doc. etc.)

- Approximately 1,500 pages need to be migrated. The rest of data is in the database. Content is in the following formats: pdf, doc., Txt, html, mp3/4, mov, swf, flv.

18. Does NGC have an internal technical and/or web development team who will coordinate with the selected agency? If so, how many members make up this team and what are their capabilities? Also who has currently been managing the multiple CMS solutions?

- Yes, there is an internal team. The multiple CMS solutions are currently managed by a combination of suppliers and internal resources. A team of 4 individuals with a mix of



technical, design and content management skills will have the capability of managing the Web site once it will be fully deployed and they will be properly trained on its operations.

19. The RFP has requested features such as dynamic content and personalization – does NGC have the in-house resources to manage and maintain this content (potentially on a daily basis)?

- Yes. From a content management perspective a distributed page ownership system will facilitate content update. The Gallery is looking forward to the opportunity to develop its ability to manage content and campaign personalization along with the implementation of new technologies and in keeping with a limited growth of its resources.

20. Please provide an approximate hosting budget for this project.

- The NGC will not be providing a hosting budget for this project. We are attentive to pricing signals from the industry.

21. Does NGC prefer to integrate Google Analytics with Google Tag Manager (GTM)?

- It is preferred, but we are nevertheless looking for recommendations from the industry.

22. Approximately how often does NGC make content updates to its sites? Approximately how often do development updates occur?

- The NGC makes content updates to its sites multiple times a day. Development updates occur in accordance with project needs, available budgets, etc.

23. What is involved in the current release management process you use today? How long is a typical release cycle?

- There is no release management process in place. The Gallery is looking for best practices in this domain.

24. In reference to e-commerce, does NGC currently have any PCI compliance requirements that must be met, or are compliance requirements the responsibility of the third-party platforms used?

- The Gallery operates e-commerce solutions from PCI Compliant 3rd party platforms. CMS embedded e-commerce solutions will be required to have PCI compliant features.

25. Are the externally hosted web properties managed and supported by external vendors?

- Refer to page 8 of the RFP. We will be looking to integrate all of these properties under a new CMS.



26. In reference to section 2.2.2 on pages 9 to 11, there are several internal system integrations stated, including CyberMuse and the Enterprise Metadata repository. Please state what internal systems are priorities for the new site and what systems could be phased in after the launch of the new main site.
- Please see instructions in 2.4.2.1, Iterative approach. The Gallery would favour a plan that gets deployed in phases. It is looking for recommendations in this regard.
27. In reference to 2.2.2 on pages 9 to 11, which of the system integrations must be real-time integrations? (Meaning the data must be transmitted and received in real time)
- Any system supporting e-commerce requires real-time integrations (e.g., online ticketing, product sales).
28. Does NGC foresee the need for caching strategies for the system integrations? If so, please elaborate on what systems integrations would be required.
- It depends on the proposed system integrations.
29. Is NGC looking to replace the search functionality provided by the Google Search Appliance, or are you looking to expand on the current implementation? If so, have all the requested search features been confirmed to be feasible with the Google Search Appliance, or will the proponent need to determine what search technologies can be used/implemented?
- This will be dependent on the recommendation that comes out of the project and the features of the selected CMS. The need for faceted search enterprise might not be feasible with GSA.
30. Microsoft recently stated as of January 12, 2016 it will only be supporting IE 11 (<http://bit.ly/1Zi1npv>). In section 2.4.3.4 Development and Site Build on page 17, it states required browser compatibility should include IE 7,8 and 9 – please confirm this is still a requirement.
- Microsoft support is only one dimension of this question, user data is also important. Section 2.4.3.4, last bullet, requires compatibility with Internet Explorer 9+ and **graceful degradation** for older browsers (I.E. 7 and 8).
31. In reference to 2.4.3.4, please confirm for mobile responsiveness that you are only expecting to accommodate modern devices with modern mobile browsers – dated BlackBerry models for example can cause potential development challenges.
- Yes. We are only expecting to accommodate modern devices with modern mobile browsers. Anything with less than 2% visits will not be supported such as BB KBD. <



Submission requirements

32. Are section header pages included in the page count limits?
- No, they aren't included.
33. In reference to section R3 on page 45, are we able to provide summary biographies in our response and attach full CVs for team members in the Appendix?
- Proponents are to provide Bios as part of the submission in the format of their choice, CVs provided as Appendix will not be examined.
34. Do pages containing only supporting imagery for case studies count towards the page limit for the section? If so, are we able to include supporting imagery in an Appendix?
- Yes, supporting imagery can be incorporated in any section described in table 3.3 and will not be counted towards the prescribed page limit. However the total space used by imagery cannot exceed 50% of the prescribed maximum page length for each of the sections.
35. Please confirm that we can include Appendix C and Appendix D checklists in the Appendix of our submission document.
- Yes, this is acceptable.
36. In reference to section M2 on page 40 and R2 on page 45, are we able to include relevant project examples using other CMS solutions (that are not our proposed CMS)?
- No, the Gallery is looking for suppliers with a substantial experience with their proposed CMS solution.
37. Can you please provide more detail and specifications on the 3rd party systems that need to be integrated?
- 3rd party applications required are identified in section 2.4.8.4, 5th item.
38. In section 2.4.8.6 "Nice to have" Features, is also located in M5.6 (mandatory) grid. Is this an error? Or are the 'nice to have's' mandatory based off the mandatory requirement grid?
- This is an error. On page 43, Nice to have features under section M5.6 are not mandatory and will be considered as rated requirements as part of the proposed CMS Solution.