



## **NEGOTIATED REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL ADDENDUM #1**

---

### **DC-2022-CD-11 - Global Traveller Research Program**

#### **Close Date/Time:**

January 31, 2023  
14:00 hours  
Pacific Time

**Issue Date:** January 17, 2023

**From:** CTC Procurement

**To:** All Vendors

**E-mail:** procurement@destinationcanada.com

---

**Below are answers to questions submitted in regards to the above noted NRFP as of January 6, 2023.**

- Q1. Section C.3 From the brief on page 8, “Gain a clearer understanding of how data and research connect to activations, the story the research is telling, and how it’s connected to the bigger picture impacting the business strategy and/or tactical planning.”:

Can you give more detail on the kinds of marketing activations and tactical planning decisions that you would want the study to help inform? Is there an opportunity to include some measurement of exposure and / or engagement with marketing activation on the study, to begin to build a picture of the influence these have on the Destination Canada (DC) brand, and travel decisions?

**Answer:** The study should inform a wide range of marketing activations and tactical planning decisions across all market channels, including consumer direct full funnel campaigns. The proponent should propose an approach that they feel would best meet this need, which may or may not include measurement of exposure or engagement with marketing assets.

- Q2. Section C.4.2 From the brief on page 10, “Be open to working with and incorporating secondary and/or industry data into insights generation”:

Could you give us any more detail on the other data sources that we might be able to tap into to help build analytic models and generated broader insights. Are there other specific second or first party data sets, that you would be keen for us to integrate with the tracking in future?

**Answer:** The proposed approach should include the ability to incorporate a wide range of data sources to support insights generation. Some examples might include, but are not limited to, tourism statistics (e.g., frontier counts), spend data, air data, search data, and attribution metrics.

- Q3. Section C.4.2 Regarding the quarterly/monthly tracking, can DC provide some perspective on the desired sample target for this more frequent tracking? Are there specific markets that DC feels this regular tracking is a higher priority?

**Answer:** The sample target audience for the quarterly/monthly tracking would be the same audience as the annual survey. The sample size may be reduced for the quarterly/monthly tracking component, while still maintaining a large enough sample to allow for some subgroup and trend analysis. DC would prefer to incorporate more frequent tracking in all of its current target markets, while also allowing for the flexibility to add additional markets as needed.

- Q4. Section C.4.2 From the brief on page 10, “These deep dives may be conducted via qualitative research, social listening, or other methodologies, as appropriate”:

Do you already buy or use some social listening? If so, can you provide details? Alternatively, would you be interested in looking at options that allow ongoing use of social media to enhance the tracking on a continuous basis (helping also to raise “red flags”), as well as just for deep-dive purposes.

Answer: DC currently employs a wide variety of research tools and is open to a range of approaches to provide high quality insights. The proponent should propose their recommended approach.

- Q5. Section C.4.3 Regarding monthly/quarterly tracking, can DC provide more detail on what the always-on research is intending to achieve? For example, is it designed to provide more timely feedback on ad/comms effectiveness?

Answer: The always-on research component is intended to provide our teams with a constant pulse on our markets and allow them to respond quickly to real-time changes. This may include insights on ad/comms effectiveness, traveller behaviour, socio-economic conditions, travel industry operations, border restrictions, or other topics affecting travel.

- Q6. Section C.4.3 Can DC provide some overview of how it currently communicates to high value guests (HVGs) and other key audiences? Specifically, providing an overview of its paid, owned and earned media and channels used, estimated volume of impressions, and how DC allocates its media budget? Please detail how this changes across all markets, but also how it changes for China.

Answer: DC engages with our markets through a variety of market channels, including consumer direct full funnel campaigns. DC will share full access to marketing and media plans with the successful proponent.

- Q7. Section C.4.3 Regarding the re-contact capability, what span of time does DC envision needing to re-contact respondents following the initial survey?

Answer: The proponent should provide their recommendation(s) based on a realistic timeframe to maximize responses while ensuring that all applicable data privacy regulations are followed.

- Q8. Regarding C.4.3 Regarding deep dives and ad-hoc studies, we understand that DC may have irregular needs that arise during the term of the contract, but it would be helpful to understand what DC thinks will be the volume of these types of requests. Can you provide some examples of what types of specific strategies might result in the need to conduct a deep dive or ad hoc study?

Answer: The volume of deep dive or ad-hoc studies required will be dependent on the insights that are gained through the ongoing quantitative research and the resulting topics that may be identified as requiring further research. Some potential examples could include, but are not limited to, an ad hoc study on specific tourism product offerings (e.g. culinary or outdoor tourism trends), or further exploring consumers’ understanding of some top drivers of destination choice.

- Q9. Section C.4.5 The NRFP indicates DC would like the vendor to conduct surveys with first-party respondents provided by DC. Can you please provide a description of the type of first-party respondents DC has or will have in the future?

Answer: DC will share details of its first party data strategy, for which development is ongoing, with the successful proponent.

- Q10. Section C.4.5 Regarding DCs desire for self-service interactive dashboards, can DC elaborate on the required feature set for these interactive dashboards?

Answer: The features for the dashboards will be dependent on the questions or stories that need to be communicated by the data. Some examples may include, but are not limited to, tracking changes over time, providing national, provincial, territorial, or regional benchmarks, and/ reporting key performance indicators (KPI) results.

- Q11. Section C.4.5 From the brief on page 13, “The Contractor should have the ability to provide self-service, interactive dashboards, standard or custom reporting, and integration with DC’s Data and Analytics Platform.”:

Are there any particular existing DC platforms or BI tools that are used internally that we will be asked to integrate with?

Would you be looking for us to include recommendations and options for dashboarding and BI tools that we could provide as part of the proposal? Could you give any more information on the range of users and needs that the dashboards would need to meet, or alternatively, would you be comfortable with us proposing a range of options, with a discovery phase that would allow us to determine those needs in detail, for you?

Answer: DC has a broad range of stakeholders, partners, and collaborators, including internal business units and external organizations, all with varying degrees of sophistication when it comes to consuming reports and analytical data products. Our goal is to provide a unified, simple, and seamless experience that reduces complexity and fragmentation for our end-users. DC's preference is to ingest data from the Global Traveller Research Program into our platform and host the resulting reports and dashboards. This offers the best flexibility for DC to build dashboards and reports, or to co-create other data products with our partners, the successful proponent or other service providers. DC will consider proposed options for proponent-hosted pre-built dashboards that meet our goals if they are the right solution to deliver immediate value. We are not looking for proponents under this NRFP to propose a Business Intelligence (BI) tool to DC.

Currently, DC uses DOMO as our primary Business Intelligence Software, and our Data and Analytics platform is based on Google Cloud Platform (GCP) technologies (primarily BigQuery). We can integrate data through Secure File Transfer Protocol (SFTP) or a secured Application Programming Interface (API) utilizing industry standard structured and semi-structured data payloads (such as Comma Separated Values (CSV), Javascript Object Notation (JSON), Apache Avro or Parquet). It is DC's expectation that the successful proponent will be responsible for providing a stable schema and meta-data to DC. DC is open to other means of secure integration as long as it does not involve any proprietary tools or incur additional licensing costs outside of DC's existing technology stack.

- Q12. Section C.4.5 Can DC elaborate on its current Data and Analytics Platform as referred to in the first sentence of C.4.5 under "Data Sharing and Ownership"?

What data is held in the platform? What is it used for? Is there an expectation that the vendor directly link its survey database via API to DC's Data and Analytics Platform? What functionality does it provide and what are the gaps that DC is looking for the Contractor to fill with a self-serve interactive dashboard and custom reporting tool?

Answer: Please see responses to Q10 and Q11.

- Q13. Section E.1.1 "Any value-added services, functions, related fee for service offerings, unique capabilities, strategic partnerships, experience or innovative ideas your company offers" – Could DC be a bit more precise as this list could be very long?

Answer: It is up to the proponent to determine what value-added services would be beneficial to DC.

- Q14. Section E.1.6 Limit of 2 pages to provide all this information for every team member assigned to DC account seems limiting. Can this limit be waved or adjusted to one page per person?

Answer: The response size limitations are guidelines; the proponent may increase or decrease their response size as appropriate to ensure the required information is provided.

- Q15. Section G.1 What proportion of survey changes should be expected year over year?

Answer: DC anticipates that it will maintain a set of tracking metric questions, including key performance indicators (KPIs), which would remain consistent over time. The remainder of the questionnaire would be open to changes year-over-year.

- Q16. Section G.1 Appendix 6 mentions "proponents should provide their suggested sample size (if it differs from the samples below) and provide associated costs". For costing purposes, should pricing be based on the specs outlined in the table in G.1.1 or do the specs listed in Appendix 6 need to be taken into account?

Answer: To ensure that Destination Canada receives pricing that can be assessed equally amongst the proponents, proponents must complete the table in Section G.1.1 without any adjustments to the

sample size. Proponents should provide their suggested sample size (if it differs) and provide associated costs in section G.3 Pricing Strategies.

Q17. Section G.1 How many open-ended questions should be assumed for costing purposes?

Answer: For the purpose of completing the “Coding of open-ended questions (including in-language coding)” row in the costing table in section G.1.1, proponents should provide costs for two (2) full open-ended verbatim questions. To ensure that Destination Canada receives pricing that can be assessed equally amongst the proponents, proponents must complete the table in Section G.1.1 without any adjustments. Proponents should provide their suggested open-ended questions approach (if it differs) and provide associated costs in section G.3 Pricing Strategies.

Q18. Section G.1 For costing purposes, what is the scope for “Analysis and Insights” in the table in G.1.1?

Answer: For the purpose of completing the “Analysis & Insights” row in the costing table in section G.1.1, proponents should allow for one (1) 40-page detailed report per market and provide the combined cost for all of those reports (i.e., total of 10 reports). To ensure that Destination Canada receives pricing that can be assessed equally amongst the proponents, proponents must complete the table in Section G.1.1 without any adjustments. Proponents should provide their suggested analysis approach (if it differs) and provide associated costs in section G.3 Pricing Strategies.

Q19. Section G.1 For costing purposes, what is the scope for “Data Deliverables” in the table in G.1.1?

Answer: For the purpose of completing the “Data Deliverables” row in the costing table in section G.1.1, proponents should provide costs for one (1) raw data file (in CSV format or similar) which can be incorporated into a data processing / data visualization platform (see response to Q11 for more details), and two (2) static data crosstabulation tables (in Excel format or similar). To ensure that Destination Canada receives pricing that can be assessed equally amongst the proponents, proponents must complete the table in Section G.1.1 without any adjustments. Proponents should provide their suggested data deliverable approach (if it differs) and provide associated costs in section G.3 Pricing Strategies.

Q20. On page 21, Section E.3. Case Studies and Expertise (E.3.1), three “multi-modal (mixed method)” research projects are requested as case studies. Can you please clarify what you mean by “multi-modal (mixed method)?” I.e., does the project have to be quantitative and qualitative, or would a quantitative-only study involving different methodologies count (i.e., telephone and online, etc.), and vice versa for qualitative-only studies?

Answer: Any combination of methodologies would be acceptable. This could include combinations of quantitative and qualitative, multiple quantitative methodologies, multiple qualitative methodologies, or a mix of primary research methodologies and secondary data sources.

Q21. Given that time required for analysis can vary based on the length of the questionnaire (# of questions), can we provide separate costs for each questionnaire length scenario in G1.1?

Answer: Please see response for Q18. To ensure that Destination Canada receives pricing that can be assessed equally amongst the proponents, proponents must complete the table in Section G.1.1 without any adjustments regarding analysis based on questionnaire length. Proponents should provide their separate costs for each questionnaire length scenario (if it differs) and provide associated costs in section G.3 Pricing Strategies.

Q22. Please clarify what is expected as part of the data deliverables in item G1.1? (e.g., SPSS files, CSV files, dashboard etc.)

Answer: Please see response to Q19. Proponents should provide costs for one (1) raw data file (in CSV format or similar) which can be incorporated into a data processing / data visualization platform (see response to Q11 for more details), and two (2) static data crosstabulation tables (in Excel format or similar).

- Q23. Given the time required to create data deliverables can vary based on the length of the questionnaire (# of questions) can we provide separate costs for data deliverables for each questionnaire length scenario in G1.1?  
Answer: Please see response to Q19.
- Q24. G.1.1 Where does questionnaire design and translations fee belong  
Answer: For the purpose of completing the costing table in section G.1.1, proponents should include questionnaire design and translation costs as part of the costs for each outlined questionnaire length for each market. If applicable, proponents should provide separate costs for questionnaire design and translation in section G.3 Pricing Strategies.
- Q25. Will results need to be trended to past research? e.g. Global Tourism Watch  
Answer: Given that the new Global Traveller Research Program may include a range of methodological approaches, DC does not have an expectation that results should be trended to any past research studies, including the Global Tourism Watch. If a need does arise to trend specific metrics to past results, DC will work with the proponent to identify caveats when interpreting results.
- Q26. For consistency and trending, can you disclose which panels were used for the most recent waves of the Global Tourism Watch study in each market?  
Answer: Please see response to Q25.
- Q27. How many questions are required to define the High Value Guests (HVG) segments?  
Answer: DC's current definition of the HVG segments may evolve over time. DC will work with the successful proponent to develop the appropriate definition questions as needed.
- Q28. Please confirm KPIs referenced in C.3.  
Answer: Some examples of historical Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) that were tracked in past waves of the Global Tourism Watch (GTW) study include Aided and Unaided Destination Consideration, Destination Knowledge, Path-to-Purchase, and Net Promotor Score (NPS). DC is seeking an approach which would allow for the flexibility to add/remove/adjust/revise the KPIs as appropriate over time.
- Q29. Do you need direct activation provided by the supplier through platforms such as Liveramp? How granular of a population are you looking to activate e.g. HVGS?  
Answer: The proponent should propose their recommended approach, which may or may not include providing direct activation capabilities. As DC's target audience may evolve over time, DC is seeking an approach which allows for the flexibility to adjust the audience for activation as appropriate.
- Q30. What data and analytics platform does DC currently use for comparability? What is your preferred data transfer mechanism?  
Answer: Please see response to Q11.
- Q31. What is the competitive set for each market? if you can't provide detail, please indicate a number of competitive destinations  
Answer: DC's current competitive sets typically include top long-haul destinations for travellers in each market, based on actual visitation. The number of competitive destinations ranges between eight (8) to 15, depending on the market. The proponent may also choose to explore alternative approaches to identifying a competitive set (e.g. based on product offerings).
- Q32. There is mention of sharing data and insights in multiple formats in C.4.4, these include reports and PowerPoint slide decks - can you clarify the difference between these 2 items (e.g., format, level of detail etc.)  
Answer: The successful proponent will be expected to share data and insights in different formats and adjust as needed for a variety of audiences. In some instances, a more detailed report outlining

in-depth analysis and findings may be required. In other cases, a higher-level presentation deck highlighting key insights may be more appropriate.

- Q33. Given the sample size (of n=9050) in Canada, can you confirm the number of reports/deliverables for the Canadian market for costing in G1.1?

Answer: Please see response to Q18.

- Q34. C.4.1 There is mention of the travel audience evolving. What is the current baseline screening criteria you would like to focus on? Does it vary by market given geographic proximity to Canada ie focus on those with higher likelihood to travel to Canada?

Answer: Please see response to Q27.

- Q35. Can you clarify the granularity of reporting that your partners need as it relates to specific subgroups, geographies within countries etc.?

Answer: The proponent should propose their recommended approach for reporting/deliverables for each market. Partners will require enough granularity to understand data, insights, and trends for their specific destination(s) and for target travellers within the market. In the past, regional analysis within countries has largely been limited to the US and Canada markets; sampling within all countries should be done at a national level with the ability to look at specific regions if needed.

- Q36. For International Business Events segment - please confirm if you wish to run B2B surveys and if so do you also have a list of partners you'd like to reach?

Answer: DC is not currently seeking to run B2B surveys through the Global Traveller Research Program. However, the successful proponent will be expected to identify areas where additional research may be useful and provide recommendations as appropriate, which may or may not include B2B deep dives.

- Q37. Are you open for a research partner to include an existing daily tracker which runs in all of DC's priority markets to deliver detailed metrics about Canada's brand perceptions, HVGs, broader traveller landscape and general trends in each market?

Answer: The proponent should propose their recommended approach to best meet the research needs outlined in the NRFP. If the proponent feels that incorporating an existing daily tracker would be advantageous to meet those needs, then they should include that as a component of their proposed approach.

- Q38. Do you have any immediate research needs relating to the data/insight you wish to acquire via this NRFP? i.e., is there any data you would prefer to obtain prior to June 2023?

Answer: This procurement is only for the work that is detailed within the NRFP, there is no additional requirement.

- Q39. C.4.3 For monthly/quarterly tracking - do you have any minimum sample requirements by market and needed subgroups (e.g., HVGs) by market?

Answer: The proponent should propose their recommended approach, including sufficient sample sizes to allow for some subgroup and trend analysis (e.g., across waves and within HVG subgroups).

- Q40. How important is it to do follow-up interviews (qualitative) based on responses to quantitative studies vs. conducting separate ad-hoc qualitative research using freshly recruited sample?

Answer: The approach should allow for both options. In some cases, a separate ad hoc qualitative study may be appropriate. In other cases, we may want to follow up directly with quantitative study respondents to gain a clearer understanding of their responses.

- Q41. Which social platforms does DC and its partners use most for activation and advertising. Are there any particular online behaviours that you consider as important outcomes?

Answer: DC will share full access to marketing and media plans with the successful proponent. One example of an online behaviour which may be considered as an important outcome would be search metrics.

Q42. Can DC be more specific and clear about what it expects in terms of seamless integration into its data infrastructure? What platforms do you utilize, what would be the required frequency of updating the data integration, what types of data would you want us to integrate with, and what would DC require beyond simply “dumping data” through an API?

Answer: Please see response to Q11. In addition, DC will work with the successful proponent to agree on an appropriate data refresh frequency or schedule.

Q43. What does an ideal integration into DC’s Data and Analytics Platform look like? What would be considered suitable if ideal is not feasible?

Answer: Please see response to Q11.

**The following is one (1) amendment to the requirements of the above noted NRFP.**

Desirable Criteria E.1.2 is deleted in its entirety and replaced with:

**E.1.2 Additional Company Background**

- Do you have any Russian or Belarusian participation in the governance structure of your organization – either as an investor or on your Board of Directors?
  - If yes, of what significance?
- Are you currently undertaking any work for an enterprise based in Russia or Belarus?
  - If yes, of what significance to your overall operation?

Maximum Marks Available – unweighted

Response should be limited to 1/2 a page or less