

**TBS SOLICITATION 24062-24-283  
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS SERIES 1**

**Question 1**

The RFP includes a Bid Submission Form as Annex C on page 50. However, it is not referenced in Bid Preparation Instructions on page 9 of the RFP.

How should we treat this? As a separate form to be submitted as a separate Section (IV?). Or should we add it to one of Sections I, II, or III specified in the Bid Preparation Instructions?

**Answer 1**

Please submit Annex C as a separate document.

**Question 2**

I can't seem to find the last date to ask questions on RFP 24062-24-283 that was released on Wednesday.

Can you assist?

**Answer 2**

**Part 2 - BIDDER INSTRUCTIONS** paragraph **2.4 ENQUIRIES - BID SOLICITATION** states:

All enquiries must be submitted in writing to the Contracting Authority no later than **5 calendar days** before the bid closing date. Enquiries received after that time may not be answered. *Questions should be submitted by May 8th at the latest.*

**Question 3**

Section 5.3 on page 28 of the RFP stipulates that "**every** individual who will be providing support to TBS for this contract will be fluent in both English and French."

Our project team includes technical specialists, such as software engineers, DevOps, and site builders, who unilingual. To limit the team working on your exclusively to fluently bilingual individuals would deprive you of the full expertise of our team as well as limit their ability to work.

Would it satisfy this requirement if we assign a bilingual support contact, whose responsibility it would be to field your support requests and then to ensure that the support is provided in the preferred language of the person requesting the support?

**Answer 3**

The Crown agrees to modify section 5.3 and also welcomes the suggestion of assigning a bilingual support contact acting as the single point of contact.

Please see Amendment 1 to the RFP.

**Question 4**

Section 6.3 on page 33 of the RFP states: "There are no security requirements for this contract."

In light of this, may we mark the Annex C – Bid Submission Form Security Clearances sections "N/A" for not applicable?

**Answer 4.**

On ANNEX C - BID SUBMISSION FORM please mark the Security Clearance Level of Bidder and Security Clearance Level of Bidder's Individuals Resources all N/A

**Question 5**

In the pricing section on page 13, the RFP includes a requirement for: "The migration of existing (4-8) projects and their associated functionality (i.e., forums) and content to the new platform."

The work and budget could vary significantly based on the nature and extent of the existing projects and content. Could you please provide the URLs of the specific projects so that we can review them and estimate the work required?

**Answer 5**

The existing projects requiring migration are:

URLs – RAS Platform Feedback:

EN - <https://letstalkfederalregulations.ca/feedback-on-the-let-s-talk-federal-regulations-platform/>

French - <https://parlonsdesreglementsfederaux.ca/retroaction-sur-la-plateforme-parlons-des-reglements-federaux>

URLs – OpenGov Action Plan

EN: <https://letstalkopengovernment.ca.engagementhq.com/nap-engagement-project>

FR: <https://parlonsgouvernementouvert.ca.engagementhq.com/participez-a-l-elaboration-du-plan-d-action-national-de-2025-2029-du-canada-pour-un-gouvernement-ouvert>

All other projects currently hosted on the platform would be archived on other Government of Canada platforms and do not require migration of their functionality.

**Question 6**

The Financial Bid on page 13 includes the following requirement: “The engagement platform will be required to go through full functionality, accessibility and quality assurance testing, to ensure seamless user experience.”

This type of process can vary greatly depending on the expectations and process established by the client. We require more precise information in order to provide an cost estimate.

Will Treasury Board be conducting this testing? Does Treasury Board have a prescribed methodology for the testing as well as acceptance thresholds?

**Answer 6**

There is no prescribed methodology for quality assurance testing. TBS will complete testing in cooperation with the service provider and report any bugs and issues before the websites are live. The requirement is to ensure that there is full functionality in both official languages so that there are no issues for users once the websites are launched.

**Question 7**

The Pricing Schedule section on page 13 includes the stipulation that, “Two websites will be hosted on the platform, each with a unique URL.”

The amount of work we must do will vary with the number of websites. Should we price the Managed Services to include two websites throughout the first two years and the option years?

**Answer 7**

The Regulatory Affairs Sector has one website (EN/FR) and OpenGov has the other (EN/FR). That said, the intention is that the service provider will provide an engagement platform for both sectors that will be hosted on the Contractors website for the entire duration of the contract which may include option years if exercised by Canada which will provide the functionality (engagement tools, widgets) as outlined in the Statement of Work, and not to build a website.

**Question 8**

In the pricing section on page 13, the RFP includes a requirement for: "The migration of existing (4-8) projects and their associated functionality (i.e., forums) and content to the new platform."

1. Has Treasury Board made a firm decision to move off the existing platform?
2. If not, is the existing contractor eligible to submit a bid in response to this RFP that would continue to use the existing platform?
3. If the existing contractor is eligible to submit a bid, how do you ensure a level playing field with new bidders who will have the cost of migration, which the existing supplier would not have?
4. If the existing contractor is eligible, could you please provide information regarding the cost of the current platform and services provided by the existing contractor? This knowledge would give an unfair advantage to a bidder if it was not also known to other bidders.

**Answer 8**

1. The existing platform is being hosted and managed by a current contract that is expiring June 30, 2024
2. Yes, the current contractor can submit a response to this bid solicitation if they choose. If the current contractor's bid submission is deemed compliant and they win the contract in accordance with the Section 4.2 Basis of Selection methodology than they would continue the services as outlined in the contract.
3. The Bidder should have the existing capability to offer these services, and the migration would be to populate tools (such as a forum) in a similar manner to how they are currently used. The Crown does not see this as an advantage to the current vendor.

The current vendor if they choose to submit a proposal will be treated in the same transparent manner as all other bidders and must meet the Technical and Financial requirements of the RFP so the playing field is equal.

4. The current incumbent is Granicus (Engagement HQ) . The contract period was April 1st, 2023 to June 30th, 2024. Total contract value: \$146,900.00

The services mentioned in this current RFP are the same or similar services that Granicus is currently providing.