

AUGUST 23, 2013

ADDENDUM #1

RFP 13-142 Web Site Redesign

This addendum is being issued in an attempt to answer questions received regarding this RFP

Architecture-

1. Does ST. CHARLES COUNTY have a preferred or required hosting/web server technology?

For example:

<i>Web Server OS:</i>	<i>Microsoft Windows 2008 R2 Server</i>
<i>Web Server Software:</i>	<i>Internet Information Server (IIS) 7.5</i>
<i>Database Server:</i>	<i>Microsoft SQL Server 2008 R2</i>

A: The County does host and support systems on the platform mentioned above, and we are currently hosting and supporting an Apache Webserver using PHP. We do not have a specific required platform at this time but those mentioned here may be seen as preferred during the technical review portion of the proposal. We do not want to limit any potential solution provider to a specific platform if they have what we perceive is a best in class solution for our project goals as described in the RFP.

Qualification Process-

2. Has ST. CHARLES COUNTY established any budget goals or allocations for the project(s) outlined within the Request for Proposal (RFP)?

A: Yes but not specified in RFP and will not be disclosed.

3. Is ST. CHARLES COUNTY'S Advertising Agency of Record being considered as a potential vendor to fulfill the project(s) outlined within the Request for Proposal?

A: We do not have a single specific advertising agency of record.

4. What was reason that ST. CHARLES COUNTY has selected to open these projects up via the RFP process rather than working with their established Interactive Agency of Record?

A: We do not have a specific Interactive agency of record

5. If the reasons were Level of Service related, can details be provided?

A: N/A as one did not exist per Question 4

6. Will they award the job to a higher bidder if they feel that bidder is more qualified?

A: The County will enter negotiations with the Vendor who best met the needs outlined in this RFP.

7. What process will they use to ensure they are comparing apples to apples on the bids?

A: Though some crossover in language does occur during the purchasing process, the 'Request for Proposal' should not be confused with an open 'Bid' for a commodity product (which is nearly always taken upon specific engineering requirements at a low price). We are looking for a best in class combination of quality and value that meets the project goals and qualifications as stated in the RFP Section 2.3, 3, 7/Appendix A, 8. Clarity of the prepared solution proposal in regards to these sections may contribute to a higher score.

CMS/IT Operations-

8. What are current complaints of the current CMS tool other than difficulty of managing 35 platforms?

A: The architecture of the CMS requires specific components and modules to be installed to support additional page, menu, multimedia features, etc. This requires constant review, patching and updating of each component or module release to comply with uncompromising security. This has become a drag on the Content Manager position which is solely dedicated to publishing and creating content across the County Departments.

9. Have you previously explored alternative CMS tools? If so, what prevented St. Charles County from implementing the alternative?

A: No

10. Would the County prefer to spend more on a robust CMS tool with out of the box functionality or a less-robust tool and devote the funds to customization?

A: Open to either approach, factors such as customization, cost, and expected long term maintenance will be evaluated.

11. What site analytics tool is the County currently using?

A: None- the separate domains contribute to operational difficulty in collecting analytics about the entire site as a whole.

12. How is the County currently managing Search Engine Optimization? Once the site is developed, is the county budgeting for on-going SEO consulting?

A: None at this time and no budgeting for this capability have been discussed.

13. Does the County have a preferred Content Management System (i.e. open source vs. .Net)?

A: No

Site Function-

14. Are detailed Functional Specifications related to the project described within this RFP available for review?

A: Detailed functional specs will be created once entering into a contract with the chosen finalist.

15. Are there any special requirements that the current solution does not support than have been defined as being import to the success of the project described within this RFP?

A: Specific site functionality that is a notable asset of the responding Solution Team's skill set should be forthcoming in the response.

16. Are there sample websites that you currently admire (either government entities or corporate)? What features of these websites appeal the most?

A: Many websites were attractive for various reason, there are too many too list.

17. Does the County currently have a compliant tracking system? If not, what is the current process for tracking citizen complaints?

A: No this is currently a manual process handle by the applicable Departments.

18. What is the County's current payment gateway system?

A: Various payments processing modules exist that are native to a particular solution or Department.

19. In Appendix A of the RFP, Online Payments is mentioned as a need. Can the County please elaborate on what need is being looked to be met or what function online payments would serve on the new website?

A: If a specific Department were to approach the IS Department in some way to facilitate payments on their web page for a particular licensing process or other business specific process, we would be interested to evaluate a single solution that might fill that need uniformly on a site wide basis.

20. The RFP asks for: "citizen friendly features such as notifications, online form submission, and alerts. Also we would like to facilitate doing business with the County Government." Obviously this involves user-friendly content management but this is a pretty broad description of the needed capabilities of the site. Can you be more specific in what that deliverable needs to be as it relates to this description?

A: The proposal response should include what features in a current product offering meet the needs outlined in this Request for Proposal. In addition if your firm has developed such features what might the range of cost be for such value added features?

Graphic Design-

21. In Appendix A of the RFP, you request prototypes for Graphic Design. Did the County have a specific number of prototype concepts in mind for this? Also, is the county asking that these be included in proposals or that the County have options to choose from during the development process?

A: No specific number of prototypes in mind. We are open to either approach suggested here, as well as others depending on a firm's proven methodology.

22. As the RFP reads in Section 2.3, "**Project Goals include but not limited to the following:**" it appears as though the County is asking for graphic design and implementation of 'new county branding'. Is this a separate project within the website project where there needs to be new branding? Or is the website design supposed to be in keeping with a new, existing, county branding? If it is a separate project, typically it is done before the design of the look and feel of the website and can be time consuming in and of itself.

A: Branding of a new St. Charles County Logo has recently been completed and is now being deployed. Any proposed solution will keep with or enhance this branding in some way.

Implementation-

23. Do you prefer a local vendor over a vendor in another state?

A:

Section 135.280.A.3. of the Revised Ordinances of St. Charles County summarized in part provides for the following:

...

In addition to the mandatory considerations, the residual benefits to the St. Charles County economy may be considered where the purchase has local source as a component in the purchase. In making purchases the County may give preference to all commodities manufactured, mined, produced, or grown within St. Charles County and to all firms, corporations, or individuals doing business in St. Charles County. "Preference" shall be defined as products where quality is equal or better and the difference in the delivered price is negligible.

24. Do you require the website to be developed with U.S.-based developers?

A: No

25. Does ST. CHARLES COUNTY have a desired timeframe associated with the project(s) included within this RFP?

A: Implementation and Go-Live 6 months from date of signed contract is preferred

Integration-

26. What type of integration are you anticipating between the new website and the payment gateway? Will this be within the site or a link to a third-party?

A: Integration should be more than just a linked out solution if possible, though a linked payment option may not be excluded from consideration amongst the strengths of other proposed solution attributes.

27. Will ST. Charles County be providing any and all photos and videos to the selected vendor?

A: Yes

28. Is the content migration strictly copy and paste from previous website or will the content be in a CSV file or some other type of automated tool?

A: Either may be an option depending on the Solution provider's typical methodology and maturity involving Content Migration. Copy and Paste may be done if necessary.

29. In Appendix A of the RFP, the County discussed Content Migration. Can the County please elaborate on the database lookup functionality mentioned? Is there a back office database or third party system involved in the database lookup?

A: The existing lookup could be considered Back Office Database, a single table, read only search is being performed, and results being returned on the same page. If data integration is needed or supported with a particular solution any kind of information regarding ODBC support is required.

30. Are there any third party systems, internal databases, etc. that will be required to integrate with the website for any functionality?

A: Please see above or Appendix A. of the RFP

31. The current website links out to Family Arena, Property Tax Database, ASI Flex, AlwaysCare, and several more. Will the new site continue to link out in a similar fashion? Or will the selected vendor be tasked with integrating with these systems?

A: Current links will likely remain, unless the proposed solution has an emphasis on and capability of Integration that is proven.

Intranet-

32. Is the Intranet part of the redesign project? If so, can we have access to the intranet so we can do a feature assessment?

A: No special consideration for Intranet capability was given in the RFP beyond treating it as an additional department that could be brought on line. If a Solution partner has a proposed intranet specific solution they feel warrants consideration please provide detail on functionality, operational efficiency, cost etc.

Vendors shall sign this Addendum as acknowledgment and return it with the proposal.

RFP 13-142 ADDENDUM # 1

Addendum #1

Dated _____

We, the undersigned, acknowledge the receipt of the above addendum(s) as dated.

By: _____

Title: _____

Company: _____

Date: _____