Addendum 2: Response to vendor questions for RFP: MA/DC/S/2018-001

Government Mobile Application for News and Alert Notifications

26 June 2018

1. Are we able to request for a month extension on the "Go Live" date? (Google store typically needs 21 days approval and iTunes is approximately 2 weeks), which gives us only 2 weeks to develop a complete application. The typical timeframe for development is 2 months and the analysis phase is 10 days. We are trying to stay under your timeframe, however it is extremely short.

Please try to stay within the timeline as best as possible. At present we cannot change it.

2. Who will host the server? ITD or can we use our in house data center?
If required, we prefer that the vendor host necessary code for the app.

3. If ITD is hosting, can we get the server requirements?
We will let the vendor provide the server requirements.

4. Can we publish the app under our own corporate accounts with iTunes and Google Play? It will be easier to manage the platform.

Given the tight timeline and we will allow vendors to use their own iTunes and Google accounts. However please outline the process for moving the app to a government account at a later date.

5. We would like to request a site visit in order to speak with your representative to get an idea of the type of design and other technical aspects. Are you open to do this and if yes are we able to do this either this week or next?

Not at this time. This will be addressed with the vendors on the short list.

Q. Should external users be able to select that they would like to receive some notifications (possibly based on type) by SMS rather than through an App and the Internet? This would allow mobile users who do not have a data plan or who have an old-fashioned phone to subscribe to urgent news.
Although this is a good point, this is out of scope for the project.

With reference to section 1.3
Q. Is the user dashboard for internal or external users? With regards to the dashboard, if for internal users, do we want to display any of the following analytical pieces of information?
- Audit of the unique devices that have received a specific notification.
- Audit of the number of subscriptions to different notification categories and subcategories.

- Audit of increased levels of un-subscription to categories (which may for example indicate that there are too many notifications.)
The dashboard is only intended for internal users. All of the analytical pieces of information described above are beneficial to the solution being requested.

With reference to section 1.7

Q. Do we need to be extend the message publication workflow to affirm that broadcast messages are checked by a second pair of eyes before the send button is clicked? This would help mitigate the risk of potentially worrisome or embarrassing false alarms, such as those recently seen with regards to missile threats by Guam and Hawaii.

This is being dealt with by an internal policy where Department Heads will pre-approve content before it gets sent for posting. Such a request for a "second pair of eyes" in general will result in bottle necks. However, this has been noted and we will monitor the internal policing of posts to the system.

The questions below reference the document **Annex C – Statement of Requirements:**

1.7 – How does the Government define concurrent users, and how was this figure determined?
We define "concurrent users" as users on the system at the same time accessing the app and it represents monthly users.

6,000 concurrent users is a projected figure over five years of app usage. The Gov.bm portal currently averages 65,000 users per month where 20% is mobile (13,000 users). We assumed that initially 10% (1,300 users) of mobile traffic will be early adopters and will increase to 6,000 users over a five year period.

1.11 – Does the Government have a hosting solution in mind for the videos, or is the government assuming that the videos will be hosted on the proposed solution?
No, the Government does not have a hosting solution in mind for videos. We currently use YouTube to host videos.

1.21 – News should be a category. Is this simply stating that the Government wishes to push non-critical news items to users of the application?
Yes. However, the user will have the ability to select the categories of information they want to receive.

2.0 – Does the government web portal have standard APIs, that are well documented, for interfacing with information on the portal? (The Government Web Portal is built on Drupal, which has an API interface, but we're unaware as to whether the customizations to the site are available through the standard Drupal interface)
There are no standard APIs on the web portal. We have created connectors to specification in the past match other systems' API's.

2.1 – Is this requirement stating that each individual user's account should be used when interacting with the web portal, or that a master account will be used for the connectivity?
No individual users' accounts will be used when interacting with the portal. Only a master account will be used for connectivity.

2.3 – Does the government have a preferred cloud provider, or are there any incentives for the solution to use a particular provider?
We do not have a preferred cloud provider. However, IDT utilizes MS Azure which is not a requirement for this project.

2.9/2.10 – To what extent is backwards compatibility an issue or concern for the Government? Should the solution target industry standards for backward compatibility level, or does the Government see a need for older OS versions to be supported?
Base compatibility on the RFP "APPENDIX D - RFP PARTICULARS, 1.5 System Requirements" which request Mobile Clients be compatible with Apple iOS 7.0 to current; and Android OS 4.0 to current.