# Answers to Questions on the RFP:

## Course Management System

1. Can we add our own institutional open short courses to the catalogue? (Or would this cause an issue with where the courses are hosted?)

   **Answer: Yes, that would be encouraged. We need to try and map ALL ODFL courses available in the region.**

2. Which content management system (CMS) was used to host the catalogue?

   **Answer: The prototype was custom-designed according to a set of indicators and deployed on AWS infrastructure. It is not necessary to continue to use the prototype platform.**

3. Will the team be provided with any system documentation to help with improving the existing CMS? (This would also help the team understand the current system.)

   **Answer: Yes – if you want to use the existing platform.**

4. Can a new CMS be used to replace the current CMS?

   **Answer: Yes, a new CMS can be used to replace the current CMS.**

5. Is there a preferred CMS? Or can we propose an alternative CMS in the RFP?

   **Answer: COL has no preference other than for use of open source as much as possible.**

6. Is there an existing LMS that the CMS links to? What is the LMS?

   **Answer: No. The catalogue simply provides information about ODFL courses available. It does not link to any LMS. It is likely that the different providers of ODFL courses will all be using different LMSs.**

7. Does development documentation of the prototype exist?

   **Answer: Yes, some documentation exists.**

8. Does existing course catalogue data from the prototype need to be transferred into the new redesigned platform?

    **Answer: No. The course catalogue currently has COL courses. We are happy to populate a new course catalogue with COL course information.**

## Layout and Settings

1. Can we revamp the look of the CMS?

    **Answer: Yes, this was a key recommendation from the regional consultancies.**

2. Since there were issues with the images and icons, will there be a vetting process in place for approvals?

    **Answer: Such a process should be included in the proposal.**

3. Is there a preference for the colour scheme?

    **Answer: No, we do not have a preference for the colour scheme. However, we hope the Pacific region could be reflected in the design.**

4. Can we replace the banner?

    **Answer: Yes, the banner could be replaced.**

5. Could you explain more about some links not correctly linking to current sites where the courses are offered?

    **Answer: At the moment, the course catalogue does not necessarily provide URLs that link to institutional course sites. Making sure these are kept up to date could be time-consuming. The prototype made provision for us to give institutional administrators free access to update/add/delete their own institutional offerings.**

## Budget

1. Are there conditions on how we can spend the budget up to January 2022?

    **Answer: The focus is on the development of the new/upgraded catalogue in line with the recommendations which came from the regional consultancies. There are no restrictions on how the proposer chooses to allocate the funds, provided the allocation indicates best value for money.**

2. Should our budget also include costing beyond January 2022?

   **Answer: No, there will be new contracts for subsequent hosting and maintenance.**

3. Can we use the funds to purchase new equipment?

   **Answer: Yes – but make a good case for why this is necessary.**

4. Are there provisions to bring on additional consultants if there is a need? Or must all consultants be named in the RPF budget?
   **Answer: Yes – just make clear in the proposal that you might sub-contract some of the development work, although USP would be ultimately responsible for the deliverables.**

## Others

1. Do you require to meet the team around the Christmas and New Year period?

   **Answer: It is not a requirement. We could arrange meetings mid-December and mid-January for example to keep the main end-of-year period free.**

2. How often do you wish to meet for a progress update?

   **Answer: Meetings should be purposeful – i.e. when something needs to be demonstrated/questioned. Development of the prototype involved short weekly meetings because the development timeframe was very constrained. We probably should have at least an introductory meeting, a mid-term demonstration of the emerging course catalogue design and a near-end meeting to demonstrate functionalities, etc, before opening live for testing.**