Topic	Question
Upgrade / relaunch / changes to	
information architecture	Do you want to upgrade your current website or relaunch the
	website?
	In Section 2.3. Is Information Architecture defined or can it be
	improved during the project?
	Please confirm if the IUCN team will retain all or most of the
	content on https://panorama.solutions/fr/explorer during the
	redesign process.
	Which documents or artefacts can be made available for the
	elaborated information architecture, such as visualisation of
	page structures, user flow or taxonomy tables, etc.?
design / visual ID	The document seems to indicate different levels of <b>design</b>
	<b>requirements</b> in different sections. Does the site require us to
	take what's currently there and modernise it slightly,
	completely redesign it or apply a design which will be supplied
	to us? Do you require us to supply a design concept as part of
	the proposal, or at the interview stage or only once the project
	is underway. Although a design can be helpful to show a route
	we might take, it can also hinder the review process as we
	usually take another route after having meetings with you and
	your team.
	In Section 2.3. What is the level of detail for Information
	Architecture and Visual Design that you will provide? Are
	branding guidelines web application specific?
	In Section 2.7. You stated: "Following the branding guidelines,
	design a new look-and-feel" but then in next sentences you
	stated in the same section: "No complete redesign is expected.
	Instead, the bidder should build on the existing design." Can
	you elaborate which of the following is expected - new design,
	or build upon existing design?
	If you're planning to relaunch, will it be the same design?
	- Is a brand book (with guidelines) available for the visual
	design phase?
	Are there guidelines or design system documentation for the
	design to be adopted?

	1) Re. design deliverables: In chapter 2.7 of the ToR it is			
	specified that "The proposer will develop a graphic concept			
	and the visual language of the new templates" and "No			
	complete redesign is expected. Instead, the bidder should			
	build on the existing design". At the same time, in chapter 2.3			
	it is said that: - "Development of the website based on the			
	Information Architecture and Design provided by IUCN and			
	partners" and - "Note that Information Architecture and Visual			
	Design material will be provided", but it's not clear whether			
	the latter statement refers to IUCN or the vendor. Could you			
	please clarify if: a) IUCN will provide any design materials (e.g.			
	wireframes or a detailed design proposal) and, if so, a brief			
	description of those deliverables b) the design of the new			
	website is going to be just an improved version of the current			
	website is going to be just an improved version of the current website or a completely different look and feel			
CMS / systems				
	Regarding the CMS and development, how keen are you from			
	moving away from your CMS to another one? Are there			
	aspects of Drupal you do or don't like. Are there elements of a			
	CMS that would be of benefit?			
	If you're planning to relaunch, do you want to host it with			
	same technologies or do you have a tech-stack in mind?			
users / roles	same teem of any or have a teem stack in filling:			
Listing Follows				
	The site has a front-and login. Can members of the public			
	The site has a <b>front-end login</b> . Can members of the public			
	access the site and if so, what can they do once registered?			
	In section 2.4. What is the definition of an External user, and			
	·			
	what are its requirements? Does he need to register/login,			
	submit content, and interact with other users?			

Г	<u></u>
	the state of the s
	In section 2.4. What is the difference between <i>Solution or</i>
	Uptake story providers and Collaboration partners?
	In section 2.5. How many users in the role of <i>Solution / uptake</i>
	story provider do you expect to have?
	In section 2.5. Can you elaborate what is the definition of an
	Solution / uptake story provider and what are their
	requirements? How should they submit their posts? Should
	they have an account? If yes, what would be their role?
	In continue 2.0. DEO 42. DEO 64 / Dunfiles ) Wiles In a faile
	In section 2.9. REQ-43 - REQ-61 (Profiles) Which of the
	following profiles and functions do you have on your current
	website? It is a bit confusing because the definition of <i>user</i> in
	REQ 43 - 61 is not explained in regards to Section 3.1. (User
	roles), so if you can define the type of user that are mentioned
	in REQ-43 - REQ-61?
	In section 2.9. REQ-68 Can you explain what the term
	nominate exactly means?
Solution review process	
	In section 2.9. REQ-42 Can you elaborate this request a bit more? What do you refer to as external functionality?

	Places alabarate on the changes that you are looking for in the
	Please elaborate on the changes that you are looking for in the
	feedback form & Solution Review process (forms & backend).
Training	
	In section 2.9. REQ-76 Can we provide general guidelines and
	online materials that we use with all our clients, and materials
	specific depending on Panorama functions, or do all materials
	have to be Panorama specific (branding of general guidelines
	for the entire Panorama project)?
Map explorer	In section 3.7.2 Map Explorer You wrote that Map Explorer is
тар ехріотеі	a " feature that does already exist on the website". But
	when we press the link it goes to some other external site
	https://www.sportanddev.org/en/connect / Can you send us
	the link that points to the existing panorama map that you're
	referring to.
	In section 3.7.2 Map Explorer Can you elaborate what does
	Additional search and filtering abilities mean for Map Explorer
	in terms of functionality?
Budget / proposal requirements	
and contracting process	Are there any financial (budgetary) restrictions or limitations
, and the second second	that we should be aware of?
	Please could you let us know if there is a defined budget for
	this project.
	this project.
	Re. criteria #6 for evaluating the technical proposal: Website
	of the proposer (5%) - This criterion is quite uncommon and
	we kindly suggest removing it, as it's not directly related to the
	project scope and objective. If that is not possible, please
	detail what are the minimum requirements to be met by a
	vendor's website in order to achieve the maximum score.
	Is it acceptable that our financial proposal is made in Euro or
	USD instead of Swiss Francs? If not possible, our price would
	likely include some provisions for bank fees and exchange rate
	risks.
Architecture of current site /	Please could you let us know the number of web pages on
migration / content	your site currently?
ingration / content	Please share the estimated volume and format of data to be
	migrated.
	In regards to migration, please clarify how many different page
	layouts do you have on your current site?
	Please confirm whether you anticipate the firm creating
	content for the redesigned website.
	Can a test access / stage system to the current Panorama
	platform be provided?
	production and production of

Hosting / maintenance	
	Please share the current web hosting architecture.
New features	
	In section 2.9. REQ-66 Can you elaborate more on this
	request? What type of messaging are we talking about - One-
	way, two-way? Inside the CMS admin or some other type of interface. Do you currently have this feature?
miscellaneous	interface. Do you currently have this feature:
Imsechaneous	
	Is there <b>anything else</b> not covered in the RFP that would help
	us in winning this project and delivering something amazing for
	you?
	In section 2.9. REQ-14 and REQ-71 The requests are not
	MoSCoW rated, can you provide the rating?
	We believe that all the technical documents will be provided
	to us in English language. Please confirm

## **Answer**

The platform needs to be migrated to Drupal 8 or 9 and we would like to implement some major improvements and new features.

The basic information architecture should remain as it is on the current platform, however minor changes and improvements are permissible and desirable; e.g. the classification of the content (solutions) will be improved, which concerns content tags and filters.

yes, all content (Solutions, news stories, resources) will be retained. Minor changes to structure and text of static pages is expexted.

taxonomy tables, user stories, all required information on architecture of current site (some of which may c

The corporate design (logo, color palette, ....) will stay the same. We do not require an actual redesign of the site and no major changes to the information architecture, the basic "look and feel" should remain the same. As such, we are not expecting a detailed design concept as part of the proposal or at the interview stage. Any tweaks to the current design, as well as design and placement of new features on the site, can be discussed and agreed during project implementation stage.

The current web platform is the basis for the information architecture and visual ID of the new platform. We can provide all information about the current platform that is required, liaising closely with the current service provider as needed. The branding guidelines concern the entire PANORAMA initiative, i.e. are not specific to the web platform.

## Build upon desisting design

Yes, the corporate design (logo, color palette, ....) will stay the same. We do not require an actual redesign of the site and no major changes to the information architecture, the basic "look and feel" should remain the same.

yes, there are general brand guidelines for the PANORAMA initiative.

see above

## see above

We wish to remain with Drupal, upgrading from Drupal 7 to Drupal 8 or 9. We like that Drupal has an easy-to-use, intuitive backend, given that the site has a large number of administrators, working across different institutions, along with the other advantages of using a widespread opensource CMS.

We would like to stay with Drupal, upgrading to Drupal 8 or 9. Most likely it will be necessary to develop a customized map module. We would prefer to integrate an external text collaboration service for the process of reviewing solutions (=user generated content). External services could potentially also be used for the "surveys" feature.

Yes, any member of the public can create a user account on the site. Once they are registered, they have the role of "solution provider", which means they can create solutions (=user generated content), comment on other users' solutions and create an uptake story. Another role are "reviewers" - registered users can be "upgraded" to this role by an admin. They can then be invited by an admin to review a draft solution that another user has submitted.

Yes, all of the above. "External users" includes both nonregistered and registered users of the platform. Registration is required to submit user generated content (e.g. Solutions). Solution or Uptake story providers are users of the platform who create user generated content (e.g. Solutions). They are typically practitioners who implement projects in the nature conservation and sustainable development field, and then publish Solution case studies about their projects on PANORAMA. Collaboration partners are other institutions, web resources and initiatives which have similar aims as PANORAMA, and with whom PANORAMA collaborates actively (see also "Collaborators" page on current platform). One key objective of the redesign is to enable interoperability with other priority peer web platforms (i.e. some of the "collaborators").

There is no upper limit to the number of solutions and solution providers/uptake story providers. We currently have close to 900 solution providers. The new platform should cater for at least 3,000 registered solution providers. Side note: The "uptake stories" feature and associated user role of "uptake story provider" is being reconsidered and might not exist on the new platform.

Solution providers are practitioners who implement nature conservation and sustainable development projects. They need to register on the platform and can then create a draft Solution case study. After review, this case study gets published and is visibly linked to the solution provider's user account, i.e. it is published under the solution provider's name. Solution providers can revise or unpublish their solution at any time after it has been published, by logging into their user account.

On the current website, we have profiles for users (external) and site administrators (internal, i.e. staff of any of the PANORAMA partner organizations). This will remain the same on the new platform. A "user" is anyone external who wishes to use the website, whether it is for submitting a solution, uptake story, reviewing a solution, or simply browsing. Administrators are those colleagues administering the backend of the platform - either the entire platform, or just a specific component of it (=a portal/Community).

We mean "appoint" other members, i.e. assign them the role of group owners, with associated rights.

Each draft Solution case study undergoes a review process (quality check) before it is being published on the platform. Currently, the entire solution submission-review-revision-publishing process takes place on the web platform, and the review process has been custom built. For the new platform, we envision the use of an external text collaboration service for this Solution review process.

The feedback form should make use of an external service provider and it should be possible to easily aggregate and evaluate responses.

You can use general guidelines and just adapt them where needed. They don't need to follow PANORAMA branding, since these materials are only meant for internal use (i.e. for all colleagues inside the PANORAMA partnership who work with the platform as administrators), not for external communications.

Apologies, here is the correct link:

https://panorama.solutions/en/explorer/map

This can be discussed and defined in more detail during implementation stage, but we envision e.g. that users can filter the solutions (e.g. by ecoystem) directly on the map. In the current map explorer, the filters are displayed above the actual map.

The maximum available budget is 100,000 CHF.

## see above

This criterion typically forms part of RfPs issued by IUCN for website development projects, but as you note, the weighting relative to other criteria is low. It will contribute to assessing the overall suitability of the vendor to the project, e.g. additional background information on the vendor's capacity, prior experience etc, which does not form part of the proposal, can be assessed from the website.

In order for IUCN to be able to compare different proposals we received, all need to be submitted in the same currency - thus we kindly request you to prepare your proposal in CHF.

The site is built on a CMS, so there are no "web pages". Currently, there is a total of 10.212 Drupal nodes. The

About 10.000 nodes, 2.000 user accounts, 3.000 Taxonomy terms. Keep in mind, that content nodes are often

As the site is build on a Content Management System, the question is rather difficult to answer. Each conter

no. Only migration of existing content. Any new content will be provided by IUCN.

Any member of the public, including interested bidders, can create a user account on the platform. Access to the code can be provided, once the vendor has been selected and contracted (during project implementation stage).

On server side: The current production server implements a classic LAMP stack (Linux, Apache, MySQL, PHP). PHP is currently locked to PHP 7.3 as the site in its current state is not compatible with PHP 8+. There is one feature that uses AWS Lambda - this feature fetches the current Twitter Feed which is shown on the landing page of the portal. The code for this feature is of rather low complexity.

We currently have a feature whereby site administrators can send an email message, via the platform, to all users of the platform, or a subset of users. Users also receive automatic email notifications from the platform, e.g. when a Solution they have submitted has been published. We wish to maintain this feature in a similar manner on the new platform.

Please see section 4.4. of the RfP: Furthermore, "additional services" will be considered but are not part of the evaluation criteria: Details of additional, related services that the Proposer considers would enhance the overall effectiveness of communications in support of the project. Please note that these will not form part of the evaluation of Proposals and will only be used in the final contract negotiations with the selected Proposer.

For REQ-14: S (to clarify: a system for reviewing solutions is "must have" - M, but it might be an option that this is directly integrated into the platform itself, rather than making use of an external service. However, we have a preference for integration of an external service); for REQ-71: M

yes





