

**Addendum #1**  
**P2026-06-01**

*Website Redesign, Development, and Implementation*  
**Algoma Public Health (APH)**

This Addendum is in response to enquiries received from potential Proponents. This Addendum constitutes clarification to the specifications as sent out in the original RFP. The clarification listed in this Addendum will be considered as official and should be included in your quotation with this in mind.

Please acknowledge your receipt of this Addendum by attaching a signed copy of the Addendum with your proposal response.

Received and acknowledged by: \_\_\_\_\_

-----

**Questions:**

**Q:** Could you clarify the division of responsibilities for content migration? Specifically, what tasks does APH expect the proponent to perform (e.g., migrating content into the new CMS, restructuring or rewriting content) versus what APH staff will handle?

**A:** APH expects the successful proponent to provide a recommended migration approach, including methodology, tools, and implementation support. APH staff will lead content review, approval, and subject-matter validation. Proponents should assume a collaborative approach in which the vendor supports migration execution while APH retains final content decisions.

**Q:** Approximately how many PDF documents currently exist on the site, and does APH want the proponent to convert priority PDFs into web-native content as part of this project?

**A:** APH has not provided a final count of PDF documents at this time. Proponents should assume a significant volume of legacy PDF content may require review during discovery. APH will identify priority documents for retention or conversion, including any content that should be transitioned to accessible web-native formats as part of a phased migration approach.

**Q:** Is the French site expected to be a full mirror of the English site structure, or a defined subset of priority pages?

**A:** The French site is not expected to be a full mirror or a defined subset of priority pages at this stage. APH is interested in solutions that support French-language access, including third-party translation tools or widgets, and welcomes recommendations on an appropriate approach through discovery.

**Q:** The RFP references a refreshed brand direction. Does APH have an existing brand guide, colour palette, and typography for the proponent to work from?

**A:** Yes. APH's ongoing brand refresh is expected to provide a brand guide, colour palette, and typography for the successful proponent to work from. These materials are anticipated to be available by the time website design and development are underway.

**Q:** Could you provide a list of the third-party platforms and tools that require integration with the new website?

**A:**

- a. Google Maps
- b. Microsoft Power BI
- c. Instagram
- d. Facebook
- e. Verto Engage
- f. Translation App (i.e. Reachdeck, Google Translation)

**Q:** Is the stated budget of \$80,000 inclusive or exclusive of HST?

**A:** It is exclusive of HST.

**Q:** What duration and scope of post-launch support does APH require?

**A:** Proponents should include post-launch support and maintenance options in their proposal. This may include bug fixes, security updates, accessibility monitoring, CMS support, and minor enhancements. APH has not defined a required duration;

proponents may propose a standard support period and identify any optional ongoing maintenance services separately.

**Q:** Could you please provide additional details regarding the specific third-party systems that are to be integrated with the new Algoma Public Health website, as well as the anticipated functionality through integration?

**A:**

- a. Google Maps – Purpose: Landmarking/Wayfinding
- b. Microsoft PowerBI – Purpose: Data Display in Realtime
- c. Instagram/Facebook - Purpose: Display latest posts/reels
- d. Verto Engage – Purpose: Appointment Booking
- e. Translation Application – Purpose: Translation of webpages

### **Content Inventory & Migration Scope**

**Q:** Provide the approximate total volume of content in scope

**A:** A final content inventory has not been completed. Discovery activities will include inventory validation and migration planning across pages, PDF documents, forms, news/posts, and media assets.

**Q:** Specify the volume of PDF documents and required treatment, including how many must be:

**A:** APH has not established final counts for PDF treatment at this time. Proponents should assume that some high-priority PDFs may be converted to accessible HTML or recreated in accessible web-native formats, while others may be retained as PDFs. Final decisions and volumes will be confirmed during discovery.

*Confirm the division of responsibility for content migration, including:*

**Q:** Which content types (pages, PDFs, forms, media, posts) are to be migrated by the proponent versus APH?

**A:** APH expects a collaborative migration approach. The successful proponent should provide the migration methodology, tools, and implementation support, while APH staff will lead content review, approval, and subject-matter validation. Final allocation of effort by content type will be refined during discovery and migration planning.

**Q:** Whether automated migration tools are permitted or expected?

**A:** Yes, automated migration tools are permitted during content migration

*Specify the required level of effort for migrated content, including whether proponents should assume:*

**Q:** Straight migration (no changes)?

**A:** It will not be a straight migration – content cleanup will be done by APH during time of migration. It will be done concurrently with proponent in a phased approach.

**Q:** Accessibility and/or plain-language remediation?

**A:** Priority will be on accessibility, plain-language remediation will be handled by APH.

**Q:** Content restructuring, consolidation, or re-authoring?

**A:** Will be handled exclusively by APH

**Q:** In addition, identify any content types or sections requiring more than basic migration.

**A:**

### **Hosting, Infrastructure & Environments**

**Q:** Identify how hosting (CMS and infrastructure) will be delivered: *(answer is bolded)*

- a. Provided and funded directly by APH
- b. Provided and managed by the proponent**
- c. Delivered via a third-party provider

**Q:** Where a third-party hosting provider is involved, indicate whether:

- a. APH will contract and pay the provider directly, or

b. The proponent is expected to procure, contract, and manage the service

**A:** APH will host the website.

**Q:** Where hosting is provided by the proponent (directly or via third party), specify: what is your annual hosting budget?

**A:** Not applicable – APH will host the website

### **Integrations & Third-Party Dependencies**

**Q:** Provide a complete list of required third-party integrations, including any known platforms.

**A:**

- a) Google Maps
- b) Microsoft Power BI
- c) Instagram
- d) Facebook
- e) Verto Engage
- e) Translation App (i.e. Reachdeck, Google Translation)

**Q:** Confirm whether integration implementation, licensing, and associated costs are:

- a) Included within the proponent’s scope and budget
- b) Procured and managed directly by APH or another third party

**A:** Proponents should identify any integration, implementation, licensing, and associated costs in their proposals. Where third-party licenses or services are recommended, APH will determine during evaluation and contracting whether they will be procured directly by APH or managed through the proponent.

### **CMS & Page Builder Requirements**

**Q:** Please clarify expectations regarding page authoring tools within the CMS, including whether a visual page builder is required for non-technical staff, any specific capabilities staff wish to have (e.g., drag and drop layouts or reusable blocks), and any CMS or page builder constraints that must or must not be used.

**A:** Templates or a visual page builder is preferred. Expectations regarding page authoring tools within the CMS include:

- a) Progressive approval process with multiple levels of authority
  - a. Level 1: Writer
  - b. Level 2: Writer, Editor
  - c. Level 3: Writer, Editor, Administrator
- b) Drag & drop layouts with predesigned templates are preferred
- c) WYSIWIG editor is preferred for inputting copy
- d) Allow for inserting of macros (i.e. drop-downs, tables, tabs, forms, search bars, content carousel)
- e) Ability to sort, move, or copy content pages
- f) Ability to seamlessly make pages restricted to the public (i.e. hidden pages)
- g) Ability to receive real-time notifications when content has been edited
- h) Set editing schedule with notifications

### **Bilingual Content & Translation**

**Q:** Identify any existing French-language content available for reuse, including draft, partial, or external materials, and provide the approximate volume (e.g., number of pages or percentage of total content).

**A:** APH has not identified an existing volume of French-language content for reuse at this time. Proponents should assume bilingual readiness is required and may recommend an appropriate approach to French-language support through discovery.

**Q:** Specify the total volume of content required in French at launch, including any priority sections.

**A:** APH has not defined the total volume of French content required at launch. Proponents should assume the solution must support bilingual functionality and may recommend a phased or scalable approach to French-language content delivery through discovery.

**Q:** Please clarify the expected approach for French content delivery, including whether a separate French domain, subdirectory (e.g., /fr), or language toggle within a single domain is required, and whether this structure already exists or must be implemented as part of the project.

**A:** A separate French domain will not be required. A language toggle utilizing a third-party translation app is preferred. This will need to be procured and integrated at

time of development.

**Q:** Confirm how translation will be fulfilled, including whether it will be:

- a. Professionally delivered (human translation)
- b. Completed using software-based or automated tools

**A:** It will be completed using software-based or automated tools, with proponents invited to recommend suitable translation solutions that align with the project requirements.

**Where professional (human) translation is required:**

**Q:** Confirm whether translation will be provided by APH, delivered by the proponent, or fulfilled through a third-party provider

**A:** Not applicable at this stage. APH's current expectation is to use software-based or automated translation tools rather than professional human translation for launch.

**Q:** Where a third-party provider is involved, indicate whether APH will contract and pay the provider directly, or the proponent is expected to procure and manage the service.

**A:** If a third-party translation solution is recommended, proponents should clearly identify any associated licensing or service costs in their proposals. APH will determine procurement arrangements during evaluation and contracting.

**Q:** Where professional (human) translation and the proponent is procuring the services is required, confirm whether associated costs must be included within the \$80,000 project budget or priced separately.

**A:** Not applicable unless a proponent recommends professional translation services as part of its approach. If proposed, those costs should be identified separately in the proposal.

**Accessibility Compliance**

**Q:** Confirm the scope of WCAG 2.2 AA compliance, including whether remediation applies to:

- a. All migrated content
- b. Templates and components only
- c. Newly created content only

**A:** WCAG 2.2 AA compliance is expected for templates, components, navigation, and newly created content. Requirements for remediation of migrated content will be confirmed and prioritized during discovery.

### **Post-Launch Support & Maintenance**

**Q:** Confirm how post-launch support, maintenance, and ongoing operations will be delivered:

- g. Included within the proponent's scope
- h. Managed by APH**
- i. Assigned to a third party

**A:** APH expects proponents to include post-launch support options in their proposals. Ongoing operations will ultimately be managed by APH, with any optional maintenance arrangements to be defined during contracting.

**Q:** What is your annual post-launch support & maintenance budget?

**A:** APH has not set out a yearly budget for ongoing support and maintenance. Proponents are encouraged to describe ongoing support options they offer, what is included and costs associated.

### **Timeline & Budget Clarification**

**Q:** Confirm the expected contract start date and overall project duration, and whether the proposed timeline (August–December 2026) is mandatory or advisory.

**A:** This is addressed in the RFP. Proponents may recommend adjustments with supporting rationale, provided overall project objectives and timelines are maintained.

**Q:** Confirm whether the \$80,000 project budget includes or excludes applicable taxes (HST).

**A:** This does not include HST.

**Q:** The RFP references a project budget of approximately \$80,000. Can APH confirm whether this budget is inclusive or exclusive of applicable taxes (HST)?

**A:** See above.

**Q:** Is the stated budget intended to include all project-related costs, including discovery, design, development, migration, training, launch support, and any software licensing costs?

**A:** Yes.

**Q:** Does APH have a preferred CMS platform or technology stack, or is APH open to recommendations based on functional, accessibility, security, and long-term maintenance requirements?

**A:** APH has not specified a preferred CMS or technology stack and is open to recommendations that meet functional, accessibility, privacy, security, and long-term maintenance requirements.

**Q:** Would APH consider both open-source and commercial CMS solutions provided they meet the requirements outlined in the RFP?

**A:** Preference will be given to open-source solutions.

**Q:** Are there any technology standards, hosting standards, Microsoft ecosystem requirements, or platform restrictions that proponents should consider when

recommending a CMS solution?

**A:** No specific platform restrictions have been identified in the RFP. Proponents should ensure compatibility with APH hosting, security, and integration requirements.

**Q:** What CMS platform currently powers the APH website, and what are the primary challenges APH would like addressed through this project?

**A:** Umbraco is currently being used. Primary challenges include responsiveness, availability of customizable templates, media storage and navigation, search functionality.

**Q:** Approximately how many webpages, PDFs, forms, media assets, and other content items are anticipated to be migrated to the new website?

**A:** A final content inventory has not been completed. Discovery activities will include inventory validation and migration planning.

**Q:** Has APH completed a recent content inventory or content audit that can be shared with proponents?

**A:** APH has not provided analytics, research findings, or audit documentation within the RFP or addendum to date. Relevant materials may be shared during discovery.

**Q:** Does APH anticipate replacing a portion of its existing PDF content with accessible web-based content as part of this initiative?

**A:** Yes. APH anticipates that selected high-priority PDFs may be converted into accessible web content where appropriate.

**Q:** Are there any existing or planned integrations with CRM systems, constituent engagement platforms, email marketing platforms, or marketing automation solutions? If so, please identify the systems involved.

**A:** We do not currently deploy any CRM systems and will not be requiring this solution during the development process.

**Q:** Are there any required integrations with third-party applications such as event management systems, appointment booking platforms, survey tools, GIS/mapping systems, public health databases, or other business systems?

**A:** We will be requiring the following third-party applications:

- a. Google Maps
- b. Microsoft Power BI
- c. Instagram
- d. Facebook
- e. Verto Engage
- f. Translation App (i.e. Reachdeck, Google Translation)

**Q:** Are there any authentication, single sign-on (SSO), or user account management requirements that proponents should consider?

**A:** There will be no additional authentication requirements required by the user. Account management requirements are to be set up as follows:

Level 1: Writer

Level 2: Writer, Editor

Level 3: Writer, Editor, Administrator

**Q:** Does APH have specific requirements related to website search functionality, such as predictive search, faceted search, document search, content tagging, or taxonomy management?

**A:** APH has not defined specific requirements for search, tagging, or taxonomy at this stage. We would like to explore the option of using the 'Search' function as the primary navigation tool, and as such should be robust in its effectiveness. This practice is subject to change based on recommended best practices and an appropriate approach following discovery.

**Q:** Can APH provide any recent website analytics, user research findings, accessibility audits, stakeholder feedback, or usability studies that may assist proponents in understanding current challenges and priorities?

**A:** APH has not completed this work at this stage. The successful proponent is expected to work collaboratively with APH during discovery to identify current challenges, user needs and priorities.

**Q:** Can APH clarify its expectations regarding bilingual content delivery, including whether French-language support is expected across the entire website or limited to priority content and services?

**A:** Proponents can recommend a scalable bilingual approach following discovery and all options will be reviewed. Preferred option at this time would be through use of a third-party application.

**Q:** Is website hosting expected to be included within the scope of this procurement, or will hosting be managed separately by APH?

**A:** Managed separately by APH.

**Q:** Does APH anticipate requiring ongoing website maintenance, support, security updates, accessibility monitoring, and enhancement services following launch? If so, should proponents include these services within their proposal response?

**A:** Yes. Proponents should include post-launch support, maintenance, security updates, accessibility monitoring, and enhancement options in their proposal response, with ongoing service arrangements to be finalized during contracting.

**Q:** Eligibility of U.S. Firms – Could you confirm whether a U.S.-based firm is eligible to apply for this RFP, provided we demonstrate compliance with Ontario’s accessibility and privacy requirements?

- A:** APH will accept submissions from proponents based outside Canada, provided all mandatory RFP requirements are met. APH will evaluate submissions in accordance with the criteria set out in the RFP review compliance as part of the evaluation or contracting process.
- Q:** Accessibility Standards – The RFP requires WCAG 2.2 AA and AODA compliance. Would evidence of ADA accessibility compliance be considered acceptable, or must proposals specifically demonstrate AODA expertise?
- A:** Proposals should demonstrate how the proposed solution will meet WCAG 2.2 AA and applicable Ontario accessibility requirements, including AODA. Experience with ADA accessibility may be considered relevant; however, proponents should show how their approach aligns with Ontario’s legislative and accessibility context.
- Q:** Data Privacy Compliance – The RFP references PHIPA and MFIPPA. For non-Ontario firms, would a commitment to comply with these laws and demonstration of secure handling protocols be sufficient, or is prior Canadian compliance experience required?
- A:** Prior Canadian compliance experience is not expressly required; however, proponents should demonstrate a clear understanding of, and commitment to complying with, applicable Ontario privacy and information-management requirements, including PHIPA and MFIPPA, where relevant to the project scope.
- Q:** Bilingual Content – The RFP requires bilingual readiness (English and French). Should vendors plan to implement bilingual CMS functionality only, or also provide translation/localization services for French content?
- A:** Proponents should assume the website must support bilingual functionality in English and French. At minimum, the proposed solution should support bilingual content management and publishing.
- Q:** Content Migration – The RFP notes APH will review and approve content, while the vendor provides migration recommendations and support. Could you clarify whether vendors are expected to **execute the migration process** or only provide guidance?
- A:** APH expects the successful proponent to provide a recommended migration approach, including methodology, tools, and implementation support. APH staff will lead content

review, approval, and subject-matter validation. Proponents should assume a collaborative approach in which the vendor supports migration execution while APH retains final content decisions.

**Q:** Technical Hosting Environment – Should vendors propose a hosting solution as part of the redesign (e.g., cloud hosting, managed services), or will APH continue to host the website internally and only require CMS implementation?

**A:** APH will host the website. Proponents should focus on CMS implementation and any related technical requirements needed to support APH-hosted deployment.

**Q:** Would like to confirm whether APH accepts proposals from vendors based outside Ontario/Canada. PureLogics LLC is based in New York State, USA, and we have strong experience delivering healthcare, public-sector, accessibility-focused, and content-heavy website projects.

**A:** See above.

Thank you for your interest in Algoma Public Health.