Answers to questions filed on or before January 16, 2025

Q1: What is the submission date of the proposal?
A: 23 January 18:00 CET

Q2: Are you willing to set up a call at this stage?
A: No, we are unable to accommodate requests for individual meetings or calls at this stage. Questions can be submitted until 16 January 2025 to patrick.de.regt@atni.org. Answers will be published on our website on an ongoing basis.

Q3: Are agencies outside The Netherlands eligible?
A: Yes, they are. We may ask the agency however to come to the office for deep dive sessions and main milestones discussions or to present their designs to the core team. We consider this to be part of your original cost proposal. We also expect agencies to adhere to our CET time zone and be responsive during our regular working hours (0900 – 1730).

Q4: What is the number of unique visitors to the website?
A: In 2024 we had about 17,500 unique visitors and expect it to grow to 20,000 this year. There are peaks around the launches of our research/Indexes/reports. The most visited page is the Index page.

Q5: Are there any user specific pages other than registration and login?
A: No currently not.

Q6: Do you have any preferred cloud provider?
A: We want our website to be hosted in Europe and follow European regulations around GDPR. Sustainable data centres and ISO27001 for the hosting provider are clearly preferable.

Q7: What Personally Identifiable Information do we collect from the users?
A: We do not collect any personal identifiable information on the website. We work with Creatio and all personal information is stored there.

Q8: Are there any uploads like files and videos part of the scope?
A: Yes.

Q9: What is the typical number of admins operating the platform?
A: Currently we have around 8 to 10 people able to access the CMS. We prefer to work with different roles and authorisations in the future.

Q10: What is the applicable VAT?
A: 21%.

Q11: Does the budget of 85,000 EUR have to include monthly hosting, maintenance and support?
A: No. This should be a separate proposal. We only will consider agencies that offer hosting, maintenance and support as part of a Service Level Agreement.

Q12: Are there any specific compliance, certifications, or other guidelines the selected agency needs to adhere to?
A: If you adhere to ISO27001 and ISO9001 guidelines or are certified that would be considered a plus. As English is our daily language, we expect the agency (and not only the project or account manager) to be able to communicate properly and clearly in English.

Q13: Are there any reference websites you would like us to refer to?
A: No. Apart from our current website which should be the baseline for the proposal.

Q14: What is the timeline for the kick-off?
A: The timeline mentioned in paragraph 9 is leading.

Q15: Investor Portal; can you share more details about the features and functionalities?
A: For more information go to this page. The portal itself consists of a news page, a library and documentation from signed up companies.

Q16: Does the existing site use any version control to manage the codebase?
A: Yes. We will not share this at this point, however.

Q17: Is a WCAG audit part of the proposal and budget?
A: No. The audit it itself is not part of the proposal and budget. The outcome of the audit (recommendations to be implemented, critical fixes) are and need to be part of the proposal. We expect agencies to deliver a website which should already be compliant or close to.

Q18: Is the deadline for delivery on 30 June 2025 also the launch of the website?
A: No. The formal launch is expected sometime before the end of August.

Q19: In the document there is a remark about us having to have full access. Can you explain what you mean?
A: It is our intention to be able to do manage the website ourselves, such as duplicating templates for example, creating Iframes on existing pages etc, and we would like to agree with the agency the boundaries of that because we understand there are limits to that. Key point is that we do not want to have to ask the agency for every change.

Q20: Power BI Integration: what is the approximate volume managed through Power BI?
A: That is difficult to say as we only recently launched what we call the Dashboard through Power BI. What we do know is that the concept of the Dashboard will play an increasingly important role in the way we make our data accessible and therefore we expect the volume to grow.

Q21: Can we access to the current website to properly size the solution?
A: No.

Q22: What is the approximate volume of content to be migrated?
A: Difficult to answer, suggest scrolling through the current website for a better idea.

Q23: Is there any complex or critical content types requiring special attention?
A: Yes, our index page and all previous indexes/reports/publications are critical to us. To an extent we want our historical date to be accessible, but that can take on multiple forms. We expect the agency to advise us in that.

Q24: Can you share the Brand book mentioned in section 12?
A: Contrary to what is stated in the RFP we will not share the Brand book at this point.

Q25: For Power BI integration, should the user interaction tracking include dynamic event logging or focus on basic embedding and session analytics?
A: As we recently launched our Dashboard and do consider this to be an important of the new website we would like to and need to learn how users interact with the Dashboard. We do not expect users having to log in, but we would like to build on how users interact with the Dashboard to gain a better understanding of how we can improve our setup.

Q26: Are there specific user groups or regions whose accessibility needs should be prioritized in the design?
A: No, the user groups as described in the RFP are the main ones.

Q27: Have there been user complaints or feedback related to accessibility?
A: No, not that we are aware of.

Q28: Can you clarify if certain sections of the current website are prioritized for redesign or decommissioning during migration?
A: Our homepage and Index page (with all previous indexes and reports) is at the core of what we have done. Combined with the Dashboard these are the most important items. Also, as stated in the RFP we strive for more balance in the way our Theory of Change is reflected on the new website.

Q29: Should the new Index page design allow for future expansions, such as additional visualisation tools or enhanced interactivity features?
A: Yes. We expect to publish/launch several indexes/reports every year and our current experience is that we progress in our thinking, and besides that new features might become available which are currently not.

Q30: Are there specific requirements for content preview or filtering options on pages using reusable templates?
A: No. As long as we use the same conventions on every template in order to make it not any more difficult for users. Look for guidance on the current website.

Q31: Should the integration of external systems like Creatio and Power BI include security-specific testing during development?
A: Yes.

Q32: Could you share challenges around SEO that should be addressed in the design?

A: We expect technical on-page SEO to be in line with the latest updates. We also expect that the website (mobile and desktop) to score above average on both SEO and performance when running it for example through SEMrush or Google Page Speed insights.

Q33: Should training for staff emphasizes more advanced topics, such as managing APIs or handling Power BI customizations, beyond standard CMS operations?
A: That is not required for Power BI as we do have a lot of inhouse knowledge. Might be for managing APIs.

Q34: Should post-launch maintenance include periodic enhancements to the Power BI integration or new functionality requests?
A: Power BI integration is out of scope. New functionality requests after launch, if needed, will have to be estimated and invoiced separately.

Q35: Are there specific dependencies or risks that might impact the proposed timeline?
A: Nothing that we currently are aware of.

Q36: Do you foresee the Investor Portal needing additional features post-launch?
A: We do not expect that.

Q37: Should the portal support MFA?
A: No.

Q38: Should the hosting environment support disaster recovery measures like automatic failovers?
A: Apart from daily backups we do not see such a requirement yet. It might become a request soon though.

Q39: Are there any specific stakeholders beyond the core team who will need access for approvals or input?
A: Beyond the core team, management will have to be involved in key decisions.

Q40: Can you provide more details on how Power BI and Creatio need to integrate?
A: Look for guidance to the current website.

Q41: Can you elaborate on how your current content editors interact with the CMS, and what specific pain points in the workflow you'd like addressed in the new permission structure?
A: The current CMS doesn’t have a permission structure. A basic structure will suffice (admin, editor, contributor). Apart from content, some editors may use HTML of CSS for advanced formatting. Concurrent use before the launch of new indexes or reports is also required and shouldn’t cause any problems. The desired permission structure has a streamlined workflow with automated notifications and improved collaboration features. When preparing for a launch multiple researchers will be adding content simultaneously.

Q42: Do you have an existing SEO strategy and keyword targeting plan?
A: No. We will create one parallel to the development of the new website.

Q43: Can you signpost to the CRMs API documentation?
A: Creatio API

Q44: Could you clarify if the external audit has already been done or if it should be completed before and/or after the new website is built?
A: See also A17. The audit hasn't been done and might be considered by us before the launch of the new website. Any potential issues that might arise from this audit need to be fixed as part of this proposal.

Q45: SEO: what is expected under these criteria?
A: See A32 and the RFP document.

Q46: Could you please confirm that the Lakehouse through Power BI is an embed/iFrame only? And to what extent does the new site need to communicate with the Lakehouse?
A: See also A20 / A25. The Lakehouse is considered to become increasingly important for our strategy. We expect the agency to advise us on a robust solution going forward.

Q47: Could development happen on the existing site as to avoid data migrations etc instead of creating a site from the ground up?
A: The current CMS is about 7 years old and all the templates were updated as part of a brand refresh in November 2024 and led to some issues with certain older index pages. We believe a new site from the ground up is needed now for the next 5 years.

Q48: In the Q&A document there is a mention of Power BI integration to track user interaction with your "Dashboard". Could you clarify more on that?
A: See the RFP document for more background.
]
Q49: Data Integration: Are there any specific challenges or limitations with the current Lakehouse and Power BI integration implementation that you'd like addressed in the new website?
A: With the current way (through an iFrame) we are unable to track and measure how the user interacts with our Dashboard. We expect the agency to provide a workable solution for this, taking into account the central role the Dashboard will play in our new website.

Q50: Content Migration: Approximately how many pages and what volume of content will need to be migrated from the current website? Are there any specific content types or formats that require special attention during migration.
A: How many pages or volume of content is hard to say. The RFP provides some background though. For us the most important aspect of migration is how we can ensure (some form of) access to previous indexes/reports/publications, there is no need to rebuild these as stated in the RFP, but we must think about the alternatives.

Q51: Content Updates: How frequently do you anticipate updating content on the website? Are there any specific sections that require more frequent updates?
A: Most pages are basic text driven (post/content) templates and apart from regularly (once/twice a week) publishing news, articles, blogs etc., we are a project driven organization and before the launch of a new report/index/publication (6-8 times a year), new content will be

added. We would like to be able to compose new pages ourselves with template files/blocks or a WYSIWYG editor for example.

Q51: Alternative CMS consideration: While your RFP specifies WordPress or Drupal, we're curious if you would be open to considering alternative CMS options that might better suit your needs?
A: No.

Q52: Do you need multilingual support on the site? If so, how many languages are required?
A: No

Q53: Can you please tell us more about what features and types of data are currently available or need to be implemented for behind the login (Investor Portal) for a basic rebuild?
A: See also A15. Adding: updating and downloading company information, reports

Q54: Can a test user login be provided for review of the portal?
A: No, not at this time**.**

Q55: For the CRM integration (Creatio), what types of data will need to be synced between the website and the CRM?
A: See A7.

Q56: Are there other third-party services or databases beyond Power BI and CRM that need integration?
A: No.

Q57: How many user roles and permission levels are required, and what specific actions should each role be able to perform?
A: See A41.

Q58: What specific content and functionalities should be accessible only behind the login on the Investor Portal?
A: See A15, A53.

Q59: Is Single Sign-On (SSO) required for user authentication in the investor portal**?**
A: No.