

RFP-CASE-449953 Michigan.org Website Development, Hosting, Maintenance	
Question	Answer
1. The RFP specifies a role-based CMS interface. Does MSF expect the redesigned site to remain on a specific CMS (e.g., Drupal, WordPress, Sitecore), or should vendors propose the platform they believe best supports scalability, accessibility, and long-term sustainability?	Vendors should propose the platform with performance justification
2. The RFP references AI-driven features and Generative Engine Optimization (GEO). Could MSF clarify whether vendors should propose specific AI tools (e.g., personalization engines, LLM-based search tracking), or whether MSF has preferred platforms already identified?	Vendors should propose the tool with performance justification. AI tools need to be recognized and established and include a very detailed description on how the tool is being used, where the data is being stored, is it training a larger AI system or is the data kept separate from all other data and clients.
3. The RFP requires an extranet for DMO and travel industry partners to upload/update properties, events, and packages. Should vendors assume responsibility for building the full extranet system (including photo licensing agreements and API integrations), or will MSF provide an existing framework to extend?	Vendors should assume responsibility with guidance and acceptance
4. The RFP lists integrations with GovDelivery, Salesforce, Tripadvisor, CrowdRiff, and Verint. Should vendors assume responsibility for configuring and maintaining these integrations, or will MSF's internal IT team provide support for certain connections?	MSF will have resources to work with to integrate and maintain integrations
5. The RFP does not specify a budget range. Could MSF provide guidance on anticipated budget parameters or ceiling limits for this project, so vendors can propose solutions that are appropriately scoped and cost-effective?	Dependent upon FY2027 Budget
6. Please advise on whether a target budget range or anticipated annual investment level has been established for this project.	Refer to question 5
7. Is there a projected budget range or anticipated investment level for the initial build and ongoing multi-year engagement?	Refer to question 5
8. Is there a target launch window for the new site, or any preferred milestones bidders should plan around?	Q2 of Calendar Year 2027
9. How does Travel Michigan describe the goal of a "cutting-edge" website, what does that mean most in this context?	First in class regarding new technologies and travel website trends
10. What are the biggest challenges with the current Michigan.org experience that you'd most like to see improved?	Vendor should identify and propose improvements
11. How will Travel Michigan define success for the new platform?	On time and within budget
12. What level of AI-driven functionality are you hoping to see at launch versus phased in over time?	AI is always evolving. The expectation is to have AI features that are helpful to the traveler and to the supporting team.
13. Could you please confirm whether the submission deadline remains the same or if there have been any changes?	Refer to RFP
14. What is the use case(s) for the Agency's desired GovDelivery integration?	The ability to sign up for subscriptions to e-newsletters
15. What is the use case(s) for the Agency's desired Salesforce integration?	Integrate web to object creation. For Example web form on the UX side to create leads or submit reports

16. What is the use case(s) for the Agency's desired Verint integration?	The ability to launch user surveys.
17. Can the MSF share some of the issues you're experiencing with the current website/CMS solution? Where is it falling short? What is your biggest complaint or source of dissatisfaction? What are your main reasons for conducting a competitive procurement at this time?	Vendor should identify and propose improvements
18. Are you planning to rebrand or update your visual identity? Do you have a creative agency of record, and would we be expected to work with them?	Not relevant to RFP
19. How many stakeholders (and from which divisions) will be involved in review/feedback?	Not relevant to RFP
20. What is the expected start date?	Q1 of FY2027
21. What is the expected launch date, and what is driving it (milestones/constraints)?	Q2 of Calendar Year 2027, driven by budget
22. Is there any existing user research that will be made available to the selected vendor?	Not relevant to RFP
23. Is there an expectation to conduct usability testing with actual users (beyond UAT)?	Yes
24. Do you have existing design system assets we're expected to leverage, or is this net new design work based on your brand/style guide?	Please refer to the RFP.
25. Who is responsible for content creation/development—are you looking for content strategy and/or content editing support?	Travel Michigan Staff
26. Do you have an existing brand/design/marketing partner for visual design/content, or are you expecting the selected vendor to provide both (design + implementation)?	incorporate design website to work with existing brand and design
27. For interactive mapping: how many interactive maps are needed, and do you have a platform preference?	Vendors should propose the platform with performance justification
28. Are you expecting personalization (based on interest/activity/location)? If so, is that intended for launch or as a post-launch/phased enhancement?	Vendors can propose the solution
29. For user-generated/social content: what third-party software is providing/managing the UGC aggregation?	Please refer to the RFP.
30. Do you have issues/concerns with your current hosting provider, and what are they?	Not relevant to RFP
31. Who will be responsible for (and procuring) hosting—client or vendor?	Please refer to the RFP.
32. If the vendor is responsible for hosting, what are your expectations for support (e.g., SLAs / response times / escalation coverage)?	We expect the highest level of support/SLA/response/escalation/etc., and it to be in line with industry expectations for a site of this caliber.
33. Do you have an accessibility monitoring/testing tool (e.g., Siteimprove), and will the client provide that license/access during the project?	Please refer to the RFP.
34. How should vendors think about the evaluation balance between visual design/aesthetic and technical implementation (and the importance of tourism-specific portfolio vs adjacent "attractive site" experience)?	Please refer to the RFP.

35. Please confirm the required proposal validity period: the Reminder references 90 days, while Section III-B states at least 180 days from April 3, 2026. Which is correct?	Both references should indicate 180 days; the RFP document has been updated.
36. How will you measure the WCAG score (tool/method), and does third-party/embed/API/UGC content count against that score?	Vendors should propose the solution
37. Is the chosen vendor responsible for SEO/rank/traffic preservation after launch, and do you have specific acceptance KPIs and an evaluation/monitoring period?	Vendors should propose the solution but will also be a dual effort.
38. Are there baseline KPIs or performance benchmarks the selected vendor will be expected to improve upon?	Not relevant to RFP
39. Do you have explicit performance targets (Core Web Vitals, Lighthouse, TTFB) tied to acceptance and/or ongoing maintenance?	Vendors should propose the solution
40. Can you share your severity definitions plus required response and resolution times, and confirm whether after-hours / 24-7 coverage is expected?	24-7, 365 expectation
41. When you say "AI-driven features" and "tracking traffic from AI overviews / LLM references," what does success look like and what reporting do you expect (sources, cadence, metrics)?	Vendors should propose the solution
42. Roughly how many partner accounts/properties/events do you expect in the extranet, and who owns partner training/support and data quality governance?	Minimum of :16,000 Accounts, 11,000 Properties, 5,000 Current Events. Training and Data Quality would be dual effort with vendor.
43. Will you provide current integration details (data models, API/feed specs, vendor contacts) for Salesforce, GovDelivery, Verint, CrowdRiff, and Tripadvisor, and are there constraints the chosen vendor must inherit?	Yes integration will be a dual effort with vendor.
44. How do you want scope changes and year-over-year enhancements handled—should the chosen vendor assume a separate enhancement budget, or are those expected to be included in the base contract?	Contingent on the budget YoY
45. What are your expectations for transition/handoff at the end of the contract (documentation, operational runbooks, continuity/escrow requirements, etc.)?	Not relevant to RFP
46. What are the KPIs post-launch for the new website? Immediately and 1-2 years post launch?	Not relevant to RFP
47. What pain points exist on the current site?	Not relevant to RFP

48. Who will make the final decisions regarding the website architecture, wireframes, design, etc?	Not relevant to RFP
49. 'Resumes of qualifications should be supplied for proposed project personnel.' Are you looking for traditional resumes for each of these team members?	Refer to RFP
50. Where should the bidder signature be located on the technical proposal?	Not relevant to RFP
51. What are the primary and secondary conversion events the MSF expects the site to track (e.g., partner referrals, newsletter sign-ups, itinerary saves, downloads)?	Vendors should propose the solution but will also be a dual effort.
52. Are there specific requirements for outbound link tracking, cross-domain tracking, or attribution modeling to quantify traffic and value delivered to partner websites?	Vendors should propose the solution but will also be a dual effort.
53. Will the selected vendor be responsible solely for technical implementation of analytics, or also for ongoing reporting and performance analysis?	Vendors should propose the solution but will also be a dual effort.
54. Are there plans for first-party data capture or CRM activation (e.g., Salesforce integration beyond lead collection)?	Not relevant to RFP
55. What primary business outcomes define success for the new platform (visitor volume to Michigan, partner referrals, trip planning actions, newsletter signups)?	Vendors should propose the solution but will also be a dual effort.
56. What are the most important improvements you hope to see compared to the current michigan.org?	Not relevant to RFP
57. Should the proposal assume a complete rebuild of michigan.org and the partner extranet?	Refer to RFP
58. Is migration of all existing content required, or will some content be archived or retired?	Not relevant to RFP
59. Does the MSF/MDEC anticipate a redesign or brand evolution, or must the site strictly adhere to the existing brand system?	Refer to RFP
60. Is UX research (user testing, stakeholder workshops, journey mapping, etc.) expected within scope?	Vendors should propose the solution but will also be a dual effort.
61. Does MSF/MDEC require assistance with content entry, image sourcing, or content production?	Vendors should propose the solution but will also be a dual effort.
62. Will MSF/MDEC provide copywriting and editorial resources, or should vendors include them?	Not relevant to RFP

63. For the site design system, are there existing brand guidelines in place that we need to implement? Is there room to change or evolve the brand through this site redesign by adding or changing colors, type, etc?	Refer to RFP
64. Is there an existing library of content modules used on the site? If so, how many, and do they currently meet your needs or are there large functionality gaps?	Not relevant to RFP
65. How many partners actively update content in the current extranet?	Not relevant to RFP
66. How frequently is partner content updated?	Not relevant to RFP
67. Will existing partner accounts and credentials need to be migrated?	Yes
68. Are there data governance policies for partner-submitted content (approval workflows, moderation, verification)?	Yes
69. Who owns content moderation, MSF/MDEC or the vendor?	Travel Michigan
70. What licensing or rights management rules apply to partner-submitted media?	Not relevant to RFP
71. Which external partner systems currently provide data feeds?	Not relevant to RFP
72. What functionality is currently integrated with:	
1. Salesforce	Vendors should propose the solution but will also be a dual effort.
2. CrowdRiff	Vendors should propose the solution but will also be a dual effort.
3. Tripadvisor	Vendors should propose the solution but will also be a dual effort.
4. GovDelivery	Vendors should propose the solution but will also be a dual effort.
5. Verint	Vendors should propose the solution but will also be a dual effort.
73. Are APIs documented and available for each integration?	Yes
74. Which system is the system-of-record for partner data?	Extranet
75. Are there rate limits, licensing costs, or vendor contracts that impact implementation?	Not relevant to RFP
76. Are real-time updates required, or is scheduled synchronization acceptable?	Both, depending on content
77. What are the current baseline KPIs (traffic, engagement rate, time on site, scroll depth, assisted conversions, referrals to DMOs, etc.)?	Not relevant to RFP
78. How are referrals to partner DMOs tracked today?	Not relevant to RFP
79. Are any AI-driven features currently envisioned (recommendations, trip planning, chatbot, personalization, content generation)?	Refer to RFP
80. Is personalization expected to use first-party behavioral data?	No
81. What tools are currently used (if any) to track LLM referrals?	None
82. Are there privacy or governance policies regarding AI or personalization usage?	Yes
83. Can or should personalization require authenticated user accounts?	No
84. Is automated content generation acceptable or restricted? If acceptable, is moderation required?	Not acceptable
85. Is a government/public sector cloud required? Does MSF/MDEC prefer a cloud provider (AWS, Azure, GCP), vendor-managed hosting, or a combination?	Refer to RFP
86. Are there State of Michigan security, compliance, or procurement hosting and infrastructure standards? If so, what are they?	Not relevant to RFP
87. Is FedRAMP, StateRamp, SOC2, or similar certification required? If so, which ones?	Not relevant to RFP

88. What search platform is currently used?	Not relevant to RFP
89. Are there known pain points with the existing search experience?	Not relevant to RFP
90. Should search results prioritize editorial content, listings, or partner content?	Not relevant to RFP
91. Is personalization expected in search (based on behavior, geography, season)?	Refer to RFP
92. Are there requirements for faceted filtering beyond activity/location/season?	Yes
93. Will the incumbent vendor assist with transition and data export/migration?	Not relevant to RFP
94. Are there contractual constraints with any current vendors that impact the incumbent vendor's ability to implement?	Not relevant to RFP
95. Will MSF/MDEC provide access to documentation and architecture diagrams?	Not relevant to RFP
96. Are there existing traveler personas that must be used? Or will these need to be defined?	Not relevant to RFP
97. Will the vendor have access to prior research studies, usability testing, and brand research?	Not relevant to RFP
98. Is new primary research (usability testing, surveys, interviews) expected as part of this engagement?	Yes
99. Are accessibility audits from the current site available?	Not relevant to RFP
100. Will the selected vendor have full administrative access to existing analytics platforms (e.g., GA4, GTM, Search Console, Looker Studio, Salesforce reports, Verint, etc.)?	Not relevant to RFP
101. What accessibility validation process will be used to confirm WCAG 2.1 AA compliance?	Refer to Question 36
102. Beyond Google Analytics, are additional analytics tools required?	Refer to RFP
103. Are there existing dashboard standards that must be maintained?	Vendors should propose the solution but will also be a dual effort.
104. Is screen-reader testing required using specific assistive technologies?	Refer to RFP
105. Is ongoing accessibility monitoring required post-launch?	Not relevant to RFP
106. What internal team will manage day-to-day content updates?	Travel Michigan
107. What training level is expected for staff and partners?	Vendors should propose the solution but will also be a dual effort.
108. Is there a ticket-based support expectation (hours, SLAs)?	Not relevant to RFP
109. Will MSF/MDEC require on-call support during peak tourism seasons?	24-7, 365 expectation
110. Should vendors structure pricing as implementation and operations, or as a single annual service?	Refer to RFP
111. Are there not-to-exceed expectations for hosting or licensing costs?	Vendors should propose the solution
112. Beyond the five named integrations, can you confirm whether there are additional third-party systems, APIs, data feeds, or custom integrations connected to michigan.org today that must be maintained or rebuilt?	Not relevant to RFP
113. Can you confirm whether any additional integration requirements are expected during the contract term, including vendor changes or new platform partnerships?	Not relevant to RFP
114. With a contract start date of October 1, 2026, what go-live date does Travel Michigan expect for the new michigan.org?	Q2 of Calendar Year 2027
115. Can you confirm whether the incumbent website vendor will be required to support transition activities, including access to repositories, databases, documentation, and hosting credentials?	Not relevant to RFP

116. Approximately how many DMO and travel industry partners currently have active extranet accounts?	refer to question 42
117. What is the typical monthly volume of partner submissions by content type, including listings, events, deals, and packages?	Not relevant to RFP
118. How would you describe the general technical proficiency of extranet users and what are the most common pain points Travel Michigan wants to solve in the new platform?	Not relevant to RFP
119. How responsive are partners today in keeping listings and events current and are there enforcement or quality-control processes in place?	Not relevant to RFP
120. For partner API feeds, approximately how many partners currently provide data via API and what formats or standards are in use?	Not relevant to RFP
121. Are there partners who want to provide API feeds but cannot today due to technical constraints, staffing, or data quality?	Not relevant to RFP
122. For partner photo and video licensing, please describe the licensing agreement workflow you need supported, including whether it is a single terms acceptance, multiple license types, an approval workflow, or retroactive tracking for existing assets.	Vendors should propose the solution but will also be a dual effort.
123. Will the selected vendor be responsible for creating original editorial content, or will content creation remain with Travel Michigan or a separate content partner?	Vendors should propose the solution but will also be a dual effort.
124. If the selected vendor will create content, what volume and cadence do you anticipate by content type, such as blogs, guides, and seasonal features?	Refer to question 62
125. Who will own the editorial calendar and content governance after launch, including prioritization, approvals, and updates?	Not relevant to RFP
126. Who will own analytics administration and reporting, including GA configuration, goals, and dashboards?	Refer to RFP
127. Who will own cross-channel coordination for web content amplification, including PR and organic social?	Not relevant to RFP
128. Does your team have any preferences or constraints related to CMS platform selection, including support for Drupal, WordPress, or other systems?	Vendor should propose solution.
129. Are there current or planned Pure Michigan brand updates, campaign shifts, or related brand workstreams that the website team must align with during the build timeline?	Not relevant to RFP
130. What are the top five challenges the current website fails to solve today?	Not relevant to RFP
131. Beyond increased engagement, what specific KPI would make this project an undisputed success?	Not relevant to RFP
132. How do you currently measure visitor satisfaction, and what is the target score or improvement you are looking for?	Not relevant to RFP
133. The RFP mentions storytelling format for results; are you looking for a long-form editorial feel or a snackable, social-media-style layout?	Vendors should propose the solution but will also be a dual effort.
134. Will the interactive mapping need to integrate real-time data like weather, road closures, or trail conditions (e.g., for the snow tracker)?	Vendors should propose the solution
135. Does the MEDC have a preference for how AI-driven personalization is presented (e.g., a conversational chatbot)?	Vendors should propose the solution

136. What is the biggest complaint you currently receive from DMO and travel industry partners regarding the current "extranet" or upload process?	Not relevant to RFP
137. Regarding the "blog/editorial content," what is your typical weekly volume of new content?	Not relevant to RFP
138. Do you require the CMS to support automated content expiration or archiving for seasonal events (e.g., "Fall Color Map")?	Yes
139. For GEO best practices, is the priority appearing in Google's AI Overviews, or are you looking for integration with voice assistants (Siri/Alexa)?	Vendors should propose the solution
140. Does the CrowdRiff integration need to allow users to upload photos directly to the website, or just pull from existing social feeds?	Not relevant to RFP
141. Regarding Verint, are you looking for deeper integration than just a feedback popup (e.g., mapping survey data to specific user journeys)?	Not relevant to RFP
142. What are the must-have features for the MVP (Minimum Viable Product) versus features that can be rolled out in year two or three?	Refer to RFP
143. Who are the primary internal stakeholders (marketing, IT, executive leadership) who will be part of the final approval committee?	Not relevant to RFP
144. Are there any specific "Pure Michigan" brand guidelines for digital interactions (e.g., motion/ animation styles) that we must adhere to?	Yes
145. What is your expectation for the frequency of "Project Control" meetings during the design phase versus the development phase?	Not relevant to RFP
146. Does the MEDC have an internal team that will handle SEO/GEO copy, or is the vendor expected to provide full-service content optimization?	Vendors should propose the solution but will also be a dual effort.
147. While the RFP mentions the MSF expects to add supplemental funding each year, does the MEDC have a designated Not-to-Exceed (NTE) amount or a specific budget range for the initial development phase?	No.
148. The RFP requires a "user-friendly CMS" but does not specify a platform. Does the MSF have a preference for Open Source (e.g., Drupal, WordPress)?	Vendors should propose the solution
149. Are there existing databases or legacy systems not mentioned in the list (GovDelivery, Salesforce, etc.) that the new site must interface with?	Refer to RFP
150. For the "Complete Hosting Solution", is there a preferred cloud provider (e.g., AWS, Azure) to align with existing State of Michigan IT standards?	Vendors should propose the solution
151. To accurately estimate the "Database Management" and "Migration" effort, can the MSF provide the current volume of content (number of pages, media assets, and blog posts) on the existing michigan.org?	Minimum of 15,000 pages with incorporated media assets.
152. Does the MSF expect the vendor to perform a full manual content migration, or will the Travel Michigan team handle content entry into the new CMS?	Not relevant to RFP
153. The site targets "international travelers". Is multi-language support (translation and localization) required as a functional deliverable?	Not relevant to RFP
154. Can the MSF provide an estimated annual budget range or not-to-exceed amount for this engagement to help bidders scope their proposals appropriately?	No

155. Is the MSF envisioning a full website redesign and rebuild for Year 1, or an evolution/enhancement of the current michigan.org platform? If a rebuild, does the MSF have a preferred timeline for launch of the new site within the contract period?	Refer to RFP
156. Does the MSF have a preference or requirement for the CMS platform to be used going forward? Are you happy with your existing CMS and platform today?	Refer to question 148
157. Does the current contract include any existing technology licenses, third-party subscriptions, or hosting infrastructure that will transfer to the selected vendor, or is the selected vendor expected to procure all technology and services independently?	Not relevant to RFP
158. Is content migration from the current michigan.org included in the Year 1 scope of work? If so, can the MSF provide an approximate volume of content (pages, listings, media assets) that would need to be migrated?	Yes and refer to question 151
159. Can the MSF provide approximate current traffic volumes for michigan.org (monthly unique visitors, peak seasonal traffic) to help bidders appropriately size their hosting and infrastructure proposals?	Not relevant to RFP
160. Are there specific hosting requirements regarding data residency (e.g., U.S.-based data centers) or cloud platform preferences (e.g., AWS, Azure, GCP)?	US Based Data Center
161. For the extranet referenced in Objective 10 (DMO and travel industry partner portal), can the MSF provide the approximate number of active partner accounts currently using the system and the expected volume of listings, events, and packages managed through it?	Refer to question 42
162. Regarding the integrations listed in Section D-16 (GovDelivery, Salesforce, Tripadvisor, CrowdRiff, Verint), are these existing integrations that must be maintained, or are some of these new integrations the selected vendor would be expected to implement?	Refer to RFP
163. Does the MSF have existing Salesforce licenses/instances that the website must integrate with, or is the Salesforce integration for a new implementation?	Existing Salesforce integration
164. Are you using a third-party solution for mapping? What about on demand integrations based on tourist questions that could lead to dynamically generated pages by market segment?	Vendors should propose the solution
165. The RFP mentioned seasonality. What have you done in the past to reflect the change in seasons? Would you like to automate this seasonal design & content?	Vendors should propose the solution
166. What are the key segments that Michigan targets? You mentioned three tourist categories: those inside Michigan, those outside Michigan but inside the USA and international tourists. Do you have additional segments based on lifestage (retirees, families, young adults, business traveller, budget/fixed income, multigenerational?), passions (nature, sport, shopping, food, history, automotive, festivals, etc), you also brought up accessibility - do you have a specific targets with special needs?	Refer to question 96
167. Is there any new campaign for Pure Michigan that the website needs to support/reflect?	Refer to RFP
168. The RFP states that bidders should have "extensive knowledge of the Michigan tourism product." Can the MSF clarify whether this refers to pre-existing familiarity, or whether demonstrated ability to rapidly acquire destination-specific knowledge through research, data analysis, and stakeholder engagement would also satisfy this requirement?	Refer to RFP

<p>169. The RFP emphasizes GEO best practices and tracking traffic from AI overviews and LLM-generated search results. Beyond Google Analytics integration, is MEDC open to implementing specialized tools for monitoring AI citations and measuring referral attribution from platforms like ChatGPT, Google AI Overviews, and similar generative search engines?</p>	<p>Refer question 139</p>
<p>170. For the four-season content experience, should the system automatically personalize content based on visitor location and time of year, while also providing users with a manual toggle to explore other seasons—or is a different interaction model preferred?</p>	<p>Vendors should propose the solution</p>
<p>171. Could you share the anticipated scale of the partner extranet in terms of concurrent users and total listings? Additionally, are there existing content taxonomies or data schemas from the current platform that should be preserved?</p>	<p>Refer to question 42</p>
<p>172. The RFP mentions using CrowdRiff content in an "elevated manner." Should this integration include real-time moderation workflows, automated campaign-based curation, and geographic tagging of user-generated content to destination pages?</p>	<p>Not Relevant</p>
<p>173. Given Michigan's diverse geography, including areas with limited connectivity, should the interactive mapping solution support offline functionality for mobile users? Is integration with state GIS datasets from DNR or MDOT expected?</p>	<p>Vendor to provide solution with Integration with GIS- Yes, Trail maps are integrated</p>
<p>174. What availability and disaster recovery targets should we architect for? Understanding the expected uptime SLA and acceptable recovery time objectives will help us design the appropriate infrastructure.</p>	<p>Refer to question 40</p>
<p>175. For the AI-driven personalization features, should the solution deliver distinctly tailored experiences for in-state residents, out-of-state domestic visitors, and international travelers—including multilingual content where appropriate?</p>	<p>Vendors should propose the solution</p>