

## **Notice to Prospective Suppliers**

### **Government Common Web Services Project**

Issued by the Department of Internal Affairs

15 September 2011

Ref: DIA/2011/ICT008

# Contents

1.	<b>Background</b> .....	<b>3</b>
2.	<b>Purpose</b> .....	<b>3</b>
3.	<b>Key Milestones</b> .....	<b>4</b>
4.	<b>Notice Reference Number</b> .....	<b>4</b>
5.	<b>Notice Point of Contact</b> .....	<b>4</b>
6.	<b>Clarification Period</b> .....	<b>4</b>
7.	<b>Briefing on Project</b> .....	<b>5</b>
8.	<b>Submission of Responses</b> .....	<b>5</b>
9.	<b>Workshops</b> .....	<b>5</b>
10.	<b>Notice Terms</b> .....	<b>5</b>
	<b>Schedule 1: Service Vision</b> .....	<b>8</b>
	<b>Schedule 2: High-level Requirements</b> .....	<b>11</b>
	<b>Schedule 3: CWS Scenarios</b> .....	<b>12</b>
	<b>Schedule 4: Response prompts</b> .....	<b>16</b>

# 1. Background

- 1.1 *Directions and Priorities for Government ICT* defines a change of focus toward shared approaches and shared solutions for government investment in ICT. Priority 3.2 of *Directions and Priorities for Government ICT* highlights the need to improve the management and content of government's web presence and Priority 4.1 highlights the need to rationalise investment, procurement and delivery of ICT infrastructure and software.
- 1.2 In July 2011, as part of implementing *Directions and Priorities for Government ICT*, the ICT Strategy Group chief executives approved the *Rethink Online* strategy to guide government use of and investment in online channels.<sup>1</sup> The strategy identifies shared web technology as a key strategic intervention that would allow government agencies to redirect limited resources away from maintaining web platforms toward improving information and services. The practical implementation of this policy is signalled on the *Government ICT Roadmap* as 'Reusable Web Services' (also referred to as Web Services or Common Web Services).<sup>2</sup>

# 2. Purpose

- 2.1 The Department of Internal Affairs (**DIA**) and a number of other agencies are collaborating on common approaches to web services, or Common Web Services (**CWS**). DIA is the lead agency.
- 2.2 The goal of CWS is to reduce duplication of effort and streamline procurement by allowing agencies to cluster around a small number of web publishing platforms or content management systems, possibly accompanied by panel procurement arrangements. The service vision for CWS is explained in more detail in Schedule 1. Through this Notice to Prospective Suppliers (the **Notice**) we are asking you (the prospective suppliers) to contribute to our requirements gathering process. DIA's preliminary high-level requirements are set out in Schedule 2.
- 2.3 Currently there is a diverse range of web publishing platforms in use by government agencies. This makes the sharing of knowledge, skills and resources across agencies difficult. CWS, in addition to reducing duplication and streamlining procurement, is intended to enable the formation of a small number of communities of interest around common publishing platforms. This will better support agencies' ability to share skills, resources and technology components within those communities. Some example CWS scenarios are set out in Schedule 3.
- 2.4 This Notice seeks information from prospective suppliers to help the CWS Project to:
- (a) create options for government CWS solutions;
  - (b) understand market capabilities;
  - (c) provide inputs that will help identify whether or not there is a viable business case for government CWS solutions; and
  - (d) inform the construction of a business case, if one is viable.
- 2.5 To avoid any doubt, DIA in issuing this Notice is not undertaking any procurement of goods or services. Responses and their suppliers will not be evaluated. The responses will be used to inform the creation of options for a CWS business case, if viable.
- 2.6 Suppliers who do not respond to this Notice will not be excluded from any subsequent market engagement process, such as a Request for Information (RFI) or a Request for Proposal (RFP).

---

<sup>1</sup> Department of Internal Affairs, 2011, *Rethink Online* ([www.ict.govt.nz/programme/rethink-online/rethink-online-strategy](http://www.ict.govt.nz/programme/rethink-online/rethink-online-strategy)).

<sup>2</sup> Department of Internal Affairs, 2011, *Government ICT Roadmap* ([www.ict.govt.nz/programme/government-ict-roadmap](http://www.ict.govt.nz/programme/government-ict-roadmap)).

- 2.7 A formal RFI or RFP seeking proposals for services in connection with one or more specified CWS solutions may or may not be issued by DIA (or another collaborating agency) after this Notice. A decision will be made following DIA's consideration of responses and other matters.

### 3. Key Milestones

- 3.1 The key milestones for this Notice process are as follows:

Date	Milestone
15 September 2011	<b>Issue Date:</b> Notice released on the Government Electronic Tendering Service (GETS).
15 September 2011	<b>Clarification commences:</b> Clarification Period commences.
10am, 30 September 2011	<b>Clarification ends:</b> Clarification Period ends.
10am, 7 October 2011	<b>Closing Date:</b> Deadline for receipt by DIA of responses to Notice
10am, 20 September 2011	<b>Registration for briefing:</b> Deadline for registration for briefing for prospective suppliers
3.30pm-4.30pm, 22 September 2011	<b>Briefing:</b> A briefing for prospective suppliers will be provided before the responses close.
20 October 2011	<b>Review of responses completed</b>
20 October 2011	<b>Notification for workshops:</b> Prospective suppliers notified timeslots for workshops
21-30 October 2011	<b>Workshops:</b> Workshops with prospective suppliers (if needed)

- 3.2 Please note that these milestones and associated dates are subject to change at the sole discretion of DIA. DIA will notify any changes to these dates that it considers may affect potential Respondents, by notice on GETS.

### 4. Notice Reference Number

- 4.1 The reference for this Notice is: DIA/2011/ICT008.

### 5. Notice Point of Contact

- 5.1 All enquiries regarding this Notice must be in writing and sent by email quoting the Notice reference and directed to Adam Stapleton (the **Point of Contact**) at [ICTtenders@dia.govt.nz](mailto:ICTtenders@dia.govt.nz).
- 5.2 Email communications to the Point of Contact should request confirmation of receipt to ensure that they are received. In the absence of such confirmation of receipt, Respondents should call the Point of Contact on +64-27-671-2485 to ensure receipt.
- 5.3 DIA may change the Point of Contact at any time. DIA will notify all Respondents of any such change by notice on GETS.

### 6. Clarification Period

- 6.1 During the period from the Issue Date to 10am on 30 September 2011 (the **Clarification Period**) Respondents may contact the Point of Contact during business hours to request clarification of any matters regarding this Notice and/or to request additional information. All requests must be in writing and submitted by email. The confirmation procedures set out in paragraph 5.2 should be followed to ensure receipt. DIA does not intend to respond to

requests for clarification or additional information received after the Clarification Period, although it reserves the right to do so.

- 6.2 If DIA considers a request to be of sufficient importance to all Respondents, it may post a copy of the request (anonymised, where required) along with the answer on GETS. All Respondents who are recorded as having downloaded this Notice from GETS will be notified by GETS that there is additional information available in relation to this RFI. Otherwise DIA may respond directly to individual Respondents where it considers it appropriate to do so.

## 7. Briefing on Project

- 7.1 DIA will provide a briefing on the project before the responses close. The briefing will provide an overview of the CWS project followed by a question and answer period.
- 7.2 Registration for the briefing is required. Prospective suppliers must register with the Point of Contact by **10am on 20 September** by email to [ICTtenders@dia.govt.nz](mailto:ICTtenders@dia.govt.nz) with the subject line: "DIA/2011/ICT008: Registration for briefing - Government Common Web Service Project" and include the organisation name and attendee name(s) in the body of the email.

## 8. Submission of Responses

- 8.1 Prospective suppliers are invited to provide responses to the prompts in Schedule 4 of this Notice.
- 8.2 Responses must be supplied in both PDF and Microsoft Word 2003-readable formats.
- 8.3 Prospective suppliers must provide their responses to the Point of Contact by **10am on the Closing Date** in an email to [ICTtenders@dia.govt.nz](mailto:ICTtenders@dia.govt.nz) with the subject line: "DIA/2011/ICT008: Response to Notice to Prospective Suppliers - Government Common Web Service Project".
- 8.4 DIA's Government ICT Supply Management Office will acknowledge receipt of responses within two business days of the Closing Date.
- 8.5 DIA accepts no responsibility for responses delivered to the wrong address or which, for whatever reason, are not received. As such, if you do not receive an acknowledgement of receipt within two business days of the Closing Date, please call the Point of Contact on 027-671-2485 to ensure that your response has been received.

## 9. Workshops

- 9.1 Depending on the number and quality of responses, DIA may invite Respondents that have provided a substantive response to this Notice to participate in workshops, with a view to DIA obtaining a better understanding of information provided in Respondents' written responses. Such workshops may be of a group nature or they may be one-on-one workshops with individual Respondents. A substantive response is one which addresses the prompts set out in Schedule 4.
- 9.2 As noted in the key milestones table at paragraph 3.1 above, if DIA elects to hold workshops, it expects to inform Respondents that have provided a substantive response to this Notice of timeslots for those workshops on or around **20 October 2011**.

## 10. Notice Terms

### 10.1 General

The terms of this Notice process are set out below. The terms are non-negotiable and do not require a response. Each Respondent that submits a response will be deemed to have agreed to these terms without reservation or variation.

## 10.2 **Business as Usual Contacts**

Business as usual communications (relating to the supply of goods and services under existing business arrangements between DIA and a Respondent) will be maintained with the usual contacts.

## 10.3 **Ownership and Intellectual Property**

- (a) Responses to this Notice will become the property of the Crown and will not be returned to the Respondent. Ownership of the intellectual property rights in a response does not pass to DIA but the Respondent grants the Crown and other collaborating government agencies a non-exclusive, irrevocable and royalty-free licence to use, copy and disclose all or part of the response, as well as associated communications and documents, for any purpose related to this Notice.
- (b) All copyright and any other intellectual property rights in this Notice and any other material provided to any Respondent will remain with and belong to DIA and collaborating agencies.

## 10.4 **Public Statements**

- (a) No advertising, press release or other information relating to this Notice shall be published by any Respondent in any newspaper, magazine, journal, website or other medium without DIA' prior written consent.
- (b) Respondents must not make any public statements to any third party in relation to any aspect of this Notice process without the permission of DIA.

## 10.5 **Confidentiality**

- (a) Each Respondent agrees to keep all non-public information provided in connection with this Notice process confidential.
- (b) Each Respondent should identify any parts of its response or other communications that are commercially sensitive by marking them "Commercial in Confidence". Subject to its legal obligations (including under the Official Information Act 1982) and its obligations to Ministers, Cabinet and Parliament, DIA will not provide such commercially sensitive information to any person other than to its staff and advisers or other agencies or their staff and advisers, who are directly involved in developing a CWS solution.
- (c) Nothing in this Notice or subsequent processes will apply to prevent DIA and collaborating agencies from:
  - (i) using information they receive from any Respondent, either in its written response to this Notice or in subsequent workshops, to:
    - A. develop the structure and strategy of, the approach to, and/or the elements of, a CWS solution; or
    - B. develop its requirements for a CWS solution and any business case for such solution; or
  - (ii) disclosing any such structure, strategy, approach or elements, or those requirements or any business case, to:
    - C. the market by way of an RFI or RFP; or
    - D. other government agencies, whether as part of Cabinet consultation procedures or otherwise; or

- E. Cabinet, any Cabinet Committee, any Minister, Parliament or any Parliamentary Select Committee,

provided that, when disclosing any such information to the market, DIA shall anonymise the information to the greatest extent practicable and not disclose either the name of any Respondent or any company-specific financial or other trade secrets provided by any such Respondent.

#### 10.6 **Rights Reserved**

DIA reserves the right to:

- (a) amend or withdraw all or any part of this Notice or associated documents on written notice to Respondents;
- (b) suspend or cancel the Notice process on written notice to Respondents; and
- (c) seek further information from any Respondent or any other organisation which DIA considers relevant or potentially relevant to the CWS project.

#### 10.7 **No Contractual Obligations Created**

No statement in this Notice binds or places DIA under any contractual or other obligation. For the avoidance of doubt, this Notice process does not give rise to a process contract.

#### 10.8 **No Anti-competitive Behaviour**

This Notice process is intended to promote fair opportunity and competition between Respondents. Respondents must not engage in collusive, deceptive or improper conduct in the preparation of their responses or other submissions or in any discussions with DIA.

#### 10.9 **Exclusion of Liability**

DIA does not warrant or guarantee the accuracy of the information contained in this Notice and will not be liable (whether in contract, tort (including negligence) or otherwise) for any cost, damage, expense or loss suffered or incurred by any Respondent, its affiliates or any other person arising directly or indirectly out of information contained in this Notice or the Notice process itself.

#### 10.10 **Governing Law and Jurisdiction**

This Notice will be construed according to and governed by New Zealand law and the Respondent agrees to submit to the exclusive jurisdiction of New Zealand courts in any dispute concerning this Notice or any response.

## Schedule 1: Service Vision

### 1. Introduction

- 1.1 The service vision for Common Web Services (**CWS**) is to commoditise web platform development and support services for informational government websites by providing one or more 'website platform-as-a-service' solutions for use across government.
- 1.2 'Informational government websites' for the purpose of the CWS project are defined as predominantly information-based websites that do not require complex integration with other databases or transactional systems.
- 1.3 It is envisaged that CWS would be fully managed services that could:
- (a) support multiple website instances across multiple government agencies;
  - (b) meet common requirements for functionality;
  - (c) provide guaranteed availability, be security compliant, and comply with other relevant policies and standards (including the New Zealand Government Web Standards).
- 1.4 CWS would start with sufficient functionality to meet high-priority common requirements but may add additional functionality in future releases. See Schedule 2 for proposed high-level requirements and Schedule 3 for scenarios that illustrate the CWS concept from a government agency perspective.
- 1.5 It is envisaged that government agencies would have some choice over functionality and service levels for each of their websites on CWS and that CWS would be priced according to requirements for each website. Government agencies using CWS would retain control over content management for their websites and would have flexibility with regard to design. Government agencies would also have the option to contribute to the CWS feature set by developing new components and designs. The CWS solution will have a simple, intuitive and user friendly user interface to maximise efficiency and reduce the skill set required to use it effectively.
- 1.6 Government agencies would be expected to use CWS for new websites requiring a new platform and when re-platforming existing websites. As for other common ICT capability, government agencies would need to seek an exemption from the ICT Council to opt-out if they have unique requirements which cannot be met by CWS, such as integration with unique government agency business applications, other channels, or other specialist requirements (e.g. complex intranets).
- 1.7 Options for delivering CWS include:
- (a) government designs, builds, and delivers CWS;
  - (b) government purchases CWS from one or more suppliers;
  - (c) government repurposes existing government assets to design, build and deliver CWS.

### 2. Strategic Context

- 2.1 *Directions and Priorities for Government ICT* defines a change of focus toward shared approaches and shared solutions for government investment in ICT, and the *Rethink Online* strategy identifies shared web technology as a key strategic intervention. For more information, see paragraphs 1.1 and 1.2 of this Notice.

- 2.2 The existence of over 600 websites and 50 distinct content management systems (CMSs) in use across central government indicates efficiencies could be gained by reducing duplicate investment in web projects and web technologies across government agencies. However, it is important to clarify that CWS is about centralised web platforms, not centralised websites.
- 2.3 The CWS service vision outlines an opportunity to rationalise web platforms across government, consolidate procurement, standardise requirements, and increase reuse of existing government agency investment in web technologies and designs.

### **3. Problem Definition**

- 3.1 Government agency website developments are usually treated as one-off projects, which is driving unnecessary reinvestment in design, development, maintenance, procurement, project management, hosting, technical support and security.
- 3.2 The cost and time of building websites from scratch is limiting the ability of many government agencies to efficiently and effectively respond to business and customer needs and maintain acceptable levels of quality and compliance with government policies and standards (such as web standards, Public Records Act, igovt, and security standards).
- 3.3 At a high level, functional requirements are often similar, with most government websites requiring a similar set of reasonably-common functional components such as syndication, consultation tools, simple forms, etc. (See the scenarios in Schedule 3 for more examples.) However, government agencies do not routinely leverage other government agencies' investment in technology components, designs and contracts.

### **4. Benefits**

- 4.1 It is proposed that CWS would enable more coordinated investment in web technologies across government, through rationalisation of technologies and contracts, and increased reuse of web assets developed within government (such as design templates, technology components, architecture, functional extensions, and other IP).
- 4.2 The direct benefits of CWS include:
- (a) Reducing the cost and duration of web projects by simplifying requirements gathering, speeding up procurement and reducing the time spent on development.
  - (b) Reducing website management costs across government by leveraging economies of scale and reducing duplicate investment in compliance.
  - (c) Reducing unnecessary investment by supporting government agencies to reuse technology and designs already developed by other government agencies.
- 4.3 The indirect benefits of CWS include:
- (a) Guaranteed compliance with government policies and standards (such as web standards, Public Records Act, igovt, and security standards).
  - (b) Having a 'neutral' place to develop and manage multi-government agency websites, reducing the complexity of working on joint projects.
  - (c) Freeing up resource to improve content and invest in new functionality.
  - (d) Driving more innovation out of suppliers and in-house developers by redirecting investment into developing new functionality.
  - (e) Simplifying the procurement process and reducing costs for prospective suppliers to government.

## 5. Opportunity Definition

- 5.1 Preliminary analysis of technology choices across government shows a natural grouping around a few CMS platforms, both open source and proprietary. After these few widely used CMS platforms, there is a long-tail phenomenon where many CMS platforms are used by only one or two agencies. This suggests that there is potential for further consolidation of technologies and suppliers and more formalised arrangements for sharing and reuse.
- 5.2 Government agencies are regularly undertaking web projects, many of which result in procurement of web services. Initial analysis of GETS data indicates that there were 15 tenders for web services in the 2010/11 financial year. However, not all web projects involve tenders and a poll of the Government Web Community found at least 40 web projects were completed in the 2010/11 financial year. Some of these may represent projects that used a closed tender or existing supply arrangements.
- 5.3 Preliminary analysis suggests that there is demand for CWS from government agencies. Benefits for government agencies may include reduced procurement costs, lower up-front investment, lower maintenance costs, lower costs for new functionality, faster web projects and reduced cost of compliance with government policies and standards (such as web standards, Public Records Act, igovt, and security standards).
- 5.4 Further work is required to benchmark current government agency costs, quantify benefits, confirm demand, evaluate solution options, and to identify an appropriate funding model for CWS.

## 6. Demand for CWS

- 6.1 DIA established the CWS Working Group in June 2011, to develop the CWS concept. The group is made up of representatives from seven government agencies who are interested in using CWS: DIA, The Treasury, Crown Law Office, Ministry for Culture and Heritage, Ministry of Social Development, Inland Revenue and Ministry of Education.
- 6.2 It is likely there will be further interest in CWS from additional agencies once the project is confirmed and government agencies have certainty about scope and timing.
- 6.3 In conjunction with this Notice, the CWS Working Group will be undertaking an agency engagement exercise to further assess agency demand.

## 7. Assumptions

- 7.1 This service vision is based on the following assumptions:
- (a) CWS could be provided within government or by one or more suppliers.
  - (b) The CWS Working Group will ensure that CWS is fit for purpose and meets the majority of government agency requirements.
  - (c) The CWS funding model will cover the costs of ongoing product management and development.
  - (d) CWS would use government common ICT capabilities where appropriate, such as Infrastructure as a Service (IaaS) and the igovt logon services.

## Schedule 2: High-level Requirements

### 1. Agency engagement

- 1.1 In conjunction with this Notice, the CWS Working Group will be undertaking an agency engagement exercise to further assess government agency requirements.

### 2. Preliminary high-level requirements

- 2.1 Early discussion of high-level requirements by the CWS Working Group has concluded the CWS will need to be supported by a technical services model including, but not limited to:
- (a) provision of one or more fully hosted and managed website technology stacks (standard templates, CMS, digital asset management, integration with approved third party SaaS products, analytics, igovt, hosting, etc);
  - (b) patching and upgrades for the technology stack/s;
  - (c) QA and change management for additions to technology stack;
  - (d) archiving services (including PRA compliance and optimisation for website harvesting);
  - (e) backup and recovery services;
  - (f) monitoring services;
  - (g) security services;
  - (h) pre-production and test environments;
  - (i) load balancing and failover;
  - (j) service support (service desk, incident management, change and release);
  - (k) service management (provisioning, reporting, billing, transition services, assistance with selecting external suppliers);
  - (l) ongoing product development and inclusion of new technologies; and
  - (m) other support services as demand warrants.

### 3. Functionality

- 3.1 Early discussion of high level requirements by the CWS Working Group suggests that CWS would need to include the following functionality:
- (a) versioning, rollback and archiving capability;
  - (b) mobile services;
  - (c) API capabilities;
  - (d) feeds; and
  - (e) forms creation.

## Schedule 3: CWS Scenarios

### 1. Introduction

- 1.1 In order to illustrate the CWS service concept at a high level, the following example scenarios have been developed.

### 2. Scenario 1: Government agency website

#### Planning

- (a) A government agency is planning to redevelop their corporate website. Before developing business requirements or going to RFP, they talk to CWS about their website requirements.
- (b) The website has a lot of information and, although it is currently pretty basic, they want to be able to host rich content and leverage social media tools to engage with their audience.
- (c) Talking through their requirements with CWS, it turns out that they don't need to go to RFP, as Common Web Services includes components that will meet their needs at an acceptable monthly cost.
- (d) CWS provides the government agency with the Common Web Services service catalogue and pricing and recommends a short list of suppliers to engage to help scope their business requirements and develop their design.

#### Design

- (e) The government agency (with help from their supplier) selects the required components and service levels from the service (and technical) catalogue.
- (f) The website is set up according to their requirements and is charged on a fixed-monthly, 'pay as you go' basis.

#### Implementation

- (g) The developer is given access to Common Web Services (technology and templates). They decide to use three existing templates and identify the need to develop an additional template and incorporate an additional CMS component.
- (h) The additional template and component are submitted to CWS for quality assurance and are admitted into Common Web Services for reuse by other government agencies.
- (i) The developer uploads a stylesheet to the new website and begins testing.
- (j) Finally, the government agency adds or migrates content across to the website.

#### Operation

- (k) With all monitoring and maintenance taken care of for them, the government agency web team can concentrate on their core role of monitoring user behaviour, managing content and optimising the user experience.

### 3. **Scenario 2: Multiple government agency campaign**

#### **Planning**

- (a) A new initiative has been identified by Ministers, which requires multiple government agencies to consult with New Zealanders in an area of shared accountability.
- (b) The government agencies require a shared consultation website to be set up and populated with content within six weeks, to meet the Minister's timeframe. The consultation is intended to run for three months, after which the content will be migrated into existing government agency websites.
- (c) Although one of the government agencies has an experienced web team, their web environment isn't currently flexible enough to set up a website in this time frame. They consider making changes to their environment but decide that if they did that, it would be difficult to share the costs equally between the government agencies.
- (d) So, the government agencies decide to host their new website on Common Web Services, with requirements gathering and design to be done by a joint project team within the government agencies.

#### **Design**

- (e) The project team identifies their requirements and CWS sets up the website for them, charged equally between the government agencies on a monthly, 'pay as you go' basis.

#### **Implementation**

- (f) The project team uploads design templates to the new website, adds content to the site and begins testing.
- (g) The website is ready within four weeks, leaving two weeks for testing the design and content with key stakeholders.

#### **Operation**

- (h) The website runs for three months, as planned. At the end of the consultation, the entire website is archived to meet Public Records Act requirements, prior to migrating the content across to the relevant government agencies' websites.

### 4. **Scenario 3: Emergency response**

#### **Planning**

- (a) Multiple government agencies must provide a coordinated response to a serious emergency.
- (b) The government agencies require a web site to provide information from a wide range of sources, and will be maintained by staff in different government agencies. The site must be independent of any government agency's branding.

#### **Design**

- (c) There is little time for setting up a site, developing content or information architecture or producing design, but collectively the government agencies have specialist skills in all of these areas.
- (d) CWS sets up an accessible cookie-cutter web site in a matter of minutes and apply a generic New Zealand Government theme to it. The site is configured for features such as blogging modules, Twitter feeds, and calendars, and a Twitter account and Facebook page linking to the site are set up.

### **Implementation**

- (e) An information architect from one of the participating government agencies quickly establishes an information architecture for the site.
- (f) Nominated staff from contributing government agencies are given access to maintain the site content. The infrastructure is already integrated with igovt and remote contributors can securely access the site.

### **Operation**

- (g) Because the infrastructure offers built-in compliance with the Public Records Act, multiple staff can manage fast-breaking news, make updates dynamically or roll back when necessary. All changes to the site are recorded and archived.
- (h) Built-in analytics on the site allow its performance to be assessed and fine-tuned quickly.
- (i) When the emergency is over, the site can be archived and disestablished, or handed over to a government agency picking up lead role for the recovery. Handed over with the site are the Twitter and Facebook accounts, with a pre-built population of followers.

## **5. Scenario 4: Government-led project at major international festival**

### **Planning**

- (a) New Zealand has been chosen as the guest of honour at a major international festival.
- (b) A government agency has been selected to lead the project to represent New Zealand on the world stage in partnership with other government agencies, local industry and the international organising committee.
- (c) The project needs an immediate web presence to provide information for potential industry partners and media interest. Longer term goals are as yet unclear.

### **Design**

- (d) Initial requirements are for a simple information site.
- (e) The lead agency works with a design company to create a simple interim brand, workshops audience needs and core information architecture.

### **Implementation**

- (f) The site is not complex and the common web service is selected and an interim site is built within six weeks.
- (g) The interim site attracts attention and potential partners start contacting the agency.
- (h) The agency quickly realises it needs a simple form to capture registrations of interest.
- (i) A simple registration of interest form that integrates with a management system and campaign monitor is available through Common Web Services.
- (j) As the project takes shape, it becomes clear that there are a number of artists whose appearance at events associated with the festival would enhance New Zealand's overall presence.
- (k) With no funding left, the agency wants to use the website to put artists in touch with potential sponsors.

- (l) A module is developed to enable artists and sponsors to list what they need or can provide, that finds matches between the two groups.

#### **Operation**

- (m) The code is contributed back to the common web service, for other agencies to reuse.

### **6. Scenario 5: Forum for consultation paper**

#### **Planning**

- (a) A government agency has a consultation paper which needs to be made available for citizens to read and comment on. They want to build a website for this consultation.
- (b) The agency wants to monitor and moderate comments as well as capture any online comments and discussion in order to be compliant with the Public Records Act.
- (c) The website needs to be branded uniquely – for political reasons it cannot be associated directly with any particular government agency. A new .govt URL is required.
- (d) Although the initial discussion document is being managed by the first agency, it may move to a second agency once consultation and policy development is progressed.
- (e) Sign-off and preview of content is required by people outside of the agency setting up the site (for example, the Minister's office).
- (f) Ongoing update will be handed over to a non-technical staff member so requires an easy to use intuitive way of direct update.
- (g) An analysis of the Common Web Services solution indicates that the solution meets the consultation website's needs.

#### **Design**

- (h) Apart from the ability to make comments it will have a simple design and basic static content.
- (i) Agency staff develop the information architecture, content, and the look-and-feel by tweaking existing CWS themes.

#### **Implementation**

- (j) Agency IT suppliers are given access to Common Web Services to begin implementation.
- (k) While the initial brief had minimal functionality, the scope expanded during implementation and now a space for citizens to make submission online is required.
- (l) The agency contracts their existing IT suppliers to build 'consultation submission' functionality. It is procured in such a way that it is for the CWS environment (enabling reuse by other agencies) rather than just for the sole agency.

#### **Operation**

- (m) Ongoing updates are handled by non-technical staff in the first agency, and at a later date responsibility for these updates is transferred to the second agency.
- (n) The 'consultation submission' functionality is tested and approved for re-use, so that it is available to other agencies.

## **Schedule 4: Response prompts**

### **1. Instructions**

- 1.1 We are looking for potential supplier responses to each the six broad topic areas listed below (paragraphs 2 to 7). Please provide no more than one A4 side for each of the six topic areas. This means your response should be no longer than three double-sided A4 pages, plus a cover sheet (see below).
- 1.2 In your response, please address as many of the itemised prompts in each topic area as you can. We are interested in an informed discussion that will contribute to requirements gathering and solution definition, not necessarily a specific response from every potential supplier to every itemised prompt.
- 1.3 Please include a cover sheet for your response that includes your organisation name, address, contact person, phone number(s), email address, and a brief statement (just two or three sentences) on your organisation's background. If your organisation has any potential conflicts of interest, please specify them on the cover sheet.

### **2. Proposed Service Vision**

- 2.1 Please discuss:
- (a) Your opinion of the service vision presented.
  - (b) Any changes recommended to the service vision and any elements and services that are missing.
  - (c) Any issues and difficulties that you see in the proposed model.
  - (d) Any additions or exclusions to the high level requirements.
  - (e) Any opportunities to provide one or more of the high level requirements as a separate unbundled service.
  - (f) The commercial viability of the proposed model.

### **3. Alternative Service Visions**

- 3.1 Please discuss:
- (a) Other approaches that may better serve the principles, objectives, and high level requirements, and the pros and cons of each.
  - (b) The commercial viability of any alternative models.

### **4. Iterative Development**

- 4.1 Please discuss:
- (a) Any factors that should drive scale, additional functionality, and incremental increase of capacity for the solution.
  - (b) Limitations that may exist to scaling the solution, given the potential size and number of government agencies that may ultimately wish to utilise it (e.g. Public Service departments, Crown entities, State-owned enterprises, local government authorities).

- (c) Challenges to maintaining the technology currency (software and hardware) of the solution, so that the solution remains up to date and compatible with other dependent services and interfaces.
- (d) Approaches to ensuring high service availability levels.

## **5. Implementation, Transition and Disengagement**

5.1 Please discuss:

- (a) A realistic timeframe for providing CWS solutions. Steps to setting up the service, or services, in New Zealand.
- (b) Any suggested approaches for transitioning agencies from their existing solutions to CWS solutions.
- (c) Any suggested approaches for the disengagement of an agency from CWS solutions to an alternative service.
- (d) Ways to motivate and reward agencies for joining CWS solutions.

## **6. Security and Risk**

6.1 Please discuss:

- (a) Any risks to development and implementation of CWS solutions and ways to manage these risks.
- (b) Any risks to both the supplier(s) and the participating agencies.
- (c) Ways to conform to government security standards, up to and including the 'Restricted' security classification as described in the New Zealand Information Security Manual (NZISM).

## **7. Experience and Capability**

7.1 Please discuss:

- (a) Your experience in delivering shared web management solutions, if any.
- (b) Any models you may have successfully implemented, and the pros and cons of each.
- (c) Lessons learned from other CWS solutions that your organisation or staff have undertaken that may assist in the development of a CWS solution.