



Request for proposals: development of innovative, interactive digital platform for producing and displaying evidence gap maps

Question and answers document

The deadline for sending queries regarding this request for proposals was **23:59 GMT, 22 November**. Where relevant, we have edited the original to combine similar questions.

Q1: It is mentioned in the RFP that the EGM platform has two versions. ‘One version is proprietary for displaying 3ieEGMs and one is a separate version that is available to approved users’. Do we have to accommodate the scope of these two versions in the project. If so, what are the features available for approved users?

A1: The RFP is just for proprietary version of platform, but our preference is for it to be developed as open source.

Q2: Regarding the data upload feature, it is mentioned that a standardised Microsoft Excel® template is used to upload data to EGM. Is it possible to share the template that is being used now?

A2: Please use this link to access the [impact evaluation](#) and [systematic review](#) template.

Q3: In the technical proposal section of RFP, it is mentioned that ‘A design section which clearly presents how the vendor will provide the required and desired elements described in Appendix A of this document;’ Does this mean, we have to provide a design sample of EGM along with proposal?

A3: We will like to see the design aspect of the organisation. We encourage applicants to submit proposed wireframes with the technical proposal, particularly the homepage.

Q4: As content migration from existing platform also has to be carried out, we would like to know the volume of content available on the platform. Can we have specifics on the volume of data, number of EGMs’, users on the platform etc?

A4: We do not have any major chunk of data on the current platform. We have around 16 Evidence gap maps on the platform. The size of MySQL database is less than 1 GB.

Q5: RFP also talks about integration of Tableau as a bonus feature. What is Tableau being used for?

A5: At present Tableau is not being used, but we’d like to explore this or something similar as a feature. Also, attaching the specific questions against the features and functionalities list mentioned in Appendix A.

New Delhi

202-203, Rectangle One
D-4, Saket District Centre
New Delhi - 110017, India

3ie@3ieimpact.org
Tel: +91 11 4989 4444

London

c/o LIDC, 20 Bloomsbury Square,
London WC1A 2NS
United Kingdom

3ieuk@3ieimpact.org
Tel: +44 207 958 8351/8350

Washington, DC

1020 19th St., NW,
Suite 400, Washington, DC 20036
United States of America

3ieus@3ieimpact.org
Tel: +1 202 629 3939

Q6: Currently, you provide approved users with a self-use version of the EGM, where they can use their own data sets and taxonomy.

- **Does the RFP's scope of work include upgrading this version?**
 - **If yes - is the self-use system also web-hosted? Do approved users upload data using Excel?**

A6: On the scope of the RFP, please see the response to Q1 and see the response to Q2 to understand how data is uploaded by users.

Q7: By when will the database structure of the new 3ie evidence repository be finalised?

A7: This will be finalised by early next year (January 2020).

Q8: On page 3, footnote #2, you mention that once of the services used in the new repository is Amazon. Which Amazon product(s) is/ are you referring to?

A8: We are using Amazon web services for hosting the new repository. Once selected, we are happy to share the list of AWS services used for the platform.

Q9: Do vendors have to register before submitting an RFP? Or is the email submission sufficient?

A9: No, the vendors does not needs to register. They can directly send the submission via email.

Q10: What are the analytics or statistical tools or reporting tools that are currently being leveraged?

A10: At present we are using Google analytics tool. Other suggestions are welcome.

Q11: Is it possible to share the current state architecture and integration points to understand the complexity better.

A11: Current platform architecture is already mentioned in the RFP. Rest of information to be shared with the final vendor.

Q12: Please describe the process used to evaluate (ex. Scoring, etc.) the RFP responses received.

A12: We will score proposals based on a combination of design, technical solutions and value for money.

Q13: Is it possible to provide information on current application size, modules, daily users Load? If yes, please share.

A13: The current EGM platform has 15 published gap maps as 15 published framework on customised high chart plugins and around 70 Drupal modules. More information will be shared with selected vendor.

Q14: Are Offshore companies eligible to bid on this RFP.

A14: Yes

Q15: In the scope of work section, under the functionality bullet point, you mention "Offer easy sharing options for content via social media". Please expand your thoughts. would you like the ability to send a link to an EGM or possibly something else? Which social media outlets are you thinking about sharing EGMs?

A15: We would like to have a functionality where gap map's (the framework) can be easily shareable via social media plugins e.g. Twitter, Facebook, LinkedIn etc.

Q16: Appendix A, Display. Symbols in the EGM should indicate 1 - what does this mean?

A16: This is an error in the RFP and can be ignored

Q17: Do you envision EGM uploaded studies to be included as new studies in the evidence repository?

A17: Yes, provided they meet the repository inclusion criteria (which they may not all do).

Q18: Would it be possible to get access to, have a demo of, or get screen shots of the current EGM builder application?

A18: Once selected we will be sharing the admin panel of the current platform for better understanding of the workflow. In brief – the interface allows users to create a new EGM, build the intervention/ outcome framework for the EGM by indicating the labels for each cell. To populate the EGM the user then uploads the .csv files with the data on each study.

Q19: What is the budget for this project? Is there a cap?

A19: The total budget is one of the assessment criteria.

Q20: In the scope of work section you ask how the exiting data for the EGM will be migration to the new system: "Describe how you will migrate all the existing content, links and multimedia content from existing platform, including testing and the overall time needed before handover." Please clarify the format the data is currently stored in. In the current platform call all of the meta data and URLs be exported?

A20: See response to Q4.

Responses to queries on Appendix A

Type of feature	Detail	MVP	Questions/Clarification	3ie response
Overall	The platform needs to be either 1) fully complementary OR 2) fully integrated with the 3ie IE and SR repositories (but need option to import data from different sources and expand the data structure)	Essential	Does it mean, it should be internally integrated with 3ie System or it should have a separate solution to generate EGM reports?	The criteria is an either/ or. The new platform needs to either be fully integrated OR fully complementary, The latter means that data downloaded from the repository site can be easily uploaded to the EGM platform site to create an interactive EGM which is available in a web format.
Display	Amount of studies displayed should not slow down how the map runs or user's actions	Essential	What is required response time to publish EGM data?	This functionality is not related to response time to publish EGM data (although users should be able to create and publish the EGM in a matter of hours, provided the data is available). Rather it is related to the ability of the EGM to display a large number of studies in a single cell without this slowing down any functionality.
	Allow choice of which outcomes and interventions to display, allowing the user to see what interventions and outcomes that matter to them.	Desirable	Does it mean EGM report filters?	This may be in the form of a filter, or some map for the user to indicate which of the interventions and outcomes in the map they are interested in and view these only.
	Provide some standard data viz. figures for a given map that can be exported as a jpg	Bonus	Is data wizard same as download EGM in PDF and JPG format?	The requirement is for users to be able to export figures that are of publication quality. Pdf, jpg or other suggestions welcome.
	Symbols in the EGM should indicate 1		Please specify this?	Please ignore this

	Ongoing studies (IEs) to be displayed separately		How is this linked to EGMs?	EGMs include ongoing impact evaluations and systematic reviews. At present the platform only has a separate symbol for ongoing SRs (protocols, in blue), with all IEs – completed or ongoing displayed in grey. We want to be able to show the difference visually.
Time frame	Ability to handle time frame independently from filtering, as is possible on academic databases.	Bonus	Does it mean a time filter for EGM?	A filter would be one way to solving this.
Data importer	Flexibility to expand the data structure to include different variables	Essential	What can be variables and relation with pre-defined parameters? Also, at what level we need to define variables?	The requirement is that users can add additional variables at the study level to those that are predetermined. This could for example be reflected in the form of user generated filters or new/ different symbols in the map.
Exporting	Be able to export lists of studies in a pop-up of a bubble, and the entire map	Essential	Regarding this point, it is mentioned that the decision of format (Excel or RIS) will be taken later. Other than the data do we have to export the visualization also?	Yes
	Be able to export underlying data	Essential as a back-end function	Does the underlying data means all the content that has been uploaded for creating a Gap Map'?	Yes