



CS-RFP-001-2026
Request for Proposal
Municipal Branding and Marketing

Addendum No. 2
(to the Request for Proposal Document)

The Request for Municipal Branding and Marketing (RFP) is modified as set forth in this Addendum. The original RFP Documents and any previously issued addenda remain in full force and effect, except as modified by this Addendum, which is hereby made part of the RFP. Respondents shall take this Addendum into consideration when preparing and submitting its Proposal.

Questions and Answers

The following questions and answers are provided as information to clarify questions raised about the Request for Proposal (RFP).

- 1. Question:** What budget range should the destination marketing and implementation plan be designed around?

Answer: Proposed budget is \$50,000; however, the Proponent's final bid price must reflect the complete Scope of Work. As outlined in Section 9 – Proposal Evaluation, fees and disbursements are one component of the overall evaluation criteria.

- 2. Question:** Is it inclusive of consultant fees, media spend, and production? (to ensure our recommendations are realistic).

Answer: Yes.

- 3. Question:** Is there a desired in-market or launch date for the new brand? Is something driving this specific timing?

Answer: It is anticipated that an agreement between the City and the successful proponent will be signed by April 21st with a project start date of asap following that date. Completion will depend on the proposed schedule. There isn't anything driving specific timing.

- 4. Question:** Is the City seeking one umbrella brand (branded house) or a brand architecture (house of brands/sub-brands)? Can you clarify whether you are seeking one master brand for everything, a corporate/municipal brand plus a

destination brand, or an endorsed system for tourism, economic development, and other City functions.

Answer: The City is seeking a corporate/municipal brand plus a destination brand for tourism, and economic development.

5. **Question:** Who is the final decision-maker on the brand options and implementation plan? The project team, senior staff, Council, or some combination, or committee?

Answer: The project team will present the options to Council in an Administrative Report, with a staff recommendation for final approval.

6. **Question:** How many review/approval rounds should be assumed?

Answer: Unknown.

7. **Question:** Will there be a dedicated contact at the city to work directly with the agency, or are there a number of stakeholders involved. The more decisions and feedback require numerous inputs, the longer the timeframe for execution.

Answer: The dedicated contact at the City will be the Director of Corporate Services. Input from the project team will filter through the Director to the successful proponent.

8. **Question:** How many in-person meetings do you anticipate throughout the project?

Answer: It is expected that at least one (1) in-person meeting would take place for the purposes of introductions and to visit the City of Temiskaming Shores.

9. **Question:** Is there a preferred virtual platform to hold all other meetings i.e., Zoom, Teams, Google?

Answer: Preferred platform is Teams.

10. **Question:** Will we have access to 1:1 stakeholder interviews, or only the focus groups/community sessions noted in the RFP? Regarding the focus groups/sessions, who will recruit participants and provide venues/logistics?

Answer: Yes there can be access to 1:1. The City will recruit and provide venues/logistics.

11. **Question:** Would interviews with Council, staff, business leaders, tourism partners, and community organizations be expected or permitted?

Answer: Any Interviews would be proposed by the proponent. Yes, they would be permitted.

13. Question: Which audiences matter most in phase one, and in what order? As the RFP covers “live, work, visit, and invest,” we recognize that these are not the same audience. Can you please rank the following by importance: residents, visitors, investors, workforce attraction, business attraction/retention, and prospective residents.

Answer: This can be discussed with project team and successful proponent.

14. Question: Are there any priority geographies?

Answer: No.

15. Question: Will deliverables need to be bilingual or multilingual, and who handles translation/transcreation? Provided by the City or included in our scope?

Answer: Yes, deliverables are required to be bilingual (French and English). The successful proponent would handle translation. Included in the scope.

16. Question: What Indigenous engagement is expected as part of the research and validation process?

Answer: Engagement with Indigenous is expected. The process will be determined with the successful proponent.

17. Question: Which Nations/organizations should be engaged, and will those introductions be facilitated?

Answer: The Nations/organizations will be determined with the successful proponent, with input and introductions made from the City.

18. Question: Should protocol guidance, honoraria, or other requirements be built into the work plan?

Answer: Yes.

19. Question: How detailed does the implementation plan need to be? A high-level rollout guidance (based on priorities and budget) - or a detailed breakdown of phased, costed application plans for everything required (this may not be realistic)

Answer: See Section 8.3.c. To be provided by the proponent.

20. Question: What existing inputs will be available at kickoff beyond the community strategy plan?

- previous brand or communications work?
- tourism/economic development plans?
- web/social analytics?
- signage/asset inventories?
- past public consultation findings?
- photography/video libraries*? (*see next questions)

Answer: Yes, all of the above will be available.

21. Question: Does the City expect new photography and/or videography to be developed as part of this project, or should we assume the use of existing image libraries?

Answer: Yes, new photography/videography should be developed.

22. Question: If new visual assets are desired, is there an anticipated budget range for photography/video production that we should consider when developing our recommendations?

Answer: The budget is not identified as part of the RFP document. We are asking proponents to provide pricing based on the scope of work.

23. Question: Does the City currently maintain an organized image or video library that will be made available to the selected proponent?

Answer: Some images will be available to the successful proponent.

24. Question: Should the RFP response include recommendations for a visual storytelling approach (photography style, shot lists, etc.), or is the City expecting actual production to be included in the scope?

Answer: RFP response can include recommendations.

25. Question: If production is expected, should it be scoped within the proposal, or treated as a separate addendum or recommended future implementation phase?

Answer: This could be treated as a recommended future phase.

26. Question: Could the City confirm the expected number of stakeholder meetings or community engagement sessions anticipated as part of this project?

Answer: This should be proposed by the proponent. See Section 8.1 of the RFP.



27. Question: Should proponents assume in-person attendance for focus groups, council presentations, and community meetings, or would hybrid/virtual options be acceptable for some engagement activities?

Answer: Virtual/hybrid options are acceptable for some engagement activities.

28. Question: Will the successful proponent be provided access to existing brand materials, marketing campaigns, or research related to the current municipal brand?

Answer: Yes.

29. Question: Will the City's recently adopted Community-Based Strategic Plan be provided to the successful proponent to inform the branding strategy?

Answer: Yes.

30. Question: Does the City have an anticipated budget range for the future implementation of the branding and marketing strategy once completed?

Answer: Proposed budget is \$50,000; however, the Proponent's final bid price must reflect the complete Scope of Work. As outlined in Section 9 – Proposal Evaluation, fees and disbursements are one component of the overall evaluation criteria.

S. Zubyck

Shelly Zubyck
Director of Corporate Services

Issued: March 18th, 2026

CITY OF TEMISKAMING SHORES
P.O. Box 2050
Haileybury, ON
P0J 1K0