BRAND USA

Brand USA – Request for Proposal

Competitive Media Intelligence & Spend Reporting

Written Questions & Answers

The following questions were submitted in response to the Request for Proposal for Competitive Media Intelligence & Spend Reporting. In accordance with the RFP, company names have been removed. Duplicative and out-of-scope questions have been omitted.

1. Report Format

Question: *Should the Excel deliverable follow a specific template (e.g., country × channel × month matrix), or may vendors propose their own structured format?*

Brand USA Response: Brand USA has not prescribed a fixed template. Vendors may propose their own structured Excel format, provided it supports all required reporting dimensions — country, month, medium/channel, and competitor, with national and regional buys delineated — and allows filtering across them. Vendors are encouraged to include a sample layout or mock tab with their proposal.

2. Historical Data Gaps

Question: *If certain countries or channels have incomplete data for earlier years (2017–2019), will partial coverage still be considered responsive, or is full historical coverage mandatory?*

Brand USA Response: Partial coverage will be considered responsive provided gaps, exclusions, and any methodology differences are clearly disclosed as required in Proposal Requirements Section 2 (Data Availability by Country).

3. Co-op Attribution

Question: *For competitor campaigns funded jointly with airlines, hotels, or OTAs, does Brand USA require vendors to separate DMO contributions from partner spend, or is blended reporting acceptable if separation is not feasible?*

Brand USA Response: As stated in the Scope of Work, spend should be attributed to the official DMO wherever possible. Where jointly funded activity cannot be separated, blended reporting is acceptable, provided the vendor clearly flags which figures are blended and describes what the blended figure includes. Vendors should indicate — by market where relevant — whether they can isolate the DMO contribution or can only report a combined figure.

4. Granularity of Data

Question: *Beyond national vs. regional buys, should the Excel report also capture subcategories such as co-branded partnerships (e.g., a tourism board + airline), and if so, how detailed should this breakdown be?*

Brand USA Response: Co-branded/partnership breakouts (e.g., a national tourism board + airline campaign) are a desired optional capability, not a mandatory element of the base report, per Proposal Requirements Section 4 (Competitor Granularity). Where the underlying data supports it, Brand USA would like the ability to identify the partnering entity within a competitor’s activity. Vendors should describe the level of breakout they can provide.

5. Currency & Conversion

Question: *Should all spend figures be normalized into USD within the Excel report, or reported in local market currency with a conversion note?*

Brand USA Response: All spend figures should be reported in USD within the Excel deliverable. Vendors must disclose the conversion methodology, the FX rate source, and the conversion date(s) applied. Vendors may additionally include the original local-currency figures alongside the USD values, but USD is required so that no conversion work is needed on Brand USA's side.

6. Delivery Timeline

Question: *For the one-time Excel report, what is Brand USA's expected turnaround after contract award, and will phased delivery (e.g., by region) be acceptable?*

Brand USA Response: Per Section 6, Brand USA has not set a fixed delivery date and asks vendors to propose their anticipated turnaround following contract award. Phased or regional delivery is acceptable; vendors electing a phased approach should include a proposed delivery schedule.