RFP DHECIC-01

RESPONSES TO WRITTEN INQUIRIES
SUBMITTED BY THE JULY 31 DEADLINE

Questions submitted by potential Offerors are presented verbatim and designated by the red **Q**. Similar questions are grouped, followed by an answer that addresses all, designated by the green **A**. For those questions that fell into multiple categories, the most applicable category to the overall thrust of the question was selected. A series of questions submitted within the same paragraph may have been distributed to various categories.

> **Product Statewide Strategy & Goals**
> **Users**
> **Product design**
> **Build or Buy**
> **Hosting**
> **Timeline**
> **Costs and Funding**
> **Privacy and Security**
> **Contractual**
> **Product Ownership**
> **Previous Programs/Initiatives**
> **Operations/support over time**
> **RFP logistics, clerical, housekeeping**
> **Training**
>
> **Updated RFP Activity Schedule**

Product Statewide Strategy & Goals

Q Are there plans to release RFPs with similar focus on planning for the future but with different specifications in the near future?

A No

Q Contracts for individual departments often limit their use to that department or location, or to a certain number of assessments, but integrating them into a statewide system across multiple locations and departments would violate those agreements. Who will facilitate the negotiations to enable adoption without breaching existing department contracts?

Q School districts in CO are spending >$1M/year on college and career planning tools that they go through lengthy RFP processes to evaluate and select. For example, JeffCO SD spends over $200K/year for their solution, as does DPS. They often choose different solutions for certain features and services they provide. Since there is considerable redundancy in the RFP requirements, is your intention to get school districts to abandon their own tools in favor of this solution? If so, what data do you have that says they will? If not, what data do you have that leads you to believe they will use redundant systems? For the school districts that will not participate in this solution, should there be an option to integrate the data from their systems into this one? If so, who will facilitate those negotiations?

A As a collaboration of state-level agencies, we intend to offer a best-in-class system to departments, organizations and individual users that will reduce duplication and confusion to users as well as expense to organizations and taxpayers. However, it will be up to each entity to determine whether they wish to use the system. While school/districts are required to provide assistance to public high school students in creating individual career and academic plans (ICAPs), there is no statutory mandate to use any specific product for this purpose. However, we believe that the selected Offeror will build a system that will provide great incentives and advantages for use, both from functionality and cost saving perspectives, to a broad variety of users.

There is great power in building an integrated system that makes resources, tools and professional support from many public entities readily available. Rather than being redundant with the restrictive, single-entity licensing provisions common among proprietary/private platforms in use, the design concept of the MATF is the opposite. Users will have the advantage of storing their information and plans in a single online portfolio, without having to establish additional accounts or lose their data each time they transfer or move between organizations. In addition, note this solution is not meant only for the K-12 system, but targets a much broader user base. At this time, there is no intention to provide data integration with private/proprietary systems that any given entity may choose to purchase.

Q In comparing key requirements of the RFI to the RFP, the "highly engaging, current and interactive" component was noticeably absent from the RFP. Was there a specific reason it was removed? Will it be included as part of the evaluation?

A These qualities are absolutely essential to an acceptable product design and winning proposal.

It was determined that any website or set of online tools should exhibit these qualities, that they are highly subjective, and that, of course, every vendor would indicate that their product offers these characteristics in abundance. Offerors are encouraged to provide, in their proposal, screen shots, testimonials, etc. to demonstrate that their solution exhibits these qualities *across all four of the other key requirement areas.* Offerors selected for in-person interviews should also highlight these characteristics in their presentations. *Return*

Users

Q Who will be the primary user of the system. Who will introduce end-users into the system? Who are supporting professionals? Schools? Colleges? State Agencies? Self register?

Q The RFP lists the program should be accessible to all students and adults of any background, does this mean that the program will be deployed in schools, social resource centres, and libraries only, or are there other places that Colorado intends to deploy it?

Q How many people, approximately, are in scope for access to this program divided across students, members of the general public, and those who are likely to access the program through a social initiative (or otherwise)? Is there a particular group the program is to cater more to, or is it equally for all groups?

> **A** State partners in the MATF, both contributing and advisory, include the Colorado Department of Higher Education, the Colorado Workforce Development Council, the Colorado Department of Labor and Employment, the Colorado Department of Human Services, and the Colorado Department of Education. Since a key product concept is to provide resources and tools from each of these agencies' platforms, primary target audiences include students in secondary (middle and high school) and postsecondary education along with adults, whether or not in the workforce. Professionals, including employers, who directly or indirectly work with and support these individuals, are also key groups to consider in the product design (e.g., counselors, case managers, etc.). Users in the State not necessarily associated with any given agency or organization must also be able to access and use the system.
>
> Consideration should be given to individuals in these target audiences who have special needs or circumstances that may impact their education, training and career pathways including physical or mental disabilities or language barriers. Access to the system and outreach or training support will occur in public and private schools and school districts, postsecondary institutions, workforce centers, libraries, county human services offices, and re-entry centers and facilities, among others.
>
> Vendors may include access, funding or phasing strategies related to these various populations in their proposal. It is also the State's intention to develop a collaborative outreach and training services plan that would introduce users to and support ongoing use of the system over time depending on the successful Offeror product design.
>
> Statistics to approximate user counts for the system may be researched by accessing state agency websites including the LMI Gateway, Colorado Department of Education, Workforce Centers, and Colorado Department of Higher Education.

Q How was user feedback incorporated in the RFP feature list generation process?

> **A** During January through April of this year, communications (email and newsletters), one-on-one conversations and focus groups were conducted among subject matter experts from partner agency staff, educators and other agency professionals who work directly with targeted populations, superintendents, associations and social service agencies, pre-collegiate programs and colleges to name a few. These efforts focused on reviewing the features list to ascertain which were most important to the populations served.

Product design

Q Does the product need to match the exact specifications prescribed in the bullet points or is there flexibility for interpretation and ongoing curriculum support?

🅠 On Page 57, you list nine survey and assessment categories to be included to "inform that user of potential good matches to careers", including custom surveys and numerous individual aptitude assessments. Based on this list, the total number of offered assessments and surveys could reach 25-50. Since all individual surveys and assessments use their own algorithms to match to careers, they will produce different results. Is your intention to offer users this many surveys that provide disparate results, or to offer an integrated, limited set of surveys and assessments that produce an integrated result? Is it acceptable to identify a primary solution that provides several integrated surveys and assessments with a single set of outcomes, then offer a section that provides "additional surveys and assessments" that are not integrated?

🅠 Do we have to use CWDC (Careers in Colorado)? Can we use O'net instead? Is there an API for Careers in Colorado?

🅐 There is flexibility in the design you may propose, both from a technology used and functionality perspective. As an element of key requirement #2, the **Essential Activity Components** in Attachment C represent the wishes of the MATF with respect to desired activities to make accessible over time. Page 26 and following of the RFP detail guiding principles for selecting and phasing the activities you choose to propose, including this statement: "Your product may have these or other activities that accomplish essentially the same outcomes." If you choose to exclude an activity, that should be noted on Offeror's Response 1 and/or 4.

An important element to consider in your activities selection and user interface is to deliver functionality by July 1, 2019, to enable high schools students to complete their State-mandated Individual Career and Academic Plan (ICAP).

As noted on page 54 in SOW Attachment B, the organization that is under contract to develop and host the Careers In Colorado site has the flexibility and resources to accommodate building APIs.

🅠 Do we have to populate Journey Itinerary with unemployment claim data? OR can we begin at "My Profile?" reference: page ii – "We envision a program where middle-schoolers through adults will input information about themselves…." It looks like the other agencies just need access to that information which could be done through permissions.

🅐 The design concept for the site is that users would be taken, during their Journey, to partner websites, tools or resources, and use those features there rather than recreating them on one giant site. Data may or may not need to transfer to or from the partner site during this process.

The activities selected initially to a user's Journey, as well as those added over time, would be based upon items stored in the user profile, whether from the initial account creation process, data transfer from our legacy system, or provided through querying the user as they navigate. We would determine how items in the user profile in combination, for example, date of birth and graduation date, logically relate to the activities that should be suggested to the user for their Journey activities. Professionals and case managers working with a user should have the capability to not only monitor but suggest additions and deletion of activities from a user's Journey.

The technology and user interface to make this work well is up to each Offeror to propose. In all cases, vendors should propose a features mix that optimizes lifelong exploration and self-discovery related to practical guidance to career and education alternatives.

🅠 Is it possible for post-secondary institutions to upload and their programs and sequence courses via csv or excel file?

🅐 Unknown; there is not a standard student information system or statewide catalog in Colorado in

which all postsecondary institutions participate. Offerors interested in delivering any such upload functionality may propose scenarios illustrating the value for potential or existing students.

Are there other sources of short-duration program and courses beyond the Colorado Eligible Training Provider List (ETPL) which should be included?
- Not to our knowledge. The ETPL is the only listing of programs from providers of every type in the State (including apprenticeships, four- and two-year institutions, occupation/technical schools) that have been vetted by the State. It includes award levels of certificate and up

Considering reporting, in several places it states that the reports are to be provided at "no extra cost". Please explain what is meant by this and the justification.
- Designing and providing report formats that can be utilized by professionals, case managers and the State as an integral component of site use or outcomes monitoring, particularly those than provide information on key activities of users, should be included in your cost proposal - which would then be incorporated into contractual requirements and budget. As with many other components, if, for example, you wish to include a fee for additional report creation or report usage in the out years, this should be disclosed in your proposal

On page 28, third bullet from bottom, there is a reference to "a delivery system available to integrate curriculum provided by other sources into the overall series of work." Please provide further details, including examples, describing the user experience.
- It is anticipated that in addition to materials that the system would provide in context, professionals and case managers may also prepare curriculum, lesson plans and accompanying worksheets or materials for their users as they navigate their Journey. It would be valuable to design an online help or advice system that could deliver not only predefined information but allow professionals to add/remove documents or instruction to/from the system.

Build or Buy

What is the motivation behind looking for a custom build for the training and career planning platform? Is there a reason for looking for a custom solution rather than exploring an existing program?

Can this product be built on top of existing solutions and services? Is there a list of preapproved organizations or service providers that could be leveraged?

Are bidders who pitch an existing program that meets or exceeds the requirements permitted to bid, or must the solution be a brand new build?

Are you looking for a vendor that will replace some of the other sites and functionality that you already have or are you looking for a vendor that can take what you have and just pull it all together?

Who is responsible for making the decisions about which surveys should be included? Many surveys charge on a per-assessment basis. Should respondents expect to include survey licensing costs into estimates? [If so, does the State have any estimate of demand or number of users so respondents can accurately predict survey licensing costs? (See Previous Programs/Initiatives Section)]
- As clearly noted in the RFP and accompanying documents, Offerors have broad flexibility in how they propose to deliver the solution & functionality mix described in the RFP. Because there is great variability in the product mix and capacities of each vendor (or consortium of vendors), the MATF is not suggesting that any one product strategy is more desirable than any other; only that it considers the key requirements and options of the RFP, including leveraging already existing State websites, tools and features rather than duplicating.

Some Offerors may choose to begin with an already built product and propose additional development and/or provide linkages to some or all of the State websites and tools listed in **SOW Attachment B** of the RFP to meet its requirements. Others may propose to develop a custom solution. Regardless of the solution proposed or features mix, any costs associated with each must be detailed adequately so that the total cost, over time, of each Offeror's solution is easily understood.

There is no list of organizations or service providers that are pre-approved.

Return

Hosting

Does the CIC have access to State of Colorado owned and operated data centers, or is the intention that the solution be solely based in the commercial cloud?

A Vendors may elect to describe and include pricing associated with one or both of these hosting scenarios. Because the target audience includes minors, vendors should keep in mind FERPA and COPPA data privacy and security considerations when suggesting hosting and data transfer mechanisms. These considerations generally require parents to authorize the retention and/or management of their children's personal information.

Return

Timeline

In the event that a suitable solution could be provided and delivered in advance of the July 1, 2019 deployment, would this pose an advantage to the state of Colorado's Multi-Agency education, Training, and Career Planning Platform initiative? i.e. is the July 1 2019 deployment dictated by other events not noted in the RFP?

A The July 1, 2019 timeframe for delivery is based primarily on the need to deliver Individual Career and Academic Plan (ICAP) functionality on or before that date since our existing product funding will expire at that point.

We use an agile environment of design and development, and would like to employ that process from the beginning. Is there room for negotiation on the timeline of deliverables to front load user feedback to ensure we build a product users will adopt rather than committing to a feature set and product described in the RFP? Should user feedback suggest a shift in scope is necessary, how will this be addressed?

Where written notice to and/or approval from the state is required (e.g., adding subcontractors, changes to privacy policies, etc) and a timeline is not otherwise specified, what is the timeline for state responses, including approval or rejection of changes presented?

Page 23 states that the platform "at minimum, assists end users to build and professionals to monitor, Individual Career and Academic Plans." And that remaining KEY REQUIREMENTS may be completed in later phases. Does this mean only Requirement 1 is required for phase 1? Or how do we interpret that?

A The MATF has not suggested specific discovery or development timeframes except the July 1, 2019 deadline to make available basic ICAP functionality. The July 1, 2019 deliverable is driven by the desire to provide a viable ICAP replacement to our existing middle and high school users prior to our existing product sunset.

Vendors should craft a timeline, associated costs, and draft work plan as described under Offeror's Response 4 that incorporates those tasks the vendor believes to be necessary to meet the key requirements under this RFP. The timeline may incorporate specific expectations for lead times and/or responses from the State.

Once a contract is executed with the successful Offeror, any change in scope, whether resulting from user input or any other necessity, would need to be agreed upon and handled as provided by the amendment processes included in the Master Task Order Contract template, RFP **Exhibit 3, Task Order Modifications**.

Costs and Funding

Q INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ESCROW – can the escrow begin after the Operational period starts? If needed prior will the state reimburse for such additional costs?

A The escrow should begin when the software is deployed.

Q Would CIC entertain a subsidized annual subscription fee model paid by user/school/district directly to the selected vendor or through CIC?

Q Will the state be open to applying for grant funds to fund the implementation, where the vendor would receive such funds if the state wins such grant applications?

Q Will the awarded company retain any rights to extend, further develop, or commercially license the software created for this project?

Q Would MATF consider alternative revenue generating models such as charging schools, universities, and other agencies on a per user charge or the like?

A Offerors are free to propose any funding strategy including subscription fees, commercial licensing, grants, fees for specific uses (such as transcripts), sponsorships, etc. The State would likely discourage overt online advertising, but may consider carefully crafted partnership agreements or potentially some cross-sponsorships or funding sources that are highly-relevant to improving the user experience without compromising the integrity of personal data or the overall solution. The State would also consider funding models that use tiered pricing approaches.

The State would prohibit any sales of user information.

Q Does the State of Colorado currently exercise any software enterprise or umbrella agreements which may reduce the burden of costs when leverages commercial software. For example, many States have enterprise agreements with Microsoft which deliver capability which could be leveraged on behalf of a proposal to reduce costs.

A While the State may have several such arrangements with individual agencies, at this time we would not be in a position to commit to terms under which your solution may partner with, or leverage, these arrangements. The State would be happy to research and assist the successful Offeror with exploring how these types of arrangements could be utilized.

Q Page ii – does not have "immediate funds" for initial build….does this mean they will have funds for implementation? Page 8 (0) – development and related costs may be presented in stages.

Q While the RFP asks for all of the details related to subscription, training and infrastructure expenses, am I right in my reading of the RFP that CIC or Partner Agencies cannot guarantee any funding post the Startup Phase?

Q If there are no other strategic funding partners, or CIC does not have a source of funding, would the selected offeror be on the hook to run the platform for 5 years?

Q During the presentation it was stated that the CIC has O&M funding for the activity, but not Design and Development funds. Does this mean that the intent is to shift the O&M money to the winning contractor? Federal Law prohibits the execution of work for the federal government without designated funding; does the State of Colorado have any similar prohibitions?

A During the presentation it was stated that the MATF intends, if at all possible, to locate and provide ongoing operations and maintenance funding for the platform, once built. Depending on the licensing, hosting and/or maintenance model the Offeror proposes, Offeror costs for O & M, licensing and so forth, may be paid by the State. As stated in the RFP, page 47 **Compensation and Invoicing**, Offerors must provide operations and maintenance pricing for periods or phases beyond product deployment. There is no specific number of years for ongoing operations required by the RFP; only that the *contract period* is anticipated to be up to five years. Offeror's should detail their expectations regarding use of the product after deployment should the State fail to secure funding at that time. Vendor proposals that include provision for these years are encouraged.

With respect to a designated funding, Master Task Order Contract provisions (template provided as RFP Exhibit 3), **section 7.B.iii:**

Available Funds – Contingency – Termination
The State is prohibited by law from making commitments beyond the term of the State's current Fiscal Year. Therefore, Contractor's compensation beyond the State's current Fiscal Year is contingent upon the continuing availability of State appropriations as provided in the Colorado Special Provisions. If federal funds are used to fund this Contract, in whole or in part, the State's performance hereunder is contingent upon the continuing availability of such funds. Payments pursuant to this Contract shall be made only from available funds encumbered for this Contract and the State's liability for such payments shall be limited to the amount remaining of such encumbered funds. If State or federal funds are not appropriated, or otherwise become unavailable to fund this Contract, the State may terminate this Contract immediately, in whole or in part, without further liability in accordance with the provisions hereof.

Regardless of the solution proposed or features mix, costs associated with each must be detailed adequately so that the total cost of the Offeror solution over time is easily understood. Likewise, funding for the features and who will bear the cost for each should be plainly identified in the proposal.

Privacy and Security

Q Does the privacy and security sections for the RFP accommodate or include requirements to meet new legislation, such as this new bill on privacy and cybersecurity?
https://leg.colorado.gov/sites/default/files/documents/2018A/bills/2018a_1128_enr.pdf

A This link refers to House Bill 18-1128 concerning strengthening protections for consumer data privacy. The State's Master Task Order Contract template has provisions related to data and PII security which are likely adequate to address requirements of this bill. However, during the contracting process, any additional requirements in force at that time will be addressed as necessary. There is no expectation that Offeror proposals anticipate requirements in advance of legislative action. If legislative action requires alteration to a contract or additional work, that work would be handled through the contract amendment and/or task order processes.

Q Since the data and privacy requirements are significantly different for students under the age of 13, and a single system that adheres to those requirements for adults will be limited in functionality, is it acceptable to limit access to the system to students 13 and up?

A Middle school is key to adequate postsecondary and workforce preparation. Limiting access to this population is not desirable and it complicates in-class use of the product for users and supporting professionals during 6th and even 7th grade instruction. There are other alternatives to resolve this access issue without limiting functionality for adults. For example, student portfolios could be created used with only date of birth, username and password for those currently under 13 years of

age. A login prompt, after age 14 is attained, could gather the remaining PII to associate with the portfolio.

Contractual

On Page 5, Activity timeline, Item 5 is "Red-lined version of Exhibit 3, Draft Contract". What does that refer to?

As discussed in RFP Section 1.R. **Standard Contract/Model Contract**, by submitting a proposal an Offeror expresses their willingness to enter into a contracting document containing the Terms and Conditions of the contract template provided (**Exhibit 3** of the RFP) as well as the requirements of the RFP, without exception, deletion, qualification or contingency. However, Item 5 of the Activity Timeline allowed Offerors not willing to abide by all the Terms and Conditions to provide a statement of explanation and listing of all exceptions by the redline date (July 31, 2018) for the State to review in advance of contracting.

In section 3.4, it states "Contractor shall not subcontract more than 40% of the Work." How do you measure percentage of work? Given the breadth of the deliverables and the stated desire for a consortium approach, is it possible to have the Contractor listed as a consortium or do you have a requirement for a single business entity to be the Contractor? How does this bear on Section 1.18: "The State reserves the right to award this RFP in part, to multiple Offerors, if so determined by the State to be in the best interests of the State."

It was suggested during the Webinar of July 26, 2018 that Offerors submit a contract redline with alternate acceptable language to address the subcontracting model they proposed. Any such redlines will be considered by the State in light of all relevant procurement and contracting standards.

The MATF reserves the right to issue a purchase order or contract to the awarded offeror. (does this mean there will be funding after an award?)

Depending on the dollar value of a Contract and/or associated Task Orders, the State may use either a purchase order or contract to complete the purchase.

Product Ownership

Re: LL. Rights in Data, Documents, and Computer Software
As the vendor would own IP in the base software platform on which enhancements would be built, would the state consider not owning any changes to software made on top of the base platform to support the state of Colorado requirements, as the state is not paying for these changes nor does it own IP for the base product? The changes made to any module would be licensed for use to the state as a part of the licensing fee during the 'Operational period'. The state would still own its own data. In essence we are asking for clause LL to be replaced with language indicating that rights to any changes to the base software platform will be owned by a vendor, including intellectual property rights. Is the state willing to consider this?

Is the state willing to relinquish its right of ownership in any intellectual property that is built on an existing platform that is the intellectual property of the vendor?

Would the state be open to having 'a right to use if base platform and module is licensed' as opposed to assigning all rights? We would like to propose that All Work Products that are built on or use/extend vendor owned IP will belong to the vendor.

[Paraphrased to shorten this question]: The RFP encourages envisioning future sales to other states along with other funding strategies, but in paragraph N it states that anything developed would be the property of the State of Colorado.

Paragraph N.14. **RFP Response Material Ownership**

All materials submitted regarding this RFP become the property of the State. Proposals, upon established opening time, become the property of the State of Colorado. All products/services produced in response to the contract resulting from this RFP will be the sole property of the State of Colorado, ==unless otherwise noted in the RFP or contract==.

This reference is standard language that typically applies to anything developed specifically and exclusively for the State. You will note the highlighted phrase above indicating flexibility. We will evaluate Offeror proposals on a case by case basis; what is to be owned by the State exclusively, what is already proprietary to an organization, and what you propose to distribute to others. The Contract terms and conditions will specify these arrangements.

If an Offeror failed to submit alternate contract language by the July 31, 2018 redline deadline, limited changes to contract language may be considered by the State during contract negotiations.

Previous Programs/Initiatives

Are there strategies that Colorado has tried before with a similar type of program that have or have not worked out, and if so, what are they?

The College In Colorado initiative, in terms of functionality, is the closest example of a successful career, education and training online program that has tools for multiple audiences,albeit one supported only by one state agency rather than a consortium. It has been successfully used and offered to State residents, free-of-charge, since 2002.

Is this rfp really a way to continue CIC'S funding – funding ends 12-31-18?

Through the generosity of College Assist as well as the Departments of Labor and Employment, Human Services, Higher Education and the Workforce Development Council, CIC is funded through June 30, 2019. The intention of the RFP is exactly what is stated therein: a re-imagined online product and services mix that integrates the best of multiple state agency websites and tools while providing users with an individualized career and education plan or Journey.

How many users are currently on the platform?

How many concurrent users do you typically see (average and peak) on a daily or weekly basis?

CIC is offered free to users. How many schools/districts depend on and use CIC for their College and Career Readiness planning?

Colorado public school districts profile
- 468,148 Students (grades 6-12 in 2016) - about 66.5K students/grade
- 178 Districts
  - 109 small rural
  - 39 rural
  - 80% of districts represent only 16% of student population (136,000 students)
- Districts having more than 50% of students with active CIC accounts:
  - 93 rural
  - 11 urban

Statistic	FY2011-2015 Average (5 years) per year	Last year
Accounts Created – end users	182,000	67,000
Accounts Created - professionals	4,200	1,900
Sessions	920,000	554,000
Page Views	17.5 million	6.3 million
Users	652,000	314,000
Daily average users	1,667	
Peaks typically January and fall	5,000 to 11,000 daily users	

User by agency connection – 7 year aggregate

Middle/High school (Districts)	655,737
No connection	357,943
Postsecondary (colleges)	41,040
Adults (workforce centers)	11,444

Note that account creation was not required to use much of the site and that supporting organizations such as BOCES, foster, pre-collegiate programs and the like could be connected to and view a user portfolio without creating duplicate user accounts. Whether the ability to use the functionality without an account is still up for consideration and will be determined in partnership with the MATF and the successful Offeror.

Q Is it required to migrate current users and their data?
A It is the goal of the MATF to preserve Individual Career and Academic Plan data to the degree possible for active middle and high school CIC users at minimum. What form the data takes will be based on the feasibility of data capture and transfer between our existing vendor and the successful Offeror.

Return

Operations/support over time

Q Whether we need to come over there for meetings? Potentially or we could come to your location with expenses paid.
A Offerors should build into their draft project plan a proposed meeting and check in schedule, both in-person and remote. If the Offeror wishes to be compensated for time, materials or expenses, that should be clearly indicated in the proposal. Offerors may also suggest travel expectations for MATF project team member(s) if that is more cost effective.

Q Can the project lead, Information Technology lead and the Security lead be the same person?
A It is up to the Offeror to propose a personnel resources plan than ensures the project will achieve all of the deliverables on time and on budget. In their proposal, the vendor should demonstrate that one person has the time and all of the necessary qualifications to achieve project goals.

- If a subscription fee model is supported, who would promote the new platform to the users?
- Who would be the first responders to support related questions? How are these tracked to closure?
- What is the rollout strategy for the new platform in terms of administering and training?
  - The support and services plans from each Offeror will be considered prior to solidifying the MATF service plan. However, it is the intention of the State to leverage each agency's support staff and outreach capacity to both promote the platform and provide training to case managers and professionals at those agencies. Other strategies including 3rd party support or service partners that cost-effectively meet the needs of the RFP will be considered.

<div align="right">

Return

</div>

RFP logistics, clerical, housekeeping

- DELIVERABLE: Online Training Modules
  DUE: By August 15, 2018
  Did they mean a different date – Aug 15, 2019?
  - Yes, August 15, 2019

- There are single (*) and double (**) asterisks on the Exhibit 2: Cost Component Response; however, there aren't any corresponding footnotes. Please advise.
  - Ignore the "*" and "**"

- The BACKGROUND indicates that funding partners and/or revenue generating strategies be provided by offerors; however, there isn't an explicit section provided for inclusion within the response. Please advise where this should be included.
  - *Please include this information in **Exhibit 2: Cost Component Response** in conjunction with your licensing, development phasing and O & M approach

- Given the desire to keep this response to 75 pages or less, is it acceptable to reference our RFI response in this RFP to eliminate redundancy where possible?
  - No. Each RFP response should stand on its own.

- Where a consortium of offerors are responding, do you require financial strength statements from all respondents, or just the organization leading the response?
  - Financial strength statements are required from those organizations that are liable for performance of the scope of work as defined in the Contract.

- Are the minimum qualifications described on pages 29 & 30 evaluated on an individual or an entity basis? If evaluated on an entity basis, how will group responses (ie. consortiums) who have formed for the purpose of this proposal be evaluated?
  - We suggest detailing how the entities involved and/or specific individuals meet the experience level criteria across the listed five work categories will help establish the credibility of the group to product the most competitive product.

- Can GitHub act as the escrow?
  - Specific vendor or platform selections for escrow agent will be evaluated during contract negotiations against their ability to provide the required services.

- What does "in writing" mean? Will email, Slack, and other informal digital communications be included?

A Depending on the formality required of the correspondence, hard copy, phone or e-mail are acceptable communication methods. Others could be suggested and used with prior State approval.

Q Can we submit the proposals via email?
A No. Please read Section 1.F. of the RFP and comply with those instructions.

Q Whether companies from Outside USA can apply for this?
Q Can we perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside USA? (like, from India or Canada)
A Yes, however in your work plan and cost structure you must expressly include any training and outreach services, along with product development interaction with the MATF, that you intend to or should provide in person, including costs associated with travel.

Training

Q Trainings are requested to occur prior to May 1, 2019; however, the solution will not be in UAT until July 1, 2019. Is May 1st the correct date? If so, what is the hope for the training, given that the solution will not yet be available?
A We hope that the solution is far enough along by May 1 that we could begin acquainting agency staff, key case management professionals and communications personnel on features and functionality as well as begin preparing materials and correspondence to users.

Updated RFP Activity Schedule

▶ August 31: proposal deadline
▶ October 1st week: oral presentations (approximate)
▶ October 29th week: selection announced (approximate)
▶ November – December: contract drafting period (approximate)