**STATE OF MAINE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**

**RFP AMENDMENT #1 AND**

**RFP SUBMITTED QUESTIONS & ANSWERS SUMMARY #2**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **RFP NUMBER AND TITLE:** | RFP #202307153  Connecting Maine’s Workforce System – MyWorkSourceMaine.org Portal |
| **RFP ISSUED BY:** | Department of Labor |
| **SUBMITTED QUESTIONS DUE DATE:** | October 11, 2023 |
| **AMENDMENT AND QUESTION & ANSWER SUMMARY ISSUED:** | November 1, 2023 |
| **PROPOSAL DUE DATE:** | November 8, 2023 **(as amended)** |
| **PROPOSALS DUE TO:** | [proposals@maine.gov](mailto:proposals@maine.gov) |
| **Unless specifically addressed below, all other provisions and clauses of the RFP remain unchanged.** | |
| **DESCRIPTION OF CHANGES IN RFP (if any):**   1. Proposal Submission Deadline is amended. | |
| **REVISED LANGUAGE IN RFP (if any):**   1. All references to the proposal submission deadline of November 1, 2023, no later than 11:59 p.m., local time. Are amended to November 8, 2023, no later than 11:59 p.m., local time. | |

**Provided below are submitted written questions received and the Department’s answer.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part I, Section A.1  Page 6 | The RFP states that the portal will provide a user-friendly way to access available jobs. Will this entail linking out to JobLink for users to search for jobs, or ingesting this information from the JobLink site to display directly on MyWorkSourceMaine.org? |
| **Answer** | |
| MyWorkSourceMaine.org is intended to provide links out to workforce services for workers and employers, allowing them to go directly to the site they choose. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **2** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part I, Section A.1  Page 6 | Please provide more detail on what is meant by “concierge service”. |
| **Answer** | |
| MyWorkSourceMaine.org is intended to provide workers and employers with one site that includes the full range of workforce services available across Maine’s workforce system. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **3** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part I, Section A.1  Page 6 | Please share which specific “partner sites” have been identified for connection at launch. |
| **Answer** | |
| The complete list of partners sites will be identified during the development phase of the project. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **4** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part I, Section A.2  Page 7 | Please explain the nature of the integration that the State would deem necessary relative to JENZABAR. Specifically, please answer the following:   1. Please explain the expected scope of functionality and the desired user experience that the integration would need to support/accommodate. Please explain this from the perspective of the various user roles. What exactly would the integration need to allow? 2. Please describe the envisioned dataflow between this new portal implementation and the existing Jenzabar system. (i.e., Would the integration be one-way, or two-way, and what is the nature of the data being passed?) 3. When, where and how would data transfers to/from the Jenzabar implementation need to happen during the user experience? At what steps/stages? 4. Please confirm that the State is under the impression that the Jenzabar system already has a sufficiently robust API in place to meet the needs of the State in relation to this project. 5. Please also confirm that API creation and adjustment for the Jenzabar system will not be deemed in scope. |
| **Answer** | |
| This integration will be defined during the development phase of the project. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **5** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part I, Section A.2  Page 7 | Please explain the nature of the integration that the State would deem necessary relative to POWERSCHOOL. Specifically, please answer the following:   1. Please explain the expected scope of functionality and the desired user experience that the integration would need to support/accommodate. Please explain this from the perspective of the various user roles. What exactly would the integration need to allow? 2. Please describe the envisioned dataflow between this new portal implementation and the existing PowerSchool system. (i.e., Would the integration be one-way, or two-way, and what is the nature of the data being passed?) 3. When, where and how would data transfers to/from the PowerSchool implementation need to happen during the user experience? At what steps/stages? 4. Please confirm that the State is under the impression that the PowerSchool system already has a sufficiently robust API in place to meet the needs of the State in relation to this project.   Please also confirm that API creation and adjustment for the PowerSchool system will not be deemed in scope. |
| **Answer** | |
| This integration will be defined during the development phase of the project. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **6** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part I, Section A.2  Page 7 | Please explain the nature of the integration that the State would deem necessary relative to CANVAS. Specifically, please answer the following:   1. Please explain the expected scope of functionality and the desired user experience that the integration would need to support/accommodate. Please explain this from the perspective of the various user roles. What exactly would the integration need to allow? 2. Please describe the envisioned dataflow between this new portal implementation and the existing Canvas system. (i.e., Would the integration be one-way, or two-way, and what is the nature of the data being passed?) 3. When, where and how would data transfers to/from the Cnavas implementation need to happen during the user experience? At what steps/stages? 4. Please confirm that the State is under the impression that the Canvas system already has a sufficiently robust API in place to meet the needs of the State in relation to this project. 5. Please also confirm that API creation and adjustment for the Canvas system will not be deemed in scope. |
| **Answer** | |
| This integration will be defined during the development phase of the project. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **7** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| **Part I, Section A.2**  **Pages 6-7** | **Is it the intent that training will be delivered directly from the MyWorkSource Maine site?** |
| **Answer** | |
| No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **8** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part I, Section A.2  Pages 6-7 | For the purpose of aggregating training information, exactly what external systems would need to be integrated with the initial implementation? For pricing of the initial build, we would want a clear and definite list of the external resources that would need to be targeted. |
| **Answer** | |
| This integration will be defined during the development phase of the project. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **9** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part I, Section A.2  Pages 6-7 | How often will the integration and data sourcing requirements change? How frequently will it be necessary to add/eliminate sources? |
| **Answer** | |
| This will be defined during the development phase of the project. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **10** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part I, Section A.2  Pages 6-7 | Are there data standards in place that will need to be accommodated? Ex. Classification of Instructional Programs (CIPs) or other coding practices? Provide details and explanation as applicable. |
| **Answer** | |
| Maine DOL does not have any specific data coding practices.  Maine's Office of Information Technology (OIT) does have data classification standards related to PII which are listed in the IT policies found here - <https://www.maine.gov/oit/policies-standards> | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **12** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part I, Section A.2  Pages 6-7 | In terms of “pulling available course offerings from the Maine Community College System, the University of Maine System, Adult Education, and private providers” - Which of these sources will have API’s available for integration on day 1 of the project? In lieu of available API’s, what other methods of updating training are considered viable for constituent contributors? |
| **Answer** | |
| This will be defined during the development phase of the project. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **11** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part I, Section A.2  Pages 6-7 | If the new MyWorkSource system will be PULLING data from third party sources, we would have some concerns surrounding the inherent requirements for ongoing sustainment of the relevant integrations. It should be understood that the APIs of targeted third-party systems might change from time to time. The timing and scope of such changes would be entirely unpredictable and beyond the control of bidders. Please therefore respond to EACH of the following:   1. Please confirm that any necessary code and configuration updates, to accommodate API changes/evolutions, would be directly billable on a T&M basis, as the need for such updates arise. 2. If T&M arrangements for updates will not be deemed acceptable, please provide bidders with some indication of the workload that should be assumed for fixed pricing purposes (i.e., updates on which systems, how often on each system, what sorts of changes to be expected). |
| **Answer** | |
| 1. Most updates that systems receive outside of standard maintenance/bug fixes etc. would be approved by management with a budget and T&M provided by the vendor. 2. Any changes will be discussed with the selected vendor. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **12** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part I, Section A.2  Page 7 | What’s involved in a “request for training support”? What purpose does such a request serve? Who approves the request? |
| **Answer** | |
| Any request for training support would be directed to Maine’s Career Centers. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **13** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part I, Section A.2  Page 7 | Please describe the vetting process for the public and private providers. Will this be managed on the platform? |
| **Answer** | |
| Training providers are vetted by MDOL. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **14** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part I, Section A.2  Page 7 | The RFP states that the “system must allow for quality control measures so that relevant training offered by private providers may be added upon approval”. Please answer EACH of the following:   1. Does the state have particular quality control measures in mind? If so, please explain. 2. Please confirm that the intent would be for all prospective training resources to be held in an audit queue for review and approval.   If applicable, would this be a single-party approval process? Or would it be a multi-stepped approval process? Please explain. |
| **Answer** | |
| Training providers are vetted by MDOL. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **15** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part I, Section A.2  Page 7 | Is there a standard lexicon/taxonomy of Career Paths that the State would want to use? If so, please provide or reference the applicable standard lexicon/taxonomy. |
| **Answer** | |
| This will be defined during the development phase of the project. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **16** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part I, Section A.2  Page 7 | Please identify the vendors who have done work relating to [www.maine.gov/healthcaretrainingforme](http://www.maine.gov/healthcaretrainingforme) (i.e., names of any vendors who built and who have sustained the platform) |
| **Answer** | |
| This was developed in house. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **17** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, Section B.1  Page 10 | The RFP seems to indicate that the system will need to allow for planning based on the user’s/client’s “needs and profile.” Please explain in more detail the scope of data/information that would need to be collected in this regard. What aspects of user needs? What elements would comprise the profile? |
| **Answer** | |
| This will be defined during the development phase of the project. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **18** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, Section B.2  Page 10 | Can the State please explain further what it has in mind for the itineraries? What would an itinerary look like? Can the state provide a sample/example? |
| **Answer** | |
| This will be defined during the development phase of the project. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **19** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, Section B.2  Page 10 | In the indicated section, the RFP refers to “supporting professionals.” Who are these individuals, and what positions do they actually occupy in the labor market? Are they State employees? Partners? |
| **Answer** | |
| State employees | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **20** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, Section B.2  Page 10 | Will data surfaced about a given job seeker need to be tailored based on the type of supporting professional who is viewing? Or will all supporting professionals have the same viewing/editing capabilities? Please explain accordingly. |
| **Answer** | |
| All supporting professionals will have the same viewing/editing capabilities. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **21** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, Section B.4  Page 10 | Is it anticipated that SWB staff will be able to manage future onboarding of training providers without technical assistance? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes, with appropriate training from the selected vendor. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **22** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, Section B.4  Page 10 | The RFP indicates that the system will need to make it possible to “define and build new or related archetypes and journeys.” Please answer each of the following:   1. From the State’s perspective, what do the terms “archetype” and “journey” mean, particularly in terms of user experience? What might these concepts look like from a functional perspective? Please provide a few examples. 2. What sorts of “journeys” would need to be supported in the initial implementation? 3. What sorts of configurability is the State expecting in relation to this requirement? What exactly would need to be possible from the perspective of a system administrator? |
| **Answer** | |
| 1. Archetype relates to careers withing job sectors, and “journey” means the career path journey a user would seek. 2. This will be defined during the development phase of the project. 3. This will be defined during the development phase of the project. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **23** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, Section B.4  Page 10 | Is the essential idea that the respective user journeys would each be centered around a particular industry or career path? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **24** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, Section B.6  Page 10 | The RFP indicates that the system will need to allow “an assisting professional or organization to add instructions, activity begin and completion time expectations, whether required or suggested for the user, level of importance… documents or other resources, further instruction or learning tools… etc.” This sounds very much like case planning and management. To what extent does case planning and management functionality need to be supported by this implementation? Please explain the scope of any case-management-oriented functional requirements in more detail. |
| **Answer** | |
| This applies to the ongoing maintenance of the site, with training provided by the vendor as described in the RFP. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **23** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, Section B.6  Page 10 | Will the system need to be capable of itinerary progress tracking? (esp. Insofar as some items in the itinerary might be deemed “requirements” for a user/client) |
| **Answer** | |
| That is possible. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **24** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, Section B.6  Page 10 | The functionality being described in the referenced section sounds similar to a Learning Management System. Please respond to EACH of the following:   1. Will it be necessary to provide LMS functionality as a part of the solution? If so, please explain. 2. Will it be necessary to enable organizations to create training content directly on the platform? 3. Will it be necessary for the new solution to provide direct (embedded) access to actual training content from external LMS implementations? |
| **Answer** | |
| This is not a Learning Management System | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **25** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, Section B.7  Page 10 | The RFP indicates that there is no intention to capture individual information or create individual accounts. However, it should be recognized that, in many places, the RFP seems to be referring to functionality that might warrant (or even necessitate) accounts and data retention. Can the State therefore provide responses to EACH of the following:   1. Please reconfirm that individual accounts and data capture should NOT be possible in the system. 2. Please clarify whether the State is OPPOSED to creating accounts and capturing information, vs. only wishes to make it optional.   If the State truly does not wish to allow for account creation and personal data capture, please explain how the system can be expected to accommodate such functionality as sign-in, training registration, personalized itinerary management, activity tracking, directed communications, and general session-to-session progress retention. |
| **Answer** | |
| The SWB is open to considering all solutions. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **26** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, Section C.3  Page 11 | Will it be necessary for the new solution to be able to pass user credentials to third-party sites, for user identification/authentication purposes? Or will users rather be expected to create separate accounts on each site? |
| **Answer** | |
| Users and setup will be discussed with the selected vendor, however, the SWB is open to any solutions. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **27** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, Section C.6  Page 11 | Should the vendor propose a professional translation service to integrate with the site, or does the State already have a service in mind? How should cost be included here? |
| **Answer** | |
| There is no standard offering within SOM. The selected vendor will need to provide this. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **28** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, Section D.5  Page 11 | Will the new solution need to allow for any notifications to be sent/generated? If so, please answer EACH of the following:   1. Please explain the functional requirements in more detail. What sorts of notifications would be necessary? Who would the recipients be? 2. If a user has shared no personal information, nor setup an account, how are they to receive a notification? |
| **Answer** | |
| This will be defined during the development phase of the project. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **29** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, ALL SERVICES (Applicable to all Components), Section A.6  Page 12 | What specific content and information will this platform share with the Maine Virtual American Job Center, and vice-versa? |
| **Answer** | |
| This will be defined during the development phase of the project. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **30** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, ALL SERVICES (Applicable to all Components), Section B.1  Page 12 | Since there are many parties involved in this multi-agency project, please provide the planned team structure and how many parties will be responsible for signing-off on deliverables. |
| **Answer** | |
| This will be defined during the development phase of the project. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **31** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, ALL SERVICES (Applicable to all Components), Section C  Page 13 | Where would the State like to host the platform? Would cloud hosting be acceptable? |
| **Answer** | |
| Cloud is acceptable with specific system requirements. For reference, please refer to IT policies found here - <https://www.maine.gov/oit/policies-standards> | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **32** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, ALL SERVICES (Applicable to all Components), Section C  Page 13 | If vendor-managed, commercial cloud hosting is being proposed, should the costs be included in the proposal? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **33** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, ALL SERVICES (Applicable to all Components), Section C  Page 13 | Can the state explain why the site needs to meet NIST 800-53 security standards if it will not be capturing or storing any personal information? |
| **Answer** | |
| This is a State of Maine standard. The State of Maine must make sure any amount of PII is protected. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **34** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix F  Page 32 | What should the vendor anticipate in terms of ongoing support requirements? Would this simply be the cost of keeping the site functional and secure, or should this also include potential costs for onboarding and integration of new training providers? If the latter should be included, can the State provide some input on the number of new providers that can be anticipated each year? |
| **Answer** | |
| Ongoing support would consist of training identified state employees on how to manage and update the system. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **35** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix F  Page 32 | Will the bidder be expected to provide support for inquiries from citizen end users? Or would support only be required for inquiries from State administrators? |
| **Answer** | |
| The bidder is not expected to provide support for inquiries from citizen end users. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **36** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix F  Page 32 | We are perfectly happy to insert responses into the excel workbook that was provided as Appendix E in the RFP. However, we would remind the State that the formatting options for the workbook appear to be locked-down. This means that any longer comments will inevitably wrap and be cut off (not be fully displayed). We imagine this will only make the review process more difficult. Would it be preferable for bidders to separately provide item responses, in a more easily reviewable format (i.e., not in the spreadsheet, just on normal typed pages, in a typical Q&A format)? |
| **Answer** | |
| Provide responses in the spreadsheet in Appendix E of the RFP. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **37** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix H  Page 34 | We were unable to open the embedded pdf with brand guidelines. Can you distribute this as a separate document? |
| **Answer** | |
|  | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **38** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | We are under the impression that many counselors and staff from provider organizations will receive system access. Assuming this is correct, please respond to each of the following:   1. Would the system need to accommodate multiple users per organization? 2. Would the system need to accommodate a tiered role structure at organizations? (ex. supervisors, counselors, organization account owner, etc.) 3. If applicable, please provide a sense of the organizational role scheme(s) that would need to be accommodated, with brief explanation of how functional permissions might vary. |
| **Answer** | |
| This has yet to be defined. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **39** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | Will the system need to track actual service delivery/utilization? (by “service” here, we mean training or support program) |
| **Answer** | |
| No. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **40** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | To what extent would the system need to directly present training to users (vs. merely route the users to the appropriate third-party sources of training)? |
| **Answer** | |
| No trainings will be provided, or presented, by or from the system. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **41** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | Please provide some sense of the essential workflows that the system would be expected to accommodate. What sorts of workflows, for what purposes, what sorts of steps, who would be involved, etc? |
| **Answer** | |
| This will be defined during the development phase of the project. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **42** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | What sorts of configurability should be possible in the solution? |
| **Answer** | |
| This will be defined during the development phase of the project. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **43** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | To what extent, and in what regards, does the State envision this new portal overlapping with the recently awarded contract for the Virtual One Stop Career Center? Please further explain the envisioned relationship between these two projects. |
| **Answer** | |
| MyWorkSourceMaine.org will link to the Virtual One Stop Career Center. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **44** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | Would the State consider allowing for a very brief round of follow-on Q&A, if the first round of answers gives rise to additional questions? |
| **Answer** | |
| No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **45** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | If possible, please allow bidders at least 10 business days to prepare proposals after final Q&A are published. |
| **Answer** | |
| All proposals MUST be received by the Division of Procurement Services by November 8, 2023, no later than 11:59 p.m., local time (as amended). | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **46** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | Will the new platform need to offer some manner of public-facing interface to allow for new provider registration? If so, please explain the necessary functionality that will need to be incorporated into the solution relative to new provider registration, review and approval. |
| **Answer** | |
| The SWB is open to considering all solutions. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **47** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | Is the State envisioning a unified scope of data collection from users across the platform (i.e., same scope of data collected for all users and journeys)? Or is the State rather expecting that the system will be capable of accommodating distinctive scopes of data collection for each respective professional career path journey? |
| **Answer** | |
| The SWB is open to considering all solutions. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **48** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | To the extent that the system would need to accomplish skills assessment, would this be a generic assessment, or would the system need to accommodate a whole series of assessments that might be distinctive to particular career paths? |
| **Answer** | |
| The SWB is open to considering all solutions and options. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **49** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | Will the system need to offer an interface for resume creation/management? |
| **Answer** | |
| No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **50** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | Will the system need to include any functionality that would be operationally integral to actual service (training or support) delivery, management and/or administration? If so, please explain the scope of the pertinent operational functionality that would need to be accommodated through the system. |
| **Answer** | |
| No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **51** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | Would the system need to accommodate any data sharing between parties (between private citizens, counselors, providers, etc.)? If so, please explain. |
| **Answer** | |
| No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **52** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | Will the system need to assign queued client cases to counselors? Some manner of automation in this regard? Please explain intentions accordingly. |
| **Answer** | |
| No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **53** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | Will this new system need to share its own data (collected data) with any other external systems? If so, please explain. |
| **Answer** | |
| No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **54** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | Please provide some basic/minimal sense of the system roles that are envisioned. We just need a general sense of what the State has in mind, not the firm and final detailed plan. A very simple list of roles, with a 1-2 sentence description of each would be ideal (would be quite helpful, even if imperfect). |
| **Answer** | |
| This has not been defined at this time. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **55** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | Would the State expect the selected vendor to provide UX services repeatedly over the contract term, for each respective user journey that is created during the five-year contract period? Or would the vendor rather only be expected to provide initial up-front consultation regarding the overall experience and the design options that would be possible, for all future journeys, as a matter of administrative configurability? |
| **Answer** | |
| The SWB expects the selected vendor to provide any necessary training to allow for SWB staff to effectively administer user journeys. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **56** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | Is the state anticipating that a relatively standardized user experience could be applied to all user journeys across the system (i.e., a standardized sequence of steps, with parallel sorts of functionality available for each journey)? Or would each journey warrant a fully distinctive experience, with totally distinctive steps and entirely distinctive functionality? Please explain accordingly. |
| **Answer** | |
| The SWB is open to considering all solutions. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **57** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | Regarding collection/aggregation of training course data:   1. Will the new system need to actively PULL the training course data from the various external sources? Or will the course data rather be PUSHED/LOADED by the external systems? 2. From how many external sources would course/offering data need to be collected?   Would it be reasonable for bidders to assume that the course/offering data will be made available in an agreeable format that will not require further transformation? |
| **Answer** | |
| 1. This data will be pulled from external sources 2. This will be defined in the development phase of the project. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **58** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | Would the system need to be capable of managing training enrollment/registration and maximum session capacity? |
| **Answer** | |
| No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **59** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | If applicable, is there any special logic that would need to be applied to course/session registration? (ex. seating/registration priority for veterans). If so, please explain. |
| **Answer** | |
| No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **60** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | Would the system need to handle direct communications to users (ex. blasts, courtesy notices, reminders, alerts and updates, etc.)? If so, please explain the functional requirements/intent. |
| **Answer** | |
| The SWB is open to options for how MyWorkSourceMaine.org could be used as a communications tool with workforce system partners. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **61** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix E, Support & Maintenance | In terms of literal wording, there are indications in the RFP that testing and remediation would need to occur outside of normal business hours. We are interpreting this to mean that the testing and remediation could still potentially occur during normal hours, as long as the associated activities do not interfere with normal live solution operation. Example: During normal business hours, it would be acceptable to conduct testing and remediation in separate servers/environments, where failures would not impact the live version in any way. Please confirm that this interpretation is reasonable and acceptable. |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes, this is reasonable and acceptable. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **62** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix E, Scope of Services to be Provided, #7 | Who are the “professionals” who are referenced in this section? What positions would they occupy in the workplace services market? |
| **Answer** | |
| “Professionals” in Appendix E refers to state employees. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **63** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix E, Scope of Services to be Provided, #7 | The RFP indicates that the “professionals” would need the ability to “turn off Career Pathway Mapping.” Does this simply mean they need the ability to override the automatically generated mapping? If it means something else, please clarify the functional requirement. |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **64** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix E, Scope of Services to be Provided, #7 | The RFP indicates that the “professionals” should be able to “set up groups.” What is a “group” in this context? Please explain this functional requirement in more detail. Provide some examples of groups, if possible. What is the use case? |
| **Answer** | |
| A “group” applies to Industry Sectors and the job positions included within. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **65** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix E, Scope of Services to be Provided, #7 | The RFP indicates that the “professionals” should be able to “provide a common journey by user group.” Please explain this functional requirement in more detail. What is the use case? What exactly would the “professional” need to be able to do? Provide some practical examples, if possible. |
| **Answer** | |
| A “common journey by user groups” applies to specific career paths within Industry Sectors. One example would be a Medical Assistant who wants to understand the career path they could take to become a Registered Nurse. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **66** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | Would the system need to handle financial transactions around training registrations (payments and fees for courses, etc.)? |
| **Answer** | |
| No. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **67** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part IV, Section III  Pages 17-19 | Under section 3, item 1, it sounds like the instructions indicate that bidders are expected to present responses to Appendix E, *as well as* some narrative content pertaining to the “methods” and “how [the bidder] will accomplish the tasks involved.” The narrative must apparently include a “description of all the work required… including the proposed project approach… discovery approach… discrete project tasks.. including design and testing plan.” The response for item 1 is additionally meant to explain how expectations and outcomes will be assured.  Under section 3, item 2, it sounds like the RFP is asking for a work plan. This is apparently meant to take the form of a timeline, *as well as* a description of “each program development and implementation task.”  From our perspective, the instructions for item 1 and item 2 seem quite redundant. We are being asked, in two places, to explain the PROCESS that we would use to plan, develop and deploy the solution. In both places, it seems like the RFP is requesting the same sort of narrative – an explanation of all work required and all tasks involved.  We would request that the State help us to better understand the response requirements of each respective section. We are particularly interested in obtaining a better sense of how each section is being differentiated and distinguished.  We are wondering whether the state would consider revising the guidelines as follows:  Section III to include -   1. Responses to Appendix E 2. Timeline for project, showing all tasks/steps, including assignment responsibility (person/position assigned to each task) 3. Narrative explanation of all tasks/steps (corresponding to timeline)   Better clarity in this regard would undoubtedly help to ease the State’s evaluation burden, as it would enable bidders to avoid presentation of the same (verbatim) information repeatedly. |
| **Answer** | |
| **PART IV**  **PROPOSAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS**  This section contains instructions for Bidders to use in preparing their proposals. The Department seeks detailed yet succinct responses that demonstrate the Bidder’s qualifications, experience, and ability to perform the requirements specified throughout the RFP.  The Bidder’s proposal must follow the outline used below, including the numbering, section, and sub-section headings. Failure to use the outline specified in PART IV, or failure to respond to all questions and instructions throughout the RFP, may result in the proposal being disqualified as non-responsive or receiving a reduced score. The Department, and its evaluation team, has sole discretion to determine whether a variance from the RFP specifications will result either in disqualification or reduction in scoring of a proposal. Rephrasing of the content provided in the RFP will, at best, be considered minimally responsive.    Bidders are not to provide additional attachments beyond those specified in the RFP for the purpose of extending their response. Additional materials not requested will not be considered part of the proposal and will not be evaluated. Include any forms provided in the submission package or reproduce those forms as closely as possible. All information must be presented in the same order and format as described in the RFP. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **68** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part III.C.2.e – p.16  Part IV – pages 17-19  Appendix E – p.29 | The instructions indicate that the bid should be broken into just four files. File 3 in particular is meant to include some text (regular word document) components, as well as responses to Appendix E, which is in Excel format. This could make consolidation of the FIle 3 materials something of a challenge. We would therefore request responses to EACH the following:   1. Will it be acceptable to submit Appendix E as a separate (fifth) file? 2. If it is not acceptable to submit Appendix E as a separate (fifth) file, how would the State like the Appendix E information to be submitted?   NOTE: As we indicated in one of our other questions above, the content of bidders’ responses in Appendix E can overrun the visible cell size. If we were to merely export the content of the excel file to a PDF, and then incorporate that PDF into a consolidated response document, some content from the Appendix would likely be obscured/clipped (would not be visible). We therefore believe that merely PDFing Appendix E would not be practical. Accordingly, we would urge the State to allow bidders to transpose the Appendix questions into the flow of a normal document, so that the text can run down the page normally, without anything obscured, in a manner that would allow for easy file consolidation (everything would simply be in a normal text document). This would likely also ease the review process, as the excel document can be quite cumbersome to deal with (evaluator would need to click into individual cells and scroll down through the text therein to view the complete content; it would assuredly be much easier to just have the information plainly visible on a page). |
| **Answer** | |
| 1. No 2. No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **69** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | We are under the impression that some funding might have been already allocated to this project. If applicable, would the allocated budget only be reflective of the first year (build) funding? Or would the funding rather represent the allocated amount for the total (five year) project lifecycle? |
| **Answer** | |
| The funding available for this project is intended to cover the project lifecycle, if necessary. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **70** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | Is the State expecting that the initial build will yield a stable and static product that can simply be maintained and operated “as is” during subsequent contract years? Or is the State rather anticipating an ongoing enhancement and evolution effort? |
| **Answer** | |
| The SWB expects MyWorkSourceMaine.org to be ready for deployment by July 1, 2024, while anticipating ongoing improvements and maintenance as deemed necessary. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **71** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | Should proposed out-year (year 2+) pricing cover prospective solution enhancement? Or would such enhancements be handled as contract modifications, as needs arise? If applicable, is there a certain funding amount, or volume of hours, that the state would like bidders to build-into their pricing for enhancement purposes?  (NOTE: We are distinguishing “enhancement” here from mere maintenance) |
| **Answer** | |
| Any prospective solution enhancements would be handled as contract modifications. | |