

# RFP Questions and Responses

Updated 01/14/2010

Vendor questions are in black.

MHDC responses are in red.

1. Is there going to be a bid meeting for this RFP?  
**We are not planning on having a bid meeting.**
2. Will it be acceptable to utilize resources at CIBER India in the completion of the work described by this RFP?  
**No, we won't be able utilize offshore resources.**
3. What is the anticipated use of SharePoint (MOSS)?
  - a. Authentication Control / Integration for Departmental Interface (Single Sign-On which would be based on internally-controlled user accounts)?  
**Yes. Also for extranet authentication.**
  - b. Version Control for the application documents?  
**Unstructured data such as submitted documents would leverage SharePoint. Structured data such as the application versions would leverage a database accompanying your solution. MHDC is open to other suggestions.**
    - i. This would only be appropriate IF there are many changes in an application from its initial version to the final version (meaning that a full electronic version of the application in PDF or similar format would be stored each time anything is modified).
    - ii. IF there are few changes, then version control can be handled within the database itself, although electronic format of any given version can still be generated as a PDF or other document type based on stored version info. This method would save significant disk space over time & require less frequent archiving and/or lower the cost of hosting infrastructure.
4. What is the anticipated volume to be processed / stored for the system?
  - c. Approximate # of applicants per week / month / year  
**There could be 2-4 application periods throughout the year. Most will be submitted on the due date. There could be 30-200 applications for each application period.**
  - d. Approximate # of programs each applicant applies for  
**1-4 is average.**
  - e. Approximate # of versions of application per applicant/program applied for  
**Expecting one application to include ability to apply for all programs. 5-10 work in process versions are possible per application.**
  - f. Approximate # of changes in application versions from initial completion to "final" application version  
**A number of fields could be modified, multiple times. It would be very rare that versions wouldn't have several updates while in process.**
5. Initial Assumptions:
  - g. The On-Line Application (Applicant Portal) would utilize stand-alone security and authentication methods which will meet or exceed the criteria laid forth in the RFP

- h. The system would not utilize SharePoint user interface screens in either the On-Line Application or the Departmental Interface  
MHDC is open to these suggestions.
6. When is the project expected to start development?  
Depends on how quickly a contract can be agreed upon. Likely January 2010.
7. When will it will be awarded?  
Likely within 3-4 weeks of the due date, 11/20/09
8. Is there a drop dead delivery date for first release?  
The Phase I pilot should be completed as soon as possible, so proper testing can occur. A desired full implementation for late Summer/ early Fall 2010, dependant on a sound pilot.
9. Is the intent of the Phase II On Line Application such that the developer would key the contents of your application as it stands today into web based screens? Can portions of the application continue to be uploaded even in Phase 2?  
The intention for Phase I is that we would have a pilot roll out. While Phase II is not outlined in the RFP, this phase would extend from pilot to full implementation after any bugs/kinks are worked out from Phase I.
10. Can one offeror propose multiple solutions under one rfp response or offer more than one rfp response?  
Dependant on the amount of detail provided for multiple solutions under one rfp response, multiple rfp responses would be preferred.
11. Will there be data auditing needs in the Phase II solution during the data entry of application data?  
As Phase II is full implementation, yes.
12. If there were a price differentiation, would MHDC consider a vendor hosted solution?  
While not desired, all RFP responses will be considered based on their merit.
13. In requirement 1.2.16.2 Collection of Fees, can you define the term "complies with MHDC policies" ?  
Appropriate controls/security are applied.
14. In requirement 1.2.3.3 what does "accept" non-electronic documents mean?  
Ability for applicant to upload/attach various kinds of documents and the system track receipt/non-receipt.
15. In Section 1.2.16. "The system must provide the ability to accept online payment at the time of application. Please provide information regarding purposed online payment acceptance method. 1.2.16.1. It is highly desirable that the collected application fees be automatically deposited in the appropriate MHDC account at the time the application is submitted. Please provide information of how fees are collected by your system."  
Can you provide more details about this section?

Today we collect a paper check for application fee payment. We need to accept electronic payment going forward, such as a credit card. Upon submission, we would like for the payment to be deposited in a designated account. We want to understand how your system collects the payment data and how it will be distributed to our account.

16. In Section 1.2.18. The system must provide the ability to customize deadlines for application submissions by program.”

Can you provide a definition of what is meant by “program” please?

MHDC has various funding sources or “programs” for which we will utilize this online application. We may elect or need to separate these on occasion or we may have other short-term sources for which we want to use the application.

17. In Section 1.3.6. Departments must have the ability to view the complete application information as submitted by the applicant for defined views.

Do you currently have a list of proposed views you will want to accept? Will/does MHDC have readers for these views?

These views are not yet defined. These views are meant to be internal MHDC views, not applicant views. We do utilize the Adobe reader (PDF), or could view within the standard Internet Explorer 8 browser.

18. 1.2.20. The system must provide the ability to customize terms and conditions by program.

Question: Can you please clarify what MHDC means by “terms and conditions”?

We need the ability to input and set “rules” or conditions that ensure the standard requirements are met by funding program.

19. If selected will there be a period where we can review the deliverables and tighten up the scope?

The answer is yes, as part of the negotiation process the deliverable and scope will be reviewed. We do recommend the response be as accurate as possible.

20. What version of MOSS 2007 do they have? (Standard, Enterprise, etc...)

Enterprise Version

21. Do you currently own the SharePoint Internet License?

We do not.

22. Do you own InfoPath?

Yes

23. Are you planning on upgrading to SharePoint 2010?

Yes, no timeline established.

24. Do you currently use any tools for payment processing online?

We currently do not use any payment processing tools online, we have a relationship with a vendor that is in an inactive status. We will be open to suggestions/recommendations as well.

25. What is the anticipated award date of this RFP? We have set a target date of 30 days after the due date.

26. What level of correspondence must the system generate? Will this correspondence be via email or will it need to be communicated to commercial printers? **Can you provide more detail, and potentially an example, so I can be sure what you're asking?**

Does the MHDC require that the system generate automated responses via email or letters based on the data entered by the applicant. For instance, after an applicant completes the application and is found unqualified for the program, does the MHDC require that an email or paper letter to be generated and sent to the applicant informing them that they do not qualify? If a letter is to be generated, does the MHDC require that such letters from a certain time period (for example, those dated 12/22) are batched and sent the printer all at once? If so, how many different automated letter or email responses are required?

**In this version, only email responses are required. The total number has yet to be determined, would estimate less than 10 at this point**

27. Does the MHDC anticipate that a Data Conversion effort from a legacy system to SQL and/or Excel to SQL will part of the project?

**No.**

28. Is an interface with scanning technology required or is it sufficient for the system to allow MHDC staff to indicate that paper documents were received and provide a mechanism for associating them with a particular application and program?

**An interface with scanning technology is not required.**

29. Approximately how many basic reports will be required in addition to the customizable reports?

**The exact number has yet to be determined.**

30. We respectfully request an extension of the due date to Friday, February 15<sup>th</sup> in order to consider the responses to these questions and to prepare a response to this RFP that is as accurate as possible.

**MHDC is unable to comply with this request.**

31. Does the MHDC anticipate an MHDC user making the decision as to whether an applicant receives funds, or does the MHDC anticipate that the system will apply logic to determine this?

**It is anticipated that an MHDC user will make the decision as to whether an applicant receives funds.**

32. Can you tell me why the RFP was re-issued? In preparing our response we wanted to get a bit of clarification on that.

**Our general reasoning for rejecting and re-issuing the RFP is "due to lack of detail, excessive costs and/or insufficient detail of total costs."**

33. 2.1.6 The vendor must provide assurance that the system will be able to support the peak demands of the applicants submitting on-line applications without degradation to the system performance and response time. For a given funding round, there may be 150-200 applicants with potential multiple versions.

**There could be up to 15 MHDC employees (processors) actively working in the system at peak times. There may be 150-200 applicants per funding round (peak time).**

34. Requirement 1.1.2. The vendor must provide a system that can be customized to meet the needs of MHDC funding programs.
- What customizations are needed for the MHDC funding programs beyond the current forms?  
**No specifics at this time, but from time to time due to regulatory/financial changes may require modifications to current programs, which would in turn require changes to the application.**
  - Are new forms being created?  
**Not currently.**
35. Requirement 1.2.3.1. The supplemental materials must be tied to the original application and project number so departments can easily view and print these materials along with the application. The ultimate goal is to have a complete, viewable, electronic file containing a completed application and all supporting documentation regardless of format.
- What is the format of the supplemental materials? Office 2007? Any other formats? Any non-standard formats?  
**Current formats include: PDF, Office 2003, and Office 2007. Clients have varying levels of technology available to them.**
36. Requirement 1.2.3.3. The system must provide the ability to accept and track non-electronic documents such as architectural plans, hard-copy reports, photos, etc.
- Will scanned images be an option to receive the documents?  
**Yes**
  - Will these documents come in via fax?  
**No**
  - What resolution quality is needed for the documents?  
**Undetermined, but need to be recognizable.**
37. Requirement 1.2.11. The system must assign an MHDC Project Identification Number to each application. It is highly desired that MHDC provide guidance for logic built into the number.
- Will this number be generated with information on the applicant forms?  
**Yes**
  - Will this number be generated from data in a back-office system?  
**No**
38. Requirement 1.2.13. Where possible entry fields must be tied to standardize and user extensible lookup tables for items such as counties, governmental district, and program(s) requested, etc.
- Are these stored in a back-office database?  
**No**
  - Will standard SharePoint lists suffice?  
**We would want the lists to be accessible, so they can be leveraged by other systems.**
39. Requirement 1.2.14. The on-line application must allow for identifying text, images, and logos provided by MHDC such that the application reflects MHDC rather than vendor ownership and branding.
- What extent will branding be provided?
    - Colors and Logos?

Yes

- o Graphics?

No

- Can you provide CSS for SharePoint based on MHDC branding or will a branding effort be required to define, review and implement?

We do not have a CSS available.

- Will all graphics be provided or will brand be defined from scratch?

Believe this will need to be the latter.

40. Requirement 1.3.5. Security regarding MHDC staff's ability to view detailed application information must be customizable as needed.

- What are the current roles for security access?

TBD

- What are the number of security roles?

TBD- The number is probably greater than 5, but less than 10.

41. Requirement 1.3.5. Security regarding MHDC staff's ability to view detailed application information must be customizable as needed.

- Will these views be created by MHDC?

MHDC will work to define the views with the chosen vendor.

- How many views will be defined?

This will be an output of the bullet point above, but would envision be similar in numbers to question 7.

42. Requirement 2.1.8. Integration of captured data from other systems (not adequately defined)

- When will other system interfaces be defined?

TBD

- Should we include time to define these system interface definitions in our proposal?

This will be at a later time, but should be noted that this capability is there.

43. Requirement 2.2.1.1. If packaged or off-the-shelf solution, the provided database must be open and non-proprietary so data can be exported into another database as needed.

- Would SharePoint content databases be acceptable?

This would be considered, but SQL is preferred.

44. Requirement 2.2.2. Microsoft SharePoint Integration (MHDC uses MOSS 2007):

- MOSS 2007 Standard or Enterprise?

Enterprise

45. Requirement 3.1.2.5. Preliminary Implementation Plan-Full Implementation. The vendor should develop a primary implementation plan for a phased approach to implementing the full functionality of the proposed solution over two application cycles.

- How long is an application cycle?

4 month lead time to complete an application, deadline due, then 2-3 month processing time frame.

46. Are there any changes to the fields on the documents provided in the exhibits for the desired online documents?

There is potential for changes based on regulatory/ financial changes that may require modifications to current programs, which would in turn require changes to the application.

47. Have you purchased a SharePoint External License connector?

No

48. Do you expect the response to be a fixed price or T&M type engagement?

We expect the response to be a fixed price, with the understanding that changes to the scope may change pricing.

49. Will the development be performed on State assets or Sogeti assets?

Please further define what is meant by assets?

50. The forms seem complex; do you have issues using ASP.NET and C# in the background as opposed to a strict SharePoint development? If we choose a mix of ASP.NET and C# with integration to SharePoint what items do you envisage would need to be integrated with SharePoint? One we clearly see in the specification document is Authorization / Authentication module. Are there any such SharePoint requirements?

We do not envision any issues using ASP.NET and C#. Unsure how to answer parts 2 and 3. Please provide clarification if further answers are required.

51. In preparing our response a question came up about MHDC's consulting firm's role in the RFP process. Is it correct that they are also bidding on the RFP? Our concern is that as a private company submitting confidential information under the RFP, sensitive company documents may be shared with RSM McGladrey. We understand that as a consulting firm for the Agency they may have access to such information, but if they are competing with us for the project this is a great concern for us. Can you please clarify if this is correct or if we are misunderstanding something?

RSM McGladrey was asked to, and did, recuse themselves as General Contractor for the online application portion of the project. They have not, nor will they be involved with reviewing neither proposals, nor the decision making process.

52. Will the development be performed on State assets or Sogeti assets?

If the vendor prefers to not do their initial development on MHDC assets, we can certainly understand that development may take place at vendors own facilities on their own equipment. However, when development is finished, we would expect final testing and software systems to in be in place on MHDC owned assets.