Joint Compact Commissions Data System RFP

Received Questions

The following is a complete list of questions submitted to the Joint Commissions during the open question window of the RFP. Questions have been answered below and are categorized according to topic.

Budget

Please confirm the initial $863,000 is funding for Year 1 platform development.

The contract will be a time and materials contract with a not-to-exceed ceiling. Because it is a time and materials contract – the $863,000 may also cover the options years. The compact commissions are working on additional fundraising efforts so a revised number of the potential size of the contract will be known to vendors before the contracting phase is complete.

The ceiling budget for the one-year period is $863,000. This is a very specific number so I am assuming someone has given the compact this budget already in advance of the RFP?

The $863,000 represents currently funds available for a time and materials, "not to exceed" contract – and does not represent a predetermined cost estimate.

What amount is being budgeted for ongoing support, software licensing, hosting, and support of the new system, or is that to be included within the $863,000 stated budget over the course of the initial contract term?

The $863,000 referenced in the RFP represents the initial budget of the data system. The compact commissions are continuing to fundraise to add further funds for development and future maintenance. The $863,000 should be viewed as the potential size of the initial vendor contract.

Timeline

Is there a projected award and start date?

We anticipate the project award and start date to occur in early 2024.

Are the answers to other questions that have been asked by participants accessible? It would be helpful to review any previously provided clarifications or insights.

All questions and answers received will be posted to the compact commission websites by November 6th.

Given the complexity of the RFP, extensive requirements, etc. can the proposal due date be extended by at least 2-4 weeks?

The compact commissions have chosen to allow for 60 days for a response. There are no current plans to extend the deadline and interested vendors should prepare to meet the initial deadline of November 20th. If there is any extension made to the deadline, potential vendors will be notified via the compact commission websites.

<u>Compact Commission Information</u>

I noticed that the RFP mentions three separate compacts. Could you confirm whether each compact will have its own distinct database instance, or will they share a common database infrastructure?

It is anticipated that the compacts will choose to develop a common database infrastructure. However, data specific to each compact will be firewalled from access by the other compacts.

Do you have a list of fees and how they are calculated?

The compact commissions have not established a fee structure yet. The compact member states may impose fees as well that would flow through the data system, but the vast majority of states have not done so yet.

What presentations, software demonstrations and/or estimates / quotes have been received related to this project and from whom?

The joint commissions have not received any formal presentations, software demonstrations, estimates or quotes since the release of the RFP.

The National Council of State Boards of Nursing (NCSBN) hosted a series of webinars before the commissions decided to issue an RFP to preview the system that the Nurse Licensure Compact uses (Nursys). The presentation was not held at any compact commission meeting though compact commissioners were invited to voluntarily attend. The presentation included an overview of the system, including screenshots.

A proposal was also received in the early part of 2023 (before the RFP was drafted) by the Counseling Compact Commission from Covalent Logic. The proposal was distributed to the Counseling Compact Commission Executive Committee but was never formally considered.

Can we obtain access to the survey results that outline the current capabilities of different states? This information will help us better align our proposal with the specific needs and capacities of each state.

The survey information is preliminary and therefore not released for the purposes of the RFP.

<u>**Location**</u>

Do you want post implementation support?

This will be a need of the compact commissions after the data system's initial buildout. This RFP is currently just for the initial buildout, however.

Where do you want to deploy the web application (On-premises or Cloud or hybrid)?

Cloud-based infrastructure.

Is the vendor required to be on site for any portion of the contract term?

No.

<u>**Open Source**</u>

Does a vendor require prior approval to include non open-source applications in a proposal?

Please know that permission to use non-open sources applications is not needed for the proposal stage. However, the proposal should disclose the intended use of the application in the project to assist the commission in their evaluation and vendor decision.

Any non-open source application could then be given formal permission through the contracting phase, based on the vendor's proposal and any further negotiation between the commissions and vendor.

Please refer to Section 5.3 for more information.

The RFP states that the Compact Commissions "intend that the software delivered under this task order will be released as open source," which is problematic for experienced COTS and SaaS solution providers within regulatory management.

  a. **Why do the Compact Commissions desire the solution to be open source?**
  b. **Does this intent potentially underscore the desire to provide ease for integration by different state licensing boards, commissions and other stakeholders for setting up the transfer of data and document files?**
  c. **If so, what analysis has been performed or safeguards established for utilization of an open source-based solution given the security concerns around individual licensee data, etc.?**
  d. **Section 3.2 Deliverables and QASP indicates the Compact Commissions prefer a custom developed solution using open source software code. Please confirm this.**

An open-source solution is preferred, however, vendors do have the option to propose licensed solutions as long as it is disclosed and explained in the proposal.

An open-source solution is preferred to provide the compact commissions flexibility for future needs and to potentially benefit new licensure compacts that are in the process of becoming active.

There is still expected to be proper security measures built by the vendor for the system.

Data System Technical Requirements

Are there any security needs required to maintain the data? I.e., FEDRAMP and Audit requirements? If so, please describe.

Section 5.1 of the RFP describes security:

Software solution must be designed for a standard, commercial-grade cloud-based environment that has a secured government environment available (i.e., the software solution must be designed for Azure Government).

Is the agency currently using another system and/ or vendor to manage your system? If so, what is the system/vendor? If not, how are licenses/permits currently being managed by the agency?

The compact commissions currently do not have another system as they are just now starting their operations. Each compact member state's licensing boards, however, maintain their own licensing systems which much interface with the compact commission's data system.

Will the system need to integrate with any existing systems such as agency financial systems, credit card provider/gateway), document management system?

The compact data system will need to interface with each compact member states licensing system. The list of compact member states will continue to grow in 2024 and beyond.

Do the systems you wish this solution to interface with have APIs available? If so, are they available for review? If not, please describe integration capabilities.

Yes – but they are not available for review yet. Each compact member state may have different integration capabilities and the system will need to meet their needs.

Which all systems/platforms need be integrated with Compact application? Please provide details of the other system.

The data system will need to interface with multiple state licensing board systems. We do not have a current inventory of all systems as more states are continuing to join the compacts.

Do you change the website content very often? Do you want to keep version of the website content? For this, are you open to use any CMS or DXP platform like; Adobe AEM, Sitecore, WordPress, etc.? This may come with additional licensing cost. Please suggest.

Vendors may propose any technology solution.

Could you please provide details of the data migration requirement, if any?

There is no requirement for data migration.

Please provide details of the preferred technology stack for the web application? Or can we recommend suitable technology stack?

Bids should propose technology stacks and make a case for why they are correct for our technical needs and the needs of participating states.

The RFP states that: "The Contractor must post all developed code to a Git repository designated by the Joint Commissions" – can this repository be "owned" or "created" by the contractor?

The vendor is welcome to use their own repository for their development work, and deliver work to the compact commissions' repository on a per-story basis or a sprintly basis, such as with a pull request. We aren't dictating to vendors where they perform development, just where the competed code is delivered.

Is the compact required to use a specific payment gateway or will the vendor choose one?

There is no specific payment gateway specified in the RFP. The vendor may propose one to be used but the determination would be made during the development phase (with approval by the compact commissions).

For data conversion requirements, please inventory all data sources, file formats, and size of the current data sets to be converted and migrated into the new system.

This information has not been collected and will be part of the data system development process.

Are the UX designs ready OR are you expecting the chosen vendor to do UX design?

It is expected that the UX designs will be constructed as part of the project.

System Size

How many applications are received per year?

The compacts operations are beginning so this data is not available.

How many license/permit types are managed by your agency?

Each of the three compact commissions will issue a singular license type to qualified individuals on behalf of the compact member states.

Please provide the number of internal users (agency employees and other reviewers) who will need access to the system as well as which ones will be performing mobile inspections. Please provide the number of external users (applicants, license/permit holders, board members, and public constituents) who will need access to the system via a web portal.

The compact data system is intended to have the following user types:

- Compact Commission staff
- Compact member states
- Licensed professionals
- Public members (including patients and employers)

Each user type is envisioned to have varying permission levels and functional needs. Because of the wide user base and the fact that more states are anticipated to join the compact, we are not able to provide accurate numbers of the users.

Do you have information regarding the estimated number of participants who will be part of the compact? Understanding the scale of the project is crucial for our planning and resource allocation.

The potential universe of participants is the size of each profession represented by the compacts. Not every licensee will qualify or wish to use the compact, so the exact number is unknown.

Future Features

What are the high-level features that are part of the additional 2-year option period? This could help us in our initial design.

This is unknowable at present. The included sample user stories provide a general idea of the sort of work that may be required, but it's impossible to know what high-level features will be required without research to determine user needs and design proposals for how to meet those through software.

What are the other languages need to be supported other than English?

For the initial buildout, we would anticipate just supporting English. However, future updates of the system may include additional languages.

Additional Information

What vendors attended the pre-proposal conference?

We do not publicly disclose the registration list from the RFP webinar.