

Question #	Question	Response
1	<p>Could the State elaborate on the specific child welfare outcome metrics or data analytics capabilities it wishes to integrate into the CCWIS to enhance data-driven decision-making? For instance, is there an interest in deploying predictive analytics for risk assessment or utilizing machine learning models to identify patterns in case outcomes to support caseworkers' decision-making processes and service delivery improvements?</p>	<p>The Administration for Children and Families (ACF) requires certain metrics such as: placement stability, permanency achievement, social worker visitation with children in foster care, re-entry into foster care. In addition, some metrics FSD is interested in include (but not limited to): timely commencement and timely closure of child safety interventions, timely completion of SDM assessments, timely completion of case plans (including initial), court reports, length of time cases are open (for all cases, by case type), and caseload per worker. Beyond these metrics/outcomes, FSD is interested in predictive analytics tools to best support service recommendations, service delivery development and other machine learning models to support case outcomes.</p> <p>In Exhibit A, Part 2, question 16 bidders are given an opportunity to describe any AI capabilities that their solution has to offer the State.</p>
2	<p>In the process of preparing for the initial data migration to the CCWIS, could the State specify which data sets, such as case histories or child profiles, are to be prioritized for early migration, considering the varying complexities of legacy system data structures? Furthermore, how does the State envision addressing the challenges of data cleansing and deduplication to ensure data integrity and accuracy in the CCWIS environment? Are there particular methodologies or tools that the State recommends or requires to streamline this process, especially for high-volume or sensitive data categories?</p>	<p>The approach will be to work on this level of detail with the selected vendor after signing a contract with the vendor. Please note in section 2.4.4 Vendor Responsibility of the RFP, the State notes that it expects the vendor to assist in data cleaning, transformation, and de-duplication.</p> <p>The winning vendor will be expected to produce a Data Conversion and Migration Plan document as one of the contract deliverables. The deliverable acceptance process is detailed in section 2.4.9 of the RFP.</p>
3	<p>Could the State detail its expectations around the provision of guides or training for Vermont DCF staff on the CCWIS system's customization capabilities? Specifically, is there a requirement for the vendor to outline the scope of customizable features within the system's architecture, such as user interface adjustments or workflow modifications, and to what extent these customizations can be made without risking system stability? Furthermore, are there preferred formats for these educational resources (e.g., video tutorials, interactive webinars, written documentation) to facilitate effective knowledge transfer and empower DCF staff to manage system customizations autonomously?</p>	<p>Customization Expectations: The CCWIS must allow for user interface adjustments and workflow modifications without compromising system stability. It should be both customizable and configurable to meet Vermont DCF's operational needs while adhering to budget and modularity standards.</p> <p>Training Requirements: The vendor is expected to provide comprehensive training that empowers DCF staff to manage system customizations autonomously. Training should include a variety of formats such as written documentation, hands-on exercises, and potentially video tutorials or interactive webinars, to cater to different learning preferences.</p> <p>Scope of Training: Training should cover all aspects of the system, ensuring that staff are well-equipped to use, customize, and maintain the system effectively, with special focus on maintaining system stability during customizations.</p>
4	<p>Could the State indicate any preferred automated testing tools or frameworks, such as Selenium for web application testing or JUnit for Java applications, that are essential for aligning with the existing testing ecosystem during the module development, deployment, and testing phases of the CCWIS project? Moreover, is there a requirement for these tools to support specific testing methodologies, like Behavior-Driven Development (BDD) with tools such as Cucumber, to facilitate communication across technical and non-technical stakeholders?</p>	<p>Once a vendor is selected the details on automated testing tools or framework will be worked out.</p>

5	What baseline metrics or outcomes has the State established to measure the direct positive impact of the CCWIS solution on Vermont's children and families? Furthermore, could the State specify any particular reporting formats or intervals that are mandatory for conducting these impact assessments? Understanding the benchmarks for success, such as improvements in case resolution times, enhanced service delivery, or increased caseworker efficiency, is crucial. Additionally, clarity on whether the State prefers these reports in specific formats (e.g., dashboards, detailed reports) and at certain intervals (monthly, quarterly) will ensure that our solution is designed to seamlessly collect, analyze, and present data in alignment with the State's expectations for ongoing evaluation and improvement.	The Administration for Children and Families (ACF) requires certain metrics such as: placement stability, permanency achievement, social worker visitation with children in foster care, re-entry into foster care. In addition, some metrics FSD is interested in including (but not limited to): timely commencement and timely closure of child safety interventions, timely completion of SDM assessments, timely completion of case plans (including initial), court reports, length of time cases are open (for all cases, by case type), and caseload per worker. Beyond these metrics/outcomes, FSD is interested in various formats to view benchmarks including, but not limited to, dashboards and monthly reports to best support support case outcomes. While many of the outcomes listed above come in quarterly intervals, there are some that FSD would be looking at weekly and monthly.
6	While the RFP provides a comprehensive outline of current requirements, it does not specifically mention exploring some features covered in our existing "Intelligent Welfare Management Dashboard." Given the potential of these futuristic features to transform experiences, would the Commission be interested in reviewing our system's capabilities? If so, may we include them in our proposal by adding an additional/optional section to the proposal submission?	The State expects the responses to our questions and requirements to be for a specific solution but in Exhibit A, Part 2, question 6A a bidder can describe other possible alternative solutions if it is desired to make the State aware of alternatives.
7	a. "The solution must Integrate the CCWIS system with the Courts system. This integration must allow for seamless data exchange between the two systems, improving efficiency and accuracy in the data processing." Do the same records and fields need to be synced bi-directionally between Courts and the CCWIS system? b. "The SSMIS and FSDNet data is sent to the ABC Registry application using some mechanisms in SQL Server. Currently, SSMIS and FSDNet are on the same SQL Server as the ABC Registry application, so it's easy for them to share data." Is a direct ODBC/JDBC connection to the SSMIS/FSDNet SQL Server the only integration option, or are APIs or file-based bulk options available? c. "The CCWIS shall integrate a Structured Decision Making (SDM) tool to support caseworkers in performing assessments." Is the State expecting the chosen vendor to provide the SDM?	Once a vendor is selected the details on integration with SQL server will be worked out. Details on what the vendor has to offer for SDM tool should be included in the proposal
8	Could State provide us some details on the existing technology infrastructure that requires modernization?	Details about technology infrastructure are included in the RFP details and a more in depth conversation will happen with the selected vendor.
9	What are the expected number of internal users that will be using the CCWIS?	For the purposes of establishing accounts/licenses, approximately 500 FSD Staff will in large part have access to the entire system so we are not going to break out staffing by module. In terms of other State Staff, we estimate that there could be up to 300 users that will need to access either the entire system or more likely, access certain modules/screens. External users are estimated at up to 500, but each external user will only need access to a particular module and/or screen. External usage frequency will vary depending on the external user. The best estimate is that external users on average would be accessing the system weekly. FSD Staff = approximately 500 State Staff (other than FSD) = estimate up to 300 External Users = estimate up to 500
10	How many external users are likely to use the CCWIS?	See response to question 9
11	What is the expected budget for this project?	We will not be providing details about the project budget at this time.
12	Does Vermont DCF have a particular timeline requirement for the implementation of the system?	The state is interested in starting the development of Vermont's CCWIS as soon as reasonably possible.
13	Will data clean up be done before the project starts?	The state expects that data clean up activities will initiate before the project starts but does not anticipate that it will be complete prior to the start of the project.

14	Will all data be imported to the new CCWIS environment or just a certain number of years?	FSD desires to import all relevant data to the new CCWIS environment in accordance with protocols around historical data.
15	Does the state have dedicated SSMIS and FSDnet IT staff that will be dedicated to the project?	SSMIS.& FSDNet resources will be allocated as needed for this project. There is an existing technical M&O staff that supports the legacy solutions.
16	Is there additional money proposed in the FY 25 budget?	We will not be providing details about the project budget at this time.
17	While Exhibit D has Salesforce related requirements, we are unable to find Appendix F anywhere in the RFP? Please clarify.	Under "2.2. FUNCTIONAL AND NON-FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS" Attachments "Exhibit D: VT CCWIS Salesforce Platform (Optional)" it says "If your proposed solution involves using Salesforce, please complete Appendix F." It should have said "If your proposed solution involves using Salesforce, please complete Exhibit D. This Exhibit is designed explicitly for vendors utilizing Salesforce Solution, allowing us to better understand how your Salesforce-based solution aligns with our Salesforce platform governance.
18	Section 4.4 References: Provide a list of three references similar in size and industry (preferably another governmental entity). References shall be clients who have implemented your Solution within the past 48 months. We believe this clause will significantly limit competition to the detriment of the State, for the following reasons: Given the recent introduction of CCWIS regulations, the majority of CCWIS projects have only started within the last 48 months. A minority of these will have reached full implementation of all functional modules. At best, some will have reached partial implementation of a subset of functional modules. The wording appears to permit projects in which partial implementation has been reached, but the project then abandoned, or paused pending re-procurement. There are several such CCWIS projects, which we suggest do not offer the best indicator of a systems integrator equipped to deliver your CCWIS successfully. We recommend that references be open to any vendor who can successfully demonstrate implementation of a CCWIS, or significant upgrades to a CCWIS, regardless of technology employed.	The State of Vermont highly values experience in implementing Comprehensive Child Welfare Information Systems (CCWIS) and similar large-scale information systems within the child welfare sector.
19	In Section 2.1- Desired Outcomes, the RFP states "We aim to modernize our technological infrastructure and improve the quality of child welfare and youth justice services we provide." Provide additional scope on what is meant by "youth justice services we provide" as we only found one requirement in Exhibit B specific to juvenile justice.	Vermont has a combined child welfare and juvenile justice system. Juvenile justice cases in large part will follow the same case flows as foster care and in-home cases. There will need to be specific forms, case types and rules applied for this population.
20	Please provide an example of what the State is expecting in Section 2.1 (C), Bulk Data Entry and Editing.	Editing and Updating Data in Bulk:  Provide functionalities to edit and update multiple records simultaneously with audit trails capturing details of changes, who made them, and when. Features should include search and filter capabilities to easily select specific data sets for bulk editing.
21	Does the State currently have (or plan to purchase) Salesforce licenses sufficient to support all of the anticipated user community stakeholders for the CCWIS? If so, please provide details of the products and license types.	The State will purchase any required Salesforce licenses and community portal if they are needed.
22	To affordably price SaaS/COTS technology, Out-of-the-Box (OOTB) solutions, can you please provide a detailed number, possibly by department/agency, role, and usage level of the licensed users that will require and need access to the CCWIS solution?	See response to question 9
23	Has the State set a budget for this project, and can you please provide that budget number or a budget range?	We will not be providing details about the project budget at this time.

24	In reviewing Section 4 Content and Format of Responses, and more specifically 4.3 Technical Response, there does not seem to be a section that provides for a narrative on the SaaS and Out-of-the-box system/solution being proposed. Will the State be adding such a section to the Technical Proposal or should we assume, such details should be provided within the comments section of the requirements for Exhibits B & C?	In response to your query about the lack of a specific narrative section for SaaS and out-of-the-box solutions in Section 4.3 Technical Response of the RFP, it is advisable to include these details within the comments sections of the requirements for Exhibits B & C,
25	With only vendors proposing Salesforce being permitted to complete Exhibit D's 214 additional requirements, worth a possible additional 1,498 points, please share how the State intends to score and utilize Exhibits B, C, & D to ensure fair competition, and where and how will such scores be configured into 3.6 Method of Award, 3.6.1 Evaluation Criteria Table 4?	See response to question #116. Solutions that are based on the Salesforce platform will not get extra points. The responses to Exhibit D will be used to supplement Exhibit C (non functional requirements) and will inform the extent to which the solution meet's the State's non functional requirements.
26	With a need to have state-of-the-art online training platform to be used for Go-live as well as supporting on-boarding of future hires, does the state have an existing LMS license that training can be built on, or should the vendor price an LMS solution to best manage the training and possible solution certification efforts?	In regards to training, at a minimum, FSD would look to the vendor to provide access to training materials as well as conduct train the trainer sessions with key staff. The state of VT does currently have a LMS and FSD may look to have CCWIS training materials/modules reside in that system. FSD anticipates that there would be approximately 150 FSD staff and approximately 150 external staff that would require train the trainer trainings. FSD would have access to a large space (approximately 50-75 people) in their central office to conduct train the trainer sessions, however, this space does not contain a computer lab and would rely on staff to bring their own laptops to receive training.
27	Regarding Exhibit C, and the scoring designated for "Compliance Level" and "Method of Compliance", are we correct to assume that though "NA" is marked as receiving the highest value, an answer of NA will be recoded to be of lesser value, and that "Fully" for Compliance Level and "Out-of-the-box" for Method of Compliance will be scored the highest (similar to Exhibit B)?	Your understanding is correct. Typically, "NA" (Not Applicable) is not scored as it indicates that a particular criterion does not apply to the given response. It is not usually assigned a value in a comparative scoring context. Therefore, "Fully" for Compliance Level and "Out-of-the-box" for Method of Compliance should indeed be scored the highest as they indicate the most desirable level of compliance with the requirements set forth by the RFP
28	Regarding Exhibits B & C, does the State prefer that the "Notes/Comments" sections are completed for each requirement or for only requirements where justifications or explanations are needed?	Only where justifications or explanations are needed

29	<p>In the RFP you suggest a preference for a SaaS or Out-of-the-box solution (which ACF might refer to as an accelerator or COTS), and in Section 1.2 Primary Objectives you share “All software customized or explicitly built for the State of Vermont using Federal Financial Participation (FFP) funds shall be the property of Vermont. This includes, but is not limited to, all custom code, configurations, and related documentation” (p. 2 of 25). In Attachment D.3 Ownership and License in Deliverables, however, the State shares “Contractor and its third-party suppliers will retain ownership of all intellectual property rights in the [System]...”. Additionally, under 3.3.C. of Attachment D.3 you share, “Proprietary operating/vendor software packages which are provided at established catalog or market prices and sold or leased to the general public shall not be subject to the ownership provisions in paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section.” We understand that software and ownership rights must comply with 45 CFR 95.617(b), in which the Federal government reserves a royalty-free, nonexclusive, and irrevocable license to the software, modifications, and documentation if produced (i.e., developed) with Federal funds. Yet preexisting SaaS, OOTB, and COTS are already developed and typically only require reconfiguration and personalization. Furthermore, such accelerators are typically licensed by the purchasing client (e.g., State), and licensing is different than “ownership”. Understanding that the State seeks to receive FFP for such adoption of SaaS, OOTB, and/or COTS which can accelerate the CCWIS modules personalization and implementation as well as augment performance, can you please clarify this possible contradiction, and if you also are open to 45 CFR 95.617(c) and 45 CFR 95.627, which when read together allows for FFP or cost allocation to pay for COTS (i.e., SaaS, OOTB) licensing, as well as configuration and installation of COTS products, while not requiring “ownership”rights”? Please see question 3 at this link for clarification; <a href="https://www.acf.hhs.gov/cwpm/public_html/programs/cb/laws_policies/laws/cwpm/policy_dsp_pf.jsp?citID=583">https://www.acf.hhs.gov/cwpm/public_html/programs/cb/laws_policies/laws/cwpm/policy_dsp_pf.jsp?citID=583</a> or <a href="https://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/documents/cb/pi1108.pdf">https://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/documents/cb/pi1108.pdf</a>.</p>	The state will work with the selected vendor and ACF to determine whether ownership versus unlimited license rights similar to those granted to the federal government
30	What is the total budget earmarked for this procurement?	We will not be providing details about the project budget at this time.
31	Has the state seen demonstrations of any solutions prior to the RFP release? If so, can you share the vendor’s name?	Any information about prior procurement activities related to this RFP is not relevant at this time.
32	Please provide details around the volume of data to be migrated. Can the agency provide the following details: 1. Case Volume - per month/annum. 2. DB size 3. Expected annual growth - case volume & DB size.	1. FSD receives approximately 20,000 intakes annually. Of those, approximately 5,500 are accepted for investigation/assessment. Annually, FSD opens approximately 750 Foster care cases and 500 In-home cases. These foster care and in-home cases numbers include juvenile justice cases. For each child welfare case opened annually, FSD completes a danger/safety assessment and risk assessment initially. During the year, each active in-home case will have a risk-reassessment completed every 90 days and if the case is moving toward reunification, a risk re-reunification assessment. All cases will have an initial case plan completed within 60 days of case opening and foster care cases will have case plans completed every 6 months. 2)FSDNet - 2 terabytes total, 375gb per copy of db, and grew 75gb in the last 12 months / SSMIS - 17gb in SQL Server total, 3.3gb per copy of db in SQL Server, 2.4gb in Informix, and growing 100mb per year . 3) FSD's overall caseload size has been stable for the past 2 years and no sizeable annual growth is expected.
33	Please provide information about the user base of individuals accessing the new CCWIS solution?	See response to question 9

34	Does the agency have any preference for a specific cloud service provider such as AWS, Azure, or Salesforce?	No
35	Could you please provide detailed information regarding the user base for each of the modules outlined in the RFP?	See response to question 9
36	Can the agency provide a breakup of users for the Financial and Eligibility Management module?	See response to question #35
37	The contract start date mentioned in the RFP is July 1, 2024. Can the agency provide information on the end date or provide the duration of the DDI (Design, Development, and Implementation) phase for this project?	The contract start date and duration will be determined by in conjunction with the estimated development schedule proposed by the selected vendor.
38	Are vendors permitted to utilize the agency's existing MuleSoft ESB for integrations?	Yes but we need to include additional capacity to budget planning. Vendor should be able to provide Required Connectors and Core capacity requirements.
39	Can the Vendor propose a Rule Engine of their choice?	Yes and it will be reviewed as part of the bid review.
40	Could you please provide a copy of Appendix F, which is specifically designed for vendors proposing solutions based on the Salesforce platform?	See response to question #17
41	Is there room for discussion or negotiation regarding the proposed solution, especially in cases where the vendor may have alternative technologies or approaches that align with the Department's objectives but might also introduce additional costs?	Yes. The State expects the responses to our questions and requirements to be for a specific solution but in Exhibit A, Part 2, question 6A a bidder can describe other possible alternative solutions if it is desired to make the State aware of alternatives.
42	Are there specific criteria for assessing compatibility, scalability, security features, and cost-effectiveness for proposing alternate enterprise architecture technologies?	All criteria used for bid selection are listed in Section 3.6 Table 4 of the RFP. Many of the listed items are part of our non-functional requirements in Part 4 of Exhibit A. Bidders are free to propose architecture technologies which can be discussed in Exhibit A, Part 2, Question 1.
43	"REPORTING REQUIREMENTS: Provide a sample of any reporting documentation that may be applicable to the Detailed Requirements of this RFP." - Could the agency provide further clarification on the types of reports required?	Please refer to the reporting module detailed in the Functional Requirements section of the RFP for initial reporting needs. As we develop the product backlog, additional reporting requirements may be identified and will be communicated accordingly.
44	Do vendors have flexibility to propose what they consider as key roles based on the project's needs, or if the agency has a predefined set of roles that are considered key. Please share details.	The State is open to proposal of key roles based on the project's needs.
45	Are there any restrictions or limitations on the use of offshore resources?	In the Comprehensive Child Welfare Info Systems (CCWIS) RFP the appendices include standard state contract attachment "C: Standard State Provisions for Contracts and Grants" items 12 "Use and Protection of State Information" , Section E state "No Confidential State Data received, obtained, or generated by the Party in connection with performance under this Agreement shall be processed, transmitted, stored, or transferred by any means outside the United States, except with the express written permission of the State."
46	In our observation of other recent Child Welfare procurements, we have seen a requirement of a sandbox environment as part of procurement process. Is that something that Vermont DCF is also considering?	Yes
47	Does the State of Vermont expect the full child welfare implementation requested in this RFP to include (intake, investigation, case-management, resource management, eligibility, service referrals, finance, report, appeals)?	Yes
48	Is the State of Vermont utilizing alternative federal funding (such as ARPA) to fund the Child Welfare Implementation?	We will not be providing details about the project budget at this time.
49	Per the RFP, the State of Vermont is seeking a CCWIS compliant solution. Does the State of Vermont intend on seeking the 50% federal funding match for implementation and maintenance of the solution.	We will not be providing details about the project budget at this time.

50	Is the State of Vermont open to a phased modular implementation approach as funding is appropriated?	The State is considering multiple approaches for this effort.
51	Did you have a pre-planning vendor involved in supporting this RFP and evaluation? If so, which vendor?	No, we did not.
52	Can you provide the number of licensed users by role? For example, case managers/caseworkers, administrators, provider users, partner users, external users, any other users, etc.?	See response to question 9
53	What is the budget NTE for this project? Has that budget amount been approved/allocated?	We will not be providing details about the project budget at this time.
54	Can offshore resources be used for development of the solution, if production and non-production environments that contain PII/PHI and other confidential information remain in the US and are not accessed by offshore resources, and all data remains in the US?	See response to question #45
55	Can the State provide a short 1-2 week extension to the due date for proposals, to allow for more thoughtful and complete responses to the RFP?	Yes, New deadline will be May 20th
56	Has the State seen any demos/talked to vendors prior to releasing the RFP, if so which vendors and technologies?	Any information about prior procurement activities related to this RFP is not relevant at this time.
57	What is the desired go-live date for this system? What is the desired go-live date for phase 1/module 1?	The state is interested in starting the development of Vermont's CCWIS as soon as reasonably possible.
58	Are there any data encryption or other requirements for this system? Is FedRAMP a requirement?	Security-related requirements are in Exhibit C VT CCWIS Non-Functional Requirements. Yes, FedRAMP is a requirement.
59	Can you provide more detail around the desired implementation plan/roadmap for this CCWIS solution? Is there a module(s) you want implemented first, if so, which, and by when?	The State is considering multiple approaches for this effort.
60	If external users require access to the system, how often will external users access the system? How many logins per month/per year?	See response to question 9
61	For the listed systems requiring interfaces/integrations with the CCWIS solutions, can you provide more details around the kinds of integration that is required for each of those systems i.e. File based, Rest API, WS/WSDL? Does any middleware/ETL tool or API gateway exist? If any changes are required to the external system for integration, we assume that the State will be responsible for those changes and will provide SMEs for integration like mapping etc, -Can you confirm?	These details will be worked out in the vendor deliverable System Integration Plan as listed in Table 3 in the RFP. The deliverable acceptance process is detailed in 2.4.9. Generally most interfaces with existing State solutions are file based but where possible and the State encourages the use of API based interface/integration. Per Table 1 of the RFP the state prefers the use of MuleSoft for data and application integration but use of MuleSoft is not required.
62	With regard to implementation and training, how many workers, supervisors, leaders, and other staff would need training?	In regards to training, at a minimum, FSD would look to the vendor to provide access to training materials as well as conduct train the trainer sessions with key staff. The state of VT does currently have a LMS and FSD may look to have CCWIS training materials/modules reside in that system. FSD anticipates that there would be approximately 150 FSD staff and approximately 150 external staff that would require train the trainer trainings. FSD would have access to a large space (approximately 50-75 people) in their central office to conduct train the trainer sessions, however, this space does not contain a computer lab and would rely on staff to bring their own laptops to receive training.
63	Incorporate advanced voice-to-text features to allow caseworkers to dictate notes and information, enhancing speed and convenience. Include text-to-voice technology to assist in reviewing and digesting large volumes of text-based information, beneficial for accessibility and reducing screen time. Does the State have a preferred tool or compliant cloud service they are using for these services already?	No! Vendors can use any tool that will meet the Security Requirements of the State and Federally mandated requirements for HIPAA.

64	Present a summary table outlining the details of each proposed project participant. This table should include the participant's name, current role or position, current employer, key functions in their current role, years of experience in their role, proposed role in this project, the percentage of time to be dedicated to this project, onsite or remote status, and years of experience in CCWIS vendor projects. Will the State consider revising this requirement to apply to Key Personnel only and limited to role, skill, and experience?	We will not be revising the requirement at this time.
65	We are open to different types of solutions (e.g., custom, low code no code (LCNC), COTS, SaaS, others?) but we believe that we prefer SaaS or cloud vendor hosted solution delivery. Does the State have a preference of Cloud vendor for Hosted Solution Delivery?	No
66	Can the State clarify the State's roles and responsibilities for DDI activities?	To clarify the roles and responsibilities of the State during the Design, Development, and Implementation (DDI) activities for the CCWIS project, please refer to Section 2.4.3 of the RFP document. This section provides a high-level overview of the State's responsibilities, which will be further detailed in the Statement of Work (SOW).
67	Will the State please clarify the number of notices templates the state expects to provide as part of the new common noticing solution?	At present, we are unable to specify the exact number of notice templates for the common noticing solution. The quantity will be determined as we continue to finalize our Product Backlog with stakeholder input.
68	Maintenance and management of all test cases within the State's preferred testing management application. What is the State's preferred testing management application?	Azure Dev Ops
69	Who is responsible for UAT, the State or the Vendor?	User Acceptance Testing (UAT) is primarily the responsibility of the State. However, the State expects assistance from the DDI vendor to ensure that all items on the Go Live Checklist have been successfully completed, that UAT results have been published, and that the project has received a go/no-go executive decision.
70	Adherence and alignment with all Federal, State, and program specific guidelines, policies, requirements, mandates, funding allocations, and directives, and collaborating with the State to ensure CCWIS Project and system-solution compliance, including but not limited to: Federal Conditions for Funding. Federal IRS compliance for use of Federal Tax Information (FTI). o Federal and State accessibility guidelines. There is a mention of federal IRS compliance for use of Federal Tax Information (FTI) yet the non-functional requirements do not mention FTI or IRS 1075. Is the new CCWIS expected to receive or process FTI?	In Exhibit A VT CCWIS Bidder Response Form (BRF) / PART 4: NON-FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS / Section 4.1 Data Compliance is where to indicate what you can comply with and how.
71	Training Management to provide the initial and ongoing knowledge transfer process, enabling stakeholders to maximize their usage, familiarity, application, and comprehension of all aspects of the solution. Will the State clarify who is responsible for training end users? If it is the Contractor, please provide the following for the best pricing: the number of trainees, number of locations, and whether the State will be able to provide facilities (rooms) for this training.	In regards to training, at a minimum, FSD would look to the vendor to provide access to training materials as well as conduct train the trainer sessions with key staff. The state of VT does currently have a LMS and FSD may look to have CCWIS training materials/modules reside in that system. FSD anticipates that there would be approximately 150 FSD staff and approximately 150 external staff that would require train the trainer trainings. FSD would have access to a large space (approximately 50-75 people) in their central office to conduct train the trainer sessions, however, this space does not contain a computer lab and would rely on staff to bring their own laptops to receive training.
72	Incorporate advanced voice-to-text features to allow caseworkers to dictate notes and information, enhancing speed and convenience. Include text-to-voice technology to assist in reviewing and digesting large volumes of text-based information, beneficial for accessibility and reducing screen time. Does the State have a preferred tool or compliant cloud service they are using for these services already?	No! Vendors can use any tool that will meet the Security Requirements of the State and Federally mandated requirements for HIPAA.



73	Present a summary table outlining the details of each proposed project participant. This table should include the participant's name, current role or position, current employer, key functions in their current role, years of experience in their role, proposed role in this project, the percentage of time to be dedicated to this project, onsite or remote status, and years of experience in CCWIS vendor projects. Will the State consider revising this requirement to apply to Key Personnel only and limited to role, skill, and experience?	We will not be revising the requirement at this time.
74	We are open to different types of solutions (e.g., custom, low code no code (LCNC), COTS, SaaS, others?) but we believe that we prefer SaaS or cloud vendor hosted solution delivery. Does the State have a preference of Cloud vendor for Hosted Solution Delivery?	See question 34.
75	Can the State clarify the State's roles and responsibilities for DDI activities?	To clarify the roles and responsibilities of the State during the Design, Development, and Implementation (DDI) activities for the CCWIS project, please refer to Section 2.4.3 of the RFP document. This section provides a high-level overview of the State's responsibilities, which will be further detailed in the Statement of Work (SOW).
76	Will the State please clarify the number of notices templates the state expects to provide as part of the new common noticing solution?	At present, we are unable to specify the exact number of notice templates for the common noticing solution. The quantity will be determined as we continue to finalize our Product Backlog with stakeholder input.
77	Who is responsible for UAT, the State or the Vendor?	User Acceptance Testing (UAT) is primarily the responsibility of the State. However, we expect the vendor to support the process by providing necessary documentation, tools, and assistance as outlined in the RFP.
78	Adherence and alignment with all Federal, State, and program specific guidelines, policies, requirements, mandates, funding allocations, and directives, and collaborating with the State to ensure CCWIS Project and system-solution compliance, including but not limited to: Federal Conditions for Funding, Federal IRS compliance for use of Federal Tax Information (FTI), Federal and State accessibility guidelines. There is a mention of federal IRS compliance for use of Federal Tax Information (FTI) yet the non-functional requirements do not mention FTI or IRS 1075. Is the new CCWIS expected to receive or process FTI?	In Exhibit A VT CCWIS Bidder Response Form (BRF) / PART 4: NON-FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS / Section 4.1 Data Compliance is where to indicate what you can comply with and how.
79	Will the State clarify who is responsible for training end users? If it is the Contractor, please provide the following for the best pricing: the number of trainees, number of locations, and whether the State will be able to provide facilities (rooms) for this training.	In regards to training, at a minimum, FSD would look to the vendor to provide access to training materials as well as conduct train the trainer sessions with key staff. The state of VT does currently have a LMS and FSD may look to have CCWIS training materials/modules reside in that system. FSD anticipates that there would be approximately 150 FSD staff and approximately 150 external staff that would require train the trainer trainings. FSD would have access to a large space (approximately 50-75 people) in their central office to conduct train the trainer sessions, however, this space does not contain a computer lab and would rely on staff to bring their own laptops to receive training.
80	Will the Verato MPI solution be available in production from day 1 of the project?	No.
81	Will the State please provide the current size (number of tables, record counts, types of databases, and database storage size) of the databases that will need to be converted?	Please refernce the responce to quesdtion 32
82	FSD staff must currently use 11 separate systems and 30+ Excel spreadsheets to support current business processes. This section talks about "11 separate systems and 30+ Excel spreadsheets" but mentions only FSDNet and SSMIS by name. Can the State clarify the systems in scope for Data conversion/migration to the new CCWIS solution?	The bulk of the data that will need to be converted/migrated to the CCWIS solution currently resides in FSDNet and SSMIS. There may also be SDM data in a separate database that has been in use for approximately 8 years that we would desire to be migrated. In addition, there may be data contained within excel spreadsheets that we may want to import into CCWIS. Other systems that FSD utilizes are ones that we may want to integrate CCWIS with in order to exchange information (ICPC, ICJ, ICAMA, for example). It should be noted that many spreadsheets in use are for the purposes of maintaining tracking of specific case information, due dates, completion dates, etc. FSD anticipates that the CCWIS solution will eliminate the need for staff to maintain seperate spreadsheets to track timelines for cases.
83	Will the State please clarify if the "traceability matrix as part of the proposal" is the same as filling Exhibits B & C?	yes

84	To reinforce the importance of these deliverables and ensure their timely completion, we have directly linked them with payment milestones. This means that the release of payments is contingent upon the satisfactory completion and validation of each listed PMO Deliverable. This approach aligns the vendor's financial incentives with the project's progress and successful delivery. Will the State please specify payment milestones or the percentages associated with the deliverables?	We will finalize that once the vendor is selected
85	Provide a sample of any reporting documentation that may be applicable to the Detailed Requirements of this RFP. Can the State provide further explanation on what they mean by "reporting documentation"?	Please Refer to reporting Module in functional requirements
86	Only emailed bids will be accepted. Bids will be accepted via email submission to SOV.ThePathForward@vermont.gov. Bids must consist of a single email with a single, digitally searchable PDF attachment containing all components of the bid. Multiple emails and/or multiple attachments will not be accepted. Is the State's preference to receive all the required spreadsheets within the single PDF format?	Bids must consist of a single email with a single, digitally searchable PDF attachment containing all components of the bid. Multiple emails and/or multiple attachments will not be accepted.
87	In the discretion of the State, a contract resulting from this RFP may provide that the State withhold a percentage of the total amount payable for some or all deliverables, such retainage to be payable upon satisfactory completion and State acceptance in accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract. What is the State's Retainage %ge for this Contract. Attachment B was included but no information on Retainage?	Retainage will be determined during contract negotiations.
88	Is this the same GlobalScape as indicated in this link <a href="https://www.globalscape.com/">https://www.globalscape.com/</a> ?	We are currently running a version of GlobalScape on in-house servers
89	Exhibit A lists "Organizational Change Management" as an item. However, that is not discussed in the RFP. Please clarify if the State is responsible for OCM with vendor support, or if the vendor is responsible for OCM.	State is responsible for the OCM with Vendor Support
90	Can the pricing table be modified to show totals and subtotals for functional requirements Method of Compliance marked as "3 - Configuration"?	Pricing tables cannot be modified to show totals and subtotals for specific functional requirements or Method of Compliance settings, such as "3 - Configuration". All configuration and out-of-the-box features should be clearly outlined within the pricing table as provided. For any customization features, please include detailed information in Question 5 of Part 8 of your documentation or submission.
91	Within the pricing table, can functional requirements that contribute to a common functional area and where Method of Compliance is marked as "3 - Configuration" be consolidated to a single deliverable price?	Pricing tables cannot be modified to show totals and subtotals for specific functional requirements or Method of Compliance settings, such as "3 - Configuration". All configuration and out-of-the-box features should be clearly outlined within the pricing table as provided. For any customization features, please include detailed information in Question 5 of Part 8 of your documentation or submission.
92	Will the Agency state your preference for staff dedicated to the VT CCWIS project versus staff shared with other projects, and or percentage of staff?	The Agency prefers staff to be fully dedicated to the VT CCWIS project to ensure focused attention and minimized risks related to resource allocation
93	Provide a list of three references similar in size and industry (preferably another governmental entity). References shall be clients who have implemented your Solution within the past 48 months. Considering references from similar projects, does the State prefer relevant experience for end-to-end Child Welfare solutions or only experience for component solutions? (e.g., an Intake & Investigations only implementation)	Any experience with CCWIS related modules and applications will be considered CCWIS experience
94	What is the method for contacting technical support? Does the State provide an initial helpdesk to field calls from caseworkers and other users for initial technical incident reporting?	The state anticipates a process where state staff field initial assistance requests from end users and will elevate those issues needing to be addressed by the vendor.

95	For Level 1 and Level 2 incidents, can the State advise how the CCWIS production support team will be notified that there is an outage or degradation?	The approach will be to work with the selected vendor to align the state's existing incident management system with the solution provider's incident management system to effectively manage incidents and maintain service availability for the CCWIS system. The preference would be to utilize the state's incident management system.
96	Does the State have an existing incident management system that the CCWIS system will use? If yes, can the State provide specific details on the Incident Management System?	Please reference the response to question 95
97	Can the State define "response resolution metrics". Is this related to incident management?	The "response resolution metrics" are included in the report module of our functional requirements. More metrics will be added as we collaborate with stakeholders and finalize the Product Backlog
98	There is a mention of CJIS compliance in this section, yet the RFP and non-functional requirements do not contain any references to CJIS related interfaces or regulatory compliance requirements. Is the new CCWIS solution expected to receive or process criminal records information that are subject to CJIS?	The state desires for the CCWIS solution to integrate with the state's crime information center (VCIC) for the purposes of receiving criminal background/fingerprint checks for foster parents and other substitute care providers. It would be the intent for this information to be stored within the CCWIS solution.
99	Is the VDH External Portal a new portal or an existing portal?	The VDH Portal is an existing portal.
100	Could the State provide the Health Information Questionnaire (HIQ)?	The Health Information Questionnaire (HIQ) is a form that captures health information about children who enter foster care to assess short and long-term health issues that FSD needs to address. The HIQ captures information such as current/past medical conditions, current medical providers, any prescription medications, and overall health.
101	Will the State provide the details on the external provider's solutions?	There are numerous service providers that FSD contracts with. The details about these solutions will be reviewed when a potential vendor has been selected.
102	What is "SQL system"?	SSMIS/FSDNet SQL Server for example
103	Is the requirement only providing access to training materials or is vendor required to provide training sessions? Please provide greater clarification regarding the 'access' to in person sessions required.	In regards to training, at a minimum, FSD would look to the vendor to provide access to training materials as well as conduct train the trainer sessions with key staff. The state of VT does currently have a LMS and FSD may look to have CCWIS training materials/modules reside in that system. FSD anticipates that there would be approximately 150 FSD staff and approximately 150 external staff that would require train the trainer trainings. FSD would have access to a large space (approximately 50-75 people) in their central office to conduct train the trainer sessions, however, this space does not contain a computer lab and would rely on staff to bring their own laptops to receive training.
104	1) Based on column D "Bidirectional Integration", is this requirement a bidirectional interface with an external system? 2) Please provide examples of targeting case management activities.	TCM activities are: Case Management activities directed to assist families/individuals to access medical, behavioral, social and educational services, including referrals, assessments and reassessments, development and periodic revision of case plan, referral to services and related activities, monitoring and follow up.
105	Are these non-state systems covered in the RFP table 2 CCWIS interfaces, or are these additional interfaces? If additional, please provide details and number of interfaces?	Currently, those are all the identified systems that will need an integration. As we work on the product backlog, we might identify more integrations
106	Are these state systems covered in the RFP table 2 CCWIS interfaces, or are these additional interfaces? If additional, please provide details and number of interfaces.	All known interfaces at this time are covered in table 2. Some are state systems and some are external systems
107	Are the contact and address information related to families and children involved with Vermont's child welfare agencies? If so, would this data be available in the Verato MPI?	Data could be in Verator MPI in some but not all cases. For example, when a new family moves to VT it is likely they will not be in our MPI.
108	Does the State own a virus scan tool that the vendor can access and use as part of this solution to meet this requirement?	Details will need to be worked out with the selected vendor.
109	Does the State own an electronic signature tool that the vendor can access and use as part of this solution to meet this requirement?	Yes, the state owns licenses for DocuSign.
110	Does the State own an SMS gateway or service that the vendor can access and use as part of this solution to meet this requirement?	Details will need to be worked out with the selected vendor.

111	Will the State clarify if the services of the state-approved third-party security vendor will be procured by the State itself?	We are looking for the vendor to conduct/procure their own third-party assessment. The ask here is that the State approves their vendor to ensure it meets the "third-party" requirements.
112	Can the state clarify whether Juvenile Justice is in scope for this RFP? If yes, please provide detailed requirements for Juvenile Justice that need to be implemented through this RFP?	Vermont has a combined child welfare and juvenile justice system. Juvenile justice cases in large part will follow the same case flows as foster care and in-home cases. There will need to be specific forms, case types and rules applied for this population.
113	Can the state clarify whether resumes are required to be included as part of our response?	Yes
114	To estimate initial storage capacity, can the state provide the approximate number of tables, volume of data, and name of the system that needs to be migrated into the new CCWIS system?	Please refernce the response to quesdtion 32
115	For us to estimate the licensing costs, can the State provide the Number of Case workers, Number of Service/Foster Providers, and other partners who need access to the new CCWIS?	See response to question 9
116	The addition of 214 requirements from Exhibit D creates disparity in proposal response preparation effort, service expectation, cost, and evaluation. We request the state to normalize the requirements regardless of the platform choice. If no, can the State clarify how it will evaluate a Salesforce and a Non-Salesforce solution equitably?	In the RFP please refer to 3.6 Method Of Award for how the State will evaluate all solutions. Exhibit D lists additional non functional requirements specific to Salesforce applications to ensure the solution will function in the designated State of Vermont Salesforce org (which will likely also host other Salesforce applications) and comply with our Salesforce platform governace. Exhibit D ties to Part 4 (non functional requirements) of Exhibit A (Bidder Response Form) and will be referenced for evaluation criteria that are related to part 4 for Salesforce based solutions.
117	Can the state confirm that the redacted version of the bid can be submitted in a separate email? In total there will be two email submissions one for the unredacted version and the second one for the redacted version?	Yes, we will accept multiple emails or attachments
118	What is the budget for these services?	We will not be providing details about the project budget at this time.
119	Is the department open to a Non-Salesforce solution, so they have the option to pick other solutions from the industry reducing the agency's total cost of ownership for a CCWIS system?	Yes. The state does not have a preference for a Salesforce based solution.
120	Can the State elaborate on this desired outcome? Specifically, what tailored functionalities for applications is the State looking for?	Examples of the purpose of a dedicated portal for service providers, foster providers, and other partners include: service providers can view service referral applications, record service dates, upload progress reports, document case status and submit invoices for services provided. Foster parents can complete foster parent applications, view relevant information about children in their care, submit service invoices, and communicate to FSD staff through the portal messaging application.
121	Can the State elaborate if interfacing with any of these modules would help satisfy a fully integrated CCWIS solution?	Yes
122	Can the State elaborate on what the Master Person Index (MPI) is used for?	A Master Person Index is a person database used to maintain accurate data across the States various systems/applications and databases. MPIs are intended to ensure person data is correct, trusted and consistent throughout the organization/enterprise regardless of its use. A key use case is to ensure the State's CCWIS solution, over time, does not add duplicate person records (e.g., John Doe, John Andrew Doe, John A. Doe). An MPI can agument but not replace a solutions native record de-duplication functionality.
123	Can the State elaborate on what IV&V interviews are?	Independent Verification & Validation (IV&V) interviews are conducted by a 3rd Party (i.e., not the State or Vendor) with key project stateholders and are mainly focused on assessing project performance and risks.
124	Per this statement, can the State explain the logic of embedding the cost worksheet within the technical submission? Should these two documents be separated to provide a more unbiased evaluation process?	Cost is just one of the factors involved in the evaluation
125	Is Odyssey a required interface of the proposed CCWIS solution?	Yes

126	Is Attachment E, for reference only? Or does the State expect the Vendor to fill and sign Attachment E?	This was for reference only for bidders to see what would be included as part of the contract if they are selected.,
127	Considering answers to vendor questions being provided has no tentative date and RFP responses being due on May 10, would the State consider extending the Proposal due date?	Yes, New deadline will be May 20th
128	We have a Named User licensing structure. Based on this definition, how many Named Users does the agency anticipate having on its new system?	See response to question 9
129	Can the State confirm the required number of interfaces? In the RFP document there are 20 identifiable interfaces, is this accurate?	That is the current identified interfaces. Once a vendor is selected the details on interfaces to be reviewed and updated
130	Can the State provide the number of databases, amount of data for each, and format that the Vendor will be required to convert and migrate to the new solution?	Please refer to the response to question 32
131	Can the State list all the types of licenses, registrations, permits, etc. that the agency supports, the approximate number of entities applying for and holding each type, and specify which license type(s) will require which types of online functionality (e.g., online applications, renewals, verifications, disciplinary processes, reciprocity, reinstatement, etc.)?	It is unclear what this question means. However, we offer the following response: For the purposes of establishing accounts/licenses, FSD Staff will in large part have access to the entire system so we are not going to break out staffing by module. In terms of other State Staff, we estimate that there could be up to 300 users that will need to access either the entire system or more likely, access certain modules/screens. External users are estimated at up to 500, but each external user will only need access to a particular module and/or screen. External usage frequency will vary depending on the external user. The best estimate is that external users on average would be accessing the system weekly. FSD Staff = approximately 500 State Staff (other than FSD) = estimate up to 300 External Users = estimate up to 500
132	Please provide the names of all system outputs required, including reports, queries, and correspondences. Also provide the audience and the location from which each will be run (back-office, public website, specific login-secured area of public website, etc.).	Please refer to the functional requirements, reporting tab for reporting details that we have at this time.
133	Can you elaborate on the agency's preferences regarding hosting with the vendor?	Please provide details on the options you are proposing in your bid and then a more details conversation on options will happen with selected vendor.
134	Can you elaborate on any need for mobile inspection/field investigation capabilities? If there is any need, please respond to the following: (a) How many mobile devices would the agency need set up to use on the new system? (b) In order that we may determine the number of forms that would be integrated into the new mobile system, how many different forms are currently in use in the field? (c) How should pricing for these items be proposed?	(a) For the purposes of establishing mobile capabilities, FSD Staff (approximately 500) will in large part have access to the entire suite of mobile applications so we are not going to break out by function. We desire, at a minimum, FSD Staff will utilize mobile applications to perform investigations, SDM assessments, case plans, service referrals and placements. (b) Currently, FSD does not have mobile forms in use in the field. (c) If the solution does not currently have mobile capabilities then that would be noted within the pricing quote and the pricing for including this capability will be indicated.
135	What is the budget for this project? If all cost proposals come in above a certain amount, would this RFP be cancelled? What is that amount? Did the legislature allocate any funds specifically for this project? If so, what is the amount allocated, and when does it need to be used?	We will not be providing details about the project budget at this time.
136	Please identify instances where any agency employee has viewed or discussed a potential software application like the one being solicited in this RFP in the last 24 months. Please name the vendor(s), dates of contact and describe the nature of the contacts including whether pricing was discussed. Has the agency received any estimates or quotations for the services and software described in this RFP, and if so, which ones and what were the amounts?	Any information about prior procurement activities related to this RFP is not relevant at this time.
137	What is the State's estimated timeline for this RFP? When does it anticipate demos? When does it anticipate contract execution? When does the State anticipate Project Kick-off? When does it anticipate Go-Live?	All information regarding the procurement schedule was posted with the RFP. Any updates to that schedule will be made public through our public facing site.

138	Does the State expect a comprehensive list of all clients in the history of the proposed vendors' existence? Would the State consider a cap on the number of years required to itemize past/current clients? E.g., a 30-year-old company has worked with 100s of government entities, would the last 5 years suffice? Is there a maximum number of government entities the state would ask the vendor to limit their response to?	RFP does not specify a requirement for vendors to provide a comprehensive list of all past or current clients throughout their operational history. Instead, the focus is on more recent and relevant experience that aligns with the objectives of the Vermont CCWIS project. Specifically, the RFP asks bidders to detail their experience in CCWIS or similar projects within the last five years.
139	Please confirm that the State is only interested in references that focus on implementation vs. the underlying solution technology. If offerors include references that just focus on technology, will those be considered less relevant and therefore receive lower scores?	Please provide references that you feel add value to your proposal and they will be reviewed as part of the bid review process.
140	The Instructions tab in the referenced spreadsheet indicates that offerors should complete 'Compliance Level, Method of Compliance, and Proposed Module Alignment' on the Salesforce tab. The instructions do not request/require offerors to provide narrative responses. However, the 'Salesforce Requirements' tab includes a column labeled 'Notes/Comments'. Please clarify the purpose of the 'Notes/Comments' column and confirm that the State does not expect offerors to provide a narrative response. If narrative responses are required, how will they factor into the evaluation process?	The State does not expect a narrative response in the Notes/Comments column. This is an optional column that the bidder can use as needed and as they see fit. For example, a note to clarify their response.
141	There is no Appendix F provided on the acquisition site. Should this be a reference to Exhibit D? Or, if there is a separate Appendix F, please provide it. What does the State expect offerors to include in the column labeled 'Notes/Comments'? If narrative responses are required, how will they factor into the evaluation process?	Under "2.2. FUNCTIONAL AND NON-FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS" Attachments "Exhibit D: VT CCWIS Salesforce Platform (Optional)" it says "If your proposed solution involves using Salesforce, please complete Appendix F." It should have said "If your proposed solution involves using Salesforce, please complete Exhibit D. This Exhibit is designed explicitly for vendors utilizing Salesforce Solution, allowing us to better understand how your Salesforce-based solution aligns with our requirements.
142	Is CJIS compliance mandatory? Does the State anticipate storing CJI data as a part of the solution? If the State does not anticipate storing CJI data in the solution, can the State please adjust and remove the RFP requirements that refer to CJIS compliance?	The state desires for the CCWIS solution to integrate with the state's crime information center (VCIC) for the purposes of receiving criminal background/fingerprint checks for foster parents and other substitute care providers. It would be the intent for this information to be stored within the CCWIS solution.
143	How many internal users (defined as those with a .gov email address) will need access to the solution?	See response to question 9
144	How many external users (defined as those with a NON-.gov email address) will need access to the solution?	See response to question 9
145	Is this RFP exclusively designed for Salesforce-based solutions or is it open for other qualified vendors to submit proposals?	The state does not have a preference for a Salesforce-based solution. Exhibit D is just for bidders that choose to use the Salesforce platform to ensure the CCWIS application will comply with State of Vermont's Salesforce application governance.
146	Is there a corresponding mechanism for vendors proposing alternative solutions to address the requirements outlined in Exhibit D, or will their proposals be evaluated based on a different set of criteria?	No. Please refer to question 145 regarding how Exhibit D will be used.
147	Will proposals utilizing alternative case management solutions be considered equally?	Yes
148	Could you kindly provide clarification on these matters?	N/A - this is the last in a series of questions posed.
149	Please provide a list of integrations which are currently established with DCF.	The list of all current interfaces is already included in the RFP. We might be identifying new interfaces as we work through the product backlog
150	Will DCF accept references from child welfare projects for which the vendor has been engaged in the last 48 months, but the solution is not yet live in production?	Yes
151	What is the total number of anticipated users, including Law Enforcement?	See response to question 9
152	Please provide a breakdown of users by CCWIS module.	See response to question 9

153	Does the state have a Learning Management System (LMS) that the vendor can use to harmonize training materials?	In regards to training, at a minimum, FSD would look to the vendor to provide access to training materials as well as conduct train the trainer sessions with key staff. The state of VT does currently have a LMS and FSD may look to have CCWIS training materials/modules reside in that system. FSD anticipates that there would be approximately 150 FSD staff and approximately 150 external staff that would require train the trainer trainings. FSD would have access to a large space (approximately 50-75 people) in their central office to conduct train the trainer sessions, however, this space does not contain a computer lab and would rely on staff to bring their own laptops to receive training.
154	What is the number of people to be trained by program area?	In regards to training, at a minimum, FSD would look to the vendor to provide access to training materials as well as conduct train the trainer sessions with key staff. The state of VT does currently have a LMS and FSD may look to have CCWIS training materials/modules reside in that system. FSD anticipates that there would be approximately 150 FSD staff and approximately 150 external staff that would require train the trainer trainings. FSD would have access to a large space (approximately 50-75 people) in their central office to conduct train the trainer sessions, however, this space does not contain a computer lab and would rely on staff to bring their own laptops to receive training.
155	What is the vendor's responsibility for delivering training? Train-the-trainer? Or is the vendor responsible for end-user training?	In regards to training, at a minimum, FSD would look to the vendor to provide access to training materials as well as conduct train the trainer sessions with key staff. The state of VT does currently have a LMS and FSD may look to have CCWIS training materials/modules reside in that system. FSD anticipates that there would be approximately 150 FSD staff and approximately 150 external staff that would require train the trainer trainings. FSD would have access to a large space (approximately 50-75 people) in their central office to conduct train the trainer sessions, however, this space does not contain a computer lab and would rely on staff to bring their own laptops to receive training.
156	If train-the-trainer, how many trainers need to be trained?	In regards to training, at a minimum, FSD would look to the vendor to provide access to training materials as well as conduct train the trainer sessions with key staff. The state of VT does currently have a LMS and FSD may look to have CCWIS training materials/modules reside in that system. FSD anticipates that there would be approximately 150 FSD staff and approximately 150 external staff that would require train the trainer trainings. FSD would have access to a large space (approximately 50-75 people) in their central office to conduct train the trainer sessions, however, this space does not contain a computer lab and would rely on staff to bring their own laptops to receive training.
157	Does the state have training labs available for the selected vendor to use to deliver training and support a statewide implementation?	In regards to training, at a minimum, FSD would look to the vendor to provide access to training materials as well as conduct train the trainer sessions with key staff. The state of VT does currently have a LMS and FSD may look to have CCWIS training materials/modules reside in that system. FSD anticipates that there would be approximately 150 FSD staff and approximately 150 external staff that would require train the trainer trainings. FSD would have access to a large space (approximately 50-75 people) in their central office to conduct train the trainer sessions, however, this space does not contain a computer lab and would rely on staff to bring their own laptops to receive training.
158	Is the vendor responsible for organizational change management or only operational readiness?	State will be responsible for OCM with vendor assistance.
159	Does DCF have a lead individual or a team engaging in OCM activities?	Yes, State will have a designated team for OCM
160	Please specify the systems, type of database, and volume of data to be considered for data migration.	The bulk of the data that will need to be converted/migrated to the CCWIS solution currently resides in FSDNet and SSMIS. There may also be SDM data in a separate database that has been in use for approximately 8 years that we would desire to be migrated. In addition, there may be data contained within excel spreadsheets that we may want to import into CCWIS. Other systems that FSD utilizes are ones that we may want to integrate CCWIS with in order to exchange information (ICPC, ICJ, ICAMA, for example). It should be noted that many spreadsheets in use are for the purposes of maintaining tracking of specific case information, due dates, completion dates, etc. FSD anticipates that the CCWIS solution will eliminate the need for staff to maintain separate spreadsheets to track timelines for cases.
161	Please provide an example of a hypothetical scoring outcome using the criteria provided.	All potential scoring criteria and their weights are listed within table 4 "Vendor Evaluation Criteria."

162	Please clarify how the deliverables listed in Table 3 of the RFP maps to the Cost Type categories provided in Part 8 Pricing.	The mapping of deliverables listed in Table 3 to the Cost Type categories provided in Part 8 of the Pricing will be thoroughly defined during the contract negotiation period once a vendor has been selected. This will ensure alignment between specific project requirements and cost structuring, tailored to the chosen vendor's proposed solution and pricing framework.
163	Does VT's system process payment card information?	no
164	To which requirements does the Payment Card Information data apply?	N/A, VT's system does not process payment card information.
165	Please provide a procurement schedule of events post-submission of the proposal responses.	All information regarding the procurement schedule was posted with the RFP. Any updates to that schedule will be made public through our public facing site.
166	Please confirm the projected Project Start Date for vendors to consistently use in a timeline.	The contract start date is listed as July 1, 2024 within the RFP.
167	Please provide a TOC / expected content / guidelines for Attachment #3: Executive Level Summary PowerPoint.	Provide a PowerPoint (minimum of 1 slide and maximum of 10 slides) that provides an Executive level summary of your proposal to the State. Label it Attachment #3
168	What is the intended use/audience for the Attachment #3 PowerPoint presentation as part of the procurement activities?	Attachment #3 will be reviewed with the rest of the submitted proposal in entirety by the state's project procurement review team.
169	May we enter this information as part of the cover letter? Or, where specifically in the response should vendors provide acknowledgement of Addendums?	The acknowledgment to confirm receipt of addendums does not apply to this bidder response form.
170	Please confirm that the State of VT registration and tax number are not required at the time of proposal submission.	This is not required to submit a bid. The vendor WILL need to be registered to accept an award.
171	Is it anticipated that a third-party vendor will be the PMO?	No. PMO will be a joint venture between the state and the vendor.
172	Can you confirm that the list to be addressed is in Section 2.4.4?	The list you referred to is in Section 2.4.4. This section outlines what we anticipate will be the vendor's responsibilities at a high level. We will develop a more detailed list collaboratively with the selected vendor as we define the scope of work. This approach ensures that we tailor the responsibilities to suit the project's specific needs and goals.
173	Is the requirement specifically to offer an NLP search field for case notes? Or can the requirement be satisfied by other search functionality?	The requirement does indeed specify the use of NLP to assist caseworkers in writing case notes, but it's considered a lower priority requirement. If you offer alternative search functionalities that can fulfill a similar need, we encourage you to detail them in the comment column
174	For the CCWIS RFP, the Exhibit A Bidders Response Form (BRF) was provided in a landscape format. Would it be permissible to return this in a portrait format to better allow content to fit on the pages?	Yes, it is acceptable as long as none of the content and structure of rows and columns is changed.