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| **Date of Issuance:** | 3/23/2022 | | **Solicitation No.** | | 2900000098 | | |
| **Requisition No.** | 2900004817 | | **Amendment No.** | | 3 | | |
| Hour and date specified for receipt of offers is changed: | | | No | Yes, to: |  | 3:00 pm CST | |
| Pursuant to OAC 260:115-7-30(d), this document shall serve as official notice of amendment to the solicitation identified above. Such notice is being provided to all suppliers to which the original solicitation was sent.  Suppliers submitting bids or quotations shall acknowledge receipt of this solicitation amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation as follows:  (1) Sign and return a copy of this amendment with the solicitation response being submitted; or,  (2) If the supplier has already submitted a response, this acknowledgement must be signed and returned prior to the solicitation deadline. All amendment acknowledgements submitted separately shall have the solicitation number and bid opening date printed clearly on the front of the envelope. | | | | | | | |
| **ISSUED BY and RETURN TO:** | | | | | | | |
| **U.S. Postal Delivery or Personal or Common Carrier Delivery:**  OMES Central Purchasing Will Rogers Building  ATTN: Teresa Terry  2401 N. Lincoln Blvd., Ste. 116  Oklahoma City, OK 73105 | | Teresa Terry | | | | |  |
| Contracting Officer | | | | |  |
| (405) 521-6679 | | | | |  |
| Phone Number | | | | |  |
| Teresa.terry@omes.ok.gov | | | | |  |
| E-Mail Address | | | | |  |
| **Description of Amendment:** | | | | | | | |
| a. This is to incorporate the following: | | | | | | | |
| On behalf of the State of Oklahoma, the Office of Management and Enterprise Services (OMES) gives notice of the following questions concerning this solicitation, QA period, which is now closed. All questions and procurement/agency responses are detailed below:  In reference to line 258 of Exhibit 2 under Hosting Requirements, will the state accept the following commercial security best practices and control frameworks in place of FedRAMP ready status - NIST, CIS CSC, PCI DSS, and ISO27k series?  No, the state is looking for a solution that is FedRAMP Ready or will have FedRAMP Ready status prior to award date.  Please explain the difference between the “References” as described in Section 2.10 and the “Business References” described in Section Twelve.  The references mentioned all come from boilerplate language supplied by OMES. However, I believe that “references” and “business references” mean the same thing: namely, a person who is knowledgeable about the experience and the outcome of the engagement and is willing and available to discuss the project with Oklahoma.    Re: General  Question: Would the State consider a StateRAMP-certified solution to allow non-FedRAMP-certified vendors the opportunity to bid on this solicitation? This would offer the State a broader selection of providers so that it would have an opportunity to evaluate best value solutions available in the market today.  No, the state is looking for a solution that is FedRAMP Ready or will have FedRAMP Ready status prior to award date.  2. Re: Exhibit 2, 212-The System should provide daily feed that includes information to make payment to providers, employers or other entities.  Question: Would the State please provide the name of the Oklahoma system that would require this interface or feed, and what data points would be required for that interface?  There isn’t a singular system that this interface should work with, but ideally the system should be able to interface with common accounting software giving the state and/or local workforce development boards the ability to generate financial reports that will translate into the processing of payments.  3. Re: Exhibit 2, 228-The System should maintain interfaces into current state systems.  Question: Please provide a list of interfaces so that vendors can accurately respond to this requirement.  Current State interfaces are mentioned in the Interface Requirement section of Exhibit 2, lines 188 – 228.  4. Re: Exhibit 2, 307-Capture all data within this "universal or common intake" that is needed for any/all programs contained within the system (i.e., name, address, date of birth, etc.).  Question: Please confirm that OKJobMatch/Oklahoma Unemployment Insurance Interface/Authorized User Input will provide this intake information.  Any data migration from the previous solution will be provided. Any programs using the system provided will need to provide universal or common intake information.  5. Re: Exhibit 2, Row 409, Wagner-Peyser – Entire section of requirements.  Row 528 – System Functionality – Multiple requirements.  Question: The requirements in the section appear to indicate that the State is interested in a replacement for the OKJobMatch system while other requirements within Exhibit 2 indicate that the State is looking for an interface/integration with the OKJobMatch system. Would the State please clarify its intent on keeping or replacing their current labor exchange system?  The RFP is for a complete labor exchange and case management system. The State does not intend to retain the current labor exchange functionality.  6. Re: Exhibit 2, Row 397 – status; for example, failed to report, refused service, rescheduled, rescheduled date, completed and completed date.  Question: This appears to be an incomplete requirement. Would the State please clarify or correct?  The requirement should read: The System should have the ability to update service status; for example, failed to report, refused service, rescheduled, rescheduled date, completed and completed date.  7. Re: General, Data Scope for migration  Question: Please provide approximate database counts for: customers, employers, services rendered, staff accounts.  This is an approximate number of active accounts, which changes all the time. The number of accounts that aren’t currently being used is larger. Currently if a user doesn’t log into the system within a certain number of days their account goes inactive. But we reactive accounts all the time. The inactive accounts have to stay in the system for a long period of time for reports that are required by DOL.  Job Seekers – 236,000  Employers – 4,500  Staff – 550  ETP – 200  8. Re: General, Activity scope for server sizing  Question: Please provide the average number of page views per day, average number of customer/seeker logins per day, average number of employer logins per day, average number of job searches per day. Also, if you see this trending up, down or stable.  See breakout below, all stable.   * Average number of page views per day: 36,990 * Average number of customer/seeker logins per day: 505 * Average number of employer logins per day: 331 * Average number of job searches per day: 1,180   9. Re: General, Data Scope  Question: Please provide the average number of PIRL rows for the last 4 quarters, as well as the min and max counts across this time.  For Title I programs only the average number of rows is 11,592. The minimum number of rows is 6,031 and the maximum is 15,091.  10. Re: Exhibit 2, Requirement 235 & SCA 19-3  Question: Requirement 235 calls for an RTO of 24 hours, while SCA 19-3 references an RTO of less than 48 hours. Please clarify and confirm that the requirement for RTO is 24 hours.  The Oklahoma Employment Security Commission is asking for solutions to provide RTOs of 24 hours.  11. Re: Exhibit 2, Requirement 236 & SCA 19-1  Question: Requirement 236 calls for an RPO of 8 hours, while SCA 19-1 references an RTO of no more than 24 hours. Please clarify and confirm that the requirement for RPO is 8 hours.  The Oklahoma Employment Security Commission is asking for solutions to provide RPOs of 8 hours.  12. Re: Exhibit 2, Requirement 306  Question: Please clarify and give examples of agencies and the partitioning within the cloud-based services.  The State is asking for potential partitioning of data from any state agency used by the solution being offered.  13. Re: Exhibit 2, Requirement 245  Question: Please clarify the environments requiring AAD for SaaS offering; development environment would not be available. Do you mean a training or test environment/instance?  Yes, the State meant the System should have a training and/or test environment instance.  14. Re: Exhibit 2, Row 562 - The solution should provide the ability to access and update host records in "real-time".  Host records in this instance means the updating of records in the database.  Question: Can the State please define ‘host records’ or provide an example of a ‘host record’?  15. Re: Exhibit 2, Row 712 - The ability of "real time" alert tracking.  Question: Please provide an example of "real time" alert tracking.  If within the system, a case manager were to notify a participant there are items for them to complete, alerts for if/when the participant read the notification and if/when they completed those items would return to the case manager.  16. Re: General  Question: MGS is respectfully requesting a further extension to April 29 to the proposal due date given the number of additional questions submitted and to allow sufficient time to provide a compliant and complete proposal.  No further extensions are being considered.  17. Re: Exhibit 2, Row 618 - The solution should provide the ability to Remove Job Seekers. Delete Job Seeker information once registrations have been removed.  Question: Would the State please confirm they would like the Job Seeker and all activities deleted from the vendor system? Or would the State like to have the ability to inactivate a Job Seeker in case of clerical error?  The State wants the ability to delete all activities tied to a Job Seeker account. The State also wants the ability to delete a Job Seeker account if determined necessary. The State also wants the ability to inactivate a Job Seeker account if determined necessary.  18. Re: Exhibit 2, Row 522 - After review by each WIA, the solution should display to any user that the program has been re-approved and which WIAs have been approved.  Question: Can the State please provide a detailed example of this workflow or explain the intended outcome with more detail?  The intended outcome is that users of the system receive a notification within the system and via email to alert them that an approval, so that any higher level of approvals can address the task in a timely manner.  19. Re: Exhibit 3, Pricing Template  Question: The State say a Bid submitted using any other format may not be accepted. The State provided a pricing table in Exhibit 3. How does would the State like vendors to include optional pricing  Does the agency intend on sending email and SMS through automated triggers?  This something that we intend doing in the future.  Does the agency plan to send reminder emails or SMS through automated triggers?  Could be e-mails and/or SMS on job announcements or appointments reminders. Additionally tasks within the system such as documentation needed, or answers to follow-up questions, etc.  What type of emails do you hope to send with the requirements of “email functionality”?  Could be e-mails on job announcements or appointment reminders. Additionally tasks within the system such as documentation needed, or answers to follow-up questions, etc.  For texting functionality - We want to know if outbound communications will be used at large-scale promotion and engagement, or as 1:1 messages with applicants.  Outbound could be at a large scale allowing us to send job announcements, reminders, password resets, etc.   If we had the capability could also see staff corresponding 1:1 with job seekers.  How many emails do you anticipate sending per day?  Not yet determined.  How many SMS/MMS messages do you anticipate sending per day?  Not yet determined.  How many unique contacts do you plan to communicate to?  Not yet determined. The number of users within the system is fluid so there isn’t a way of determining a single number at this point.  Is there a budget established for the project?  There is an estimated budget, however, you should provide your best solution at your best price.  When does the State of Oklahoma intend to award the project?  As soon as possible following State procurement policies and procedures.  When does the state seek to go live with all staff trained? (Exhibit 1 Section 2.4)  To be determined. This should be part of the overall project management plan when implanting the solution.  How many Administrative staff will the state need trained? (Exhibit 1 Section 2.4)  To be determined.  How many state technical staff will need to be trained? (Exhibit 1 Section 2.4)  To be determined.  How many employer and partner agency users will have logins for the system? (Exhibit 1 Section 2.4)  Employers – 4,500, Staff – 550  How many clients do you estimate will utilize the system annually?  This is an approximate number of active accounts, which changes all the time. The number of accounts that aren’t currently being used is larger. Currently if a user doesn’t log into the system within a certain number of days their account goes inactive. But we reactive accounts all the time. The inactive accounts have to stay in the system for a long period of time for reports that are required by DOL.  Job Seekers – 236,000  Employers – 4,500  Staff – 550  ETP – 200  What financial information is required as requested in section 8.2K (Instructions  This was not requested in 8.1 so it is not required.  Security assessment in separate doc or embedded? (Clarification on instructions 8.2H  This needs to be filled out in a separate document and be returned in the excel format.  Does every security assessment requirement also require a narrative element?  When requested a narrative element is required.  In section 8.1B, requirements for the submission are laid out. Section 8.2 outlines additional requirements. Are any of those elements of the packet not required for submission?  (Instructions)  Section 8.2 is the format in which the solicitation needs to be sent in and what is required in each section. If it’s not requested in the specifications or in 8.1 then that section is N/A.  Can the exhibit 2 spreadsheet response column be unlocked for formatting? (Cannot currently wrap text)  This has been added to the website.  Will the State be asking for demonstrations of the product as part of the evaluation? When does the state expect to be viewing demonstrations?  To be determined.  What Is the state expecting to migrate? How does the state expect to migrate the data?  The State is expecting to migrate our data from our current workforce development system. We expect to migrate the data as part of the overall project management plan when implanting the new solution.  For pricing (exhibit 3) can license and maintenance fees be combined?  The State wants to see the license and maintenance fees separated as detailed in Exhibit 3.  The security assessment for hosted facilities asks if the solution has FedRAMP status or will by the date of product implementation.  Is this a mandatory requirement for the application to be selected?  The state is looking for a solution that is FedRAMP Ready or will have FedRAMP Ready status prior to award date. | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| b. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged. | | | | |
|  | | |  |  |
| Supplier Company Name (**PRINT**) | | |  | Date |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Authorized Representative Name (**PRINT**) |  | Title |  | Authorized Representative Signature |