**STATE OF MAINE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**

**RFP AMENDMENT # 2 AND**

**RFP SUBMITTED QUESTIONS & ANSWERS SUMMARY**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **RFP NUMBER AND TITLE:** | 202406106 Maine General Assistance Management Technology Platform |
| **RFP ISSUED BY:** | Department of Health and Human Services, Office for Family Independence |
| **SUBMITTED QUESTIONS DUE DATE:** | September 10, 2024 |
| **AMENDMENT AND QUESTION & ANSWER SUMMARY ISSUED:** | September 27, 2024 |
| **PROPOSAL DUE DATE:** | October 22, 2024, no later than 11:59 p.m., local time (***as amended)*** |
| **PROPOSALS DUE TO:** | Proposals@maine.gov |
| **Unless specifically addressed below, all other provisions and clauses of the RFP remain unchanged.** |
| **DESCRIPTION OF CHANGES IN RFP:**1. Proposal Submission Deadline is amended.
2. Part V, B.2. Stage Four – demonstrations schedule changed.
 |
| **REVISED LANGUAGE IN RFP:**1. All references to the Proposal Submission Deadline of October 8, 2024, no later than 11:59 p.m., local time are changed to **October 22, 2024, no later than 11:59 p.m., local time.**
2. Demonstrations are expected to take place during the week of December 9, 2024, between 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. EST.
 |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | 1. Please provide the total number of users who will be accessing the system.
2. Also, can you provide a breakdown of the users by role (Intake worker, Administrator, Reviewer etc.) and as internal or external user?
 |
| **Answer** |
| 1. Potentially six hundred (600) or more individuals – every town in Maine would need a user, recognizing that many towns have more than one (1) person who would need access, in addition to users within the Department.
2. The Department does not have data reflecting specific roles within municipalities.
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **2** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | 1. Is there historical data that must be migrated into the new system?
2. If so, roughly how many records are there and what is the size of those records in GB?
 |
| **Answer** |
| 1. No. However, some municipalities may wish to enter historical data into the system or upload old records, but there would be no historical data migration performed by the awarded Bidder.
2. N/A
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **3** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | Please clarify if the agency has a preferred public cloud vendor like AWS of Azure for hosting the solution. |
| **Answer** |
| It is at the Bidder’s discretion to propose a solution that meets the requirements outlined in the RFP. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **4** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | Can you provide a list of the standard reports that need to be created on a regular basis? |
| **Answer** |
| * Demographics (age, race, citizenship status, income, education)
* Financial Reports (monthly report for each separate Municipality, cumulative annual reports, categorical spending, vendor reports, benefit types, Statewide and local/individual)
* Data Reports (average duration of assistance, average amount of assistance etc.)
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **5** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | Do you prefer we use your existing advanced reporting/analytics software, and if so, can you please provide the software name? Or do you prefer that the vendor bring their own embedded within the solution? |
| **Answer** |
| Bidders must propose a solution that includes reporting/analytics which meets the requirements outlined in the RFP. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **6** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | Does the state have an anticipated start date for implementation of the Solution? |
| **Answer** |
| It is at the Bidder’s discretion to propose an implementation start date for the proposed solution.  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **7** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | Does the agency have any preferred Digital signature solution like DocuSign or Adobe Sign to be integrated with the product? |
| **Answer** |
| No, it is at the Bidder’s discretion to propose a solution that meets the requirements outlined in the RFP. Refer to the [MaineIT Digital Signatures](https://www.maine.gov/oit/signature) policy. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **8** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | Does the solution require a virus scanning tool for documents that are uploaded electronically? |
| **Answer** |
| Yes, the proposed solution must ensure the document-upload feature does not become a vector for malware injection. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **9** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | Does the agency have any preferred business rules engine / Workflows Engine like Drools, InRule or Corticon? |
| **Answer** |
| The Department expects a configurable SaaS product. The choice of the rules engine, if any, that is embedded into the product, is at the Bidder’s discretion. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **10** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | 1. Is there an incumbent already engaged at DHHS?
2. Have you seen demonstrations of GA case management systems prior to issuing this Solicitation? If so, will you share which systems?
 |
| **Answer** |
| 1. No.
2. No.
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **11** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | Would the State consider allowing offshore resources to do work on the project provided that they only have access to development and testing environments with no access to production systems or production State data? |
| **Answer** |
| Yes, but subject to a rigorous verification that only synthetic and/or obfuscated data are available to the offshore personnel. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **12** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | Considering the comprehensive requirements, can the agency extend the response due date by 2 weeks, instead of 08th Oct’24, can it be revised to 22nd Oct’24? |
| **Answer** |
| Refer to the amended language at the beginning of this document. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **13** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | What are the ETL, ESB and other tools available at the State for data migration and integration? |
| **Answer** |
| The State does not have a standard ETL product. But the State has indeed standardized on the Oracle Service Bus. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **14** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, A., Page 10 | 1. Is integration with ACES real-time or batch?
2. What will be the volume and frequency of this interface?
 |
| **Answer** |
| 1. Real-time.
2. Users will be required to use the solution to look up certain applicant information in the ACES database, so volume and frequency will vary.
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **15** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, A., Page 10 | Are there any other integrations required with other applications, systems, or databases for vendors? |
| **Answer** |
| No. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **16** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, A., Page 13 & 15 | Would you like to have the ability to ‘Save’ mid-process when an individual recipient or municipal employee is filling out an application or case? |
| **Answer** |
| Yes. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **17** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, A., Page 13 & 15 | Is the expectation that all municipal employees with the right permission sets will need access to all of the individual recipients of services in their respective municipalities |
| **Answer** |
| Yes. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **18** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, A., Page 13 & 15 | Can you share an example of the current calculations for recipients for such services today? |
| **Answer** |
| Calculations are based on maximum levels of assistance which vary on a local level. Applicant income is deducted from the maximum level of assistance with consideration to an Applicant’s actual expenses for basic necessities.  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **19** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, A., Page 13 & 15 | How do you envision integration for Integrated Eligibility and Enrollment (IE&E) and this portal? |
| **Answer** |
| No integration is envisioned at this time. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **20** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, A., Page 13 & 15 | 1. Can you please share the seasonality of the applicants? (periods of high and low seasons)
2. What are the anticipated rates (the frequency of interacting with the system) for both individual recipients and individual municipal users? (For Example, do municipal users need to interact with the system more than 3 times a month, or is this daily utilization? Do Citizens engaging with services need to apply monthly or is this seasonally?)
 |
| **Answer** |
| 1. Municipalities may receive less applications for assistance in summer months however fall, winter and spring tend to present the greatest need due to colder weather and the billing/collection cycles of utility companies.
2. Utilization will vary depending on local need. Some Municipalities will require full-time usage; others may only require usage a few times per year.
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **21** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, A., Page 13 & 15 | What overlap is there for individual recipients and those who qualify for IE&E? |
| **Answer** |
| There may be some overlap. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **22** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, B.4. page 12 | For the topic of Help Desk support, what are the expectations for communications for internal users and external users? |
| **Answer** |
| Help Desk support must be available between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., ET, Monday through Friday (excluding State holidays). |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **23** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part I C, page 8 and Appendix C, page 29 | Part I C on page 8 and the Eligibility Certification on page 29 states “The GA management solution must, at a minimum, include components previously proven to successfully deliver the following functionality” with the second bullet including: “Web-based GA portal for Municipalities and the Department;” In our interpretation this disqualifies bidders who have not already produced a Web GA portal solution used by DHHS and Maine municipalities. Is this correct understanding? |
| **Answer** |
| The proposed GA management solution must include a Web-based GA portal for Municipalities and the Department in order to meet the eligibility requirements outline in Part I, C. of the RFP. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **24** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | Will the Department consider an existing benefits management solution with development extensions to support GA functionality? |
| **Answer** |
| It is at the Bidder’s discretion to propose a solution that meets the requirements outlined in the RFP. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **25** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | Will ACES provide a real-time API to directly support GA system requirements or assume use/extension of existing integrations? |
| **Answer** |
| Real-time. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **26** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part IV, Section II, 6. Page 19 | Can you please provide the link for IT Service Contract (IT-SC)? |
| **Answer** |
| [IT Service Contract (IT-SC)](https://www.maine.gov/dafs/bbm/procurementservices/sites/maine.gov.dafs.bbm.procurementservices/files/inline-files/IT%20Service%20Contract%20%28IT-SC%29%20Template_1.12.24_0.pdf). |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **27** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, A.1.a. Page 9 | What proportion of this first set of users (slated to be between 500-1000) are paid staff for the GA program? |
| **Answer** |
| As this is outside the scope of the RFP, the Department declines to answer. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **28** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part I, A. page 7 | Does the Department intend to use any existing document repository for GA, or would you like to procure something separate for this solution? |
| **Answer** |
| It is at the Bidder’s discretion to propose a solution that meets the requirements outlined in the RFP. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **29** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part I, A. page 6 | Could the Department share the historical number of GA program cases and forecasted number of GA program applicants? |
| **Answer** |
| Due to the lack of a current system, the Department is unable to calculate the historical or current number of unique GA cases since each Municipality reports monthly cases to the Department and there is no mechanism to de-duplicate those data. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **30** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part I, B. page 7 | Could the Department provide an estimated date by which the award notification is expected to be issued? |
| **Answer** |
| The Department anticipates the award notification to be issued mid-late December 2024/ early January 2025. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **31** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part IV, Section IV (File #4); page 20 | Could the Department provide the total estimated funding it expects to allocate to the Initial Period of Performance, as defined in the RFP? |
| **Answer** |
| As this is a competitive process, the Department declines to answer. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **32** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | Does the Department allow the use of an offshore development team, provided necessary security controls are in place for access to production data? |
| **Answer** |
| Refer to the answer to Question 11 of this document.  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **33** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | Will the Department provide the needed Application Lifecycle Management (ALM) tools or does the Contractor/Vendor need to procure and include costs for these tools? |
| **Answer** |
| It is the Bidder’s responsibility to provide a fully bundled SaaS product.  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **34** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | Would the Municipalities have the ability to be provided access to the State network and to State systems, such as Maine Service Bus, DocuWare, etc.? |
| **Answer** |
| No, the awarded Bidder’s product must interface with the State network and MaineIT tools.  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **35** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| PART I, A. Pages 6 & 7 and PART II, Page 10 | The RFP mentions voucher generation as part of the required functionality. Specifically, it states that the system should be capable of "Generation of voucher" as part of the approval process. What are the customization needs for issuing and tracking vouchers? Please share details. |
| **Answer** |
| Vouchers are printable document that a Municipal prints on security paper, which states the Municipality’s information, details on how to collect payment, the Applicant receiving assistance, and the type and amount of assistance being issued. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **36** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| PART I, A. Development Phase 1, Pages 6 & 7 and PART II, Development Phase 1, Page 10 | What is the preferred payment method for issuing vouchers (e.g. physical or virtual)? Please share more information. |
| **Answer** |
| Physical vouchers will be given to eligible Applicants and then provided to the intended vendor. The vendor will return the voucher to the Municipality to be processed for payment. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **37** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| PART I, A. Development Phase 1, Pages 6 & 7 and PART II, Development Phase 1, Page 10 | Phase 1 requires the selected vendor to “digitize the process of Applicant eligibility determination onward.” Please describe your existing process for tracking vouchers? |
| **Answer** |
| The existing process for tracking vouchers:1. A voucher is written for an eligible Applicant, either printed on security paper or on carbon copy paper.
2. The voucher is given to the eligible Applicant as proof of a “promised payment” from the Municipality.
3. The Applicant provides the voucher to the vendor as proof of payment for services.
4. The vendor notes the amount the voucher is written for and the amount of voucher actually spent. For example, a client may have a $100 voucher to the grocery store and the total grocery cost was $98. The vendor provides an invoiced statement and returns the voucher with a request for payment.
5. The Municipality receives the voucher from the vendor and processes it into the database for payment with the actual dollar amount spent.
6. The Municipality is able to pull a report to allow them to issue actual payment to the vendor.
7. The Municipality can pull reports to show vouchers issued or outstanding, vendors, amount spent per category of assistance, amount spent per vendor, amount spent per household etc.
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **38** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | What is the estimated number of individuals receiving GA benefits for SFY2023? |
| **Answer** |
| Refer to the answer to Question 29 of this document. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **39** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | Has the department established a budget range for the implementation and ongoing operation of the system? |
| **Answer** |
| As this is a competitive process, the Department declines to answer. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **40** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | Regarding the online training requirement in Phase 3, would the Department consider video format as an acceptable medium for delivering these trainings? |
| **Answer** |
| Yes. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **41** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | Will there be a pre-conference meeting? Please share those details if so |
| **Answer** |
| No. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **42** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | Where will the full set of vendor questions and agency responses be posted?  |
| **Answer** |
| Refer to Part III, A.2. of the RFP. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **43** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| PART II, C. Page 13 | What level of customization is expected to accommodate differences in GA administration across different municipalities? |
| **Answer** |
| The Department expects the overall GA process to be consistent across Municipalities, but there could be variations in how the Municipalities operationalize the process. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **44** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| PART II, A. Pages 9-12 | How does the state envision handling historical data from the current systems? Is there an expectation for historical data migration? |
| **Answer** |
| Refer to answer to Question 2 of this document. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **45** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| PART II, B. Page 11 | Does the state have a preference for the type of cloud infrastructure to be used? |
| **Answer** |
| No, the technical underlayment of the Bidder’s proposal must be in full alignment with the existing [MaineIT Policies & Standards](https://www.maine.gov/oit/policies-standards).  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **46** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| PART II, A. (Phase 2) Page 11 | What is the state's vision for how the public-facing online application (in Phase Two) should integrate with or relate to other state benefits application processes? |
| **Answer** |
| The online application must be a standalone application and not integrated with other benefits applications processes. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **47** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | Can the State please provide the number of system users by role? Specifically: How many internal users (Admin/Supervisor/Case worker etc.) and how many external users – (Municipality/Community case workers, etc.) |
| **Answer** |
| Refer to the answer to Question 1 of this document. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **48** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | 1. How many external public users/applicants will access the system per month/per year?
2. And does this state anticipate this number increasing in future years, if so by how many?
 |
| **Answer** |
| 1. Refer to the answer to Question 1 of this document.
2. The Department cannot predict future user numbers.
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **49** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | To allow for more thoughtful and complete responses to the RFP, can the State extend the due date for proposals by 1-2 weeks? |
| **Answer** |
| Refer to the amended language at the beginning of this document. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **50** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| PART II, Page 10 | “**Req** - Ability for OFI to receive invoices submitted electronically by Municipalities for review, approval, and preparation for manual submission to OFI’s payment processing system.”Can you explain this requirement? We assume that OFI’s Payment is some system and you are not looking for any integration with this system. Municipality user will be accessing and approving the payment in the new System and will manually enter data in OFI’s payment. |
| **Answer** |
| Maine is not looking for integration with its accounts payable system.  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **51** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| PART II, Page 11 | “Req - Secure user authentication/authorization administered from a remote system (e.g., using secure web services) for OFI and other State staff;”1. Can you please provide more detail around this requirement?, We are assuming the user base (user account- Credentials access etc.) will be the new system.
2. Do you mean a user setup for integration – using webservices / Rest API ?
 |
| **Answer** |
| 1. All internal (State of Maine) users must consumer authentication from the State Executive Branch Office 365 Active Directory. However, most users of the system will be Municipal GA staff and not State staff.
2. The product proposed must integrate with the Okta platform, and comply with OpenID 2.0, OAuth 2.0, and SAML 2.0.
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **52** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| PART II, Page 11 | “Req - Online applications to be translated into multiple languages.”1. Which language(s) you are looking for translation to?
2. Is the Chrome browser extension (translation) not enough?
3. How many online application types are there?
 |
| **Answer** |
| 1. Lingala, Arabic, Somali, French, Haitian, Spanish.
2. It is at the Bidder’s discretion.
3. The Department’s does not currently have an online application process.
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **53** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | Can the State specify where in the budget form proposers should enter annual license costs? |
| **Answer** |
| Refer to Amendment 1 on the [Office of State Procurement Services RFP Page](https://www.maine.gov/dafs/bbm/procurementservices/vendors/rfps). License cost should be included on Schedules 4 and 5 of the cost form. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **54** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | What is the budget NTE (not to exceed) amount for the base period (phase 1 and phase 2)? |
| **Answer** |
| As this is a competitive process, the Department declines to answer. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **55** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | What is the budget NTE (not to exceed) amount for the entire project? |
| **Answer** |
| As this is a competitive process, the Department declines to answer. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **56** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | Has the budget for this project been approved/allocated? |
| **Answer** |
| Yes. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **57** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | 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? |
| **Answer** |
| Refer to the answer to Question 11 of this document. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **58** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | Has the State seen any demos/talked to vendors prior to releasing the RFP, if so which vendors and technologies? |
| **Answer** |
| Refer to the answer to Question 10.b. of this document. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **59** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | 1. Could you provide detailed technical specifications regarding the ACES API infrastructure, particularly focusing on the supported authentication mechanisms (e.g., OAuth 2.0, API keys, or SAML), data format preferences (such as JSON, XML, or SOAP), and any existing rate limiting or throttling policies?

We often observe variations in data synchronization intervals and security protocols, such as the use of TLS 1.3 or encrypted data exchanges. 1. Could you confirm if these are required for this integration and whether there are any restrictions regarding third-party system interactions, such as IP whitelisting or specific logging requirements for audit purposes?
 |
| **Answer** |
| 1. The Department would build a new API with the awarded bidder. It is at the bidder’s discretion to propose a solution which meets the requirements of the RFP.
2. The State blocks porn, clibkbait, and malware, as well as [Maine.gov/oit/prohibited-technologies](https://www.maine.gov/oit/prohibited-technologies). But, to date, no reputed tech or biz resource has gotten snagged by this restriction.
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **60** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | It is often observed that applicant databases require real-time synchronization with various municipal and state systems. 1. Could you clarify the specific data exchange protocols and formats mandated for this platform to interact with existing municipal systems seamlessly? For example, do you require standardized protocols like RESTful APIs using JSON, or is XML preferred for more structured data exchanges?
2. Moreover, should we account for WebSocket or other real-time communication protocols to maintain continuous synchronization, and are there any preferred data validation mechanisms, such as schema validation, to ensure data integrity across systems?
 |
| **Answer** |
| 1. The State does not dictate technology options for Municipalities. The baseline assumption is that any mainstream technology that is currently supported must be accommodated. Which means, both REST and plain-XML must remain viable options.
2. No mainstream technology that is currently supported can be ruled out and must be accommodated.
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **61** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | 1. Given the importance of handling PII and other sensitive information, could you provide specific data retention and purging policies that must be adhered to, particularly in the context of MaineIT’s data exchange and security requirements? For instance, should we assume a retention period aligned with state regulations, such as a 7-year minimum, or are there specific data categories (e.g., applicant financial information, case notes) that have different retention schedules?
2. Also , What are the required methods for secure data purging, such as cryptographic erasure or DoD-compliant wiping techniques, to ensure compliance with both state and federal guidelines?
 |
| **Answer** |
| 1. Client files may require retention beyond seven (7) years if the Applicant has a court case, a property lien, or any other reason that the Municipality deems essential to maintain the record.
2. Compliance with NIST SP 800-88.
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **62** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | 1. Considering the anticipated volume of 500-1000 municipal portal users in Phase 1, could you clarify the specific expectations for user authentication mechanisms? For instance, should we incorporate a single sign-on (SSO) solution such as SAML or OAuth 2.0 for seamless integration with existing systems, or is multi-factor authentication (MFA) a mandatory requirement for additional security?
2. Are there any existing identity management systems, such as Active Directory or other federated identity services, that we should plan to integrate with, or should we design the platform to be independent of these services?
 |
| **Answer** |
| 1. Refer to the answer to Question 51 of this document.
2. Refer to the answer to Question 51 of this document.
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **63** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | 1. Considering the work queue functionality for GA Administrators in Phase 2, could you clarify the expectations for prioritization and assignment algorithms within the platform? For instance, should the system allow for dynamic prioritization based on criteria such as the urgency of the applicant’s situation, application submission date, or benefit category?
2. Should the platform offer fully configurable rules for each municipality, allowing them to customize assignment workflows based on local policies or staff availability, or are you looking for a more standardized approach across all municipalities?
 |
| **Answer** |
| 1. The Department expects priority to be given based on submission date and emergency status.
2. The Department expects the solution to provide for a standardized approach across all Municipalities.
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **64** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | 1. For the reporting and dashboard functionality, could you clarify whether the preference is for predefined report templates that standardize data presentation across municipalities, or a more flexible approach where municipalities can customize reports to suit their specific operational needs?
2. Such as, would you like to see options such as custom filters, grouping by different data categories (e.g., benefit type, approval status, or applicant demographics), or the ability to schedule automated report generation?
3. Moreover, should these customizable dashboards allow municipalities to create and save their own visualizations for ongoing monitoring of key metrics?
 |
| **Answer** |
| 1. The Department seeks standardized applications, with flexibility to customize reports based on operational needs.
2. Yes.
3. Yes.
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **65** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | 1. For the dashboard functionality, would you prefer a visual distinction between “Regular” and “Emergency” GA recipients, such as using separate charts or color coding for quick reference, or should this be managed through filters and drill-downs that allow users to toggle between categories?
2. Also, would it be beneficial to offer dynamic visual indicators, such as icons or badges, to highlight recipients who are currently receiving emergency benefits, or are you looking for a more streamlined, unified view with options for data filtering?
 |
| **Answer** |
| 1. Visual distinction for Applicants requiring interpreter services and Applicants requesting emergency assistance.
2. Unified view otherwise.
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **66** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | 1. Should we anticipate future integration with other state-run programs or systems beyond General Assistance (GA), such as SNAP, TANF, or Medicaid?
2. If so, what additional considerations should we account for in terms of system flexibility and modularity? For instance, would you expect the platform to support standardized data exchange protocols like HL7 or FHIR, or accommodate future API connections for seamless interoperability?
 |
| **Answer** |
| 1. No.
2. N/A
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **67** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | It is often beneficial for platforms to offer configurable workflows. 1. Should we design the system to allow each municipality to tailor their application review and approval processes based on local requirements, such as adding specific review steps, custom approval thresholds, or unique notification rules?
2. Alternatively, would you prefer a more standardized, uniform workflow across all municipalities to ensure consistency in the application process?
3. If customization is preferred, are there any specific parameters or controls that must be in place to ensure compliance with state-wide policies while allowing for local flexibility?
 |
| **Answer** |
| 1. It is at the Bidder’s discretion.
2. It is at the Bidder’s discretion.
3. It is at the Bidder’s discretion.
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **68** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | 1. In integrating the platform with MaineIT and municipal systems, would it be advantageous to incorporate API monitoring tools to provide real-time visibility into data exchanges and system performance? For instance, should the system include capabilities such as automated alerts for failed data transfers, performance metrics for API response times, or dashboards displaying the status of critical integrations?
2. Would you require these monitoring tools to support logging for auditing purposes or integration with existing monitoring platforms used by MaineIT or the municipalities?
 |
| **Answer** |
| 1. It is at the Bidder’s discretion.
2. It is at the Bidder’s discretion.
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **69** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | 1. Given the requirement for audit trails to prevent fraud, waste, and abuse, could you clarify which specific activities or data elements should be prioritized for tracking? For instance, should the platform track changes to applicant information, approval/denial decisions, or voucher issuance in real time?
2. Moreover, are there defined thresholds for triggering automatic reporting of anomalies, such as unusual spending patterns, repeated manual overrides, or discrepancies in household income verification?
3. If so, should these thresholds be configurable based on municipal policies or remain standardized across all municipalities?
 |
| **Answer** |
| 1. Ability to flag when an Applicant has applied for assistance in another municipality. Ability to flag when an Applicant has been disqualified for fraud.
2. No.
3. No.
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **70** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | 1. For the electronic Municipal invoice summaries, should the platform include built-in budget forecasting tools to help municipalities project future GA expenditures, or would this functionality be managed externally through existing financial systems? For example, would it be beneficial for the platform to provide predictive analytics based on historical spending data and trends, or integrate with external financial systems via APIs to consolidate budgetary insights?
2. Should the platform support scenario modeling to assist municipalities in planning for fluctuations in GA demand?
 |
| **Answer** |
| 1. It is at the Bidder’s discretion.
2. It is at the Bidder’s discretion.
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **71** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | 1. Given the anticipated volume of users for the municipal portal (500-1000), how do you envision the structure of role-based access control for different user levels? Should the platform allow for fully customizable permissions, enabling municipalities to assign specific tasks—such as application review, benefit approval, or voucher processing—to various roles within their organization?
2. Would you require predefined user roles (e.g., Administrator, Reviewer) across all municipalities, or should each municipality have the flexibility to create and manage custom roles and access levels tailored to their internal workflows and policies?
 |
| **Answer** |
| 1. Customizable permissions.
2. Pre-defined user roles/permissions, managed by the municipality.
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **72** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | 1. Given the need for applicants to upload supporting documents, would it be beneficial to integrate document classification or recognition tools, such as Optical Character Recognition (OCR), to streamline the review process for GA Administrators? For instance, should the system automatically categorize and extract key data from uploaded documents—such as pay stubs or identification—or will manual verification by administrators be the preferred method for accuracy?
2. Would you also require any automation to flag incomplete or illegible documents during the upload process to ensure efficient case management?
 |
| **Answer** |
| 1. Manual verification is required.
2. No.
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **73** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | 1. To track actual voucher expenditures, how should the platform manage reconciliation between issued vouchers and the actual expenditures by applicants?
2. Should the system include automated reconciliation workflows, such as matching issued voucher amounts against documented expenses, and flagging discrepancies for further review?
3. Are there specific financial reconciliation processes or audit trails that need to be built into the platform to ensure compliance with municipal and state auditing requirements, such as logging any manual adjustments or anomalies in expenditure reporting?
 |
| **Answer** |
| 1. Actual voucher expenditures will be manually entered.
2. No.
3. No.
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **74** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | 1. Considering the requirements around GA Administrator reviews and approvals, would you prefer that the platform provides automated suggestions for approval or denial based on predefined thresholds, such as income levels or asset limits, to streamline decision-making? Or should all decisions remain fully manual to allow municipalities the flexibility to apply their local policies and judgment?
2. If automated suggestions are preferred, should these thresholds be configurable to adapt to policy changes or variations across municipalities?
 |
| **Answer** |
| 1. Reviews and approval/denial decisions will be determined manually by the GA Administrator.
2. N/A
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **75** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | 1. For the public-facing online application, do you envision this being integrated into an existing state portal for a unified user experience across state services, or would it be more beneficial to develop a completely standalone solution with its own dedicated domain and branding for easier access and management by municipalities?
2. If integration with an existing portal is preferred, are there specific design or technical standards that must be adhered to for consistency?
3. Alternatively, should the standalone approach offer flexibility for municipalities to customize branding and features based on local preferences?
 |
| **Answer** |
| 1. The proposed product must integrate with the Okta platform, and comply with OpenID 2.0, OAuth 2.0, and SAML 2.0.
2. The proposed product must integrate with the Okta platform, and comply with OpenID 2.0, OAuth 2.0, and SAML 2.0.
3. No.
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **76** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | The electronic municipal invoice submission appears to be a key component for tracking GA expenditures. 1. Are there specific requirements for generating detailed invoices, such as allowing municipalities to use customizable templates that reflect their individual financial reporting needs, or should the invoicing system follow a uniform template across all municipalities to ensure consistency?
2. Also, should the platform support features like automated line-item breakdowns, categorization by GA assistance type, and customizable fields for local variations in reporting, or would standardized fields suffice for all users?
 |
| **Answer** |
| 1. Templates are required to be uniform across all Municipalities.
2. Standardized fields.
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **77** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Not provided | 1. Given the need to search for applicants receiving benefits across municipalities, would you prefer the search function to include advanced filtering capabilities—such as filtering by timeframes, benefit categories, or municipal-specific data—to provide a more granular view of applicant history and benefit details? Or would a more basic lookup by name and social security number be sufficient for the initial version, with potential expansion of search features in future phases?
2. Should there be any specific audit or logging requirements for tracking search activity across the system to ensure data access compliance?
 |
| **Answer** |
| 1. Basic look up with specific parameters (such as SSN/DOB).
2. Yes.
 |