**STATE OF MAINE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**

**RFP AMENDMENT #1 AND**

**RFP SUBMITTED QUESTIONS & ANSWERS SUMMARY**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **RFP NUMBER AND TITLE:** | RFP# 202501014 Cannabis Inventory Tracking System |
| **RFP ISSUED BY:** | Department of Administrative and Financial Services |
| **SUBMITTED QUESTIONS DUE DATE:** | February 10, 2025 |
| **AMENDMENT AND QUESTION & ANSWER SUMMARY ISSUED:** | February 24, 2025 |
| **PROPOSAL DUE DATE:** | March 14, 2025, no later than 11:59 p.m. local time (**as amended**) |
| **PROPOSALS DUE TO:** | [Proposals@maine.gov](mailto: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 II, C, 4 – Training and Support is revised. 3. Part II, D, 5 – System Requirements/Records and Reporting is revised. 4. Part II, D, 14 – Configuration Requirements is revised to include number 19. 5. Part III, C, 3, b, File 3 – Proposal Submission/Submission Format is revised. 6. Part III, C, 3, b, File 4 – Proposal Submission/Submission Format is revised. 7. Part IV, Section II is revised to include number 8 – Prior Contractual Obligations. 8. Part V, B, 1 – Scoring Weights and Process/Scoring Weights is revised. 9. Appendix F – Cost Proposal Form is revised. | |
| **REVISED LANGUAGE IN RFP:**  All references to the Proposal Submission Deadline of **March 7, 2025, no later than 11:59 PM local time** are amended to **March 14, 2025 no later than 11:59 PM local time.**    **PART II SCOPE OF SERVICES TO BE PROVIDED**   1. Training and Support   4. Provide ongoing, twenty-four (24) -hour support of the SaaS to the Department and regulated members and entities, as described in D (2) – Service Levels, below.   1. System Requirements   5. Records and Reporting  a. Provide Confidentiality of information in the database by preventing access from unauthorized individuals.  b. Provide the Department with a written report (which may be electronic) of performance metrics, including uptime percentage and record of service support requests, classifications, and response and resolution times, at least once a month, or as requested by the Department. The Department may independently audit the report at the Department’s expense and select awarded Bidder’s cooperation.  c. Meet with the Department as often as may be reasonably requested by either party to review the performance of the Service and to discuss technical plans, financial matters, system performance, service levels, and any other matters related to this Agreement.  d. Provide the Department with regular status reports during unscheduled downtime, at least twice per day or upon request.  e. Provide the Department with root cause analysis within thirty (30) days of unscheduled downtime at no additional cost.  19. Ensure that the data and UIDs assigned to a licensee do not disappear and/or reappear under a different licensee's account.  **PART III KEY RFP EVENTS**   1. Proposal Submission 2. Submission Format:   b. Bidder’s proposal submissions are to be broken down into multiple files, with each file named as it is titled in bold below, and include:  **File 3 [Bidder’s Name] – Proposed Services and Technical Assessment:**  *PDF format preferred*  All required information and attachments stated in PART IV, Section III, including **Appendix D** Technical Assessment Form  **Appendix E** Business and Technical Requirements Form  **Appendix H** Recommended Options Form  **File 4 [Bidder’s Name] – Cost Proposal:**  **Appendix F** (Cost Proposal Form) and all required information and attachments stated in PART IV, Section IV. (*Excel format preferred)*  A narrative statement may be included in Word format or PDF format.  **PART IV PROPOSAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS**  **Section II Organization Qualifications and Experience (File #2)**  **8. Prior Contractual Obligations:** Bidders must disclose when they have not been able to meet their contractual obligations or have experienced performance issues, e.g. inability to meet implementation deadlines, within the last five years.  **PART V PROPOSAL EVALUATION AND SELECTION**   1. **Scoring Weights and Process** 2. Scoring Weights: The score will be based on a 100-point scale and will measure the degree to which each proposal meets the following criteria.   Section I. Preliminary Information (No Points)  Includes all elements addressed above in Part IV, Section I.  Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience (10 points)  Includes all elements addressed above in Part IV, Section II.    Section III. Proposed Services and Technical Assessment (50 points)  Includes all elements addressed above in Part IV, Section III.  Section IV. Cost Proposal (40 points)  Includes all elements addressed above in Part IV, Section IV.   1. The remaining 10 points allocated to the Cost Proposal will be used to evaluate proposed expenses and related benefits for the following sections of Part II: C(3), D(8), D(13)(o), D(14)(k), D(14)(l), D(14)(m), as well as the overall cost to industry, including any subscription fees, tagging fees, or other fees. | |

****

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Section II, pp. 18-19  Appendix C, p. 23 | Reference Requirement – The RFP requires three (3) references from similar public sector projects. If a vendor has relevant private sector experience but not public sector references, would those be acceptable? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **2** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Section II, p. 19 | Financial Stability – Vendors must submit balance sheets and income statements for the past three years. If a vendor’s financial statements did not exceed $250,000 per year, would that impact eligibility? |
| **Answer** | |
| No. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **3** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Section II, p. 19 | Insurance Requirements – The RFP lists general liability, professional liability, and cybersecurity liability insurance (if applicable).  a. Are there minimum coverage limits required for each policy per occurrence?  b. Does the Certificate of Insurance need to be valid at the time of proposal submission, or is it only required upon contract award? |
| **Answer** | |
| 1. Not less than $1M in limits; the type of insurance and coverage limits required under this agreement will be sufficient to cover the full scope of services and financial exposure due to any negligent actions of the vendor. 2. The Certificate of Insurance needs to be valid upon contracting. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **4** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, A, p. 9  Part II, D, p. 12 | System Integration – The system must integrate with Maine’s Agency License Management System (ALMS) and OCP’s data analytics database.  a. Will vendors be provided with API documentation or middleware specifications?  b. Will a test environment or sandbox be available for integration testing? |
| **Answer** | |
| 1. Yes, MaineIT will work with the selected bidder to implement APIs. 2. Yes, OCP will provide test data for connecting to the primary data analytics database (where the vendor will pull all data from). | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **5** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, D, p. 12 | API & Third-Party Compatibility – The RFP states the system must support API-based data entry from third-party systems, including POS software.  a. Are there specific POS vendors or software platforms that must be supported?  b. Are there predefined API functions that vendors must implement? |
| **Answer** | |
| 1. No. Currently, OCP has approved over 100 API and third-party vendors. 2. See Part II, D, 13, n and o, p. 13 and Appendix E on p. 31 of the RFP | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **6** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, E, p. 15 | Security & Compliance – The system must comply with NIST 800-53 Rev 5 and meet data encryption standards.  a. What are the minimum encryption requirements for data at rest and in transit?  b. Are there additional state-specific cybersecurity requirements beyond NIST 800-53 that vendors must follow? |
| **Answer** | |
| 1. The minimum acceptable level of dynamic encryption is TLS 1.2. For any exchanged data, by default, the payload must be encrypted in-flight and at rest to the AES-256 standard. 2. Yes. See Part II, E, p. 14 and Appendix D on p. 30 of the RFP | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **7** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part III, 2, pp.19-20 | Data Migration – Will vendors be responsible for migrating historical cannabis tracking data from the state’s current system, or will this be handled internally? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes. See Part IV, Section 3, 2, p. 19 of the RFP. MaineIT & the OCP Data Analytics team will be available to assist. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **8** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, C, p. 9  Part II, D, p. 14  Part III, 2, pp. 19-20 | Training & Support – The RFP requires training for regulators, licensees, and enforcement personnel.  a. How many users will require training?  b. Should training be a one-time implementation effort, or will ongoing training support be required throughout the contract? |
| **Answer** | |
| 1. To be determined at the time of contracting, but at minimum – OCP staff and one person per adult use license. Licensee information changes daily. Refer to the Office of Cannabis Policy’s Open Data pages for the most up-to-date information. 2. Yes, on an ongoing basis. See Part II, C, p. 9 of the RFP. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **9** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, D, p. 10 | Performance & SLAs – The system must maintain 99.95% uptime, and vendors must meet response time requirements for critical issues.  a. Are there penalties or contract deductions for failing to meet uptime or response time SLAs?  b. Will the state conduct periodic audits or performance reviews? |
| **Answer** | |
| 1. To be determined in final contract language. 2. To be determined in final contract language. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **10** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part V, B, p. 21 | Proposal Evaluation & Cost Scoring – The cost proposal accounts for 40% of the evaluation criteria.  a. Beyond price, are there specific areas where vendors can earn additional points, such as enhanced security, API capabilities, or scalability? |
| **Answer** | |
| 1. Including all elements addressed in RFP 202501014 Part IV, Section III and all elements address in Part IV, Section IV. Also, refer to RFP AMENDMENT language on pages 1-3 of this document. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **11** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix H, p. 35 | Where does Appendix H belong in bidder’s proposal? Should it be added to File 4 - Cost Proposal? |
| **Answer** | |
| File 4, refer to AMENDMENT #1 202501014 language on pages 1-3 of this document. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **12** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part IV, Section II, 4, Litigation, p. 18 | Is there a materiality threshold to litigation? Does the term litigation encompass criminal matters related to the Bidder's parent company, subsidiaries, owners, executives, and/or officers during the time of their business relationship and/or employment with the Bidder? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes, litigation encompasses criminal matters related to the Bidder's parent company, subsidiaries, owners, executives, and/or officers during the time of their business relationship and/or employment with the Bidder. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **13** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, D. 5. Records and Reporting, p. 11 | The first question does not have a number/letter associated with it. Should this be sub question a. and the following questions be numbered accordingly? |
| **Answer** | |
| This was a typographical error. Refer to RFP AMENDMENT #1 language on pages 1-3 of this document. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **14** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part IV, Section II Organization Qualifications and Experience, p. 18 | Will the State consider requesting vendors also submit at least three references from third-party software vendors that integrate into the vendor's seed-to-sale solution? |
| **Answer** | |
| This can be included at the Bidder’s discretion and included in Appendix C. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **15** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Cover Page, p. 1 | Would the State kindly consider extending the proposal submission deadline? |
| **Answer** | |
| The proposal deadline is extended to March 14, 2025. See RFP AMENDMENT #1 language on pages 1-3 of this document. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **16** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, C. Training and Support, p. 9 | Will the State request vendors describe the system(s) used to track and resolve support cases from licensees from end to end? This would help demonstrate that there are established systems and processes in place for quality assurance and detailed tracking. |
| **Answer** | |
| This can be included at the Bidder’s discretion and included in Appendix C. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **17** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix C, p. 28 | Can vendors submit more than three project descriptions? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes, but OCP only guarantees reviewing the first three project descriptions for scoring purposes. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **18** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part III, C. 3.b Submission Format, p. 17 | Please confirm that vendors are to submit appendices D & E, which are Excel spreadsheets, in PDF format. |
| **Answer** | |
| Excel format is preferred. PDF format will be accepted. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **19** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix D, "MaineIT" A3, p. 30 | Will the State evaluate vendors' ability to meet support SLAs by asking for information on the number of daily support tickets it receives on average? This would help validate that the vendor is adequately staffed and equipped to handle a large number of support cases from licensees. |
| **Answer** | |
| This can be included at the Bidder’s discretion and included in Appendix C. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **20** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part IV, Section IV, Cost Proposal, p. 20 | Where should vendors include cost narrative information? Such a narrative is often used to help clarify and provide context behind the hard numbers provided in a cost proposal. |
| **Answer** | |
| File 4. Refer to the RFP AMENDMENT #1 language on pages 1-3 of this document. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **21** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix F, Section II, p. 32 | If vendors don't charge for tags but instead charge different types of optional and/or required fees to industry, how should they disclose this in the Additional System Desired Requirements section? And how will this affect the point allocation, e.g. will it be four points total for that section, regardless of the cost model used? |
| **Answer** | |
| Please refer to the updated RFP AMENDMENT #1 language on pages 1-3 of this document, which now accounts for “Additional Non-Tag and Subscription Fees Licensees Incur.” Appendix F has been updated and is embedded on page 3 of this document. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **22** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part IV, Section III Proposed Services, p. 19 | While vendors may commit to an implementation timeline in a proposal, there have been examples of vendors not delivering their seed-to-sale system on time (e.g. FL, NY, RI, VT). Will the State require offerors to disclose when they haven't been able to meet their contractual obligations or have experienced performance issues (e.g. inability to meet implementation deadlines and/or receipt of notices to cure)? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes, Bidders must disclose when they have not been able to meet their contractual obligations or have experienced performance issues, see RFP AMENDMENT #1 language on pages 1-3 of this document. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **23** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, D. 14. Configuration Requirements, p. 13 | Is there a requirement to ensure that the data and UIDs assigned to a licensee do not disappear and/or reappear under a different licensee's account (sometimes referred to as "ghost inventory")? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes, Bidders must ensure that the data and UIDs assigned to a licensee do not disappear and/or reappear under a different licensee's account, see RFP AMENDMENT #1 language on pages 1-3 of this document. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **24** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, C. Training and Support, p. 9 | Will the State evaluate vendor's ability to meet training requirements by asking about prior performance? In other words, will the State consider a requirement for vendors to provide information on how they have rolled out training programs in the past -- and any supporting metrics on efficacy and/or user satisfaction? |
| **Answer** | |
| This can be included at the Bidder’s discretion and included in Appendix C. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **25** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix D, p. 30 | Will the State evaluate vendors' ability to meet the support SLAs in this contract by asking about prior performance? In other words, will the State request that vendors provide support metrics from other similar contracts, such as customer satisfaction scores and and/or case resolution time? Prior history of meeting SLAs would help demonstrate that the vendor is able to meet the SLAs defined in this contract, too. |
| **Answer** | |
| This can be included at the Bidder’s discretion and included in Appendix C. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **26** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, C. Training and Support, p. 9 | Will the State evaluate if vendors outsource their support services or leverage full-time employees to fulfill that service? |
| **Answer** | |
| See Part IV, Section II, 2, p. 18 of the RFP. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **27** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part IV, Section II Organization Qualifications and Experience, p. 18 | Will the State request vendors disclose the average tenure of the support organization? This would help demonstrate the experience and knowledge of the support team. |
| **Answer** | |
| This can be included at the Bidder’s discretion and included in Appendix C. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **28** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix D, S4, p. 30 | Will you please define the "cyber risk appetite" statement? |
| **Answer** | |
| Typically, an organization having a cyber risk appetite will have an official statement on what their definition for cyber risk appetite is; typically low, moderate or high – each reflecting their tolerance for risk. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **29** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix E,  R. Security, p.31 | Will the State require that vendors undergo SOC 1 and SOC 2 Type II audits and yearly penetration testing? |
| **Answer** | |
| A SOC2 Type II is required annually. Penetration testing will be done prior to initial deployment. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **30** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, C. Training and Support, p. 9 | Will the State request that vendors describe what recent improvements have been made to the Support organization (people, processes, and/or tools)? This would help demonstrate continuous improvement and investment in user experience. |
| **Answer** | |
| This can be included at the Bidder’s discretion and included in Appendix C. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **31** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part V, B. Scoring Weights and Process, p. 21 | Sections I through IV each have the following statement: "Includes all elements addressed above in Part IV, Section \_\_." Section I refers to Section I (correctly); however, the remaining sections appear to be incorrect. Section II refers to Section III (assume it should be Section II, Organization Qualifications and Experience). Section III refers to Section IV (assume it should be Section III, Proposed Services). Section IV refers to Section V (assume it should be Section IV Cost Proposal). Can you confirm these assumptions are correct? Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience (10 points) Includes all elements addressed above in Part IV, Section III. Section III. Proposed Services and Technical Assessment (50 points) Includes all elements addressed above in Part IV, Section IV. Section IV. Cost Proposal (40 points) Includes all elements addressed above in Part IV, Section V. |
| **Answer** | |
| This was a typographical error. Refer to the RFP AMENDMENT #1 language on pages 1-3 of this document. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **32** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, C.4, p. 9 | "...as described in E (9) – Service Levels." There seems to be a problem with the numbering/lettering. Currently, "Service Levels" is numbered as "2" and the list below it is lettered a-g (there is no "9"). In other words, there is no E(9) Service Levels. |
| **Answer** | |
| This was a typographical error. RFP AMENDMENT #1 language on pages 1-3 of this document. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **33** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, C.4, p. 9 | Please define "regulated members and entities." |
| **Answer** | |
| OCP is responsible for the oversight of all aspects of legalized cannabis, including Maine's existing Medical Use of Cannabis Program. Currently, 28-B M.R.S. § 105 requires that Office implement and administer a system for the tracking of cannabis plants, adult use cannabis and adult use cannabis products from immature cannabis plant to the point of retail sale, return, disposal or destruction. Regulated members and entities in RFP 202501014 refers to Adult Use licensees. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **34** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part IV, Section III Proposed Services, p. 19 | Will the State ask vendors to disclose the average time to go-live from their last four implementations? |
| **Answer** | |
| This can be included at the Bidder’s discretion and included in Appendix C. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **35** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part IV, Section IV, Cost Proposal, p. 20 | Section I only includes one field for each line item. How should vendors indicate differences in year-over-year costs? |
| **Answer** | |
| In the narrative statement that is allowed pursuant to the RFP AMENDMENT #1, include an explanation regarding differences in year-over-year costs. The yearly costs should include the total for the term of the bided contract. See RFP AMENDMENT #1 language on pages 1-3 of this document; the updated Appendix F is embedded on page 3. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **36** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, A. General Requirements, 3, p. 9 | Similar to Part II. D.1.a. for the System, could this question be updated to include "except for scheduled downtime / maintenance"? |
| **Answer** | |
| No. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **37** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix E, C.4, p. 31 | XML based standards are outdated and no longer an "industry standard". The tech industry largely uses JSON as the preferred communication data format. Can this question be updated to remove XML-based or change it to "an industry accepted standard"? |
| **Answer** | |
| XML and JSON will be accepted communication data formats. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **38** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | To allow for accurate cost proposals, can you provide the total number of licensees currently operating? The number of cultivators? Processors? Dispensaries? |
| **Answer** | |
| This information changes daily. Refer to the Office of Cannabis Policy’s Open Data pages for the most up-to-date information on current licensees and Q&A Summary answer 33. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **39** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | To allow for accurate cost proposals, can you provide an estimate of the unique identifiers/tags are consumed on an annual basis? |
| **Answer** | |
| Calendar year 2024 (rounded to the nearest thousand):  Cannabis Plant Tags\*: 225k printed, 186k used by licensees  Cannabis Package Tags: 445k printed, 304k used by licensees  \*Plant Tags include individual plant tags and batch tags. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **40** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Cost Proposal Section II | Can you explain the consensus approach to evaluation and scoring? |
| **Answer** | |
| Both section II and III scoring would be consensus meaning no individual evaluator gets to score any part of the proposal, it will be a unanimous team consensus on how many points out of the maximum a bidder earned on each section, section IV scoring will be based on the following mathematical formula as stated under Part V, B, 3, on the RFP. Additional information can be found on the Maine Office of State Procurement Services website, [State of Maine RFP Process Overview video](https://youtu.be/m_CUfS3UALU) (~25:00 min mark), statutes and rules. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **41** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Scope of Services D. System Requirements 13, p. 12 | In regards to section N: Have a robust API at no cost to the industry. Will the State allow the Offeror to provide advanced functionality beyond the requirements of this RFP to be available behind a paywall? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes, see Part II, D, 14, g, p. 13 of the RFP. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **42** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Section III #3 Submission Format, p. 20 | The RFP states File 1 should include Appendix A, Appendix B, and “All required eligibility documentation stated in PART IV, Section I.” However, PART IV Section I lists only Appendix and Appendix B. Can you clarify whether any additional documentation is required in File 1? |
| **Answer** | |
| No additional documentation is required in File 1. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **43** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Section III #3 Submission Format, p. 20    Part IV Proposal Submission Requirements Section IV Cost Proposal, p. 23 | The RFP states that Excel format is preferred for File 4. However, Appendix F is provided in PDF format. Can Appendix F be submitted in PDF format?  Also, what information is required in addition to Appendix F for this attachment? The Submission Format section says to provide “Appendix F (Cost Proposal Form) and all required information and attachments stated in PART IV, Section IV.”  Part IV, Section IV says  “a. Bidders must submit a cost proposal that covers the period  starting July 1, 2025 and ending on June 30, 2027.  b. The cost proposal must include the costs necessary for the  Bidder to fully comply with the contract terms, conditions, and RFP  requirements.”  This appears to be covered by Appendix F. If nothing additional is  required, can the whole file be provided in PDF format since Appendix F  is in PDF, not Excel, format? |
| **Answer** | |
| Excel format is preferred. PDF format will be accepted.  Appendix E, Column H is for detailing costs for any non-existing functionality. Bidders can detail costs in Appendix E or submit a narrative statement for each item. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **44** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendices D and E, pp. 34-35 | Please provide these appendices separately. The embedded documents  would not open for us. |
| **Answer** | |
| This may be a technical issue on the vendors end. Address the technical issue, and if still unable to open, contact the RFP Coordinator. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **45** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendices D and E, pp. 34-35 | Given the above question and lack of access to key appendices, would  it be possible to get an extension to the deadline for the proposal? |
| **Answer** | |
| The proposal deadline is extended to March 14, 2025. Refer RFP AMENDMENT #1 language on pages 1-3 of this document. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **46** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | Does the Office of Cannabis have any specific pain points or challenges with their current Inventory Tracking System that would make them want to consider a different system? It would help to know the drivers of this initiative. |
| **Answer** | |
| OCP is engaging in the request for proposal process, as required by 5. M.R.S., ch. 155. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **47** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part I Introduction  A.  Purpose and Background, p. 9 | Based on the information provided, it looks like the project will kick off in July 2025 and the system needs to be up and running by January 2026 so that the current system can be retired on February 4th, 2026. Is that correct? Is February 2026 an absolute deadline or is it possible to extend the contract for several months? |
| **Answer** | |
| The current contract terminates on February 4, 2026. The expectation is that there will be no downtime between contracts and all initial training will be completed and all data will be migrated by the current contract’s termination date, if necessary. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **48** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | Is there an approximate budget for this project? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **49** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | Does the State and the Office allow the use of offshore resources to configure the solution with the assumption that they will not have any access to State or personal data? |
| **Answer** | |
| No. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **50** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | Is Data Migration from the current system included within the scope of this project? If so, how much data (in number of records and overall size) needs to be migrated from the current system? Will the incumbent assist in providing this data? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes, see Part IV, Section 3, 2, p. 19 of the RFP. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **51** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| PART II Scope of Services To Be Provided  A.  General Reqs, #6 | Besides the State’s ALMS and OCP’s data analysis database, what other systems will this solution need to integrate? |
| **Answer** | |
| See Part II, D, 13 and 14, pp. 12-14 of the RFP. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **52** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| D. System Requirements, #14, Requirements l. | Does the Office have a preference for RFID scanners? Could staff use smartphones for this? |
| **Answer** | |
| See Part II, D, 13, l, p. 14 of the RFP: Support of Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) tags and handheld RFID scanners for state regulators, *or other technology* [emphasis added] that minimizes manual counting of plants in a specific physical area. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **53** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix F, Section II Additional System Desired Functionality | Can you provide a little more detail around request for “Replicating Database Tables/Analytic Offerings” in the “Additional System Desired Functionality”? Is this for backup purposes? |
| **Answer** | |
| This is primarily for analytics purposes – not for IT or backup purposes. OCP maintains a data lake separate from the vendor’s own database, in which OCP maintains up-to-date copies of all tables vendor’s own database. OCP uses these for its own analytics reporting tools, as well as for merging with licensee data available elsewhere for other functions within the OCP. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **54** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix F, Section II Additional System Desired Functionality | Also, in the same section, can you provide a little more information around the “Enhanced Testing User Experience (Clearly states the Mandatory Testing Requirements and Sample Size)? |
| **Answer** | |
| See Appendix E, p. 30 of the RFP. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **55** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II SCOPE OF SERVICES TO BE PROVIDED, A. General Requirements, 13 Interface Requirements | We understand the different stakeholders within the Cannabis industry will need access to the system through a portal or through APIs to upload data into the Office Inventory Tracking System. Will the Cannabis industry stakeholders also use the system to manage their inventory or is the system just for the Office’s use? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes, see Part II, D, 13, k, p. 12 of the RFP. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **56** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | Approximately how many internal users currently use the Inventory Tracking System? |
| **Answer** | |
| OCP estimates approximately 50 internal users: approximately 5 administrative uses, approximately 45 standard users.  This is subject to change depending on staffing, budget and potential legislation. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **57** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | If the cannabis industry businesses or external users log into the system, approximately how many of these are there and how often do they log into the system? |
| **Answer** | |
| For cannabis industry businesses, this information changes daily. Refer to the Office of Cannabis Policy’s Open Data pages for the most up-to-date information on the number of current licensees.  OCP does not understand who “external users” are in this question and is unable to provide an answer. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **58** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | Is there an external portal into which customers log into? |
| **Answer** | |
| OCP does not understand who “customers” are in this question and is unable to provide an answer. | |