Responses to Questions
Web Application Development RFP
Posted - 4-20-21

1. The Proposals Due Date is listed as Thursday, April 30, 2021 in a few places. However, April 30 falls on a Friday. Would you mind clarifying the due date for us and the rest of the interested vendor community? The deadline is Friday, April 30, 2021.

2. Do you wish to have notification capability in the event of pending approval/task for users?   Yes

3. If yes, what is preferred method of notification (email, Text, system alert) – E-mail is preferred.

4. What is the average size of attachments? Unknown, but I don't anticipate the attachments being very large overall, with probably a few exceptions.

5. What is the average size of attachments? Unknown, but I don't anticipate the attachments being very large overall, with probably a few exceptions.

6. Does FHRC have Office 365 subscriptions? Yes

7. How many data fields does the system manage?   25-50, 50-75, 75-100 or more? It is anticipated to be less than 100, and most likely less than 50.

8. Can you describe different screens that system will need? For e.g. (Login screen, Password reset screen, Funding Request, Confirmation, Approval, Rejection, History, Reports etc.) Agree with all examples listed. In addition, it is anticipated to potentially have a few drill down screens to ask more specific info depending on the funding category identified.

9. Do you wish to have the ability to manage user logins? Yes, as well as, make as self-sufficient as possible for the user to reset passwords as needed. Review login activity, change password, suspend account etc. Administrator to have ultimate control.

10. Can a user have multiple roles? Yes. In some instances the same person my enter and approve. This decision will need to be made jurisdiction by jurisdiction.

11. Do you wish to have self-service password reset capability? Yes

12. Is there a need for MFA (multi-factor authentication) enabled for all logins? Open for guidance, as most systems have 2FA. I am not familiar with the cost associated, so open for suggestions to weigh whether the associated cost is worth any potential value. The information that will be in the system is not sensitive, but could reveal a few vulnerability, so on the other hand I could see an advantage.

13. What reporting capability is desired?   To keep the cost low, would FHRC be open to a simple excel download of data available through the solution which then can be used for ad hoc reporting? Yes. If not, can FHRC provide list of all the reports desired and filters needs for each report.   There will be specific reporting needs, and this could be done manually. The reports are not fully predefined at this time. Reporting examples would include a way to 1) report the data for each jurisdiction that submits entries; 2) comprehensive list of all entries by date/year submitted/approved. 3) a report by funding category. 4) A roll-up report showing all entries by priority rank. 5) Export of all data by funding status. 6) Export of all data by priority. These could all be accomplished through a simple export to excel and sorting method, or reports are an option as well.

14. If Vendor hosted, is there any special qualification required for the hosting cloud? No. Like GCC (Government Community Cloud), FedRAMP, or general? Open to contractor recommendation.

15. As per the RFP requirement (29.1.3), there should be a workflow process needs to be implemented for the approval process. So please confirm whether this workflow requirement is limited to create a sequential workflow process(Maximum of 3 stages , Creator, Reviewer and Approver) . Please clarify. Yes. It is anticipated that one person enters data, one person (potentially same or may be higher rank) approving and creating a jurisdictional ranking, and then a Board reviewing and creating a 2nd tier-ranking as an overall regional ranking among all entries/jurisdictions for each specific funding need category and then a 3rd overall ranking.

16. According to the RFP requirement (29.1.3), as part of the workflow process, there will be a provision to invite participants for reviewing and approving the unfunded needs from each identified entity, So please clarify whether these entity's users needs to be created within system as reviewer/approver as part of the generic user/role management or these users are only needed as and when a workflow process is initiated . This is needed to understand the complexity of the workflow process to come up with a realistic effort estimation. Please clarify. Our goal is to pre-identify a representative from each jurisdiction (agreed upon by the City/County Manager) that would serve as an approver. But that the system is flexible enough for the Administrator role to add, delete or update and manager users. They would only be contacted when workflow process is initiated, or when notifications need to go out about the deadlines to submit and approve data. (This notification function could happen within the system or outside the system.)

17. RFP Requirement (29.1.4), Please confirm, Is there any Membership management is needed for this application?, then please provide more information ? The Administrators would need to have the ability to add, delete, edit roles for each member.

18. Based on the RFP requirement(29.1.5), there will be multiple unfunded type/categories needs to be managed through this web application. Therefore we are assuming that each type/category will have different type of metadata/Data fields needs to be managed in the database. So please confirm how many such unfunded type/categories needs to be managed as part of this current scope. Because this is needed to assess how many data interfaces needs to be created based on each unfunded type/category. Yes, correct. Answered on prior response posting #10. Equipment/Supplies; Technology; Personnel; Planning/Analysis/Research; Infrastructure; Facility-Related; Other

19. RFP requirement (29.3) . We understood that, the preferred backend is MS SQL Server , so please let us know Is there any specific technology preference for the application development as well. example C#/PHP/Java etc. No preference. Please provide your recommendation.

20. We need to know, approximately how many data capturing forms needs to be developed for the overall CMS solutions. This has not been fully mapped out to date, but estimated at 15 or less.

21. Is there any specific reporting needs (Predefined/Ad hoc) as part of the application. If yes, please provide few information about the reporting needs and also share the approximate reports counts if it is predefined. There will be specific reporting needs, but this is not predefined at this time. Reporting examples would include a way to report the data for each jurisdiction that submits entries. A report by funding category. A roll-up report showing all entries by priority rank. Export of all data by funding status. Export of all data by priority.

22. Do we need any third party integration is required for this application ? Not anticipated.

23. What is maximum delivery timeline for this implementation from requirement study to go live? 6 months max

24. What is the maximum time(Days/Weeks)FHRC team will take for the UAT (User Acceptance Test) activities, This is needed to plan our support activities effort for those period. FHRC would like to ensure a quality product and is willing to provide any time necessary to ensure the end product meets expectations. Although FHRC staff time is limited, this project is important, and so we are willing to dedicate a few hours per week to answer any questions, run test, etc.

25. Do you have a 365 or LDAP user directory that could provide the capability for Single Sign-on? And would you be interested in such functionality for internal users and perhaps Board members? We have 365. We do not currently have a user directory that is connected to our member jurisdictions, for single sign-on. We would be interested in this functionality for internal users and Board Members if possible and depending on associated cost.

26. How should fields be added to forms in the system? Should you want to add a field to a form, is this something that users should be able to do; or would it fall under 29.2 "application updates and enhancements"? Ideally the system would be designed in a way that the administrator would be able to add/edit fields, and for it to be as user-friendly as possible (for the administrator, but not for use by the jurisdiction-level users). This could also fall under application updates and enhancements.

27. Can you provide the number of anticipated data field requirements, type of field (text) requirements for the input forms for unfunded need(s) for each jurisdiction? This has not been mapped out fully to date, but number of fields is anticipated to be less than 100. Most likely less than 50. Mix of text fields, check boxes and drop-down menu options.

28. Is there a single form requirement or multiple form requirement depending upon the jurisdiction and/or funding need? I envision the same standard form for each jurisdiction to use. It is also envisioned to have a few layers/drill down components (not many) that may require additional pages to collect more detailed information. Let me know if this answers this question.

29. Do you have a wireframe or document detailing the screen flow? Do not have at this time.

30. Will there be a discovery period for design once the project is started? It appears the design is fluid at the moment. Add any phase you feel is necessary to complete the project. A list of fields will be provided to the selected contractor.

31. Can you approximate the number of screens and field elements to be managed? This has not been mapped out to-date, but estimated 10-15 screens. Number of fields is anticipated to be less than 100. Most likely less than 50.

32. Excluding jurisdictions, are there any other target users of the system? If yes, please identify who they are and how they will likely be using the system? Jurisdiction staff and elected officials that serve on our Board of Directors are anticipated to be the primary users, along with FHRC staff. I am not envisioning others outside of those roles at this time.

33. Can we be provided the access code for the recorded pre-bid video currently on the website? We used the initial code for the pre-bid meeting, but that did not seem to work. Check the video again, and the passcode setting was eliminated, so you should be able to access the video.

34. Can out of state firms submit? If so, are firms in the local area preferred? Yes, out-of-state firms may submit proposals. There is no point system established to grant a local firm more points over an out-of-state firm specifically.

35. Are you open to a Canadian firm bidding for this tender? There is no prohibition for procuring services outside of the U.S, however domestic services are encouraged by our funding source and preferred.

36. Are there any existing UI mockups that could be shared? None

37. How many daily users/volume would be expected on a daily basis? Low volume –anticipated 25 max, but most likely just 2-3 any given day.

38. What different types of restrictions do you expect between different types of users (e.g. the administrators and new members)? Two levels of administrators would be preferred (master and sub) and have the ability to manage the site in full, view audit log, make edits, add fields, etc. Member users would only be able to edit their own jurisdictions' info. Data entry and editing capability.

39. Are there any requirements for system uptime, level of redundancy, as well as backup & restore? I am not sure what you mean by uptime or level of redundancy? Please clarify. Yes, regarding back-up and restore

40. Can you share more information regarding the requirements for the administration control panel (e.g. what site settings need to be able to be implemented via the control panel)? View audit log, view status of approval process from external users, ??

41. Are there any specific cybersecurity requirements? None. Open to recommendations.

42. Can you elaborate on the total number of final users & entities uploading data, on an expected daily and yearly basis? Could you share the expected size & frequency of uploads of the data & attachments? Size and frequency of upload is anticipated to be fairly small. See prior responses posted related to the number of users and entities.

43. Could you share the type of file(s)/attachments being uploaded? Anticipated to be word, excel, pdf, jpeg, (the standard file types) that the most city/county employees would have access to as part of normal operations.

44. Do you have a specific budget that you are working with? We are requesting each consultant to do their due diligence to identify a reasonable cost for what it will take to conduct the work; and therefore, we are not providing a budget.

45. What is the timeline for implementation of the web application? We would like for you to develop a timeline.

46. Our company, while located in the U.S. also has office locations outside of the U.S. Are you open to utilizing offshore resources for the work proposed, in coordination with our US based resources? There is no prohibition for procuring services outside of the U.S.; however, domestic resources are preferred.

47. Please let us know if the bid is open to an international development agency from across the borders. See response to question #46 above.

48. Is there any domestic or international travel required for vendor team members for this project? I do not anticipate travel being necessary.

49. Are there any compliances that must be followed? (ex. ADA, Data Protection (state wise), Data Residency, etc.) Compliances should follow U.S. best practices. Listing in proposal is encouraged.

50. Do you have any technology & CMS preference; or do you want us to propose a technology and CMS? No preference, just quality at reasonable price

51. Do you want to design a new application from scratch; or do you want to revamp your existing website? This RFP is for a new application that would be available online, but not a revamp of existing website.

52. If it's a revamp, do you want to migrate the data from your existing site?

53. If yes, what is the approximate data size?

54. We are assuming the current website will be in the English language only. Do you need support for multiple languages on your site? English only

55. Will there be any front-end login and registration process? Log-in for users will be needed

56. How many user roles will be there? Estimated 25-30 users that would be able to enter data and make modifications. 25-30 users that would review, make comments and approve, 25 potential view only users, 1-2 admin users, and 1 super admin is anticipated

57. What would be the supportive Attachment types? (*with reference to 29.1.1*) pdf, word, excel anticipated

58. What would be the autodeletion policy? (*with reference to 29.1.2*) Set a date into the future that would autodelete, if user enters draft, but it is never approved by a supervisor after several e-mail reminders.

59. How many levels of approval will be there, and will there be any timeline for the approval? (*with reference to 29.1.3*) Anticipated one person entering data, one person (potentially same or may be higher rank) approving, and then a Board reviewing and ranking in priority by specific funding need categories

60. How many types of membership will be there and will it be free of cost? (*with reference to 29.1.4*). We are a membership based organization, and this application would be free for our members to use.

61. What are the categories of unfunded need? (*with reference to 29.1.5*) Equipment / Supplies (COVID or Other); Technology; Personnel; Planning/Analysis/Research; Infrastructure; Facility-Related

62. How many levels of prioritization will be there and what be the timeline? (*with reference to 29.1.6*) 2 levels of prioritization (Jurisdiction level and then region-wide level). Ranking each entry as 1) Immediate (1-2 years); 2) High (3-5); 3) Future (5+ years); 4) No longer being considered at this time.

63. Will there will be approval flow for funding? Maybe - 2 approval levels possible – 1) FHRC Board & 2) Benefiting Jurisdiction(s) (with drop down list of member jurisdictions). FHRC will research potential funding options / strategies, and will need to enter data identifying one or more potential funding strategy, and a status field to indicate 1) Researching; 2) Potential funding options identified (and be able to list multiple sources) 3) Actively pursuing funding source; 4) Full or Partial Funding Awarded 5) Project Underway, 6) Project Complete

64. if yes, then how many levels of approval will be required? (*with reference to 29.1.8*). See response above

65. Which type of Security you are expecting? (*with reference to 29.1.9*) Prevent hackers from entering site

66. Could you please explain the internal and external users? (*with reference to 29.1.10*) Internal users would be Flint Hills Regional Council (FHRC) staff (2-5 staff). External users would be 1) city or county staff entering data, 2) a city/county manager so the staff's entry is approved before going outside the jurisdiction; and then 3) FHRC Board may further prioritize or mark/tag items that are important for FHRC to potentially provide support and/or assist to identify potential funding strategies and potentially assist to pursue funding opportunities.

67. Do you need to integrate chat features? Chat features are not necessary, but a comments and notes field would be good.

68. Do you have any preference for a hosting platform? Quality at reasonable price but no preference otherwise.