**STATE OF MAINE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**

**RFP AMENDMENT # 1 AND**

**RFP SUBMITTED QUESTIONS & ANSWERS SUMMARY**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **RFP NUMBER AND TITLE:** | RFP# 202401005  Improve Delivery of Digital Services to Constituents |
| **RFP ISSUED BY:** | Department of Administrative and Financial Services - MaineIT |
| **SUBMITTED QUESTIONS DUE DATE:** | March 20, 2024 |
| **AMENDMENT AND QUESTION & ANSWER SUMMARY ISSUED:** | March 29, 2024 |
| **PROPOSAL DUE DATE:** | April 17, 2024, no later than 11:59 p.m. local time |
| **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. Contract Renewal Period #1 Start Date amended to 01/01/2027. 2. Part II, Section C.4.c.v. – “identity” amended to “identify.” 3. Part II, Section B.2.a – “tenant” amended to “tenet.” | |
| **REVISED LANGUAGE IN RFP (if any):**   1. **Part I, C Contract Renewal**  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Period** | **Start Date** | **End Date** | | Initial Period of Performance | 07/01/2024 | 12/31/2026 | | Renewal Period #1 | 01/01/2027 | 12/31/2028 | | Renewal Period #2 | 01/01/2029 | 12/31/2030 | | Renewal Period #3 | 01/01/2031 | 12/31/2031 | | Renewal Period #4 | 01/01/2032 | 12/31/2032 | | Renewal Period #5 | 01/01/2033 | 12/31/2033 | | Renewal Period #6 | 01/01/2034 | 12/31/2034 |  1. **Part II, Section C.4.C.v.**   Bot Protection; identify visitor behavior through analysis, technical and behavioral data.   1. **Part II, Section B.2.a**   Consent is a core tenet of maintaining the public trust in the Constituents’ Portal   and will be a foundational component of the architecture. | |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A General | How many businesses do you anticipate interacting with the website? |
| **Answer** | |
| The State of Maine has 160,000 businesses, we are estimating 10% will interact with the portal in the first year. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **2** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A General | Roughly, how many citizens does the state anticipate interacting with the portal? Would the state like the ability to have a profile for every citizen even if not all citizens will use the portal? |
| **Answer** | |
| The State of Maine has 1.39 million citizens and anticipates 25% will interact with the portal in the first year. Only constituents that have signed up for and opted into the portal will have a profile. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **3** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A General | How internal users (defined as those with a .gov email address) will need access to citizen/business profiles? |
| **Answer** | |
| A small number of internal users will have administrative access to the Portal. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **4** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A General | Would the State like the ability for Citizens or Businesses to ‘save’ their progress while filling out forms in the portal? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **5** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix G Requirement #13 | Can you provide more details on the data sources we will need to integrate with (please include if it's with APIs, batch/file, etc.)? |
| **Answer** | |
| APIs (SAML 2.0, OAuth 2.0, OpenID 2.0), additional data sources may be identified during discovery. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **6** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix G | Are there requirements to integrate at an application or database layer with the different State agencies backend systems which will be accessed through the Citizen One Stop Portal? Please advise if this would be either as part of the initial rollout of the Citizen One Stop Portal, or as part of a planned functionality roadmap. |
| **Answer** | |
| Integration with legacy applications will be based on how applications authenticate, the majority of the applications are expected to consume the Portal authentication via SAML 2.0, or OAuth 2.0, or OpenID 2.0.  The determination of applications and agencies integration will be determined during discovery. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **7** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Page 10 Recommended Technology | Please expand on the Recommendation Technology requirement - should recommendations be based on web/portal activity? Should these recommendations inform email messaging? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes, the recommendation technology will recommend other state services based on the user’s portal activity & consent from the constituent. Email messaging for recommendations is not in scope for the initial roll out. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **8** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Page 9  N/A General | How are citizens being invited to register for the portal? Is there an email and/or SMS tool in place for mass communication? |
| **Answer** | |
| Bidders should provide portal registration recommendation based on industry best practices. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **9** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A General | Is there a need for automated communications related to citizen activity in the portal? |
| **Answer** | |
| Automated communications are not part of the initial rollout. Bidders’ solutions for automated communication should be added to Appendix I - Cost Proposal Form, (IV) Value Added. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **10** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A General | If yes to the above [Question 9], how many emails would be sent annually? |
| **Answer** | |
| N/A | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **11** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A General | If yes to above [Question 9], would the FedRAMP requirement extend to the messaging platform, which may not need to house PII? |
| **Answer** | |
| N/A | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **12** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A General | Can you provide an estimated budget for this project? |
| **Answer** | |
| Bidders are expected to provide their best value pricing. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **13** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part 2, Section B, Line Item 1i, Page 9 | What authenticators (options) is the State of Maine looking to support for citizen multi-factor authentication? |
| **Answer** | |
| All options will be considered, including mobile app, SMS, email, voice callback with code, etc. Maine is a rural state, parts of which suffer from spotty cellular data connectivity. Therefore, all options on the table, including mobile app, SMS, email, voice callback with code, etc. We do NOT expect to rollout hardware tokens to the consumers. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **14** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part 2, Section B, Line Item 1d, Page 9 | Can the State of Maine provide more details on existing ID-proofing methods that are currently being utilized by State agencies? |
| **Answer** | |
| Existing ID-proofing methods will be defined during discovery. Bidders are to provide solutions based on industry best practice and products. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **15** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part 2, Section B, Line Item 2, Page 9 | Is the State of Maine planning to allocate developer resources to build a custom state application portal/dashboard interface? Or does the identity solution need to provide an existing dashboard interface for the State to leverage? |
| **Answer** | |
| Bidders are to provide an existing dashboard out-of-the-box, which may require minimal configuration for the State of Maine, such as inheriting our public stylesheets, etc. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **16** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part 2, Section B, Line Item 1b, Page 9 | What current State of Maine systems would the identity solution need to connect to for identity provisioning and deprovisioning? |
| **Answer** | |
| The identity provisioning and deprovisioning must be furnished by the proposed as part of the submission. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **17** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part 2, Section C, Line Item 4c, Page 12 | Is it acceptable for security components of the identity solution to not be available immediately, but on the roadmap as a future release? |
| **Answer** | |
| No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **18** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Section II.B.1.d, Page 9 | The RFP states that the CIAM solution will need to integrate with existing identity proofing methods. Can you share the methods and vendor solutions? |
| **Answer** | |
| Existing ID-proofing methods will be defined during discovery. Bidders are to provide solution based on industry best practice and products. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **19** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Section II.B.1.g, Page 9 | Are separate entities required for an individual and a small business owned by that individual? When a constituent who is a business owner goes through identity proofing, does the identity of the business itself also need to be proofed/validated? |
| **Answer** | |
| Both options must be made available. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **20** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Section II.B.1.h, Page 9 | Have you already defined the details that you want to verify in the various tiers of identity proofing for the different constituent roles? Is checking documents at live / in-person locations within scope of identity proofing? |
| **Answer** | |
| Various tiers of identity proofing will be defined during discovery. The in-person across-the-transom option must be the statistically minor option, made available as a fallback when everything else above it has failed. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **21** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Section II.B.2, Page 9 | In relation to the “Personalized Dashboard”, is the portal user experience design (considering persona-level design considerations) in scope? Are there existing portals or solutions (e.g., InforME) that may be considered as a starting point and/or input to portal capabilities design and experience consistency? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes. The portal solution will be required to inherit the look and feel of Maine.gov. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **22** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Section II.B.2.a, Page 9 | Once someone registers and creates a profile in the portal, may we assume consent for profile data to be stored, managed, and mastered is given in perpetuity? Are there scenarios where an entire profile and associated data may need to be deactivated/expunged? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes, once consent is accepted by the constituent. Consent may indeed be withdrawn by a consumer. Upon which, portal data must be purged conclusively, and the consumer must be notified post-purge. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **23** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Section II.B.2.a, Page 9 | Are there use cases where a constituent is providing consent on behalf of others (other business employees as the owner of small business, minors, etc.)? |
| **Answer** | |
| Consent requirements will be defined during discovery. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **24** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Section II.B.2.c, Page 10 | For integration tools/middleware potentially required for the future state solution, is the State open to a cloud-based managed deployment strategy, or is there a requirement to maintain everything in the State’s own managed space? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes, cloud-based (as opposed to on-prem) preferred. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **25** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Section II.B.2.c.ii, Page 10 | Are there existing customer service and/or contact center solutions that are used by the State that would need to be integrated with? Is the purpose of the customer service solution to provide constituent support for the portal access only or the underlying Agency-offered services? If the latter, which underlying agency services and is there any additional information around the type or volume of requests expected to be handled? |
| **Answer** | |
| No, portal access only. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **26** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Section II.B.2.c. iii, Page 10 | When matching identity of the portal user to identity of the same user in Agency system(s), what is the expected user experience of this matching? |
| **Answer** | |
| Bidders should propose a solution to identity matching. The State does expect the user will receive a notification, and affirmatively be asked for consent to link/merge an existing identity. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **27** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Section II.B.2.d, Page 11 | ‘Phone, email, chat, etc.’ are mentioned as channels of service request intake. What other channels are mandatory as a part of the initial release of the solution? Does the state have specific self-service or case deflection requirements for the future solution, such as a public or authenticated knowledge base? |
| **Answer** | |
| Additional channels to be proposed are at the Bidder’s discretion.  Phone, email and Chat are mandatory. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **28** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix G. User Stories, Page 32 | In the acceptance criteria of this user story, only a single agency service being added to the portal home page will be supported on initial roll out. For clarification, does this mean only up to a single agency service can be selected by each individual (but multiple are in scope for integration)? Or only one agency is in scope overall for selection?  Based on the response to above, has the agency / service that will be supported upon initial rollout been identified yet? Are there specific criteria you’re considering for the first agency rollout? Additionally, has an overall agency rollout strategy been defined, particularly focused on incenting constituent digital login based on priority benefits (e.g., ease of use, ability to access multiple services)? |
| **Answer** | |
| The determination of the exact number of applications and agencies will be determined during discovery. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **29** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix I.III. Licenses, Page 34 | What are the different teams/personas that would support customer service requests from different channels coming from portal users? What is the corresponding user count of these teams? |
| **Answer** | |
| Refer to Part II, B.D of the RFP. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **30** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part III – C.2.f, Page 16 | Is the expectation that vendors should submit one file per Appendix or per File? And if one per File, then how should vendors handle the mixed Excel and PDF file formats requested in File 3? |
| **Answer** | |
| Each File should include the Appendices listed under that File as described on Pg 16, Part III in the RFP. Zip files are allowable, but must comply with the other submission requirements as stated in Part II, C, 2 of the RFP. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **31** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part III – C.2.f, Page 16 | Should vendors submit Appendix G in its native Excel format, or as a PDF as stated in the RFP? If as a PDF, are vendors allowed to adjust the print layout to improve readability? |
| **Answer** | |
| Vendors can submit Appendix G in its native Excel format. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **32** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, Section A. Overview | Do you have a list of business services to be implemented? Do you need help determining which services should be digitized? |
| **Answer** | |
| Early adopter(s) use case will be identified during discovery. Digitizing services are outside of the scope of this RFP. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **33** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, Section C. Technical Requirements, #3 Support and Maintenance | How will new services be identified, included, and maintained into the constituent portal post implementation? Is there a specific team within the Maine Department of Administration and Financial Services that manages these services? |
| **Answer** | |
| New service identification post implementation is out of scope for this RFP. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **34** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | What agency are you looking to rollout on the constituent portal first? |
| **Answer** | |
| Early adopter(s) use case will be identified during discovery. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **35** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix G, Detailed Requirement 21, Item 3 | Are you looking for a 24x7 help line with this solution, or would knowledge articles and guides be sufficient? |
| **Answer** | |
| Refer to Part II, B.D of this RFP. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **36** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | Are we correct in assuming the solution would be the source of truth for constituents' login and personal information? If so, are there current logins that would need to be migrated into the new system? Will the various service providers all have unique credentials for users? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes. No migration expected.  No, service providers will be expected to consume credentials via the Portal solution. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **37** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix G, Detailed requirement 19 Security Controls, Item 4 | What is meant by “Real-time visibility” in Security Controls item 4 in Appendix G? |
| **Answer** | |
| Real-time monitoring and analytics. Live SIEM-integration. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **38** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Response File 3 | Are supporting attachments permitted as part of our responses to Appendices F/G/H? |
| **Answer** | |
| Bidders are not to provide additional attachments beyond those specified in the RFP for the purpose of extending their response.  Additional materials not requested will not be considered part of the proposal and will not be evaluated. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **39** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Sec D, Pg. 7 | POP dates are incorrect. 7/1/24 – 12/31/26 ; 1/1/26 – 12/31/28 year 2026 is counted twice? Please clarify. |
| **Answer** | |
| See Amendment #1. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **40** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Sec A, Pg. 8 | Components identified by the State…a.) Identity Proofing b.) Identity Verification. Will you please define what your definition of these 2 are? What functionality/use case do you require from each? |
| **Answer** | |
| Industry-standard definition. Tiered verification of a consumer who they claim to be. All options on the table, including Selfie with the State Driver's License held next to the face, uploading additional docs upon demand, etc. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **41** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Sec d. Pg. 9 | …capable of integrating with existing identity-proofing methods currently utilized…What are these methods/what solution provider(s) by the State agencies? |
| **Answer** | |
| Existing ID-proofing methods will be defined during discovery. Bidders are to provide a solution based on industry best practice and products. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **42** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix G, Detailed Req. Tab, #13 API | a) OpenID, OAuth, WS-Fed, SAML, LDAP, Active Directory, Application Programming Interfaces (APIs), Software Development. How many total applications will be supported? |
| **Answer** | |
| Existing ID-proofing methods will be defined during discovery. Bidders are to provide a solution based on industry best practice and products. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **43** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix I. Table A. Provisioning | There are 3 quantities: 325k, 650k, 1,300K. What are the total number of users to be quoted 1,300K? Or are you seeking step pricing? A price for the 1st 325K users, then a price for the next 325K, and finally a 3rd price for the additional 650K users? Or is the State asking for a Price if there are 325K users. Or 650K users. Or 1,300K users? If this is the case, then why totaling them up is unclear to us. Are these all external/constituent users? Are there any State employees / internal users who will need access? How many? Will there be any B2B users? How many? Will there be any G2G users? (Federal or other States). |
| **Answer** | |
| The State is seeking all costs associated with provisioning licenses. The quantities provided are for evaluation purposes. Bidders are to list any cost assumptions, conditions, and constraints, in the Cost Proposal Form. The state does not expect full adoption of 1.3M in year one. Quantities, in Tables B, C and D for identity proofing, are provided for evaluation purposes only, and do not reflect the exact quantities for the resulting contract. The State does not expect all constituents will require the highest tier. The quantities provided are Tier 1 - 25%, Tier 2 - 25% and Tier 3 - 50%, for evaluation purposes only.   All constituents are external users.  State employees who are not administrators may choose a constituent ID but will not be doing any State business with their constituent ID.   B2B and G2G integrations and any other identity stores will be determined during discovery. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **44** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Sec. c. Pg. 9 | iii. Attribute maps. Please explain what is meant by this? |
| **Answer** | |
| Depending upon individual user preference and Identity Tier, the attributes of an individual identity will vary. Attribute maps are from administrative perspective of that correspondence, associated with individual consumer. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **45** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Sec. c. Pg. 9 | Is this question in relation to lifecycle management of non-human (‘service’) accounts? |
| **Answer** | |
| In reference to attribute maps, all accounts/identities are subject to this provision. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **46** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Sec. v. Pg 10 | “Highly configurable with version control and history tracking for consent language.”  Please explain more detail about consent language requirements. |
| **Answer** | |
| Consent must be managed at a granular level, on a per-user, per-identity (Personal v. Business), per-app basis. Each individual consent may be granted, withdrawn downstream, and re-granted further downstream. Which is what leads to version-control. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **47** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part I, Section C. 2 Eligibility to Submit Bids Page 6 | State of Maine (SoM) has stated that, "... offsite work delivered by the assigned Project team within the continental United States…".  Can offshore resources be utilized for solution development (in the lower environments), that does not require access to Any SoM data? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes, but there must be verifiable certification that SOM data are not accessed from overseas. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **48** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part I, Section D Contract Renewal Page 7 | The RFP mentions Renewal Period #1 as 01/01/2026 to 12/31/2028. Did the State mean 01/01/2027 to 12/31/2028 or was the initial term requested for 1 year? Please clarify the initial term and renewal period dates. |
| **Answer** | |
| See Amendment #1 | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **49** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, Section B.1.d Page 9 | Item d refers to the capability to “Allow integration with applications across various State Agencies. More specifically, be capable of integrating with existing identity-proofing methods currently utilized by State Agencies.”  Can you please provide information on existing identity-proofing methods currently utilized by the state agencies? Also, please provide information on agencies and applications utilizing such proofing methods. |
| **Answer** | |
| Existing ID-proofing methods will be defined during discovery. Bidders are to provide solution based on industry best practice and products. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **50** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, Section B.1.e Page 9 | Item 3 refers to the capability to “Be able to integrate with authoritative sources of identity-proofing maintained by the State Agencies. No replication allowed.”  Please elaborate on the types of authoritative sources currently in use. |
| **Answer** | |
| Any identity-proofing already deployed must be consumed as an API from the source. No replication, that is, harvesting of such data allowable. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **51** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, Section B.2.b Page 10 | Requirements around recommendation technology refer to “…not allow any party to directly target or track the preferences of an individual or their usage of the portal.”  Can you please elaborate on what SoM considers as any party? |
| **Answer** | |
| The Constituent Portal will end up being a rich repository of personal data and individual preferences re: consent. We are seeking the maximum protection against commercial trackers and advertising bots. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **52** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, Section B.2.C Page 10 | Has SoM decided on the number agencies and application/services to be part of the data management integration? Please provide details and counts of the agencies and applications/services to be integrated. |
| **Answer** | |
| The State has not decided on the number of agencies and applications to be included in the data management integration. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **53** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, Section B.2.d Page 11 | Does the state have a 24x7x365 help desk to provide customer service? Is the state looking to integrate with the current help desk functions or looking to establish a help desk / contact center for the portal via this initiative? |
| **Answer** | |
| The State is not seeking to integrate with an existing help desk, but is seeking Bidder to propose a Customer Service Solution support 24x7x365. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **54** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix F - Technical Assessment: Non- Functional requirements, Item H1 | Requirement states that "Any technical solution must be hosted in a data center".  Does SoM prefer a cloud hosted solution or prefer parts of the solution to be hosted in their data centers? Does SoM provide cloud infrastructure? |
| **Answer** | |
| Cloud hosting (as opposed to on-prem) preferred. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **55** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix G - Details Technical and Functional Requirements Form, Item 13 | Has the SoM identified agency application for integration with Constituent Portal? Can you please share the details on the application, including how many users, unique user attribute(s), and the application platform. |
| **Answer** | |
| The State has not decided on the number of agencies and applications to be included in the data management integration. This will be determined during discovery | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **56** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix G - Details Technical and Functional Requirements Form, Item 6 | Please elaborate on the requirement in row 30 where SoM indicates “Cloud Services: Azure, AWS, Oracle, Google” under Security Event Logging |
| **Answer** | |
| The proposed solution must be able to seamlessly integrated w/ standard offerings from major cloud platform vendors. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **57** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix G - Details Technical and Functional Requirements Form, item 7 | Row 38 under Security certifications talks about IRS requiring a 45-day letter approval for new cloud solutions, yet IRS is not listed above it. Please clarify this requirement. |
| **Answer** | |
| That comment is just to prep the eventual (winning) bidder re: lead times for anything that involves IRS compliance. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **58** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix G - Details Technical and Functional Requirements Form, Item 9 | Please elaborate on SoM data management policies. |
| **Answer** | |
| All SOM I.T. policies are listed in <https://www.maine.gov/oit/policies-standards> | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **59** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix G - Details Technical and Functional Requirements Form, Item 9 | Requirement refers to at least one application. Please identify the total number of applications SoM intends to integrate under this bid for scoping purposes. |
| **Answer** | |
| The determination of the exact number of applications and agencies will be determined during discovery. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **60** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix G - Details Technical and Functional Requirements Form, Item 20 (1) | Is SoM looking for Native App; (iOS and Android) for the portal? Please explain/elaborate the desired user experience here. |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes, native mobile app is a requirement. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **61** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Cost Proposal Form – General | The anticipated contract procurement has an initial term and 6 option terms. The cost proposal has only 5 years. Please clarify how SoM wants the bidders to split the costs for the Initial Term, currently listed as 2 years. |
| **Answer** | |
| Bidders are to use the following dates for cost breakdown:  Year 1 = Initial Period of Performance Year 2 = Renewal Period #1 - 01/01/2027 - 12/31/2028 Year 3 = Renewal Period #2 - 01/01/2029 - 12/31/2030 Year 4 = Renewal Period #3 - 01/01/2031 - 12/31/2031 Year 5 = Renewal Period #4 - 01/01/2032 - 12/31/2032 | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **62** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Cost Proposal Form – General | Appendix G refers to user stories and capabilities and identifies that initial implementation is for one application only. Please clarify how many applications and agencies SoM intends to implement during the initial term. |
| **Answer** | |
| The determination of the exact number of applications and agencies will be determined during discovery. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **63** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Cost Proposal Form – General | Please clarify what SoM intends to procure during option years and years beyond the initial term. Is it just M&O for what is in production, or does it include integrating additional agencies and applications with the base solution? Please provide counts of agencies and application SOM intends to integrate during the contract. |
| **Answer** | |
| The State has not determined what it intends to procure during the option years or years beyond the initial year. The State has not determined the counts of agencies, this will be determined during discovery. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **64** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Cost Proposal Form – Customer Service | Please clarify what the helpdesk support model that SoM is requesting. The RFP talks about support during regular business hours (8am – 5pm) in some instances and 24x7x365 in other instances. Please clarify support and help desk requirements expected of the bidders. |
| **Answer** | |
| Business Hours - Section C.3.d. refers to application administrators.  24x7x365 - Refer to Part II, Section B.2.d. of this RFP for Constituent Portal Customer Service. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **65** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| RFP Section C.3.D, Technical Requirements, Support and Maintenance | Item D requests “Provide toll-free telephone support through a qualified technician with direct and demonstrated experience in the implementation and maintenance of the approved implemented solution during regular business hours (8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. EST).” Is this support request geared towards application administrators and Identity/Portal solution administrators? Please clarify if the state is intending to procure a citizen facing helpdesk via this RFP. If yes, please provide anticipated call volumes based on current interactions with agencies. |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes, the toll-free number in Section C.3.d. refers to application administrators.   Refer to Part II, Section B.2.d. of this RFP for Citizen Customer Service. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **66** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | What is the financial gain expected from this program? How will it be measured? |
| **Answer** | |
| The Department declines to answer. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **67** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | What are the anticipated time savings of Maine residents? What are the anticipated time savings of Maine employees? |
| **Answer** | |
| The Department declines to answer. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **68** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | What is the budget for implementation of the program? |
| **Answer** | |
| The Department declines to answer. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **69** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | What is the budget for the ongoing operation of the program? |
| **Answer** | |
| The Department declines to answer. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **70** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | What are the anticipated software licensing costs for the project? |
| **Answer** | |
| The Department declines to answer. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **71** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | What channels are required for outreach? |
| **Answer** | |
| Outreach is not in scope for this RFP. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **72** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | Where is the information required for this program currently? Are APIs available for these current systems? |
| **Answer** | |
| The baseline expectation is that downstream apps will consume identity via SAML 2.0, OAuth 2.0, OpenID 2.0, etc. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **73** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | What current systems must be integrated to the solution? |
| **Answer** | |
| Refer to Part II, C of the RFP. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **74** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | What channels must be tracked and activated? |
| **Answer** | |
| Refer to Part II, B, D of the RFP. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **75** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | What are the top three goals of the project? |
| **Answer** | |
| Refer to Part 1, A. of the RFP. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **76** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| II B.2.c Page 10 | What state Agencies will be accessible through the portal? |
| **Answer** | |
| State Agencies requesting to participate in the constituent portal will be considered based on project governance criteria and will be determined during discovery. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **77** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| II B.2.c Page 10 | Is the data sharing the same between all agencies? What level of data sharing will occur between each agency? |
| **Answer** | |
| Data sharing is not uniform between agencies. The proposed solution should allow integration with applications across various state agencies. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **78** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| NA | What is the anticipated monthly page views |
| **Answer** | |
| The State does not have an anticipated number of page views at this time. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **79** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| II A.2 Page 8 | How many profiles do you anticipate |
| **Answer** | |
| Appendix I, Cost Proposal Form lists licensing quantities. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **80** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| II B.2.b Page 10 | What are the anticipated storage requirements for the portal? |
| **Answer** | |
| The State does not have anticipated storage requirements at this time. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **81** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| NA | Can you provide technical architecture for each agency, highlighting the integration pint? |
| **Answer** | |
| To be determined during discovery. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **82** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| NA | How many users will need access to the platform? |
| **Answer** | |
| Appendix I, Cost Proposal Form lists licensing quantities. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **83** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| NA | Would you consider most pages on the portal to be Dynamic non-cached? |
| **Answer** | |
| Bidders may propose options. Nothing has been determined yet. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **84** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| NA | Do you use a CDN today that you would like to leverage for the portal? |
| **Answer** | |
| No CDN today. Bidders may propose options. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **85** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Submission Deadline – Pg. 1 | Would the State of Maine be willing to consider granting a 2-week extension to the 4/17 deadline? |
| **Answer** | |
| The Department does not intend to extend the Proposal Submission Deadline. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **86** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix C – Pg. 26 | Re. eligibility question #2: Could the state please clarify if this is asking bidders to confirm they have the capacity to staff resources within the continental US, or is there a requirement that this project must be staffed with 100% onshore resources? Is the state willing to consider a mix of offshore resources where appropriate to provide a lower cost/greater efficiency, assuming that offshore resources would not access the production system or interact with production data? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes, but there must be verifiable certification that SOM data are not accessed from overseas. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **87** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| General – N/A | Are bidders permitted to include assumptions and requested exceptions/redlines to Terms and Conditions or appendixes within the RFP response? |
| **Answer** | |
| All assumptions should be included within the RFP response.  Any exceptions / redlines to the State’s terms and conditions will be negotiated with the awarded Bidder following conditional award and will not be considered during the evaluation of proposals. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **88** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| General – N/A | Will the state consider leveraging an existing statewide or master agreement if applicable? |
| **Answer** | |
| The Department does not intend to leverage any existing statewide or master agreements. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **89** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| General – N/A | Could the state identify the number of agencies and that the portal must provide support for? |
| **Answer** | |
| This will be determined during discovery. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **90** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| General – N/A | Is the state anticipating a “big bang” approach to this solution, or a phased in approach, based on prioritization of functionality and agencies to be supported? |
| **Answer** | |
| It is at the bidder's discretion to propose a reasonable implementation approach. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **91** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| General – N/A | In order to properly scope the deployment of this solution, could the state provide offerors with information on the applications to interface with the portal solution, to include 1) application name; 2) size of data to ingest/interface with. 3) Location of application (cloud/on-prem), 4) backend data storage type (e.g Oracle, SQL, custom) 5) estimated monthly active users for the application. |
| **Answer** | |
| State agencies requesting to participate in the constituent portal will be considered based on project governance criteria. The size of data ingestion, hosting location, data storage architectures and estimated monthly active users will vary widely. However, what is likely to stay invariant is that these applications will consume authentication via modern standards (such as, OpenID 2.0, OAuth 2.0, SAML 2.0, etc.). | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **92** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| General – N/A | Does Maine OIT have an existing data catalog and data classification technology? If so which technology and where is it hosted (on-prem, cloud)? |
| **Answer** | |
| No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **93** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| General – N/A | Does Maine OIT have an existing data lake? If so which technology and where is it hosted (on-prem, cloud)? How many source systems feed into the data lake? |
| **Answer** | |
| No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **94** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| General – N/A | Is there a canonical data model representing some or all data intended for the Constituent Portal? |
| **Answer** | |
| Bidders are to provide a canonical data model based on industry best practices. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **95** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| General – N/A | Will the solution require any payments processing? |
| **Answer** | |
| Payment processing is not in scope for this RFP. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **96** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| 2.d – Page 11 | Could the state clarify if they are seeking a fully staffed 24/7/365 “311-like service desk” solution or would they be amenable to a method to leverage technology to provide after hours support? |
| **Answer** | |
| Refer to Part II, section b.2.d - Customer Service | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **97** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part 1 D – Page 7 | Can the state please confirm that this is the period of performance, as it contradicts Part IV Section 4 (Page 18) which states the period of performance is from 2/24 – 12/26. |
| **Answer** | |
| See Amendment #1. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **98** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| 2.d – Page 11 | Could the state provide us with an anticipated number of calls/requests to customer support per day/per month/per year? |
| **Answer** | |
| No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **99** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| 2.d – Page 11 | Does the state anticipate that the customer support is acting as Tier 1 support, with handover to specific agencies for Tier 2 support? If so, what is the anticipated mechanism for this handover (e.g. is everyone leveraging an existing IVR solution?) |
| **Answer** | |
| Bidder should propose a flexible support model. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **100** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part 2 A 1 a – Page 7 | Does Maine OIT have a preferred partner/technology for identity-proofing? |
| **Answer** | |
| The state is seeking bidders to provide an identity-proofing solution that meets the requirements detailed in this RFP. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **101** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part 2 A 2 a – Page 9 | The section states “allows Constituents to choose State services to be included in their personalized dashboard”. Is the expectation of the Personalized Dashboard to allow constituents to save a tile per state service that contains a few data points on that dashboard that hyperlinks to a state services application? |
| **Answer** | |
| The state expects constituents will be able to personalize their dashboard, bidders to provide how they will meet this requirement in their proposals. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **102** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part 2 B 2 c v – Page 11 | The RFP states logging data must be available for system dashboards and reporting. Please confirm if those "system dashboards" are just part of the Constituent Portal or if the log data needs to be shared with an external SOM reporting system (other than Splunk)? |
| **Answer** | |
| The system dashboard logging and reporting must be made available to system administrators. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **103** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part 2 C 1 a – Page 11 | iOS and Android app. Please confirm if a web application that is mobile responsive is the requirement? Or please confirm if the expectation is to have a web application on the internet, a native iOS application deployed through the Apple App Store, and an Android application deployed through Google Play Store. |
| **Answer** | |
| Bidder should propose offering dedicated support or features through an app designed specifically for mobile devices. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **104** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part 2 C 4 a – Page 12 | The section states the solution must comply with or have four security certifications. RFP provides links to Policies and Standard including "Security Assessment and Authorization Policy and Procedures (CA-1)" but unclear how to verify compliance. Does SOM have a standard to verify compliance? |
| **Answer** | |
| The quoted standards themselves include defined other-party certification requirements. SOM has the internal expertise to verify said other-party certifications. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **105** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix F – NFR A1 | Does Maine OIT have an existing policy for data retention? Can that be shared? |
| **Answer** | |
| Maine State Records Management stipulations are set by the Secretary of State. See https://www.maine.gov/sos/arc/records/state/index.html. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **106** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix F – NFR A2 | This section lists the following environments for an application solution: Development, Staging, Productions, DR, etc. Does OIT have a standard around the number of running environments for any application implementation? |
| **Answer** | |
| No, the number of environments will be defined during discovery. It will not be just one. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **107** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix F – ISS S3 | Requirement states the “bidder will report a security incident that occurs on the Agency’s information systems that may affect the Agency or State of Maine systems to the CISO within 24 hours of discovery in accordance with the terms of the Maine IT Non-Disclosure Agreement (Attachment D). ”. Is the incident reporting an email to the CISO, an entry into a single website or something more? |
| **Answer** | |
| See 4.2 of <https://www.maine.gov/oit/sites/maine.gov.oit/files/inline-files/RemoteHostingPolicy.pdf> | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **108** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix G – Detailed Requirements - 11 | The section indicates the system must apply the Data Management Rules as per the Data Management Policies. Is this policy listed on the Policy & Standards page. If so, which one or can you provide the policy? |
| **Answer** | |
| See the Data Classification Policy and Data Exchange Policy in Maine.Gov/oit/policies. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **109** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part 2 B.1.E – Page 9 | “Be able to integrate with authoritative sources of identity-proofing maintained by the State Agencies. No replication allowed”. Could the state clarify the intent and priority of such integration? Has the state considered the implications of such a request for a FedRAMP security requirement? |
| **Answer** | |
| The Constituent Portal will end up being a rich repository of personal data and individual preferences re: consent. We are seeking the maximum protection against commercial trackers and advertising bots. Have not yet considered FedRAMP impact. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **110** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix I | On the cost proposal tab, appendix I table, B, and table C are exactly the same for tier 1 and tier 2 identity proofing. Are those meant to be the same or are they repeated? Could the state provide an explanation for volume in the tier tables? |
| **Answer** | |
| Refer to Question 43. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **111** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part 2 B.1 – Page 8 | In the overall summary of the RFP overview Part II section B .1 it uses identity proofing and identity verification in the same sentence. Is the identity proofing line-item in the cost matrix encompassing both terms? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes, bidders should include costs for both identity proofing and verification. Bidders are to list any cost assumptions, conditions and constraints in the space provided on the Cost Proposal Form. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **112** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| General – N/A | Throughout the RFP, the business owner is referred to as one of the constituents to be identity proofed and managed. In these cases where business owners are in question, oftentimes business verification is a function that is needed. Is the state requesting the solution to provide business verification independent of verifying the Identity of the individual that owns the business? |
| **Answer** | |
| The state expects the need to verify both business and individual citizens, final determination will be defined during discovery. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **113** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix G – Detailed Requirements - 16 | Will some or all the state agencies’ services be able to implement a programming API endpoint to standardize a way to securely push data into the solution? If so, how many agencies? |
| **Answer** | |
| We do not expect any agency applications to PUSH data into the Portal. The expectation is that agency applications will PULL authentication from the Portal. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **114** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| General – N/A | How is the State of Maine managing constituent profiles? |
| **Answer** | |
| The State, as a whole, is not currently managing constituent profiles. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **115** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| General – N/A | Does the current portal provide a unified view of constituent activities? |
| **Answer** | |
| The current portal does not provide a unified view of constituent activities. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **116** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| General – N/A | What are the data sources that compile a constituent profile? Do we expect to want to federate data from new sources in the future? |
| **Answer** | |
| The data elements of the individual profile have not yet been defined. In theory, future federation cannot be ruled out. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **117** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| General – N/A | Currently are there any constituent segments defined based on demographics within the State of Maine? |
| **Answer** | |
| The State, as a whole, does not currently define constituent segments based on demographics. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **118** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix G – Detailed Requirements - 3 | What multi-factor authentication methods if any, would you like to implement as part of this project? (SMS, voice, authenticator app, hardware tokens etc.) |
| **Answer** | |
| Maine is a rural state, parts of which suffer from spotty cellular data connectivity. Therefore, all options on the table, including mobile app, SMS, email, voice callback with code, etc. We do NOT expect to rollout hardware tokens to the consumers. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **119** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix G – Detailed Requirements | Do existing constituent users need to be migrated from a legacy identity provider as part of the scope for this project? |
| **Answer** | |
| A legacy application that contains existing constituent users would be considered in scope for this project. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **120** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | 1. Identity Access Management (CIAM): a. Can you provide more details on the tiered identity proofing process? What specific methods will be used for tiered identity proofing? b. Regarding integration with existing identity-proofing methods, could you specify which methods are currently in use by State Agencies?  c. Are there any specific requirements or preferences regarding the extensibility of architecture for future means of identity-proofing, such as biometrics? |
| **Answer** | |
| a) All options on the table, including selfie with the state driver's license held next to the face, uploading additional docs upon demand, etc. b) Integration with any existing method will be through REST/SOAP APIs. c) Indeed open to future options, such as biometrics. But, again, must be subject to granular individual consent. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **121** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | 2. Personalized Dashboard: a. Can you elaborate on the expectations for recommendation technology? Are there specific privacy considerations or limitations we should be aware of?  a. b. Regarding data management, are there any specific regulations or standards we should adhere to when sharing data between State systems? |
| **Answer** | |
| a) Privacy is of paramount importance. Recommendations may indeed be provided IF, and ONLY IF, the consumer has consented to such recommendations. b) At this point, the only data exchange planned is for downstream apps consuming authentication from the Portal. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **122** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | 3. Technical Requirements: a. Regarding compliance with MaineIT Policies & Standards, could you provide more information on the specific requirements for each policy and standard listed? |
| **Answer** | |
| Refer to links in Part II, Section C.2 in the RFP. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **123** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | 4. Customer Service:  a. Is Maine seeking a helpdesk type customer service to help constituents resolve solution issues or general customer service across the various state services? |
| **Answer** | |
| The State is seeking solutions to provide help to constituents with the portal, not general customer service across agencies. | |