

**RFP 2014-0500-2348 ANSWERS SLDS DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION SERVICES  
 NOTICE OF REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL/ALASKA COMMISSION ON POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION  
 QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES**

<i>DATE RECEIVED</i>	<i>QUESTION</i>	<i>RESPONSE</i>
01/14/14	Is there a system design already developed and ACPE is looking for technical services to implement it or is system design and architecture also part of the project scope?	A high-level system design concept has been developed as demonstrated by the business flows and functional requirements (see RFP Attachments). A detailed system design and architecture based on these concepts are part of the work in this contract.
1/15/14	With regard to the above listed RFP, will there be a statewide transcript component that will be needed to support the gathering of information that will go into the database? Or, is the purpose of the RFP to take what information you already have, and create a new statewide database where it will be housed for myriad purposes?	The objective of the NCES SLDS grant funding the work under this RFP is to link existing early childhood through the workforce (P-20W) data for longitudinal analysis. A P20 transcript component is not part of the scope of work under this project.
1/15/14	The Higher Ed is the agency overseeing the release and submission of this RFP. Will the decision be made by ACPE or will all agencies be involved in the decision making process as to who is awarded this?	The RFP evaluation team includes members of the multi-agency ANSWERS project team. ACPE is acting in a project management role for the ANSWERS project, and will be the contracting agency for procurement purposes.
1/15/14	Does the state currently have existing data structure architecture in place or would the state be open to a vendor solution that provides the framework that can be built out?	Alaska does not have a data structure architecture in place but has developed requirements for data structure architectures as outlined in the RFP attachments. While not the only requirement of the data structure architecture, it is expected that the staging and warehouse be structured to use a separate table for each data source and to use the same element names as the data source.
1/15/14	Would the state if within budget look at a solution that provided the architecture and build out by the vendor solution team (alongside the internal team) that would provide the design, architecture, ETL of data and reporting services that would allow the state to be up and running in 6-8 months that the state would own, maintain and expand internally as needed?	Yes, Alaska would look at such a solution if the proposal is deemed responsive to the RFP.
01/17/14	There are licensed software systems or frameworks (including brand name products)	Alaska will accept solutions for the components if Alaska owns the code at the

	<p>that provide much of the required functionality of this RFP.  This includes frameworks for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Data Validation</li> <li>* Record Matching</li> <li>* Extract/Transform/Load (ETL)</li> <li>* Longitudinal Analysis and Reporting</li> </ul> <p>Will Alaska accept solutions which license and use any of these components in lieu of custom development if the overall price falls within the guidelines?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">or</p> <p>Is Alaska committed to a solution which is custom built under the guidance of the ANSWERS project team?</p>	<p>end of the contract, is free to make changes or enhancements to the products, and there are no annual charges associated with the products.</p>
--	---	--

As stated in section **1.02 Contract Term and Work Schedule** of the RFP, the deadline for questions was **January 27, 2014**. *Questions below were received after the deadline, and answers are being provided to assist potential offerors.*

<p>01/30/14</p>	<p>RFP No. 2014-0500-2348: ANSWERS SLDS Development and Implementation states that "The contractor's technical resources will work remotely for the majority of the contract and will work onsite in Juneau and Anchorage during critical times as needed. The offerors are asked to propose a travel schedule for each of the technical resources they intend to provide including the general time frame and duration of onsite work." However, later in the RFP, ACPE request that offerors not include transportation costs in the proposal for travel to other locations: "Note that travel to other locations for meetings and project activities may be required. The offeror should NOT include transportation costs in the price proposal. ACPE will separately make and pay for contractor travel arrangements in accordance with the State of Alaska travel requirements."  Should offerors exclude all travel costs from their proposals, or only travel to locations other than Anchorage and Juneau?</p>	<p>As stated in section 1.05 Location of Work, offerors are asked to propose a travel schedule for each of the technical resources they intend to provide including the general time frame and duration of onsite work. The cost of the agreed-upon travel, as proposed by the offeror and approved by ACPE, will be arranged and paid for by ACPE, in accordance with State of Alaska travel requirements and <u>should not</u> be included in the cost proposal. Travel to other locations as required by project activities will also be paid for and arranged by ACPE as determined necessary.</p>
-----------------	--	--