

## Written Questions and Answers

CECentral Accreditation Management Platform UK-2391-24

Closing Date: December 8, 2023 Today's Date: December 1, 2023

No.	Question	Answer
1	Is there a preferred SSO method/protocol?	Our primary preference for Single Sign-On (SSO) integration is University of Kentucky LinkBlue. However, we are open to exploring additional SSO methods. We are particularly interested in compatibility with widely used platforms like Google and Facebook, as well as potential integrations with our educational partners.  For API-related information regarding LinkBlue integration, it will be necessary to contact the
2	Can you provide added details on the requirement for Custom URLs as part of the Data and Workflow section?	University of Kentucky's ITS department.  Our current system supports the creation of custom URLs, which aligns with our requirements outlined in the Data and Workflow section. This feature is essential for direct and easy access to specific pages, such as: <a href="http://CECentral.com/PediatricAnxiety">http://CECentral.com/PediatricAnxiety</a> <a href="http://CECentral.com/DEA-MATE">http://CECentral.com/DEA-MATE</a> We are flexible in terms of using subdomains or URIs (Uniform Resource Identifiers) as demonstrated in these examples. The primary goal is to create memorable and direct URLs for specific courses or content areas, enhancing their marketability.

3	Can you please provide added details on the content migration?	We will require user account migration; however, content migration remains optional. Our decision to manually re-enter content or opt for an automated migration process will largely hinge on the associated costs.  Currently, our data is stored in a relational MySQL database. Our team possesses a good understanding of the database schema and business domain, which positions us well to facilitate the migration process to your preferred format if necessary.
4	Can you please provide additional details on the user migration? Is this solely migration of users or will this also include historical records, and to what level of detail (course completion data vs activity level detail)?  a. What format will we receive the user data in? .csv?  b. How many users approximately and years worth of data?	At a minimum, we will require migration of users, including the last six years of transcript information. Legacy transcripts do not need to be linked to specific activity content. We are flexible as to how this information is attached to the user account (PDF, integrated, HTML display, etc). For any unique cases, we will still be able to reference old data from our homegrown system.  a. As for the data format, we can provide user data in multiple formats such as CSV, Excel file, or a MySQL dump. b. We would transfer users from the last six years (approximately 50,000) with six years of transcript information containing course completion data with credits received. c. Annually, we anticipate around 12,300 unique users in terms of site traffic.
5	How are the eCommerce needs currently being met with the homegrown system? Is the eCommerce functionality built into the home-grown system vs an integration with a 3rd party eCommerce solution? Does UK HealthCare CECentral have a targeted eCommerce platform they would like the AMS/LMS to integrate with?	Our current system is integrated with Auth.net for payment processing, as the university requires. All other financial functionalities are incorporated within our home-grown system. While we do not have a preference for an alternative eCommerce platform, we are open to considering other options as long as they comply with PCI-DSS standards. Please note that any additional eCommerce solutions proposed must be approved by the University of Kentucky Treasury.

6	Is the current reporting to CPE Monitor and PARS a manual process or automated with direct integration with the home-grown AMS?	Our reporting to the CPE Monitor is fully automated, which is crucial given the 3-day reporting requirement. As for PARS, while reports are generated within our system, they are currently uploaded manually. With evolving reporting requirements, an automatic upload feature for PARS would be beneficial, although it is not a mandatory requirement at this stage.
7	Is a non-production environment(s) desired as part of the cloud hosted solution i.e. test, sandbox, etc.?	Yes, having a non-production environment, such as a test or sandbox area, is nice. This feature is desirable as it allows us to demonstrate activities to faculty members and stakeholders before they are officially launched live.
8	Confirming that respondents are able to submit two sealed envelopes, one clearly marked as the technical proposal and the second clearly marked as the financial proposal, within the same expedited shipping envelope.	Please note that while we ask that the technical and financial responses be packed separately, they can be sent in one larger envelope or box.
9	It doesn't appear that vendors need to submit an official "intent to bid" for this RFP, is that correct?	We do not require an intent to bid.
10	Vendors must submit responses based on the following:  • Technical Proposal: Two (2) copies on electronic storage devices (USB) (1 copy per storage device) each clearly marked with the proposal number and name, firm name and what is included (Technical Proposal) and two (2) printed original copies  • Financial Proposal: Two (2) copies on electronic storage devices (USB) (1 copy per storage device) each clearly marked with the proposal number and name, firm name and what is included (Financial Proposal) and two (2) printed original copies  It doesn't appear that UKY needs any RFP responses emailed, only physical copies. Is that correct?	We do not accept electronic transmissions of bids at this time, so you will need to mail in the hard paper copies with the flash drives. Please note that while we ask that the technical and financial responses be packed separately, they can be sent in one larger envelope or box.

Provided the high level functional requirements, is UK HealthCare CECentral agreeable to a narrow price range for the implementation portion of the financial proposal? If it is to be a fixed bid number, is there any vendor protection for an increased level of effort as a deeper level of understanding of the requirements are achieved?

A narrow price range in the initial proposal is acceptable, provided that the vendor outlines the factors influencing the final purchase price. Final pricing would be negotiated after selection as the preferred vendor.