1.	Solicitation No.	030325/ET
2.	Solicitation Name	Project GO and Language Training Centers Website Maintenance and Upgrade
3.	Issue Date	March 6, 2025
4.	Closing Date	March 27, 2025
5.	Solicitation Amendment No.	1
6.	Solicitation Amendment Date	March 20, 2025

7. The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 9 below.

8. The hour and dates specified for receipt of proposals/quotations: ⊠ is not extended; ☐ is extended as described in Item 9 below.

9. Description of Amendment/Modification:

The purpose of this solicitation amendment is to inform prospective offerors/bidders that the above numbered solicitation is hereby amended to provide responses to questions as follows.

See attached document.

END OF AMENDMENT

RFP for Project GO and Language Training Centers Website Maintenance and Upgrade – Q&A

Table of Contents

Hosting, Security, and Maintenance

Q1: The RFP mentions FedRAMP-compliant hosting is preferred but not required. Are there specific security compliance measures beyond FedRAMP that the new hosting provider must adhere to?
A1: No, but if you include FedRAMP hosting as part of the proposal, we prefer Azure or AWS hosting in the U.S. East region.

Q2: To help us assess the maintenance needs and get a clearer picture of the site structure, could you share the following reports from the current Drupal build?
   a. **Field list report:** Includes content types, entities, and all fields.
   b. **Available updates report:** Includes versions, names, and available updates for all
   c. **Status report:** Highlights the site status, exact PHP version, and Drupal version.
A2: A summary of the field list report is addended at the bottom of this document. The other requested reports are under review and will be added to this document at a later date.

Q3: What is the anticipated support level required (e.g., 24/7 critical issue resolution, business hours support, etc.)?
A3: We anticipate needing business hours support primarily, with a possible, extremely rare need for off-hours critical issue resolution. To date we have never requested support outside of normal business hours for either of these websites, but it is possible that it could be needed at some point.

Q4: Can you provide historical data on the number of support requests submitted over the last 12 months?
A4: Including requests such as security scans, a cookie banner, and minor page edits, we estimate around 12 requests submitted in the past 12 months; requests are infrequent for these sites as the IIE program team makes most content updates.

Q5: How many monthly support and maintenance hours do you anticipate needing?
A5: We anticipate needing a maximum 10 hours of support and maintenance per month, although we use less than this in a typical month.

Q6: What are your current hosting arrangements (e.g., service provider, environment specifics)? Would you prefer to remain with a similar configuration, or are you open to a new provider/environment?
A6: We currently rely on our vendor to provide hosting, and would like to continue with this arrangement. If FedRAMP hosting is proposed, we have a preference for Azure or AWS hosting.

Q7: Are there any known issues or limitations with the current hosting provider?
A7: No known issues or limitations with the current hosting provider.

Q8: Are there specific requirements for data storage location (e.g., U.S.-based servers)?
A8: Not at this time.

Q9: Since FedRAMP-compliant hosting is mentioned as "preferred," can you clarify whether that is a strict requirement or if a FedRAMP-moderate solution would be sufficient? What advantages of FedRAMP are most important to you?
A9: For this contract, FedRAMP is not a strict requirement. Security is a priority for the DOD sponsor. A FedRAMP-moderate solution would be sufficient.

Q10: What are your current average and peak traffic levels (e.g., monthly unique visitors) for each site? Are there any expected spikes in traffic (such as application deadlines or major announcements) that we should plan for in terms of load testing and scalability?
A10: We do not currently have analytics on site traffic. We would guess that Project GO website has spikes in traffic around the application opening date (on or around October 1) and closing date (on or around January 15). No expected traffic spikes for the LTC website.

Q11: Are there any integrations with third-party services or databases that need to be maintained or improved?
A11: No.

Q12: What specific FedRAMP requirements must be met?
A12: At this time, no specific requirements must be met as FedRAMP hosting is not required but preferred.

Q13: Are there any additional cybersecurity or IT security assessments that vendors must complete?
A13: Yes. The RFP includes information on the additional security assessment requirements.

Q14: Will the vendor need to manage user authentication, or is there an existing single sign-on (SSO) solution in place?
A14: There is no SSO in place for these sites, nor is there a need for an SSO. Authentication is managed through the CMS.

Q15: What are the expected response and resolution times for support requests?
A15: Anticipated response times would be within 24 hours for non-urgent requests and within 1 hour for urgent requests. Resolution times would depend on the complexity of the support requested.

Q16: What level of reporting and analytics support is required?
A16: Minimal if any; we have never made a request of the vendor previously for reporting or analytics for these sites.

Q17: Is there a required uptime SLA?
A17: While there isn't a strict uptime SLA requirement, prompt responses are expected. The response time expectation may vary depending on the cause of the issue.

Accessibility

Q18: What are the accessibility expectations for the vendor to perform in relation to WCAG and ADA 508 compliance?
A18: The offeror shall not install, configure, or integrate the equipment and software in a way that reduces the level of conformance with the applicable Revised 508 Standards. Any new system or process must meet ADA 508 compliance at the WCAG 2.0 Level AA.

Q19: Who is responsible for ongoing accessibility compliance (internal team, third-party vendor, hybrid approach)?
A19: The vendor would be responsible for accessibility compliance in coordination with IIE.

Q20: If an internal team, do you have a designated accessibility officer or team overseeing compliance efforts?
A20: No, there is currently no designated accessibility officer.

Q21: For both Project GO and Language Training Centers, when was the last time you conducted a manual, site-wide content audit for WCAG compliance (including embedded content, PDFs, timed media, etc.)?
A21: Unknown.

Q22: Do you conduct user testing with individuals with disabilities? If so, how often, what methods do you use (e.g., screen reader testing, keyboard navigation testing, usability sessions), and do you work with a partner?
A22: No, we have not performed user accessibility testing.

Q23: With respect to Drupal content authoring, in addition to enforcing accessible content, do you require that the Drupal authoring experiences on both websites are WCAG/ATAG compliant?
A23: Content authoring should meet ADA 508 compliance requirements.

CMS and Upgrades

Q24: Is Drupal the only CMS under consideration?
A24: To best leverage the IIE project team's institutional experience and knowledge, Drupal is the only CMS under consideration at this time.

Q25: The RFP mentions an upgrade from Drupal 10 to Drupal 11. Are there any specific functionalities or modules that need reconfiguration or enhancement as part of this upgrade?

A25: We do not anticipate that any reconfiguration or enhancement will be needed as part of the Drupal upgrade.

Q25: Are there any existing features on the current websites that you believe should be retired? If yes, please list.
A25: No, there are no features that we would like to retire at this time.

Q26: Conversely, are there features or functionalities that you would like to enhance or expand in the new version?
A26: We may wish to enhance the functionality of the resources section of the Project GO website. However, any changes requested would be minor.

Q27: Can you confirm the number of expected user roles and access permissions post-upgrade?
A27: There is no expected change to the number of user roles or access permissions post-upgrade.

Q28: Is there a requirement for automated content migration from Drupal 10 to 11, or will content updates be managed manually?
A28: Yes, there is a requirement for automated content migration as part of the Drupal upgrade.

Content & Management

Q29: Will content updates be managed centrally by IIE, or will different teams/institutions be responsible for updating content?
A29: While members of different partner institutions may update content, no content is published without IIE review, and all content updates are managed by IIE.

Q30: What is the expected frequency of website content updates (e.g., daily, weekly, ad-hoc)?
A30: Website content is updated on an annual cycle (June for LTCs and August/September for Project GO) and also ad-hoc.

Q31: Will any new sections or content types be introduced that are not part of the current site structure?
A31: We do not anticipate adding any new sections or content types to either of the websites.

Q32: Are there any new features or major functionality changes (aside from the Drupal 11 upgrade) you anticipate adding in the next 12 to 18 months?
A32: No new features or functionality changes are expected in the next 12 to 18 months.

Q33: Could you clarify how many administrators and institutional users there are in total and whether you foresee the number growing?
A33: Currently for Project GO and LTC we have approximately 15 administrators for both sites. For Project GO we have around 20 active institutional users and for LTC around 15. These numbers may be subject to change (we have had as many as 65 institutional users for Project GO in the past), as the number of institutional partners varies depending on program funding. We do not anticipate this growing beyond 100 institutional users for each site.

Q34: Are there any future plans to introduce additional user roles, or new layers of permissions within existing roles?
A34: There are currently no plans to introduce new user roles or new layers of permissions within those roles.

Q35: Beyond keeping the sites updated and secure, do you envision broader digital transformation goals, such as integration with other systems, enhanced analytics, or user experience (UX) redesigns?
A35: Not at this time.

Q36: Will the entire .edu or .org domain need to be migrated?
A36: Yes. Both are .org domains.

Q37: Are there additional domains that need to be migrated?
A37: No.

Q38: In regard to migration, how many different page layouts do you have on your current site
A38: For Project GO, there are 11 content types on the site. For LTC, there are 8 content types on the site.

Budget

Q39: What is the estimated budget range for this project, including hosting, maintenance, and the Drupal 11 upgrade?
A39: We understand that because we have noted that FedRAMP hosting is preferred but not required, budgets and cost proposals will vary. We are committed to selecting a vendor that demonstrates capability to do the work required effectively at a competitive price point.

Q40: Will there be separate budgets for ongoing maintenance and the Drupal upgrade, or should costs be consolidated?
A40: These costs should be broken down within the same budget, so it is clear how much is being allocated for each piece, but the total budget should include the upgrade, hosting, and maintenance costs.

Q41: Is this a fixed-price contract, time-and-materials, or another type of pricing model?
A41: While the proposing vendor is open to propose an alternate model, we anticipate a fixed monthly cost for hosting and CMS, as well as fixed price Drupal upgrades, with reimbursable costs for hourly maintenance requests.

Scope

Q42: Can you confirm that the scope of work is limited to the Project GO and LTC websites and does not include other affiliated sites or systems?
A42: Yes, the scope of work is limited to the Project GO and LTC websites and does not include other affiliated sites or systems.

Q43: Are there any specific user experience (UX) improvements or accessibility enhancements you would like to prioritize beyond compliance with Section 508?
A43: Not at this time.

Q44: Are there third-party integrations (e.g., CRM, analytics tools, payment gateways) that need to be maintained or added?
A44: None.

Other

Q45: Do you have an SEO strategy in place? If so, what are its primary focus areas?
A45: No.

Q46: How do you currently attract traffic to the site (e.g., paid ads, social media, search engine marketing)?
A46: None of these. Our university partners do some outreach but otherwise we do not engage in marketing.

Q47: Are there any specific evaluation criteria that hold more weight than others (e.g., cost vs. technical capability)?
A47: Yes, this is explained on p. 8 of the RFP.

Q48: Is there an incumbent vendor currently managing the websites? If so, what are the key reasons for issuing this RFP?
A48: There is an incumbent vendor managing the websites. The current contract has expired, which is why the RFP was issued.

Q49: Will IIE consider receiving proposals from vendors possessing the 54151S NAICS code? In our experience, organizations often use 54151S to procure similar website maintenance and upgrade services.
A49: Yes, we would consider receiving proposals from vendors possessing other than 541519 NAICS code. We want to remind offerors that this is a small business set aside opportunity. The selected vendor will have to certify either in SAM.gov or directly to IIE that they are a small business. The size standard for this opportunity is that of NAICS 541519, $34,000,000. For more information on the size standards please visit the following link. https://www.sba.gov/sites/default/files/2023-06/Table%20of%20Size%20Standards_Effective%20March%2017%2C%202023%20%282%29.pdf

Q50: What is driving the dates of this project?
A50: Our current sub-contract ends as of April 30, so we are recompeting with the dates listed in the RFP. The dates listed for the Drupal upgrade is based on a planned upgrade schedule.

Q51: What happens if you miss any or all of the dates of this project?
A51: It is imperative there is no lapse in hosting of the site. We expect all other work to be completed in the timeline / by the dates stated in the RFP.

Q52: Who currently hosts your website(s)? Are you looking to change this arrangement?
A52: This is an open competition and IIE will select the vendor who submits the best-value proposal that meets the requirements as stated in the RFP.

Q53: How many developers do you have to work on templates, and other CMS-related development?
A53: IIE does not do this work. Any development of templates would be generated by the vendor in collaboration with the program team.

Q54: How many individuals at your institution will need to use the CMS?
A54: An estimated 15 users for each site at our institution will need administrative access to the sites.

Addendum: Field List Summary

Project GO Field List Summary (68 total)

Field Type	Count of Fields
Comments (module: comment)	1
Date (module: datetime)	4
Email (module: core)	3
Entity reference (module: core)	14
File (module: file)	4
Image (module: image)	9
Link (module: link)	2
List (text) (module: options)	2
Number (integer) (module: core)	1
Table Field (module: tablefield)	1
Text (formatted, long) (module: text)	4
Text (formatted, long, with summary) (module: text)	3
Text (plain) (module: core)	19
Webform (module: webform)	1

LTC Field List Summary (50 total)

Field Type	Count of Fields
Comments (module: comment)	1
Date (module: datetime)	1
Email (module: core)	2
Entity reference (module: core)	11
Entity reference revisions (module: entity_reference_revisions)	1
File (module: file)	5
Image (module: image)	4
Link (module: link)	2
List (text) (module: options)	3
Meta tags (module: metatag)	1
Text (formatted, long) (module: text)	2
Text (formatted, long, with summary) (module: text)	3
Text (plain) (module: core)	14