North Carolina Community College System
Dr. Jeff A. Cox
President
200 W. Jones St., Raleigh NC 27603

IMPORTANT BID ADDENDUM

March 30, 2026

THIS BID ADDENDUM DOES NOT HAVE TO BE RETURNED:

BID Number: **50-2526007**
ADDENDUM Number: **01**
PURCHASER: **Grant Braley**

COMMODITY: **Federal Grant Management System**
USING AGENCY: *****DEPARTMENT - NCCCS*****
OPENING DATE/TIME: **April 14, 2026 @ 2:00:00 PM EST**

INSTRUCTIONS:

1. Answers to Vendor Questions

#	Section	Subsection	Vendor Question	Answer
1	3.0 RFP REQUIREMENTS AND SPECIFICATIONS	3.5 BUSINESS AND TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS	Can the Agency provide estimated annual and peak-cycle volumes, including the number of grant programs administered, total grant applications received per cycle, average and peak submission volumes, and the number of awards issued annually?	Data System Component: Based on current data system operations, transaction volumes are driven by student intake, attendance entry, assessment entry, reporting, and API integrations and do not have peak cycles. The system must support: High-frequency daily transactions (attendance, enrollments, updates) Peak periods aligned with program start/end dates and reporting deadlines Concurrent usage across 66 colleges and providers statewide The system should be scalable to handle statewide usage with no degradation in performance, including batch reporting and real-time data entry. Grant Management System: Peak time would be Spring set up back end for the future year, roll over in July, college information input August and September, December for semester end, February-March for mid year reporting, and May-June for End of Year.
2	3.0 RFP REQUIREMENTS AND SPECIFICATIONS	3.5 BUSINESS AND TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS	Can the Agency provide estimated user population details, including the number of internal users by role (e.g., administrators, program staff, reviewers), number of external users (e.g., applicants, subrecipients), expected peak concurrent usage, and anticipated user growth over the contract term?	The State anticipates multiple user types accessing the system across state and local levels. While exact counts may vary, the following represents the expected roles and estimated user distribution: User Types / Roles: State Administrators (10–20 users): Full system access for oversight, configuration, monitoring, and reporting State Program & Fiscal Staff (20–40 users): Review applications, manage awards, monitor performance, and conduct compliance activities Local Provider Administrators (60–80 users): Manage organizational submissions, oversee staff, and coordinate grant activities

				Local Provider Staff / Data Entry Users (150–250 users): Enter application data, upload documentation, manage budgets, and support reporting Read-Only / External Stakeholders (25–50 users): Limited access for monitoring, auditing, or partner visibility Total Estimated Users: Approximately 250–400 total users, with 75–125 concurrent users during peak periods. User counts are based on 58 community colleges and multiple community-based organizations, with variability in staffing levels across providers. Summary: The system must support a multi-role, role-based access model with several hundred users statewide, including both state-level and local provider users, with scalability for future growth.
3	3.0 RFP REQUIREMENTS AND SPECIFICATIONS	3.3 ENTERPRISE SPECIFICATIONS	Can the Agency provide detailed information on legacy systems in scope for migration, including the number of source systems, types of data (structured and unstructured), estimated data volumes (records, documents, and storage size), data quality considerations, required data cleansing or transformation rules, and any expectations for historical data retention or archival?	The system must support API-based integrations using RESTful services, including: Student records (demographics, attendance, assessments, PoPs) External systems (e.g., HSE, workforce systems, reporting tools) The Advansys platform demonstrates this capability via REST API endpoints supporting GET, POST, PATCH, DELETE operations with JSON payloads
4	3.0 RFP REQUIREMENTS AND SPECIFICATIONS	3.3 ENTERPRISE SPECIFICATIONS	Can the Agency provide a consolidated inventory of systems requiring integration, including system names, purpose, interface types (e.g., REST/SOAP APIs, file-based, messaging), data exchange patterns (real-time, near real-time, batch), expected data volumes and frequency, and any available interface control documents (ICDs), schemas, or API specifications	The current ecosystem includes: Title II Data Information System HSE systems (e.g., HSE Advantage) Reporting systems aligned with NRS/OCTAE requirements These systems support intake, attendance, assessments, outcomes, and federal reporting.
5	3.0 RFP REQUIREMENTS	3.3 ENTERPRISE SPECIFICATIONS	Can the Agency provide defined system performance requirements, including target response times for key transactions,	Information is not available.

	AND SPECIFICATIONS		throughput expectations, peak load conditions (e.g., concurrent users and submission spikes), acceptable latency thresholds, and any required service level objectives or performance SLAs? Rieger Answer: The system must: Support concurrent statewide users without latency Provide real-time validation and error checking at data entry Support large-scale reporting (NRS tables, ad hoc queries) Maintain high availability and responsiveness during peak usage Data validation and logic checks must occur at entry (e.g., duplicate prevention, date validation, score ranges)	
6	3.0 RFP REQUIREMENTS AND SPECIFICATIONS	3.3 ENTERPRISE SPECIFICATIONS	Can the Agency clarify the expected hosting and deployment model, including whether the solution is required to be Agency-hosted or vendor-hosted, any constraints or preferences for cloud environments, and any requirements related to cloud service providers, security authorization boundaries, or infrastructure ownership?	The system should be: Web-based and cloud-hosted Accessible via secure HTTPS connections Scalable to support load increases during peak usage API architecture should be stateless and environment-specific (e.g., staging vs production URLs)
7	3.0 RFP REQUIREMENTS AND SPECIFICATIONS	3.5 BUSINESS AND TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS	Can the Agency provide detailed operations and maintenance expectations, including required support hours and coverage model, incident response and resolution SLAs by severity level, escalation procedures, service request handling timelines, and any reporting or performance monitoring requirements?	The solution must include: Ongoing system maintenance and updates Data backup and recovery processes Monitoring and performance management Support for upgrades without disruption The system should also support configuration changes to meet evolving state and federal requirements.

8	3.0 RFP REQUIREMENTS AND SPECIFICATIONS	3.5 BUSINESS AND TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS	Can the Agency clarify detailed implementation timeline expectations, including any mandated interim milestones, sequencing constraints for phased rollout, onboarding priorities, dependencies on external systems or stakeholders, and any required transition or cutover deadlines leading up to full implementation requested by July 1, 2027?	Implementation should include: Discovery and requirements validation Data migration from legacy systems Configuration of business rules and reporting User training and documentation Customization is expected to align with NCCCS workflows and WIOA/NRS requirements.
9	3.0 RFP REQUIREMENTS AND SPECIFICATIONS	3.1 GENERAL REQUIREMENTS AND SPECIFICATIONS	The RFP indicates an expectation to leverage existing Agency licenses. Can the Agency clarify whether vendors are required to strictly utilize existing licensed platforms, or if proposing a commercial off-the-shelf platform with its own licensing model is acceptable, provided it meets all functional, technical, and security requirements?	The system must support: Interoperability with external systems via APIs Identity management and secure authentication Data exchange using standardized formats (JSON, REST)
10	Section 2.3, Page: 4	For the NCCCS system office, 58 community colleges, and 10 CBOs, how many staff members will require access to the solution?	For the NCCCS system office, 20 staff. External - The system supports a statewide user base including: ~66 providers (community colleges + CBOs) Data entry staff, instructors, administrators, and state-level users Role-based access is required, with granular permissions controlling functionality (e.g., data entry, reporting, approvals)	Section 2.3, Page: 4
11	Section 3.5.B.ii, Page: 11	How many students will be submitting intake information, and is it a one-time submission, or	Student intake volume is high (thousands annually), but interaction is typically one-time at entry, with no ongoing system access required for students.	Section 3.5.B.ii, Page: 11

		will they need ongoing access?		
12	Section 3.3.4, Page: 8	Is there a current integration platform in place?	There is no single standardized integration platform statewide; vendors should design for a flexible, hybrid integration environment.	Section 3.3.4, Page: 8
13	Section 3.3.6, Page: 9	What is the estimated total record count and historical file storage volume (in GB/TB) required for the data migration from the legacy Perkins V and WIOA systems?	Exact record counts and storage volumes are not yet defined, but vendors should plan for multi-year data, thousands of records, and significant document storage, with scalable capacity.	Section 3.3.6, Page: 9
14	Section 3.5.1.A.i, Page 10	How many external stakeholder users (i.e., workforce boards) will need access to the solution?	66 providers (community colleges + CBOs)	Section 3.5.1.A.i, Page 10
15	Section 3.5.1.D.IV, Page 12	Across all 58 colleges and historical records, what is the estimated total number of Unique Student	While an exact count is not defined, vendors should plan for hundreds of thousands of unique student profiles across multiple years, with appropriate scalability and data matching capabilities.	Section 3.5.1.D.IV, Page 12

		Profiles that will be unified?		
16	Section 3.3.4, Page 8 & Section 3.5.1.E, Page 13	How many total data sources are expected? Is it one central NCCCS SIS hub, or separate connections to 58 different Banner/Colleague instances?	There is no single SIS hub; vendors should plan for a decentralized model with multiple institutional data sources, potentially up to 58 separate connections, with flexibility for aggregation where available.	Section 3.3.4, Page 8 & Section 3.5.1.E, Page 13
17	Section 3.5.1.I, Page 13 & 14	Are there key milestones or deadlines that must be met during implementation?	While exact milestones are not predefined, the State expects a structured, phased implementation plan with standard project milestones leading to initial go-live within 9–15 months.	Section 3.5.1.I, Page 13 & 14
18	Section 3.5.1.F, Page 13	What level of training is expected (e.g., train-the-trainer, end-user training, role-based training)?	Train the trainer for NCCCS staff and then initial implementation training for the 66 providers (community colleges + CBOs)	Section 3.5.1.F, Page 13
19	Section 1, Page 3 & Section 5.2, Page 15	Can NCCCS provide additional detail on how demonstrations will be evaluated (e.g., use cases, scoring criteria,	Demonstrations will be evaluated using a rubric based on the deliverables.	Section 1, Page 3 & Section 5.2, Page 15

		required scenarios)?		
20	Section 3.5.1.D.ii, Page 12	Does NCCCS have specific expectations for automation, predictive analytics, or AI-enabled capabilities (including descriptive, predictive, prescriptive, generative, or agentic AI) within the solution?	NCCCS does not have any expectations on automation, predictive analytics, or AI-enabled capabilities but vendors may integrate them into their solution.	Section 3.5.1.D.ii, Page 12
21	7	3	In regards to 7.3 FINANCIAL RESOURCES ASSESSMENT, QUALITY ASSURANCE, PERFORMANCE AND RELIABILITY, could you please clarify if NCCCS is requiring a bid bond at this time?	The RFP does not require a bid bond.
22	4	Cost of Vendor's Offer	What is the annual budget allocated for this grant management and data system effort?	The annual budget for this grant management and data system effort has not been predetermined and will be finalized based on available funding, program needs, and the scope of services proposed. Vendors are encouraged to propose cost-effective solutions that align with the requirements outlined in this solicitation.
23	1.0 & 6.2.2	Anticipated Procurement Schedule & Questions Concerning the RFP	For clarification: Section 1.0 shows "Written Questions Deadline" as 3/21/2026, while Section 6.2.2 states 3/18/2026 at 2:00 PM. The question submission form instructions reference "the date and time listed in the Procurement Schedule section," which is	Vendor questions were submitted on time.

			3/21/2026. Can you confirm the official deadline is 3/21/2026 per the schedule?	
24	2	2.3	Is there a ceiling funding amount for this contract?	The annual budget for this grant management and data system effort has not been predetermined and will be finalized based on available funding, program needs, and the scope of services proposed. Respondents are encouraged to propose cost-effective solutions that align with the requirements outlined in this solicitation.
25	2	2.3	Is there an expected total # of FTEs for this contract?	Staffing expectations will depend on: System complexity, Integration requirements (e.g., API, ERP, MIS), Data migration scope and Ongoing support expectations
26	2	2.3	What is the current system for managing grants? Is it online or offline?	The current online ecosystem includes: A Title II MIS system with detailed student, program, and reporting functionality. The Advansys platform, which supports: Student records, Attendance, NRS Assessments; Periods of Participation (PoP) anad Transcripts. Additionally, requirements reference a structured data system aligned with WIOA reporting and federal tables. Grant management is currently completed with a Moodle platform.
27	2	2.3	Is there an existing contract for this work?	Yes, but contracts are expiring.
28	2	2.3	Approximately, how many grants are their per year? How many transactions per grant?	The system will manage two grant programs: WIOA Title II and Perkins.
29	2	2.3	Approximately, how many users will the system support?	Not explicitly stated, but based on system roles and permissions: State-level administrators, Provider-level staff (66 providers), Instructors/data entry staff. The system supports role-based access with granular permissions (view, edit, approve, etc.).
30	2	2.3	Is the application expected to be public facing or require a login of users belonging to a specific set of domains?	Partially. The system includes a forward-facing student intake/self-registration component. Core functionality (data entry, reporting, admin) is restricted via role-based permissions. The solution will likely be a hybrid: Public-facing intake and Secure internal system.
31	3	3.3.6	What is the current format of the data?	Data is structured and standardized: Stored and exchanged in JSON via REST APIs. Includes: Demographics, Attendance, Assessments, Transcripts, Program participation. Example structure includes fields like: Student ID (numeric), DOB, gender, ethnicity, Attendance history, Assessment scores, etc.
32	3	3.5.1.B	Will reports be publicly available or only available to users of the application (who have an account).	Reporting access is controlled by user roles and permissions. Data will be transferred to the NRS tables and NCCCS Data Dashboards.
33	3	3.5.1.E	Are NCCCS ERP and NCCS's student information system government hosted or	The system supports API-based integration (REST, JSON) and tracks detailed student-level data aligned with federal reporting.

			contractor hosted? What are the technologies of these applications?	
34	3	3.5.1.G	Are there any key personnel as identified by the government?	The government does not identify key personnel. NCCCS will require role based approach based on assignment.
35	4	4.2	Is there a preset list of deliverables or is it up to the contractor to identify the deliverables and their delivery dates?	The expected deliverables likely include: Grant Management system first and them System design & implementation, Data migration; API integrations, Reporting capabilities, User role/permission setup, Validation and compliance features (WIOA, NRS). Final deliverables will be defined in the RFP scope of work.
36	Section 2.2	Agency Background (page 4)	What user groups will require access to the new grants management platform? (e.g., Students, Community College Staff, Community Program Staff, NC Citizens, State Employees, etc.)	NCCCS staff (state employees), access for students (via forward-facing self-registration/intake), providers/program staff, instructors, and state/system administrators with role-based permissions.
37	Section 2.2	Agency Background (page 4)	If non-NC employee users are required to access the system, will they need to register an NCID account? If so, does NCID support self-registration for users that are not state employees?	Yes, non–State employee users (e.g., local provider staff, contractors, and other external partners) who require access to the system but may not have an NCID account.
38	Section 3.3.3	Identity and Access (page 8)	What integration protocols does NCID support for integrating external applications with the NCID identity and access management functionality?	NCID (North Carolina Identity Management) is the State's enterprise identity and access management platform and supports federated authentication using industry-standard protocols but will not be used. Vendors must support SAML 2.0 as the baseline integration protocol, with the ability to accommodate OAuth 2.0/OIDC where applicable as NCID capabilities evolve.
39	Section 3.3.3	Identity and Access (page 8)	Is NCID used only by state employees, or will public users be required to register for an NCID account in order to gain access to the new application?	Is NCID used only by state employees, or will public users be required to register for an NCID account in order to gain access to the new application? NCID will not be required for the solution.
40	Section 2.1	Intro (page 4)	What type of users will be submitting an application?	NCCCS and vendor will develop new user protocols.
41	Section 3.3.6	Data Migration (page 9)	What is the anticipated volume of records to be migrated?	Based on current system operations, transaction volumes are driven by student intake, attendance entry, assessment entry, reporting, and API integrations. The system must support: High-frequency daily transactions (attendance, enrollments, updates), Peak periods aligned with program start/end dates and reporting deadlines, Concurrent usage across ~66+ providers statewide.

				The system should be scalable to handle statewide usage with no degradation in performance, including batch reporting and real-time data entry.
42	Section 3.3.6	Data Migration (page 9)	Will there be a cap on how far back records for data migration go back, or is a wholesale migration of all past records to be considered in scope?	Per US Department of Education requirements for the grant programs, the system will need to support and import three years worth of yesteryear data.
43	Section 3.3.6	Data Migration (page 9)	Is cleansing and transformation of legacy data expected to be in scope? Who will be responsible for cleansing and transformation?	Yes, cleansing and transformation of legacy data is expected to be in the scope and it is the responsibility of the selected vendor in collaboration with NCCCS.
44	Section 3.3.6	Data Migration (page9)	Is there an existing common data model for WIOA Title II and Perkins V grant records? If not, is it expected that the vendor would need to create one as part of their scope of work?	A current student data structure/business-rule baseline exists for Title II, but not a separate common data model for grant records. Vendors should plan to define detailed data mapping/modeling during discovery and migration.
45	Section 3.3.6	Data Migration (page 9)	What are the systems of record and data formats for legacy records?	The current student system is Advansys/Benchmark ITS. Student data is exposed through a REST API over HTTPS with JSON responses.
46	Section 2.3	Problem Statement (page 4)	As we review the RFP and the explore current capabilities within the current NC ecosystem, there are a number of ways to approach this. Would NC be willing to host a vendor day to discuss formulating an approach with their existing tools versus procuring a new SaaS-based solution?	Finalists will have a demonstration day. Awarded vendor will collaborate with NCCCS on implementation.
47	Section 2.3	Problem Statement (page 4)	What system(s) are currently used for WIOA Title II and Perkins V grant management and student tracking? Are they the same system, or separate systems? Who owns each system? Can the state provide a current-state architecture diagram for this system(s) to include the technology stack, application and system boundaries, and databases	Grant management system is managed in Moodle. The current Title II student-tracking environment is Advansys/Benchmark ITS (student records API plus Title II MIS requirements).

			involved?	
48	Section 3.5	D-Capabilities, iv (page 12)	Number of internal users and external users?	Internal: 20 users. External: The system supports a statewide user base including: ~66 Title II providers (community colleges + CBOs), Data entry staff, instructors, administrators, and state-level users. Role-based access is required, with granular permissions controlling functionality (e.g., data entry, reporting, approvals).
49	Section 3.5	D-Capabilities, iv (page 12)	How many concurrent users does the grants management system need to support? What is the expected user growth during the period of performance? Can the state indicate performance metrics to help mitigate unbound performance engineering scope?	The State anticipates approximately 250–400 registered users across all Title II providers, with an estimated 75–125 concurrent users during peak operational periods (e.g., quarterly reporting deadlines, NRS submissions, and fiscal closeout activities). User roles include local provider data entry staff, program administrators, state-level monitors, and system administrators. Concurrency is typically highest during standard business hours (8:00 AM–5:00 PM ET), with occasional after-hours usage near reporting deadlines. Expected Growth: The State anticipates modest growth of 10–20% over the period of performance, driven by:Expansion or consolidation of provider agencies, Increased data reporting requirements, and Potential integration with additional workforce or education systems. Vendors should design for scalable growth up to at least 500 total users and 150 concurrent users without degradation in performance. Performance Expectations / Metrics: To reduce ambiguity in performance engineering, the State expects the system to meet the following baseline service levels: Page load times: ≤ 3 seconds for 95% of standard user transactions Data entry/save operations: ≤ 2 seconds under normal load Batch processing (e.g., NRS tables, data validation): Completed within reasonable operational windows (e.g., <15 minutes for standard reporting jobs) System availability: ≥ 99.5% uptime, excluding scheduled maintenance Scalability: Ability to maintain performance thresholds during peak concurrent usage without manual intervention Data integrity: No loss or corruption of user-entered data during high-load conditions The State prefers a cloud-based, elastic architecture that can dynamically scale resources during peak usage periods.

50	Section 3.3.4 & 3.5.E (Pages 8 & 13)	Integration Approach (pages 8 & 13)	Can the state please clarify what technologies comprise and what integration protocols are supported by NCID for SSO, the Student Information System, NCCS, and both the Banner and Ellucian ERP systems? Do all of these systems have consumable APIs, or will they require another integration method?	The State's technology environment includes a combination of enterprise identity management, a centralized Title II MIS (Advansys), and distributed institutional systems across the North Carolina Community College System (NCCCS). Integration capabilities vary by system; therefore, vendors must support a hybrid integration model. Support for OAuth 2.0 / OpenID Connect (OIDC) is preferred but not required at this time. Title II MIS (Advansys): The State's current Management Information System (Advansys) includes API capabilities for student records and program data, as outlined in the State's technical documentation. Key integration characteristics include: RESTful API endpoints for student-level data (e.g., enrollment, demographics, outcomes) Structured data exchange formats (JSON and/or XML) Authentication and authorization controls consistent with State IT security standards Support for incremental data exchange and system-to-system communication In addition to APIs, the system supports: Batch file processing (CSV/XML) via secure transfer (e.g., SFTP) Data extracts for federal reporting (e.g., NRS tables) Vendors should design integrations assuming API-first where available, with batch-based alternatives as needed. NCCCS (North Carolina Community College System): The NCCCS environment is decentralized, with 58 community colleges operating local systems that may vary in configuration and capability. Integration methods may include: REST or SOAP APIs (where enabled locally) Secure file exchanges (CSV/XML via SFTP) ETL processes or scheduled data synchronization Vendors must support configurable integration patterns to accommodate variability across institutions. Banner / Ellucian ERP Systems:

				Many NCCCS institutions utilize Ellucian Banner, which may include access to: Ellucian Ethos Integration (RESTful APIs) SOAP-based web services (legacy support) Database-level access (read-only, where permitted by institution) Batch file interfaces API availability and maturity vary by institution; therefore, vendors should not assume uniform access to modern APIs across all colleges. Overall Integration Expectations: The State environment includes both consumable APIs and non-API integration methods Vendors must support RESTful API integration, as well as file-based and ETL-based approaches Solutions must be secure, scalable, and adaptable to varying technical capabilities across partner systems Vendors should clearly describe how their solution handles: Systems with limited or no API availability Data validation, error handling, and reconciliation across integration points Future-state modernization, including increased API adoption over time Summary: The State confirms that some systems (including Advansys and portions of Banner/Ethos) provide consumable APIs, while others may require batch or intermediary integration methods. Vendors are expected to support a flexible, hybrid integration architecture that can evolve as system capabilities mature.
51	Section 3.5.B	Data Analytics and Reporting (page 11)	Can the state please provide a detailed list and count of the reports that will be required? Will these reports require access to information contained in other systems of record or databases outside of the grants management system?	The State anticipates a comprehensive set of reports to support federal (e.g., NRS), state, fiscal, and programmatic reporting requirements, as well as operational and ad hoc reporting needs. At this time, the State estimates approximately 75–125 standard reports, including but not limited to: Federal reporting (e.g., NRS tables, performance outcomes) Participant-level and aggregate data reports Fiscal and grant tracking reports Data validation and error reports Monitoring and compliance reports User activity and audit reports In addition to standard reports, the State expects the system to support ad hoc reporting and configurable dashboards for state and local users.

				Some reports may require integration with or access to data from external systems, including but not limited to: The Title II MIS (student-level data system) NCCCS and local institutional systems (e.g., Banner/Ellucian) Potential financial or grants-related systems of record Vendors should assume that reporting will be based on a combination of data housed within the grants management system and data integrated from external systems, and should describe their approach to data aggregation, synchronization, and ensuring data consistency across sources.
52	Section 3.5.B	Data Analytics and Reporting (page 11)	Can the state please clarify reporting requirements, will near-real time dynamic dashboards and configured reports that can be run and sent based on frequency and recipient parameters both be required?	Yes, the State requires support for both near real-time, dynamic dashboards and configurable, scheduled reporting. The solution should provide: Interactive dashboards with near real-time data updates to support program monitoring, performance management, and operational decision-making at both the state and local levels Configurable reports that can be generated on demand and scheduled for automated distribution based on defined parameters (e.g., frequency, user roles, and recipient groups) Flexible delivery options (e.g., system notifications, secure email, downloadable formats) Vendors should ensure that reporting tools are user-friendly, role-based, and support both standard and ad hoc reporting needs, with the ability to manage data refresh timing and report distribution in alignment with business requirements.
53	Section 3.2	Security Specifications (pages 6 & 7)	Can the state please clarify the required certifications at award vs post-award?	The State expects vendors to clearly identify all relevant certifications held at the time of proposal submission/award and those that will be obtained or maintained post-award. At Award: Vendors should possess and demonstrate current compliance with baseline security and operational standards, such as: Industry-recognized security frameworks (e.g., SOC 2 Type II or equivalent) Compliance with State of North Carolina IT security policies and standards Any required business registrations, insurance, and contractual certifications Post-Award: Vendors will be expected to maintain existing certifications and obtain any additional certifications required to support the solution over the life of the contract, which may include:

				Ongoing security compliance attestations and audits Alignment with State or federal requirements (e.g., data protection, accessibility such as Section 508/WCAG) Participation in State security reviews, risk assessments, and authorization processes (as applicable) Summary: Vendors must demonstrate current compliance at the time of award and commit to maintaining and/or obtaining required certifications post-award to ensure continued alignment with State and federal standards.
54	Section 3.2	Security Specifications (pages 6 &7)	Any state-specific overlays beyond NIST?	Yes. In addition to alignment with NIST-based frameworks, vendors must comply with State of North Carolina–specific security policies, standards, and procedures, as established by the State's enterprise IT governance. These include, but are not limited to: North Carolina Statewide Information Security Manual (NC SISM) State requirements for identity and access management (e.g., NCID integration) Data classification, privacy, and protection standards Incident response and breach notification requirements Accessibility standards (e.g., Section 508 / WCAG compliance) Vendors will be expected to align with all applicable State security controls and participate in State security reviews, risk assessments, and authorization processes as required. Summary: Yes—vendors must meet State-specific security overlays in addition to NIST, including compliance with NC SISM and other applicable North Carolina IT and data governance standards.
55	Section 3.5.I	Project Implementation (page 14)	Does the state prefer a phased rollout? If so, which grant program should be prioritized first?	Yes, the State prefers a phased rollout approach to reduce risk and support effective implementation across providers. The State anticipates prioritizing core grants management functionality for Title II (Adult Education and Family Literacy Act – AEFLA) as the initial phase, given its alignment with the primary user base and existing system dependencies. This includes functions such as application submission, review, award management, and performance tracking. Subsequent phases may include: Expansion to additional grant programs (as applicable) Enhanced integrations with external systems (e.g., MIS, financial systems) Advanced reporting and monitoring capabilities

				Vendors should propose a flexible, phased implementation plan that supports iterative deployment, user validation, and scalability across programs.
56	Section 3.5.I	Project Implementation (page 14)	Does the state prefer to pilot the new application with a single or small group of community college(s) and a community-based stakeholder prior to a larger rollout to the broader 58 colleges and community-based programs?	Yes, the State prefers to pilot the solution with a small group of representative providers prior to full statewide rollout. The pilot group is expected to include a subset of community colleges and at least one community-based organization (CBO) to ensure the solution is validated across different provider types and operational contexts. The pilot will allow the State to: Validate core functionality (e.g., application, award, reporting) Test integrations with the Title II MIS and other systems Gather user feedback and refine workflows Identify and resolve issues prior to broader deployment Following a successful pilot, the State anticipates a phased rollout to all 58 community colleges and additional CBO providers. Vendors should propose an approach that supports pilot implementation, feedback cycles, training, and scalable deployment.
57	Section 7.11 Project Management	Project Management (page 26)	Who owns data governance, change management, and final acceptance? Rieger Answer: The State retains primary ownership of data governance, change management, and final acceptance for the system.	Data Governance: The State is responsible for establishing and enforcing data governance policies, including data standards, data quality, access controls, and compliance with state and federal reporting requirements. Change Management: The State will lead change management activities, including prioritization and approval of system changes, with vendor support for implementation, impact analysis, and release management processes. Final Acceptance: Final system acceptance will be determined by the State based on successful completion of agreed-upon deliverables, testing (e.g., user acceptance testing), and compliance with contractual and functional requirements. Summary: The vendor will support these functions, but the State maintains oversight, authority, and final decision-making responsibility.
58	Section 3.3.5	Business Continuity (page 8)	Does the State has a required uptime SLA?	Yes. The State expects the solution to meet a minimum uptime Service Level Agreement (SLA) of 99.5% availability, excluding approved scheduled maintenance windows. Vendors should: Clearly define their SLA commitments, including uptime calculations and exclusions Provide monitoring, alerting, and incident response procedures Describe disaster recovery and business continuity capabilities

				Higher availability (e.g., 99.9% or greater) is preferred and may be considered favorably.
59	Section 3.3.5	Business Continuity (page 8)	Does the State enforce penalties beyond standard SaaS terms?	Yes. The State reserves the right to enforce contractual remedies beyond standard SaaS terms, consistent with State procurement and contracting requirements.
60	Section 4.0 & Attachment D	Cost Form (pages 14, 57,58)	Is there a preferred software pricing model structure (e.g., per user, per institution, or enterprise)?	No, an enterprise price is preferred.
61	Attachment B	Subpart 5-Travel (page 28)	Is there any expectation for on-site contractor staff? If so, can the state please indicate which roles would be required to be on-site? And if that on-site presence expectation is full-time, or part-time as needed for stakeholder workshops, etc.?	No full-time on-site staffing is required; however, vendors should plan for occasional, as-needed on-site support for critical project milestones.
62	Attachment B	Subpart 5-Travel (page 28)	Can the state indicate if they have an expected travel budget for this contract that the vendor can plan against as they formulate their pricing? Is there a not-to-exceed monthly travel allowance that the state has in mind?	The State has not established a predefined or not-to-exceed travel budget for this contract. Vendors should propose reasonable and necessary travel costs based on their recommended implementation and support approach. Travel is expected to be limited and event-based (e.g., kickoff, key workshops, pilot support, training, and go-live activities), consistent with a primarily remote delivery model. Vendors should: Clearly itemize all anticipated travel costs Align travel with project milestones and on-site needs Follow State travel policies and reimbursement guidelines (as applicable)
63	Attachment B	Subpart 9-Acceptance (page 30)	Can the state provide their acceptance criteria for software and non-software deliverables in the RFP? (as payment is directly tied to acceptance per Attachment B, Subpart 10)	The State will define detailed acceptance criteria in collaboration with the selected vendor; however, at a minimum, acceptance of both software and non-software deliverables will be based on the following standards: Software Deliverables: Alignment with functional and technical requirements defined in the RFP and agreed-upon specifications Successful completion of system, integration, and user acceptance testing (UAT) with no critical defects and acceptable resolution of non-critical issues Verification of security, accessibility (e.g., Section 508/WCAG), and performance requirements Successful execution of data migration and validation activities (as applicable)

				Delivery of required documentation (e.g., system design, user guides, technical documentation) Non-Software Deliverables: Completion of deliverables in accordance with approved project plans, timelines, and scope Review and approval of project artifacts (e.g., implementation plans, training materials, test plans, reports) Demonstrated completeness, accuracy, and usability of deliverables Incorporation of State feedback and required revisions General Acceptance Process: Deliverables will be subject to State review within a defined acceptance period The State will provide formal acceptance or documented deficiencies Vendors will be required to remediate identified issues prior to final acceptance Payment will be tied to successful completion and formal acceptance of deliverables as outlined in the contract Summary: Acceptance will be based on compliance with requirements, successful testing and validation, and State approval of deliverables, with payment contingent upon meeting these criteria.
64	Attachment B	Subpart 9-Acceptance (page 30)	How long will the vendor have to correct a deliverable that is deemed unacceptable by the State?	The exact timeframe may vary based on the nature, complexity, and severity of the deficiencies. The State may require: Shorter turnaround times for critical issues or time-sensitive deliverables A corrective action plan outlining steps and timelines for resolution All corrections must be completed to the State’s satisfaction prior to final acceptance and associated payment.
65	Section 3.5.1	Subpart A and B (pages 10,11)	Where applicable, does the state have structured data types for expected Application Intake values, as well as defined validation logic, or will this need to be defined during discovery?	The State has some existing structured data elements and validation rules, particularly those aligned to federal reporting (e.g., NRS), program requirements, and current MIS (Advansys) data standards. These include defined data fields, formats, and business rules for key elements such as participant demographics, enrollment, outcomes, and performance measures. However, for the grants management application intake process, the State anticipates that additional data structures, field definitions, and validation logic will be refined and finalized during discovery and design in collaboration with the selected vendor. Vendors should: Leverage existing State and federal data standards where applicable Support configurable data fields and validation rules

				Provide tools for managing and updating validation logic without extensive custom development Summary: A foundation of structured data and validation exists, but final definitions for application intake will be completed during discovery, with an expectation of flexibility and configurability in the solution.
66	Section 3.5.1	Subpart B, I (page 11)	Does the state currently use any third party tools like Power BI to create data visualizations? Is the expectation that existing data analytics tools will need to access the new grants management system data? How many dashboards will the state require and is it expected that all of the data being visualized by the dashboards will be contained in the new grants management system, or will data from other sources need to be included as well?	The State currently utilizes data visualization and analytics tools (e.g., Power BI or similar platforms) to support reporting and performance monitoring. The State expects that existing analytics tools will continue to be used and will require access to data from the new grants management system, either through direct data connections, APIs, or curated data extracts. Dashboards: The State anticipates a combination of: Standard dashboards (estimated 10–20) to support statewide oversight, federal reporting, fiscal tracking, and program performance Configurable/ad hoc dashboards for state and local users Data Sources: Dashboards will not be limited to data within the grants management system. The State expects dashboards to incorporate data from multiple sources, including: The Title II MIS (student-level data system) NCCCS/local systems (e.g., Banner/Ellucian) Potential financial or grants-related systems Vendors should support: Data accessibility for external analytics tools (e.g., APIs, secure data exports, or data warehouse integration) The ability to combine and reconcile data from multiple systems Role-based access and data security controls for all reporting outputs Summary: Yes—existing analytics tools will continue to be leveraged. The State expects support for both system-native dashboards and external reporting tools, with dashboards drawing on integrated data from multiple systems, not solely the grants management system.

67	Section 3.5.1	Subpart A, iv (page 10)	Does the state have defined compliance checks for each grant program? Is each program subject to unique compliance checks, and how often are those modified? Does any underlying business logic need to be configurable to adapt to changing compliance requirements?	The State has defined compliance requirements and monitoring criteria aligned with federal (e.g., WIOA Title II) and state policies. While there is significant overlap across programs, individual grant programs may have program-specific compliance checks, rules, and documentation requirements. Compliance requirements are periodically updated, typically driven by: Changes in federal or state regulations and guidance Updates to program policy or performance expectations Continuous process improvement and monitoring findings As such, the State requires that underlying business logic be highly configurable to support evolving compliance needs. This includes the ability to: Configure and update validation rules, workflows, and required fields Modify compliance checklists and monitoring criteria Adjust business rules without extensive custom development or vendor intervention Summary: Yes—compliance checks exist and may vary by program, and they are subject to periodic change. The system must support flexible, configurable business logic to adapt to evolving compliance requirements.
68	Section 3.5.1	Subpart A, vi (page 10)	Can the state provide requirements for the "comprehensive local needs assessment" feature?	The State anticipates that the system will support the Comprehensive Local Needs Assessment (CLNA) as part of the broader application and planning process; however, detailed requirements will be refined during discovery and design in collaboration with the selected vendor. At a minimum, the CLNA feature should support: Structured data collection: Configurable forms/templates to capture required elements such as labor market data, participant demographics, service gaps, and program needs Narrative and document submission: Ability for providers to enter narrative responses and upload supporting documentation Data integration: Incorporation of relevant data from existing systems (e.g., Title II MIS, labor market information sources) where available Workflow and approvals: Support for review, feedback, and approval processes at the State level Versioning and audit trail: Tracking of submissions, revisions, and approvals over time Alignment to federal and state requirements: Flexibility to adapt to evolving guidance and policy updates The State expects the CLNA functionality to be configurable and reusable across grant cycles, with the ability to update

				requirements without significant custom development. Summary: High-level requirements are defined, but detailed specifications for the CLNA feature will be finalized during discovery, with an emphasis on configurability, integration, and workflow support.
69	Section 3.5.1	Subpart A, vi (page 10)	Do the narrative response fields require rich text formatting functionality? Do the narrative fields have word count limits? Yes, the State expects narrative response fields to support basic rich text formatting, such as bold, italics, bulleting, and paragraph structure, to improve readability and usability for applicants and reviewers. Narrative fields may include word count or character limits, depending on the specific question or section. These limits are not universally defined at this time and will be configurable by the State based on program and application requirements. Vendors should ensure the solution supports: Configurable rich text editors for narrative fields The ability to set and enforce word/character limits Validation messaging when limits are exceeded Summary: Yes—rich text formatting is required, and word/character limits will be configurable	Do the narrative response fields require rich text formatting functionality? Do the narrative fields have word count limits? Yes, the State expects narrative response fields to support basic rich text formatting, such as bold, italics, bulleting, and paragraph structure, to improve readability and usability for applicants and reviewers. Narrative fields may include word count or character limits, depending on the specific question or section. These limits are not universally defined at this time and will be configurable by the State based on program and application requirements. Vendors should ensure the solution supports: Configurable rich text editors for narrative fields The ability to set and enforce word/character limits Validation messaging when limits are exceeded Summary: Yes—rich text formatting is required, and word/character limits will be configurable based on the specific application requirements.

			based on the specific application requirements.	
70	Section 3.5.1	Subpart A, vi (page 10)	Is unstructured data provided in the narrative fields subject to any validation checks or used in any reporting?	Unstructured data entered in narrative fields is primarily used for qualitative review, evaluation, and monitoring purposes and is not generally subject to the same level of validation as structured data elements. Basic validation may be applied, such as: Required field enforcement Word/character limits File type/format checks (for attachments) At this time, narrative data is not expected to be a primary source for standardized reporting (e.g., federal/NRS reporting). However, it may be: Referenced in reviews, scoring, and monitoring activities Used for limited internal analysis or keyword-based search (if supported by the solution) Vendors are not expected to implement complex validation rules on unstructured narrative data, but should support searchability, accessibility, and usability of this information within the system. Summary: Narrative data is mainly for qualitative use with minimal validation, and while it may support limited internal analysis, it is not a core source for structured reporting.
71	Section 3.5.1.	Subpart B, iii (page 11)	Is there a current format for the "Unique identifier" for records associated with students that do not provide a SSN? If so, what is that format? Will that format need to be carried over into the new system, or can whatever native unique record identification numbering schema a SaaS tool uses be utilized? The State currently utilizes a system-generated unique identifier within the Title II MIS (Advansys) for participants who do not provide a Social Security Number (SSN). This	Is there a current format for the "Unique identifier" for records associated with students that do not provide a SSN? If so, what is that format? Will that format need to be carried over into the new system, or can whatever native unique record identification numbering schema a SaaS tool uses be utilized? The State currently utilizes a system-generated unique identifier within the Title II MIS (Advansys) for participants who do not provide a Social Security Number (SSN). This identifier is used to ensure unique tracking of individuals across records and reporting processes. The exact format of this identifier is defined within the existing system; however, the State does not require vendors to replicate the exact formatting schema, provided that the proposed solution can:

			identifier is used to ensure unique tracking of individuals across records and reporting processes. The exact format of this identifier is defined within the existing system; however, the State does not require vendors to replicate the exact formatting schema, provided that the proposed solution can:	
72	Section 3.5.1.	Subpart A, I (page 10)	Will grant record unique identifiers need to follow a specific format? If a SaaS product is utilized, can the native unique record identification number suffice? Can the State provide all of the attributes/expected form fields for each grant program's application form?	The State does not require grant record unique identifiers to follow a specific predefined format. Vendors may utilize a native unique identifier schema within their SaaS solution, provided it ensures: Vendors should describe how their solution manages unique record identification, sequencing (if applicable), and referential integrity across related records (e.g., applications, awards, amendments).
73	Section 3.5.1	Subpart A, v (page 10)	Are there any exception or appeal workflows that will need to be accounted for? If so, can the State please provide those requirements in this section?	Yes, the State anticipates the need to support exception and appeal workflows within the grants management system; however, detailed requirements will be refined during discovery and design
74	Attachment D	Cost Form (pages 57,58)	If the State is expecting a firm-fixed price contract can they please provide the requirements associated with the features described in Section 3.5 with acceptance criteria for all deliverables?	If the State is expecting a firm-fixed price contract can they please provide the requirements associated with the features described in Section 3.5 with acceptance criteria for all deliverables?
75	Section 3.5.1 Terms and Conditions	Subpart G,i- Personnel (page 13)	Can the State confirm that it is leaving the designation of key personnel solely up to the vendor?	The state maintains oversight and approval authority to ensure appropriate staffing for successful project execution.
76	3.5.1.B.vii		Does NCCCS currently utilize Microsoft cloud services, such as Microsoft 365, Dynamics 365, Power Apps, Azure, or SharePoint Online? If so, do any of the users of this new	Yes, the North Carolina Community College System (NCCCS) and its institutions utilize Microsoft cloud services, including Microsoft 365 (e.g., Outlook, Teams, SharePoint Online) and, in some cases, Azure-based services. Usage may vary across individual colleges due to the decentralized nature of the system. Many users who will access the new Grants Management system (e.g., state staff and local provider staff) already use Microsoft

			Grants Management system use those Microsoft cloud services?	365 tools in their daily operations. However, the State does not require the proposed solution to be built on or dependent upon Microsoft-specific platforms. Vendors may propose solutions that: Integrate with Microsoft services where appropriate (e.g., email notifications, document management, authentication if applicable) Operate independently of Microsoft platforms while still supporting standard integration methods Summary: Yes—Microsoft cloud services are in use across NCCCS, and many end users are familiar with them; however, use of Microsoft technologies is not a requirement, and solutions should remain platform-agnostic with integration flexibility.
77	3.5.1.B.vii		What the types/roles of users accessing the software and number of users in each type/role?	The State anticipates multiple user types accessing the system across state and local levels. While exact counts may vary, the following represents the expected roles and estimated user distribution: User Types / Roles: State Administrators (10–20 users): Full system access for oversight, configuration, monitoring, and reporting State Program & Fiscal Staff (20–40 users): Review applications, manage awards, monitor performance, and conduct compliance activities Local Provider Administrators (60–80 users): Manage organizational submissions, oversee staff, and coordinate grant activities Local Provider Staff / Data Entry Users (150–250 users): Enter application data, upload documentation, manage budgets, and support reporting Read-Only / External Stakeholders (25–50 users): Limited access for monitoring, auditing, or partner visibility Total Estimated Users: Approximately 250–400 total users, with 75–125 concurrent users during peak periods. User counts are based on 58 community colleges and multiple community-based organizations, with variability in staffing levels across providers. Summary:

				The system must support a multi-role, role-based access model with several hundred users statewide, including both state-level and local provider users, with scalability for future growth.
78	3.5.1.B.vii		How many total users will need access to the software?	The State estimates approximately 250–400 total users will require access to the system across all roles (state staff, local provider administrators, and local provider staff). User counts are based on participation from 58 community colleges and multiple community-based organizations, with variability in staffing levels across providers. The system should be designed to support scalability beyond this range, with anticipated growth of 10–20% over the life of the contract.
79	n/a		What is the budget for this project?	The annual budget for this grant management and data system effort has not been predetermined and will be finalized based on available funding, program needs, and the scope of services proposed. Vendors are encouraged to propose cost-effective solutions that align with the requirements outlined in this solicitation.
80	2.3		Are applicants individuals, organizations, both, or other?	Applicants are organizations, not individuals. Eligible applicants include local provider entities, such as: Community colleges (primary providers) Community-based organizations (CBOs) and other eligible entities as defined by program requirements Individual users will access the system on behalf of their organization, but applications are submitted and managed at the organizational level.
81	2.3		Are Perkins V applicants and recipients Community Colleges throughout the state?	Yes. For purposes of this RFP, Perkins V applicants and recipients are the North Carolina Community Colleges throughout the state. The North Carolina Community College System (NCCCS) serves as the primary eligible recipient for Perkins V funds, with local community colleges acting as subrecipients responsible for application submission, implementation, and reporting.
82	2.3		Are WIOA Title II applicants and recipients Community Colleges throughout the state?	No. WIOA Title II (Adult Education and Family Literacy Act – AEFLA) applicants and recipients are not limited to community colleges. Eligible applicants include a range of local provider organizations, such as: Community colleges (primary providers in North Carolina)

				Community-based organizations (CBOs) Other eligible entities as defined under WIOA Title II In North Carolina, the majority of providers are community colleges (58), with the remaining providers being community-based organizations and other eligible entities. Summary: WIOA Title II applicants and recipients include both community colleges and non-college providers, not exclusively community colleges.
83	2.3		Will there be individuals using the software to apply for grants/funding?	No. The system is intended for organizational applicants, not individual applicants. While individual users (e.g., staff at community colleges or community-based organizations) will access and use the system, they will do so on behalf of their organization. All applications, submissions, and awards are managed at the organizational level, not the individual level.
84	3.5.1.B.iii		In regards to Data Validation and Error checking in the RFP - will this data be provided/reported by the Community Colleges to NCCCS or by the individuals themselves?	Data subject to validation and error checking will be entered and submitted by local provider organizations, primarily community colleges (and community-based organizations), to the State (NCCCS). Individual users will input data within the system; however, they do so on behalf of their organization, and all data is submitted, certified, and reported at the organizational level, not by individuals independently. Vendors should ensure the solution supports: Field-level and cross-field validation at the point of data entry Error checking and data quality controls prior to submission Organizational review and certification workflows before final submission to the State Summary: Data is entered by individual users but reported and validated at the organizational (provider) level to NCCCS.
85	3.3.6		Please provide more information regarding the data structure and quantity of existing data to be migrated into the new system. For example, will the data be migrated from other systems or Excel/Access files? How many records in those systems or files, and	The State anticipates that data migration will involve a combination of structured data from existing systems and, in some cases, supplemental data from files (e.g., Excel or similar formats). The primary system of record for program-related data is the Title II MIS (Advansys), with additional grant-related data potentially residing in legacy tracking tools or internal files. Data Sources: Primary: Title II MIS (Advansys) – structured, system-based data

			what data is to be migrated (e.g. grants, awards, transactions, payments, etc.)?	Secondary: Existing grant tracking tools, spreadsheets (e.g., Excel), and limited ad hoc data sources Data Types to be Migrated (anticipated): Grant applications and narratives Award records and funding allocations Budgets and budget revisions Performance and program-related data (as needed for context/reporting) Monitoring, compliance, and audit records User and organizational data Attachments and supporting documentation (where applicable) Data Volume: The State does not have a finalized record count at this time; however, vendors should anticipate: Multiple years of historical data (to be defined during discovery) Data associated with 58 community colleges and additional CBO providers Potentially thousands of grant-related records and associated transactions/documents Migration Approach: Final scope (e.g., number of years, specific datasets) will be determined during discovery The State may elect to migrate a combination of active and select historical data, with older data potentially archived Vendors should support data mapping, transformation, validation, and reconciliation across multiple source formats Summary: Data will be migrated from a mix of existing systems and file-based sources, with multiple years of grant, program, and organizational data. Exact volumes and scope will be finalized during discovery, and vendors should propose a flexible, scalable migration approach.
86	3.3.4		The RFP mentions integration with a) NCID for single sign-on, 2) Ellucian Colleague Student Information System, and 3) Ellucian Banner ERP - can you confirm those are the 3 required integrations that must be completed as part of the implementation?	The integrations identified in the RFP, Ellucian Colleague Student Information System, and Ellucian Banner ERP—represent key systems within the State's current environment; however, they should not be interpreted as the only required integrations for implementation. At a minimum: NCID integration for authentication (SSO) is not required Integration with student information systems (e.g., Colleague, Banner) is anticipated, but may vary by institution and use case

				The State expects the solution to support a flexible, scalable integration framework capable of accommodating: Variability across institutions (e.g., some using Banner, others Colleague) Integration with the Title II MIS (Advansys) and other relevant systems Both API-based and file-based integration methods, depending on system capabilities Summary: NCID is not required integration, while integrations with Colleague and Banner are expected but may be implemented based on defined use cases and priorities during implementation. Vendors should design for a broader, adaptable integration approach rather than limiting scope to only these three systems.
87	3.5.1.E		For the integration with Colleague, describe what you seek in this integration, i.e. one-way or bi-directional, what data is to be sent or received, on what frequency?	The State anticipates that integration with the state ERP and will support data exchange necessary for program alignment, reporting, and data validation, but detailed requirements will be refined during discovery. Integration Direction: Primarily one-way (ERP → Grants Management System) for reference and validation data Limited bi-directional integration may be required for specific use cases, but is not assumed as a baseline requirement Data Elements (anticipated): Student enrollment and status information (as needed for validation or reporting alignment) Course/program participation data Institutional identifiers and organizational data Potential outcomes or completion indicators (where relevant and available) Frequency: Preferably scheduled/batch integration (e.g., nightly or periodic sync) Near real-time or API-based exchange may be considered where supported and justified by the use case Integration Approach: Support for API-based integration (preferred where available) Ability to accommodate file-based exchanges (e.g., CSV/XML via secure transfer) where APIs are not available Configurable to align with institution-specific capabilities and data availability

				Summary: The State expects a primarily one-way, batch-oriented integration from Colleague, with flexibility to support API-based or file-based methods, and the potential for limited bi-directional exchange if required by specific use cases.
88	2.0 FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS		Is NCCCS looking to purchase a relational-based or form-based system? (i.e., relational-based systems keep all data and documents connected to the record, form-based collects data and documents in different places, such as attached to the application or different workflows, typically forcing customers to export data into spreadsheets for accurate reporting and document reconciliation).	The State prefers a relational, data-driven system architecture that maintains structured relationships between records, transactions, and supporting documentation. The desired solution should: Maintain data integrity and relationships across entities (e.g., applicants, applications, awards, budgets, performance data) Store and associate documents and attachments directly with relevant records Support robust reporting and analytics without reliance on manual data extraction or reconciliation Enable end-to-end traceability across the grant lifecycle While form-based components (e.g., application intake forms) are expected as part of the user interface, the underlying system should be relational rather than siloed or document-centric. Summary: The State prefers a relational-based system, with form-based functionality layered on top for data collection, ensuring integrated data, reporting, and lifecycle management.
89	2.1 INTRODUCTION		Can NCCCS clarify whether the system is expected to function as a system of record for student-level data, or integrate with existing systems (e.g., SIS) that serve as the system of record?	The grants management system is not intended to serve as the system of record for student-level data. The Title II MIS (Advansys) and institutional systems (e.g., SIS platforms such as Banner or Colleague) will remain the authoritative systems of record for student data. The grants management system is expected to: Integrate with existing systems to consume relevant student-level data as needed Support data display, validation, and reporting context within grant workflows Avoid duplicating or maintaining authoritative student records Summary: The system will integrate with existing systems of record for student data, rather than replace them.
90	2.1 INTRODUCTION		Is NCCCS currently managing its processes manually or with a GMS? If a GMS, which GMS are you currently using and what are	The State is currently managing grants processes through a combination of internal tools, existing systems, and manual workflows, rather than a single, centralized grants management system (GMS). Key Pain Points:

			three pain points you are having with the system? If a manual process, what are your three biggest pain points with your process?	Fragmented processes and lack of standardization: Activities such as application intake, review, award management, and reporting are handled across multiple tools (e.g., spreadsheets, documents, and systems), resulting in inefficiencies and inconsistent processes. Manual workflows and administrative burden: Many processes rely on manual tracking, routing, and approvals, increasing the risk of errors, delays, and lack of transparency. Limited reporting and data visibility: Challenges exist in generating timely, accurate, and consolidated reports, particularly when data must be compiled from multiple sources, leading to limited real-time insight for decision-making. Summary: The current environment is partially manual and decentralized, and the State is seeking a modern, integrated solution to improve efficiency, data quality, and reporting capabilities.
91	3.2 SECURITY SPECIFICATIONS	3.2.2 SOLUTIONS NOT HOSTED ON STATE INFRASTRUCTUR E	The RFP references NIST 800-53 and third-party assessments. Can NCCCS clarify whether there are any additional state-specific security controls, documentation, or ongoing audit requirements beyond those listed?	Yes. In addition to alignment with NIST 800-53 and applicable third-party security assessments (e.g., SOC 2, ISO 27001), vendors must comply with State of North Carolina–specific security requirements. These include, but are not limited to: North Carolina Statewide Information Security Manual (NC SISM) and related policies State requirements for identity and access management (e.g., NCID integration) Data classification, privacy, and protection standards Incident response and breach notification requirements Accessibility requirements (e.g., Section 508 / WCAG) Ongoing Requirements: Vendors may be required to: Participate in State security reviews, risk assessments, and authorization processes Provide security documentation and attestations upon request Support periodic audits or compliance reviews in alignment with State and federal requirements Summary: Yes—there are State-specific security controls and ongoing compliance expectations beyond NIST, including adherence to NC SISM and related governance processes.
92	3.2 SECURITY SPECIFICATIONS	3.2.2 SOLUTIONS NOT HOSTED ON STATE	The RFP references multiple regulatory frameworks (e.g., FERPA, HIPAA, PCI DSS).	The State references multiple regulatory frameworks to reflect the range of data types and potential integrations that may be involved. Not all frameworks are universally required; applicability depends on the nature of the data handled by the solution.

		INFRASTRUCTURE	Can NCCCS clarify which are strictly required versus conditionally applicable?	Strictly Required / Generally Applicable: FERPA (Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act): Required to the extent the system handles student-level education records or data derived from the Title II MIS State security and privacy requirements: Including NC SISM, data protection standards, and related State policies Conditionally Applicable (based on use case): HIPAA (Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act): Applicable only if the system processes or stores protected health information (PHI), which is not a standard requirement for this solution PCI DSS (Payment Card Industry Data Security Standard): Applicable only if the system processes, transmits, or stores payment card data, which is not anticipated as part of the core scope Expectation: Vendors should: Demonstrate compliance with applicable frameworks based on their proposed solution and data handling Clearly identify which standards apply to their architecture and how compliance is maintained Summary: FERPA and State security requirements are expected, while HIPAA and PCI DSS are conditionally applicable depending on whether those specific data types are involved.
93	3.2 SECURITY SPECIFICATIONS	3.2.2 SOLUTIONS NOT HOSTED ON STATE INFRASTRUCTURE	Can NCCCS distinguish between requirements expected of the system itself versus vendor operational processes (e.g., incident response, policies)?	Yes. The State distinguishes between system-level requirements (capabilities of the solution) and vendor operational requirements (policies, processes, and controls maintained by the vendor). Both are required and will be evaluated. System-Level Requirements (Solution Capabilities) These apply to the functionality and technical characteristics of the proposed system, including: Authentication and access control (e.g., NCID SSO, role-based access) Data security features (e.g., encryption in transit and at rest, audit logging) Workflow, reporting, and integration capabilities Data validation, error handling, and system performance Accessibility compliance (e.g., Section 508 / WCAG) Vendor Operational Requirements (Processes & Controls)

				These apply to how the vendor operates, manages, and secures the solution, including: Incident response and breach notification procedures Security policies and governance Ongoing monitoring, vulnerability management, and patching Disaster recovery and business continuity planning Staffing, training, and access management practices Compliance with applicable standards (e.g., NIST alignment, SOC 2, ISO 27001, NC SISM) Summary: The State requires both a secure, compliant system and a vendor with mature operational processes. Vendors must address both areas in their response, clearly distinguishing between system functionality and organizational practices.
94	3.2 SECURITY SPECIFICATIONS	3.2.2 SOLUTIONS NOT HOSTED ON STATE INFRASTRUCTURE	Beyond NIST 800-53, are certifications such as SOC 2, FedRAMP, or StateRAMP required or preferred?	The State does not require a specific certification beyond alignment with NIST 800-53–based controls; however, recognized third-party certifications are strongly preferred as evidence of a mature security posture. Acceptable certifications include: SOC 2 (Type II) ISO 27001 FedRAMP or StateRAMP (where applicable) No single certification is mandated or favored over others. Vendors should demonstrate compliance with at least one recognized framework and the ability to align with State of North Carolina security requirements (e.g., NC SISM). Summary: Certifications such as SOC 2, FedRAMP, or StateRAMP are not required but are preferred, and will be considered as part of the overall security evaluation.
95	3.2 SECURITY SPECIFICATIONS	3.2.2 SOLUTIONS NOT HOSTED ON STATE INFRASTRUCTURE	Can NCCCS clarify expected data classification levels (e.g., PII, student data, financial data)?	The State anticipates that the system will handle multiple categories of sensitive data and expects vendors to align with State of North Carolina data classification and security standards (e.g., NC SISM). Expected Data Classification Levels: Personally Identifiable Information (PII): Includes names, contact information, demographic data, and other identifiers associated with applicants, staff, and participants → Classified as confidential/sensitive data

				Student-Level Data (FERPA-protected): Includes participant demographics, enrollment, assessments, and outcomes derived from the Title II MIS → Classified as confidential and subject to FERPA requirements Financial / Grant Data: Includes budgets, allocations, expenditures, and funding details → Generally sensitive, though some elements may be public depending on reporting requirements Organizational and Application Data: Includes application narratives, program plans, and supporting documentation → Typically sensitive but not highly restricted, unless containing PII or other protected data Public Data (Limited): Certain high-level reports or aggregated information may be publicly shareable, as defined by the State Expectations: Vendors must: Support role-based access controls aligned to data sensitivity Implement encryption in transit and at rest for sensitive data Ensure compliance with FERPA and State data protection standards Provide mechanisms for data segregation, auditing, and secure handling Summary: The system will handle PII, FERPA-protected student data, and sensitive financial/program data, requiring a solution that supports robust data classification, protection, and access controls in alignment with State standards.
96	3.2 SECURITY SPECIFICATIONS	3.2.2 SOLUTIONS NOT HOSTED ON STATE INFRASTRUCTURE	What are expectations for incident response SLAs and breach notification timelines? rieger: The State expects vendors to maintain formal incident response procedures aligned with State of North Carolina security requirements (e.g., NC SISM) and industry best practices. Incident Response SLAs (expected): Critical incidents (e.g., system outage, confirmed security incident): Initial response: within 1–2 hours Ongoing status updates: regular intervals	What are expectations for incident response SLAs and breach notification timelines? rieger: The State expects vendors to maintain formal incident response procedures aligned with State of North Carolina security requirements (e.g., NC SISM) and industry best practices. Incident Response SLAs (expected): Critical incidents (e.g., system outage, confirmed security incident): Initial response: within 1–2 hours Ongoing status updates: regular intervals (e.g., every 4–8 hours) until resolution High-priority incidents: Initial response: within 4 hours Standard incidents: Initial response: within 1 business day

			(e.g., every 4–8 hours) until resolution High-priority incidents: Initial response: within 4 hours Standard incidents: Initial response: within 1 business day Breach Notification Expectations: Vendors must notify the State of any actual or suspected security breach or unauthorized access without undue delay, and typically within 24 hours of discovery Notification must include: Nature and scope of the incident Data elements potentially affected Actions taken or planned for containment and remediation Vendors must support the State in meeting any regulatory or legal notification obligations Additional Expectations: Documented incident response and escalation procedures Support for forensic investigation and root cause analysis Implementation of corrective actions and prevention measures Summary: The State expects rapid response SLAs (1–2 hours for critical issues) and breach notification within approximately 24 hours, with full support for incident management and compliance obligations.	Breach Notification Expectations: Vendors must notify the State of any actual or suspected security breach or unauthorized access without undue delay, and typically within 24 hours of discovery Notification must include: Nature and scope of the incident Data elements potentially affected Actions taken or planned for containment and remediation Vendors must support the State in meeting any regulatory or legal notification obligations Additional Expectations: Documented incident response and escalation procedures Support for forensic investigation and root cause analysis Implementation of corrective actions and prevention measures Summary: The State expects rapid response SLAs (1–2 hours for critical issues) and breach notification within approximately 24 hours, with full support for incident management and compliance obligations.

97	3.2 SECURITY SPECIFICATIONS	3.2.2 SOLUTIONS NOT HOSTED ON STATE INFRASTRUCTUR E	Are there any data residency or geographic hosting requirements?	The State requires that all data be hosted and maintained within the United States. Vendors must ensure that: All production and backup data reside in U.S.-based data centers Data is subject to U.S. jurisdiction and legal protections Any data access (including support or administrative access) complies with State security and privacy requirements Vendors should clearly describe: Hosting locations and regions Any use of subprocessors or third-party hosting providers Controls in place to ensure data residency and access compliance Summary: Yes—data must be hosted within the United States, with appropriate controls to ensure compliance with State security and data governance requirements.
98	3.3 ENTERPRISE SPECIFICATIONS	3.3.1 ARCHITECTURE DIAGRAMS	As these are proprietary information, would NCCCS allow vendors to submit these diagrams upon downselection? If not, would NCCCS consider signing an NDA?	The State prefers that vendors include sufficient technical and architectural detail within their proposal submissions to support evaluation. However, the State recognizes that certain materials may be proprietary or sensitive. In such cases: Vendors may provide high-level architecture information in the proposal More detailed or sensitive materials may be provided during subsequent phases (e.g., demonstrations, discussions, or negotiations), including after downselection if requested The State is generally not able to execute NDAs during the solicitation phase. All submissions are subject to applicable public records laws, though vendors may designate materials as confidential in accordance with RFP instructions. Summary: Provide high-level details in the proposal; more detailed diagrams may be shared later if needed. The State typically does not execute NDAs during the solicitation phase.
99	3.3 ENTERPRISE SPECIFICATIONS	3.3.2 SOLUTION ROADMAP	As these can contain trade secrets, would NCCCS allow vendors to submit this upon	The State prefers that vendors include sufficient detail in their proposal to enable a thorough evaluation. The State recognizes that some materials may contain trade secrets or proprietary information. In such cases:

			downselection? If not, would NCCCS consider signing an NDA?	Vendors may provide high-level information in the initial proposal More detailed or sensitive materials may be requested and shared during later stages (e.g., demonstrations, discussions, or negotiations), including after downselection The State is generally not able to execute NDAs during the solicitation phase. All submissions are subject to applicable public records laws, and vendors should mark any confidential or trade secret information in accordance with RFP instructions. Summary: Yes—more detailed, sensitive materials may be shared after downselection if requested, but the State typically does not execute NDAs during the solicitation phase.
100	3.3 ENTERPRISE SPECIFICATIONS	3.3.4 INTEGRATION APPROACH	Can NCCCS clarify whether integration with Colleague and Banner is expected to be standardized across all institutions, or if variations exist by college?	Integration with Ellucian Colleague and Banner is not expected to be fully standardized across all institutions. The North Carolina Community College System (NCCCS) operates in a decentralized environment, and implementations, configurations, and integration capabilities may vary by college. As a result: Some institutions may support modern API-based integrations (e.g., Ellucian Ethos) Others may rely on legacy methods (e.g., file-based exchanges, database views, or SOAP services) Vendors must design a solution that supports: Flexible and configurable integration approaches Ability to accommodate institution-specific variations Both API-based and batch/file-based integration methods Summary: Integration will vary by institution, and vendors should plan for a non-standardized, flexible integration model across colleges.
101	3.3 ENTERPRISE SPECIFICATIONS	3.3.4 INTEGRATION APPROACH	What is the current middleware being used for Ellucian and Banner systems? What data would you want to flow from these systems into the Grant Management and Data System?	The State has not identified a single, standardized middleware platform in use across all institutions for Ellucian Banner or Colleague integrations. Given the decentralized nature of the NCCCS environment, middleware and integration approaches may vary by college. Some institutions may utilize platforms such as Ellucian Ethos or other integration tools, while others may rely on direct integrations or file-based processes. Data Flow from Banner / Colleague to the Grants Management System (anticipated): The State anticipates primarily inbound data flow (SIS → GMS) to support validation, reporting alignment, and program oversight.

				Data elements may include: Student enrollment and status data Course/program participation information Institutional identifiers and organizational data Completion or outcome indicators (where applicable) Limited financial or program-related reference data (if needed for reconciliation) Integration Characteristics: Primarily one-way (SIS → GMS) Typically batch-based (scheduled) as the baseline Support for API-based integration (e.g., Ethos) where available and appropriate Flexibility to accommodate variation in institutional capabilities and middleware usage Summary: There is no single statewide middleware standard for Banner/Colleague integrations. The State expects vendors to support a flexible integration approach, with primarily one-way data flow from SIS systems into the grants management system for validation and reporting purposes.
102	3.3 ENTERPRISE SPECIFICATIONS	3.3.4 INTEGRATION APPROACH	Beyond Ellucian Colleague and Banner, are there additional enterprise systems (e.g., finance, CRM, data warehouse) that must be integrated as part of the initial scope? Rieger: Beyond NCID (SSO) and institutional systems such as Ellucian Colleague and Banner, the State does not require additional enterprise system integrations as mandatory components of the initial implementation scope. However, the State anticipates potential integration with the following systems, which may be addressed during implementation or in subsequent phases: Title II MIS (Advansys): Primary system for student-level data	Beyond Ellucian Colleague and Banner, are there additional enterprise systems (e.g., finance, CRM, data warehouse) that must be integrated as part of the initial scope? Rieger: Beyond NCID (SSO) and institutional systems such as Ellucian Colleague and Banner, the State does not require additional enterprise system integrations as mandatory components of the initial implementation scope. However, the State anticipates potential integration with the following systems, which may be addressed during implementation or in subsequent phases: Title II MIS (Advansys): Primary system for student-level data (expected integration) Financial / grants-related systems: For budget, allocation, or reconciliation purposes (as needed, to be defined) Analytics / reporting platforms (e.g., Power BI): For dashboards and data visualization (expected for reporting access) Document storage or content management systems (if applicable): For managing attachments and supporting documentation Expectation:

			(expected integration) Financial / grants-related systems: For budget, allocation, or reconciliation purposes (as needed, to be defined) Analytics / reporting platforms (e.g., Power BI): For dashboards and data visualization (expected for reporting access) Document storage or content management systems (if applicable): For managing attachments and supporting documentation Expectation: No additional enterprise systems (e.g., CRM, data warehouse) are required for initial go-live beyond those identified Vendors should design for a flexible, extensible integration architecture to support future integrations Summary: No additional enterprise integrations are mandated in the initial scope, but vendors should support integration with MIS, reporting tools, and potential financial systems, with the ability to expand over time.	No additional enterprise systems (e.g., CRM, data warehouse) are required for initial go-live beyond those identified Vendors should design for a flexible, extensible integration architecture to support future integrations Summary: No additional enterprise integrations are mandated in the initial scope, but vendors should support integration with MIS, reporting tools, and potential financial systems, with the ability to expand over time.
103	3.3 ENTERPRISE SPECIFICATIONS	3.3.4 INTEGRATION APPROACH	Does NCCCS prefer a real-time, API-based integration model, or are batch-based integrations acceptable?	The State supports a hybrid integration model. Batch-based integrations are acceptable and expected as the baseline, particularly given variability in institutional systems and current capabilities. However, the State prefers real-time or API-based integrations where feasible and where they provide clear business value. Vendors should:

				Support both API-based (real-time/near real-time) and batch/file-based integrations Design for scalability toward increased API usage over time Accommodate institutional variability in integration capabilities Summary: Batch integration is acceptable and expected, but API-based integration is preferred where feasible, with a flexible approach required.
104	3.3 ENTERPRISE SPECIFICATIONS	3.3.5 DISASTER RECOVERY AND BUSINESS CONTINUITY	Can NCCCS define target Recovery Time Objectives (RTO) and Recovery Point Objectives (RPO) for the system?	The State expects vendors to propose industry-standard disaster recovery capabilities aligned with system criticality; however, specific RTO and RPO values are not strictly predefined in the RFP. As general guidance, the State anticipates: Recovery Time Objective (RTO): within 24 hours or less for full system restoration Recovery Point Objective (RPO): within 24 hours or less, with preference for shorter intervals (e.g., near real-time or hourly backups) Vendors are encouraged to propose: More aggressive RTO/RPO targets where feasible Detailed backup, failover, and recovery strategies Evidence of tested disaster recovery procedures Final RTO/RPO requirements will be established during contract negotiation and aligned with the vendor’s proposed solution and State expectations. Summary: Baseline expectations are ≤24-hour RTO/RPO, with shorter recovery times preferred, and final targets to be defined during contract finalization.
105	3.3 ENTERPRISE SPECIFICATIONS	3.3.6 DATA MIGRATION	Can NCCCS provide more detail on the volume, structure, and quality of legacy data to be migrated?	The State anticipates that legacy data to be migrated will vary in volume, structure, and quality, and detailed profiling will be completed during discovery. The following provides current expectations: Volume (Estimated) Data spanning multiple grant cycles (multi-year history) Associated with 58 community colleges and additional CBO providers Anticipated thousands of grant records, including applications, awards, budgets, and related transactions Supporting documents/attachments (potentially large volume of files)

				Structure Structured system data from the Title II MIS (Advansys), accessible via APIs or data extracts (e.g., JSON, CSV/XML) Semi-structured and structured data from spreadsheets (e.g., Excel-based grant tracking) Unstructured data including narratives and attachments (e.g., PDFs, Word documents) Data relationships may exist but are not consistently normalized across all sources. Data Quality Data quality is expected to be variable, including: Potential inconsistencies across sources Duplicate records or incomplete data elements Variations in naming conventions, formats, and data standards Differences in historical record completeness The State anticipates the need for: Data cleansing, normalization, and deduplication Validation and reconciliation processes Establishment of standardized data definitions during implementation Migration Approach Expectations Vendors should: Conduct data profiling and assessment during discovery Support mapping from multiple source formats into a unified data model Provide tools/processes for data validation, error handling, and reconciliation Support migration of both structured data and associated documents Summary: Legacy data will include a mix of structured, semi-structured, and unstructured data with moderate volume and variable quality, requiring a flexible, robust data migration and cleansing approach.
106	3.3 ENTERPRISE SPECIFICATIONS	3.3.6 DATA MIGRATION	What level of responsibility does NCCCS expect the vendor to assume for data cleansing and transformation?	The State expects the vendor to assume primary responsibility for data migration activities, including data transformation, mapping, and technical data cleansing, with active collaboration and oversight from the State. Vendor Responsibilities:

				Conduct data profiling and assessment of source data Define and execute data mapping and transformation logic Perform technical data cleansing, including: Standardization of formats Deduplication (based on defined rules) Identification and handling of invalid or incomplete data Implement validation and reconciliation processes to ensure data integrity Provide tools, reports, and documentation to support migration transparency State Responsibilities: Provide business rules, data definitions, and context Assist with data quality decisions (e.g., handling exceptions, resolving ambiguities) Review and approve mapping, transformation logic, and validation results Summary: The vendor is expected to lead technical data cleansing and transformation, while the State provides business guidance and validation, resulting in a collaborative data migration process.
107	3.3 ENTERPRISE SPECIFICATIONS	3.3.7 APPLICATION MANAGEMENT	What level of audit trail granularity is required (e.g., field-level tracking, user activity logs, historical changes)?	The State expects a comprehensive, multi-level audit trail capability to support compliance, monitoring, and accountability. At a minimum, the system should provide: User Activity Logging: Log user logins, access, and actions within the system Track who performed an action and when Record-Level Tracking: Maintain history of creation, updates, submissions, approvals, and status changes for key records (e.g., applications, awards, budgets) Field-Level Change Tracking (preferred): Capture before/after values for critical data elements Identify which fields were changed, by whom, and when Workflow and Approval History: Track routing, decisions, comments, and timestamps across workflows Maintain a complete audit trail of approvals and modifications Data Retention and Reporting: Support retention of audit logs in accordance with State and federal requirements

				Enable searching, filtering, and reporting on audit data Summary: The State expects robust audit capabilities, including user activity logs, record-level history, and preferably field-level tracking, to ensure full transparency and compliance.
108	3.5 BUSINESS AND TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS	3.5.1.A.i APPLICATION MODULE	Does NCCCS require support for collaborative review processes, including scoring, commenting, and panel workflows? rieger: Yes, the State requires support for collaborative review processes as part of the grants management system. The solution should support: Reviewer assignment and panel management Scoring capabilities (e.g., configurable scoring criteria, rubrics, and weighted scoring) Commenting and feedback tools, including the ability to capture reviewer notes and justifications Independent and consensus review workflows Role-based access controls to ensure appropriate separation of duties Tracking and auditability of all review actions, scores, and decisions The system should allow for configurable review processes that can vary by program (e.g., WIOA Title II vs. Perkins V) and support both individual and panel-based evaluations. Summary: Yes—collaborative review functionality, including scoring, commenting, and panel	Yes, the State requires support for collaborative review processes as part of the grants management system. The solution should support: Reviewer assignment and panel management Scoring capabilities (e.g., configurable scoring criteria, rubrics, and weighted scoring) Commenting and feedback tools, including the ability to capture reviewer notes and justifications Independent and consensus review workflows Role-based access controls to ensure appropriate separation of duties Tracking and auditability of all review actions, scores, and decisions The system should allow for configurable review processes that can vary by program (e.g., WIOA Title II vs. Perkins V) and support both individual and panel-based evaluations. Summary: Yes—collaborative review functionality, including scoring, commenting, and panel workflows, is required, with an emphasis on configurability and auditability.

			workflows, is required, with an emphasis on configurability and auditability.	
109	3.4 BUSINESS AND TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS	3.4.1	Would NCCCS allow vendors to submit VPAT upon downselection? If not, would NCCCS consider signing an NDA?	Would NCCCS allow vendors to submit VPAT upon downselection? If not, would NCCCS consider signing an NDA? Rieger: The State expects vendors to provide sufficient accessibility information (e.g., VPAT or equivalent documentation) as part of the proposal to support evaluation of compliance with Section 508 / WCAG requirements. If a full VPAT contains sensitive or proprietary information, vendors may: Provide a summary or redacted version with the proposal, and Be prepared to provide the full VPAT upon request during later stages (e.g., discussions, demonstrations, or negotiations), including after downselection if applicable The State is generally not able to execute NDAs during the solicitation phase, and all submissions are subject to public records laws, with appropriate marking of confidential information per RFP instructions. Summary: Vendors should provide accessibility documentation with the proposal (full or summary). More detailed materials may be shared later if requested. The State typically does not execute NDAs during the solicitation phase.
110	3.5 BUSINESS AND TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS	3.5.1.A GRANT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM SPECIFICATIONS	Does NCCCS require management of multiple programs with distinct workflows in a single instance?	Yes. The State requires the system to support management of multiple grant programs within a single instance, while accommodating distinct workflows, rules, and requirements for each program. The solution should support: Program-specific workflows (e.g., WIOA Title II, Perkins V) Configurable business rules, forms, and approval processes by program Role-based access control with permissions that may vary by program Data segregation and reporting by program, with the ability to aggregate where needed Summary: Yes—the system must support multiple programs in a single instance, with flexible, program-specific workflows and configurations.
111	3.5 BUSINESS AND TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS	3.5.1.A GRANT MANAGEMENT	Does NCCCS require management of multiple programs with distinct workflows in a single instance? Rieger: Yes. The State requires the system to support management	Does NCCCS require management of multiple programs with distinct workflows in a single instance? Rieger: Yes. The State requires the system to support management of multiple grant programs within a single instance, while accommodating distinct workflows, rules, and requirements for each program.

		SYSTEM SPECIFICATIONS	of multiple grant programs within a single instance, while accommodating distinct workflows, rules, and requirements for each program. The solution should support: Program-specific workflows (e.g., WIOA Title II, Perkins V) Configurable business rules, forms, and approval processes by program Role-based access control with permissions that may vary by program Data segregation and reporting by program, with the ability to aggregate where needed Summary: Yes—the system must support multiple programs in a single instance, with flexible, program-specific workflows and configurations.	The solution should support: Program-specific workflows (e.g., WIOA Title II, Perkins V) Configurable business rules, forms, and approval processes by program Role-based access control with permissions that may vary by program Data segregation and reporting by program, with the ability to aggregate where needed Summary: Yes—the system must support multiple programs in a single instance, with flexible, program-specific workflows and configurations.
112	3.5 BUSINESS AND TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS	3.5.1.A GRANT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM SPECIFICATIONS	Does NCCCS envision the system as the system of record or as an orchestration layer integrating with existing systems?	The State envisions the grants management system as a hybrid solution, serving as the system of record for grants management data while also acting as an integration/orchestration layer with existing systems. Specifically: The system will be the system of record for grant-related data, including applications, awards, budgets, workflows, and compliance activities Existing systems (e.g., Title II MIS, SIS such as Banner/Colleague) will remain the systems of record for student-level and institutional data The solution should integrate with and consume data from external systems to support validation, reporting, and decision-making Summary: The system will function as a system of record for grants management and an integration layer with other authoritative systems, not as a replacement for existing systems of record like the MIS or SIS.

113	3.5 BUSINESS AND TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS	3.5.1.B DATA ANALYTICS AND REPORTING SYSTEM SPECIFICATIONS	What are expectations for advanced reporting (dashboards, ad hoc reporting, cross-program insights)?	The State expects the solution to provide robust, flexible reporting capabilities that support operational, programmatic, and executive-level needs. Dashboard Expectations: Interactive, role-based dashboards for state and local users Near real-time or regularly refreshed data views Visualization of key metrics (e.g., applications, awards, performance, compliance) Ability to filter, drill down, and export data Ad Hoc Reporting: User-friendly tools for creating custom reports without technical expertise Ability to select fields, apply filters, and define groupings Support for exporting data (e.g., Excel, CSV, PDF) Configurable saved reports and reusable templates Cross-Program Insights: Ability to aggregate and compare data across programs (e.g., WIOA Title II, Perkins V) Support for standardized data models that enable consistent reporting Capability to analyze trends, performance, and outcomes across funding streams Integration with External Analytics Tools: Support for data access via APIs, data extracts, or warehouse integration Compatibility with tools such as Power BI or similar platforms for advanced analytics Summary: The State requires comprehensive reporting capabilities, including interactive dashboards, ad hoc reporting, and cross-program analysis, with support for both system-native reporting and external analytics tools.
114	3.5 BUSINESS AND TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS	3.5.1.A.v INTEGRATED WORKFLOW APPROVALS	To what extent is configurable workflow automation expected vs custom development?	The State expects the solution to provide highly configurable workflow automation as the primary approach, with minimal reliance on custom development. Configurable Workflow Expectations:

				Ability to define and modify workflows through configuration (not code) Support for program-specific workflows (e.g., WIOA Title II, Perkins V) Configurable steps, routing, approvals, roles, and notifications Support for conditional logic, branching, and escalation paths Ability to update workflows over time to reflect policy or process changes Custom Development: Should be limited and not required for standard workflow changes May be appropriate only for unique or highly specialized use cases not supported through configuration Summary: The State strongly prefers a configuration-driven workflow model, with minimal custom development, to ensure flexibility, maintainability, and adaptability over time.
115	3.5 BUSINESS AND TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS	3.5.1.A.i APPLICATION MODULE	How important is user experience for applicants and reviewers in evaluation criteria? R	User experience is considered an important component of the overall solution and will be evaluated as part of the technical approach and functionality. The State expects the system to provide: An intuitive and user-friendly interface for applicants, reviewers, and administrators Streamlined workflows that reduce administrative burden and improve efficiency Clear navigation, guidance, and error messaging Accessibility aligned with Section 508 / WCAG standards While user experience is not identified as a standalone weighted category, it is a key factor within the technical evaluation and will contribute to the assessment of how effectively the solution meets user needs. Summary: User experience is important and will be evaluated within the technical criteria, particularly in terms of usability, efficiency, and accessibility.
116	3.5 BUSINESS AND TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS	3.5.1 D Capabilities	Can NCCCS clarify whether all listed capabilities are required at initial go-live, or if a phased implementation approach is acceptable?	Not all listed capabilities are required at initial go-live. The State supports and prefers a phased implementation approach. The State anticipates: An initial go-live (pilot phase) focused on core functionality (e.g., application intake, review, award management, and basic reporting)

				Subsequent phases to introduce additional features, integrations, and enhancements Vendors should: Clearly identify which capabilities are included in initial go-live vs. later phases Provide a phased implementation roadmap aligned with the overall timeline Ensure that early phases deliver functional value while minimizing disruption to ongoing grant cycles Summary: A phased approach is acceptable and preferred, with core capabilities at initial go-live and additional functionality delivered incrementally.
117	3.5 BUSINESS AND TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS	3.5.1.D.iv CAPABILITIES	Can NCCCS provide expectations around scale (users, programs, applications)? Rieger: The State provides the following estimates to inform solution design and scalability expectations. Final volumes may vary. Users Total users: Approximately 250–400 Concurrent users: Approximately 75–125 during peak periods Includes: State staff: ~30–55 users Local provider users (community colleges and CBOs): ~200–350 users Programs The system must support multiple grant programs within a single instance, including at a minimum: WIOA Title II (AEFLA) Perkins V Additional programs may be added over time Applications / Volume 58 community colleges plus additional community-based organizations	The State provides the following estimates to inform solution design and scalability expectations. Final volumes may vary. Users Total users: Approximately 250–400 Concurrent users: Approximately 75–125 during peak periods Includes: State staff: ~30–55 users Local provider users (community colleges and CBOs): ~200–350 users Programs The system must support multiple grant programs within a single instance, including at a minimum: WIOA Title II (AEFLA) Perkins V Additional programs may be added over time Applications / Volume 58 community colleges plus additional community-based organizations participating Anticipated: Dozens to over 100 applications per cycle (depending on program and funding opportunity) Multiple years of historical data to be maintained Associated records including budgets, amendments, reports, and attachments Scalability Expectations Vendors should design for: Growth of 10–20% in users and data volume over time Ability to handle peak usage during application and reporting periods Support for increasing number of programs and reporting complexity

			participating Anticipated: Dozens to over 100 applications per cycle (depending on program and funding opportunity) Multiple years of historical data to be maintained Associated records including budgets, amendments, reports, and attachments Scalability Expectations Vendors should design for: Growth of 10–20% in users and data volume over time Ability to handle peak usage during application and reporting periods Support for increasing number of programs and reporting complexity Summary: The system should support hundreds of users, multiple programs, and ongoing application cycles, with the ability to scale over time in both users and data volume.	Summary: The system should support hundreds of users, multiple programs, and ongoing application cycles, with the ability to scale over time in both users and data volume.
118	3.5 BUSINESS AND TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS	3.5.1.F TRAINING	What are NCCCS's expectations for training delivery and user adoption support?	The State expects a comprehensive training and user adoption approach that supports both initial implementation and ongoing system use across state staff and local providers. Training Delivery Expectations: Role-based training tailored to different user groups (e.g., administrators, reviewers, fiscal staff, local providers) A mix of delivery methods, including: Live virtual and/or in-person training sessions Recorded sessions and on-demand materials User guides, job aids, and quick reference materials Training aligned with system functionality and business processes Support for train-the-trainer models to enable scalability across providers

				User Adoption Support: Change management support, including communication and rollout planning Pilot-phase training and feedback loops to refine materials and processes Post-go-live support, including help desk resources and knowledge base access Ongoing refresher training and updates as system enhancements are introduced Additional Expectations: Materials should be clear, accessible, and easy to maintain/update Training should accommodate a distributed user base across community colleges and CBOs Vendors should provide a training and adoption plan as part of their proposal Summary: The State expects role-based, multi-modal training and strong user adoption support, including initial training, ongoing resources, and post-go-live support to ensure successful statewide implementation.
119	3.5 BUSINESS AND TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS	3.5.1.G TECHNICAL SUPPORT	What are expectations for ongoing support (hours, SLAs, escalation)?	The State expects vendors to provide comprehensive ongoing support services aligned with standard enterprise SaaS practices and State requirements. Support Hours: Standard support: Coverage during normal business hours (Monday–Friday, 8:00 AM–5:00 PM ET) Extended or after-hours support: Required for critical incidents and key periods (e.g., application deadlines, reporting cycles, go-live) Service Level Expectations (SLAs): Critical (Severity 1): Initial response: within 1–2 hours Continuous effort until resolution or workaround High (Severity 2): Initial response: within 4 hours Medium (Severity 3): Initial response: within 1 business day Low (Severity 4): Initial response: within 2 business days

				Vendors should also define: Resolution targets or workaround timelines System availability SLAs (e.g., ≥99.5% uptime) Escalation Expectations: Defined tiered support model (e.g., Tier 1, Tier 2, Tier 3) Clear escalation paths for unresolved or critical issues Designated account manager or support lead Regular status updates and communication protocols Additional Expectations: Access to a help desk/ticketing system Knowledge base and self-service resources Support for incident tracking, reporting, and root cause analysis Summary: The State expects business-hours support with 24/7 coverage for critical issues, defined SLAs and escalation procedures, and a structured, responsive support model.
120	3.5 BUSINESS AND TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS	3.5.1.G TECHNICAL SUPPORT	Does NCCCS expect vendor support for external users (applicants, subrecipients)?	Yes. The State expects the vendor to provide support for external users (e.g., applicants, subrecipients, and local provider staff) as part of the overall support model. Vendor support should include: A help desk or support channel accessible to external users (e.g., email, portal, or ticketing system) Assistance with technical issues (e.g., login/access, system errors, navigation) Support aligned with defined SLAs and response times The State may retain responsibility for: Programmatic or policy-related questions Guidance on application content, eligibility, or compliance requirements Vendors should describe a support model that clearly distinguishes between:

				Technical support (vendor responsibility) and Program/business support (State responsibility) Summary: Yes—the vendor is expected to provide technical support for external users, with the State handling programmatic inquiries, within a coordinated support approach.
121	3.5 BUSINESS AND TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS	3.5.1.I.i PROJECT IMPLEMENTATIO N	Does NCCCS have a target go-live date or phased rollout approach?	The State has not established a fixed go-live date; however, it anticipates an implementation timeline of approximately 9–15 months from contract award to initial go-live. The State prefers a phased rollout approach, which may include: An initial pilot phase with a subset of providers Deployment of core functionality at initial go-live Incremental releases to expand functionality and/or additional programs (e.g., WIOA Title II, followed by Perkins V) Vendors should propose a detailed, phased implementation plan that aligns with this timeline and minimizes disruption to ongoing grant cycles. Summary: No fixed go-live date is defined; the State expects a phased rollout with initial go-live within ~9–15 months post-award.
122	3.5 BUSINESS AND TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS	3.5.1.I.i PROJECT IMPLEMENTATIO N	What are expectations for UAT (duration, participants, criteria)?	The State expects User Acceptance Testing (UAT) to be a structured, collaborative phase to validate that the system meets business, technical, and user requirements prior to go-live. Duration: Typically 4–8 weeks, depending on scope and complexity May be conducted in phases or cycles aligned with the implementation approach Participants: State staff (program, fiscal, and administrative users) Representative local providers (e.g., community colleges and CBOs), especially during pilot phases Vendor support team to facilitate testing, issue tracking, and resolution UAT Scope and Activities:

				Validation of end-to-end business processes (e.g., application intake, review, award, reporting) Testing of integrations with external systems (e.g., MIS, SIS, SSO) Verification of data accuracy, workflows, and role-based access Execution of test scripts and real-world scenarios Acceptance Criteria: All critical and high-priority defects resolved or mitigated System meets functional requirements and business needs Compliance with security, accessibility, and performance expectations State sign-off on UAT results Additional Expectations: Vendor provides test plans, scripts, and defect tracking tools Clear issue resolution and retesting processes Documentation of UAT results and approvals Summary: UAT is expected to last approximately 4–8 weeks, involve both State and representative external users, and require successful validation of functionality, integrations, and performance prior to State approval and go-live.
123	4.0 COST OF VENDOR'S OFFER	4.1 OFFER COSTS / ATTACHMENT D COST FORM	Can NCCCS provide more detail on the expected scope of training (users, locations, delivery method)?	The State expects a comprehensive, scalable training program that supports a distributed user base across the State and aligns with different roles and responsibilities. Users to be Trained Training should cover all primary user groups, including: NCCCS staff (administrators, program staff, fiscal staff, reviewers) Local provider users (community college and CBO administrators, program staff, data entry users) Read-only or oversight users (as applicable) This represents approximately 250–400 total users, with varying levels of system interaction. Locations / Delivery Approach

				Given the statewide, distributed nature of users: Training is expected to be delivered primarily virtually (remote) Limited in-person sessions may be requested for: Project kickoff or key stakeholder workshops Pilot participants Initial go-live support (as needed) Delivery Methods Vendors should provide a multi-modal training approach, including: Live instructor-led sessions (virtual and/or in-person) Recorded/on-demand training modules User guides, job aids, and quick reference materials Train-the-trainer options to support scaling across providers Additional Expectations Role-based training tailored to user responsibilities Support for pilot-phase training and feedback loops Ongoing training resources for new users and system updates Materials that are accessible and easy to maintain/update Summary: Training should support hundreds of users statewide, be delivered primarily virtually with limited in-person support, and include role-based, multi-format materials to ensure effective adoption and long-term sustainability.
124	4.0 COST OF VENDOR'S OFFER	4.1 OFFER COSTS / ATTACHMENT D COST FORM	Does NCCCS expect ongoing training and development of custom materials?	Yes. The State expects vendors to support ongoing training and maintenance of training materials beyond initial implementation. Vendors should: Maintain and update training materials, user guides, and job aids as the system evolves Provide refresher training and onboarding support for new users Support training updates aligned with system enhancements or process changes The State prefers a model that includes: Reusable and easily maintainable materials A train-the-trainer approach to enable internal sustainability Access to on-demand training resources (e.g., recorded sessions, knowledge base)

				Summary: Yes—vendors are expected to provide ongoing training support and updates to materials, ensuring users remain effective as the system and requirements evolve.
125	4.0 COST OF VENDOR'S OFFER	4.1 OFFER COSTS / ATTACHMENT D COST FORM	Can NCCCS clarify what is meant by the "Command Center," including its purpose and scope?	The "Command Center" refers to a temporary, focused technical support and coordination function established during critical phases of implementation, particularly go-live and stabilization. Purpose: Provide centralized oversight and coordination of system performance, issues, and support activities Enable rapid identification, triage, and resolution of issues during high-risk periods Support a smooth transition to production use for all users Scope of Activities: System monitoring and performance tracking Incident management and escalation coordination User support triage (working in coordination with help desk functions) Daily status reporting and communication with State stakeholders Coordination of vendor and State resources to resolve issues quickly Duration: Typically active during go-live, pilot, and initial stabilization periods May be scaled down or transitioned to standard support once the system is stable Summary: The Command Center is a short-term, intensive technical support and coordination function designed to ensure successful go-live and stabilization, not a permanent operational structure.
126	4.0 COST OF VENDOR'S OFFER	4.1 OFFER COSTS / ATTACHMENT D COST FORM	What roles, staffing, and responsibilities are expected for the Command Center?	The State expects the "Command Center" to be a temporary, centralized support structure during go-live and stabilization, staffed with a cross-functional team from the vendor (with State participation as needed). Key Roles (Vendor-Led) Command Center Lead / Manager: Oversees operations, coordinates activities, and serves as primary point of contact with the State Technical Lead / Solution Architect:

				Provides expertise on system configuration, integrations, and technical issue resolution Application Support Specialists (Tier 2/3): Troubleshoot system issues, defects, and user-reported problems Integration / Data Specialists: Address issues related to data flows, interfaces (e.g., MIS, SIS), and data validation Infrastructure / DevOps Support: Monitor system performance, availability, and environment stability Help Desk / Tier 1 Support: Intake and triage user issues, route to appropriate teams State Participation (as applicable) Program / Business Leads: Provide business context, prioritize issues, and validate resolutions Functional SMEs: Assist with workflow validation and user support for program-specific questions Responsibilities Centralized issue intake, tracking, and triage Incident management and escalation across support tiers System monitoring and performance oversight Rapid resolution of defects and user issues Daily status reporting and communication (e.g., issue logs, priorities, resolutions) Coordination of vendor and State resources Support for user adoption and stabilization activities Operating Model Active during go-live, pilot, and early stabilization phases May include extended support hours during critical periods Utilizes a ticketing system and defined escalation paths Summary: The Command Center should be a vendor-led, cross-functional team responsible for real-time issue management, system monitoring, and coordinated support, with State participation for business validation during go-live and stabilization.
127	4.0 COST OF VENDOR’S OFFER	4.1 OFFER COSTS / ATTACHMENT D COST FORM	What should be included in “Operating Costs of the Command Center”?	“Operating Costs of the Command Center” should include all costs associated with establishing, staffing, and running the Command Center during go-live and stabilization. At a minimum, this should include: Staffing Costs Command Center Lead / Manager

				Technical and Application Support staff (Tier 2/3) Integration/Data specialists Infrastructure/DevOps support Help Desk / Tier 1 support (if included in scope) Any extended hours or surge staffing during critical periods Operational Support Tools Ticketing/incident management systems (if not already included in base solution) Monitoring and alerting tools Communication tools (e.g., dashboards, status reporting mechanisms) Communication & Coordination Daily status reporting and coordination activities Stakeholder communication support (e.g., meetings, updates, issue tracking) Facilities / Logistics (if applicable) Costs associated with on-site presence (if required) Travel expenses related to go-live or pilot support Duration-Based Costs Costs should reflect the defined Command Center period (e.g., pilot, go-live, and stabilization phase), not ongoing support Exclusions / Clarifications Ongoing, steady-state help desk and support services should be separately identified from Command Center costs Command Center costs should be clearly distinguished as temporary, implementation-phase expenses Summary: Operating costs should cover staffing, tools, coordination, and any temporary support resources required to run the Command Center during go-live and stabilization, clearly separated from ongoing support costs.
128	4.0 COST OF VENDOR'S OFFER	4.1 OFFER COSTS / ATTACHMENT D COST FORM	What should be included under "Customization, Development or First Time Engineering" vs configuration?	The State expects vendors to clearly distinguish between configuration (no-code/low-code setup) and customization, development, or first-time engineering (FTE). Configuration (Preferred Approach) Configuration refers to capabilities delivered through standard product features without custom code, including: Workflow setup and routing rules Form creation and field configuration Role-based access and permissions Business rules, validations, and notifications Report and dashboard configuration System settings and parameters

				Configuration should be admin-configurable and maintainable by the State without vendor intervention. Customization / Development / First-Time Engineering (FTE) These refer to work requiring custom code, extensions, or non-standard development, including: Custom features or modules not available out-of-the-box Custom integrations beyond standard connectors or APIs Significant UI/UX modifications outside standard configuration Custom data models or logic that cannot be achieved through configuration One-time development required to meet unique or complex requirements These efforts may require ongoing vendor support and maintenance. Expectation: The State strongly prefers a configuration-first approach Custom development should be minimized and clearly justified Vendors should separately identify and price configuration vs customization/FTE Summary: Configuration includes standard, no-code setup using built-in features, while customization/FTE includes any custom-coded or non-standard development. The State prefers configurable solutions with minimal customization.
129	4.0 COST OF VENDOR'S OFFER	4.1 OFFER COSTS / ATTACHMENT D COST FORM	Should support be bundled in subscription fees or itemized separately?	The State prefers that ongoing support be included within the subscription (SaaS) pricing to provide predictable and transparent total cost of ownership. However, vendors should: Clearly identify what is included in standard support (e.g., help desk, maintenance, updates, SLAs) Itemize any optional or enhanced support services (e.g., premium support tiers, extended hours, dedicated resources) Summary: Standard support should be bundled in subscription fees, with any additional or optional support services clearly itemized.

130	4.0 COST OF VENDOR'S OFFER	4.1 OFFER COSTS / ATTACHMENT D COST FORM	What is intended under "Enhancement Costs"?	Rieger: "Enhancement Costs" refer to costs associated with future system improvements or additional functionality beyond the initial implementation scope. This may include: New features or modules added after go-live System enhancements or upgrades requested by the State Additional integrations not included in the initial scope Modifications to workflows, forms, or business logic that exceed standard configuration Performance or scalability improvements driven by evolving needs Enhancements may be delivered through: Vendor product roadmap updates (included or subscription-based), or State-requested changes requiring additional effort Vendors should clearly distinguish: Enhancements included in standard product updates (no additional cost) Enhancements requiring additional fees (e.g., custom development or new modules) Summary: Enhancement costs cover future functionality or changes beyond initial scope, and should be clearly separated from base system, configuration, and ongoing support costs.
131	4.0 COST OF VENDOR'S OFFER	4.1 OFFER COSTS / ATTACHMENT D COST FORM	Can vendors include annual price increases or must pricing be fixed?	Vendors may propose annual price increases; however, pricing must be clearly defined, transparent, and aligned with State contract requirements. If proposing price increases, vendors should: Clearly specify the rate, timing, and basis for any increases (e.g., fixed percentage, CPI-based) Ensure pricing remains predictable and reasonable over the term of the contract Comply with any State-imposed caps or contractual limitations (as defined in the final agreement) The State may give preference to pricing models that offer cost stability and predictability. Summary:

				Annual price increases are permissible if clearly defined, but pricing should remain transparent, controlled, and aligned with State expectations for stability.
132	4.0 COST OF VENDOR'S OFFER	4.1 OFFER COSTS / ATTACHMENT D COST FORM	Should vendors price based on current scope only or include future growth assumptions?	Vendors should price based on the current scope and requirements defined in the RFP. However, vendors are also expected to: Demonstrate that their pricing model is scalable and can accommodate anticipated growth (e.g., additional users, programs, or data volume) Clearly identify any assumptions related to growth Provide pricing structures or tiers (if applicable) that reflect how costs may change as usage increases Summary: Pricing should be based on the current scope, with clear visibility into how the solD52+E52:E53
133	7.0 OTHER REQUIREMENTS AND SPECIAL TERMS	7.4 VENDOR'S LICENSE OR SUPPORT AGREEMENTS	Will NCCCS allow vendors to redline the State's standard contract terms?	Yes. The State will allow vendors to submit redlines to the State's standard contract terms as part of their proposal. Vendors should: Clearly identify any requested exceptions or modifications in their proposal (pre-award), in accordance with RFP instructions Provide justification for proposed changes All proposed redlines are subject to State review and approval, and final terms will be determined during the contract negotiation process. Summary: Yes—vendors may submit redlines with their proposal, but all changes are subject to State approval during negotiations.
134	7.0 OTHER REQUIREMENTS AND SPECIAL TERMS	7.4 VENDOR'S LICENSE OR SUPPORT AGREEMENTS	Are there any non-negotiable contractual provisions vendors should be aware of?	The State does not provide a definitive list of all non-negotiable terms in the RFP; however, certain provisions are generally required or highly resistant to modification due to State law, policy, and procurement requirements. These typically include: Compliance with State and federal laws and regulations State security and data protection requirements (e.g., NC SISM, data privacy obligations) Public records and data ownership provisions Indemnification and liability provisions consistent with State statutes Governing law and jurisdiction (State of North Carolina)

				Audit and access to records requirements Payment terms tied to deliverables and acceptance Vendors may propose redlines; however, provisions driven by statute, policy, or statewide standards are generally not negotiable or only minimally flexible. Summary: While redlines are permitted, vendors should expect that State-mandated legal, security, and compliance provisions will be non-negotiable or highly constrained.
135	7.0 OTHER REQUIREMENTS AND SPECIAL TERMS	7.4 VENDOR'S LICENSE OR SUPPORT AGREEMENTS	Can NCCCS clarify expectations regarding data ownership and data export upon termination?	The State retains full ownership of all data created, collected, or maintained within the system, including data entered by users and any derived data associated with program operations. Data Ownership: All data is the property of the State of North Carolina Vendors may not use, share, or retain data beyond what is necessary to perform contracted services, except as permitted by the State Data Export Upon Termination: Vendors must support a complete and timely data return process, including: Provision of all State data in a commonly used, machine-readable format (e.g., CSV, XML, JSON) Inclusion of all relevant data elements, including: Structured data (e.g., applications, awards, users, workflows) Associated documents and attachments Metadata and relationships necessary to reconstruct records Delivery within a reasonable timeframe defined in the contract Additional Expectations: Vendors should support data extraction during the contract term (not only at termination) Assistance with data transition or migration to a new system, if required Secure deletion or return of all State data following confirmation of successful transfer, in accordance with State policies Summary:

				The State retains full data ownership, and vendors must provide complete, usable data exports upon termination, along with support for secure transition and data handling.
136	7.0 OTHER REQUIREMENTS AND SPECIAL TERMS	7.4 VENDOR'S LICENSE OR SUPPORT AGREEMENTS	Can NCCCS clarify expectations around cybersecurity liability and whether liability is capped?	Can NCCCS clarify expectations around cybersecurity liability and whether liability is capped? Rieger: Cybersecurity liability requirements will be governed by the State's standard contract terms, including provisions related to liability, indemnification, and insurance. The State does not define a separate or unique cybersecurity liability framework in the RFP; however: Vendors are expected to maintain appropriate cybersecurity liability insurance coverage as specified in the contract Liability, including for data breaches or security incidents, will be addressed within the overall contractual liability provisions Regarding Liability Caps: The State may consider reasonable limitations of liability, but these are subject to negotiation Certain obligations—particularly those related to data security, confidentiality, and legal compliance—may be excluded from or subject to different treatment under liability caps, consistent with State policy and legal requirements Summary: Cybersecurity liability will follow standard State contract terms, with liability caps subject to negotiation, though data security and confidentiality obligations may be treated more stringently.
137	7.0 OTHER REQUIREMENTS AND SPECIAL TERMS	7.11 PROJECT MANAGEMENT	What internal resources will NCCCS allocate to implementation?	The State anticipates allocating a cross-functional internal team to support implementation, working in partnership with the selected vendor. Anticipated State Resources: Project Sponsor / Executive Leadership: Provides strategic oversight, decision-making, and issue escalation support Project Manager: Coordinates State activities, timelines, and communication with the vendor Program / Business SMEs: Subject matter experts for WIOA Title II, Perkins V, and related processes to support requirements, validation, and testing Fiscal / Grants Staff: Provide input on budgeting, funding workflows, and financial requirements Technical / IT Resources: Support integration, security review, NCID coordination, and data migration oversight Data / Reporting Specialists:

				Assist with data validation, reporting requirements, and data governance Training and Change Management Leads: Support user adoption, communication, and training coordination Level of Engagement: Active participation during discovery, design, testing (UAT), and go-live Ongoing involvement for decision-making, validation, and issue resolution Availability of SMEs will be coordinated based on project phase and needs Summary: The State will provide a dedicated, cross-functional team including project management, business SMEs, technical staff, and training support to collaborate with the vendor throughout implementation.
138	2	2.2	Grant Revenue - What is the combined annual federal grant funding administered through WIOA Title II and Perkins V that this system will manage? Please break this out by grant program and whether the figure reflects state-level pass-through totals or only the NCCCS administrative allocation.	Perkins - 15-20 million annually. WIOA Title II - 15-20 million annually. State level pass-through.
139	3	3.3.6	Data Migration - What is the approximate number of grant records, student/participant records, and budget transaction records to be migrated into the new system? Please provide estimates separately for WIOA Title II and Perkins V.	For WIOA, Title II, Answer: The exact number of records is not specified; however, the system is designed to support large-scale student data across multiple providers, including community colleges and CBOs, and supports historical data tracking, reporting, and migration. North Carolina has the 5th largest WIOA, Title II program in the country, so we manage close to 100,000 student records annually.
140	3	3.3.6	Data Migration - What is the current system of record for each grant program, and in what format is data currently stored (e.g., flat files, CSV, SQL database export, proprietary SaaS export)? Are there existing APIs or documented data schemas available to support extraction?	The current system supporting Title II data collection and reporting is ADVANSYS, a web-based Adult Education Management System used to manage student intake, enrollment, attendance, assessments, outcomes, and federal reporting (NRS/WIOA). The system supports comprehensive student records, Periods of Participation (PoP), and reporting aligned with OCTAE requirements. In addition, ADVANSYS includes integrated components such as APIs for student records and data exchange, enabling interoperability with other systems and supporting data migration efforts. Data is currently stored in all formats listed in your question.

141	3.5	3.5.1 B ii	Student Data Scope - Section 3.5.1.B.ii describes collecting 'basic demographic information' on each student via a forward-facing intake form. Can NCCCS clarify the full list of required data fields? Specifically, will the system be collecting and storing Personally Identifiable Information (PII) such as legal name, Social Security Number, date of birth, and address — or will it rely on a unique system-generated ID linked to PII stored in the College Information System (CIS)?	The system captures comprehensive student-level data required for state and federal reporting, including demographic information (e.g., age, gender, ethnicity), employment status, educational status, barriers to employment, attendance, assessments, outcomes, and participation history. It also provides a consolidated student profile view for tracking performance and progress.
142	3.5	3.5.1 B ii	Section 3.5.1.B.v references Periods of Participation (PoPs) per OCTAE guidelines, and Section 3.5.1.B.ii references WIOA reporting requirements. Is the intent for this system to serve as the system of record for NRS performance reporting (i.e., replacing or supplementing existing tools such as LACES or TOPSpro Enterprise), or is the system intended to feed data into an existing NRS reporting tool? Understanding this distinction is critical to scoping the solution.	The intent is for the solution to serve as the system of record for NRS reporting and grant administration procedures. The solution will ship a flat file to NCCCS on the 1st of each month as a flat file for data validation and duplication of records per provider to meet the requirements of state performance reporting, where students are duplicated across providers, when applicable. The solution will serve as the deduplicated system of record for the state's federal NRS reporting.
143	3.3	3.3.4	Section 3.3.4 requires integration with Ellucian Colleague and Banner ERP systems. Can NCCCS confirm which ERP platforms are in use across the 58 community colleges and 10 community-based organizations, and whether all institutions are on the same platform version? Are existing API credentials or middleware (e.g., Ethos) available to support integration?	All colleges are currently on the Ellucian Colleague platform, but will migrate to the Banner ERP system soon. The current system supports interoperability through REST API functionality, enabling integration with external systems for data exchange as needed.

144			Is NCCCS currently using an existing grant management platform for either Perkins V or WIOA Title II? If so, what system(s) are in use, and is this RFP intended to replace, consolidate, or supplement those systems?	The existing data system (ADVANSYS) is primarily used for WIOA, Title II student data management, reporting, and compliance. The grants are currently managed using Moodle.
145	3.5	3.5.1.A.vi	Section 3.5.1.A.vi requires a Comprehensive Local Needs Assessment (CLNA) feature with NCCCS-supplied data visualization and six narrative response sections. Can NCCCS describe the data sources and format for CLNA data? Will NCCCS push this data to the vendor via API, flat file, or other mechanism?	The system shall integrate longitudinal tracking of program and non-PII student data from the state system of record (PowerBI). For purposes of the Comprehensive Local Needs Assessment (CLNA), NCCCS will provide standardized data elements to support NCCCS-defined analyses and data visualizations required under Perkins V. Data sources may include student information systems, program participation records, performance and outcome measures, and other NCCCS-maintained administrative datasets relevant to CLNA requirements. The CLNA module shall include functionality to support six structured narrative response sections aligned with Perkins V statutory requirements. The system shall allow providers to enter, edit, and review narrative responses in conjunction with NCCCS-supplied quantitative data and visualizations. The CLNA is an internal planning and compliance tool required under Perkins V and is intended to support internal review and data-driven decision-making. Access to CLNA data and narratives shall be restricted to the submitting provider and authorized NCCCS staff through role-based access controls. The system shall support secure storage and retention of CLNA submissions to allow review of prior-year assessments
146	3.5	3.5.1.I	Section 3.5.1.A.vi requires a Comprehensive Local Needs Assessment (CLNA) feature with NCCCS-supplied data visualization and six narrative response sections. Can NCCCS describe the data sources and format for CLNA data? Will NCCCS push this data to the vendor via API, flat file, or other mechanism?	NCCCS anticipates a phased implementation approach, including discovery, data migration, configuration, and deployment. NCCCS has a very limited staff to assist.
147	3.2	3.2.2	The RFP requires NIST 800-53 compliance and references FERPA obligations. Can NCCCS confirm whether the student PII collected through this system will be classified as Medium Risk (Restricted) or High Risk (Highly Restricted) under the NC Statewide Data Classification policy?	The system includes role-based access controls, authentication mechanisms, and secure API access using HTTPS. It supports data validation and user permission structures to ensure data integrity and controlled access. While specific NIST 800-53 compliance is not explicitly stated in the provided materials, the system architecture supports standard security practices and can be configured to meet applicable requirements. Rieger Answer: The system includes role-based access controls, authentication mechanisms, and secure API access using HTTPS. It supports data validation and user permission structures to ensure data integrity and controlled access. While specific NIST 800-53 compliance is not explicitly stated in the provided materials, the system architecture supports standard security practices and can be configured to meet applicable requirements.

148	N/A	N/A	Does NCCCS have an approved budget for this new Grants Management System?	The annual budget for this grant management and data system effort has not been predetermined and will be finalized based on available funding, program needs, and the scope of services proposed. Respondents are encouraged to propose cost-effective solutions that align with the requirements outlined in this solicitation.
149	N/A	N/A	Did NCCCS utilize any vendor / SME consultants in defining the sought-after functionality and/or scope of work enumerated in the RFP? If yes, please provide the name of the vendor/consultant.	The State developed the requirements and scope of work for this RFP through a combination of internal subject matter expertise, stakeholder engagement, and program knowledge. The State does not have any specific vendor or consultant to disclose in relation to the development of the functionality and scope outlined in this RFP.
150	2.0 Purpose of RFP	2.3 Summary of Problem Statement	If the NCCCS is using an existing GMS, what are the current pain points with the solution and the concerned vendor?	The State does not currently utilize a single, centralized grants management system (GMS) that fully supports all required functions. Existing processes rely on a combination of internal tools, manual workflows, and supplemental systems, which has resulted in several operational challenges. Key pain points include: Fragmented processes and systems: Grant application, review, award management, and reporting are managed across multiple tools and formats (e.g., spreadsheets, documents, and existing systems), leading to inefficiencies and lack of standardization Limited workflow automation: Current processes involve manual routing, tracking, and approvals, increasing administrative burden and risk of delays or errors Data silos and integration gaps: Limited integration between systems (e.g., MIS, institutional systems) results in duplicate data entry, inconsistent data, and challenges in reconciliation Reporting limitations: Difficulty generating timely, accurate, and consolidated reports, particularly for federal reporting and performance monitoring Lack of real-time visibility: Limited ability for the State and providers to track application status, funding, and performance metrics in real time User experience challenges: Existing processes are not optimized for end users, resulting in inefficiencies for both State staff and local providers Summary: The State’s current environment is decentralized and partially manual, and the goal of this procurement is to implement a modern, integrated grants management solution that improves efficiency, data quality, and reporting capabilities.
151	N/A	N/A	Given the requirement to manage federal funds, does NCCCS require vendors who	No. The State does not require vendors to have prior experience implementing grants management systems specifically at the federal level.

			have experience deploying Grants Management Systems at the federal level?	However, vendors should demonstrate relevant experience managing grants or similar systems in complex, regulated environments, particularly those involving: Federal funding requirements (e.g., WIOA, Perkins, or similar programs) Compliance, monitoring, and reporting Multi-entity or statewide implementations Experience working with state agencies, higher education systems, or workforce programs is highly relevant and will be considered favorably.
152	N/A	N/A	Can you provide the annual dollar amount of grant funding you receive for the current fiscal year?	The State administers multiple federally funded grant programs (e.g., WIOA Title II, Perkins V), and funding levels may vary annually based on federal allocations. For the current fiscal year, the State anticipates administering20-40 million dollars in total grant funding across applicable programs. More detailed program-specific funding levels can be provided or referenced through publicly available federal and State allocation materials. Summary: Funding levels are significant and variable by program and year; vendors should anticipate supporting multi-million-dollar grant administration across programs.
153	N/A	N/A	What dollar volume of these grants are pass-through grants to sub-grantees?	Approx 20 million for each grant to 58-66 providers based on grant. The system shall only track pass-through management of these funds.
154	N/A	N/A	What is the total dollar amount of grants distributed?	The system will only be tracking the budgeted amount for the 66 providers as financial management is handled by the NCCCS Business Office.
155	3.0 RFP Requirements and Specifications	3.5.1.I.i Project Implementation	Does NCCCS have a timeline / anticipated go-live date for the new system?	The State has not established a fixed go-live date at this time. However, the State anticipates an implementation timeline of approximately 9–15 months from contract award to initial go-live, depending on the proposed solution and approach. The State expects a phased implementation, which may include: Initial pilot phase with a subset of providers Incremental rollout to all providers following successful pilot validation Vendors should propose a detailed project timeline, including key milestones such as discovery, design, development/configuration, testing, training, and deployment.

				Summary: No specific go-live date is defined; however, the State anticipates a phased rollout with an initial go-live within approximately 9–15 months post-award.
156	2.0 Purpose of RFP	2.2 Agency Background; 2.3 Summary of Problem Statement	Are the Perkins V and WIOA grant programs the only grant programs in-scope for this implementation?	Yes.
157	N/A	N/A	When do each of the programs' application periods begin in a given fiscal year?	Application periods vary by program and funding cycle and are not uniform across all programs. For major programs: WIOA Title II (AEFLA): Application cycles are typically aligned with multi-year grant periods (e.g., competitive procurements every few years), with annual continuation processes as applicable Perkins V: Applications are generally aligned with the state fiscal year (July 1 – June 30), with local applications typically occurring in advance of the fiscal year start Specific application release dates and timelines are determined by the State each cycle and may vary based on: Federal guidance and funding availability State planning and procurement timelines Program-specific requirements
158	2.0 Purpose of RFP	2.3 Summary of Problem Statement; 3.5.1.I(2) Project Implementation	How does NCCCS manage its grants today? If vendor-provided solution is deployed, which vendor provided it to NCCCS?	Grants are managed using Moodle for all documentation.
159	3.0 RFP Requirements and Specifications	3.3.4 Integration Approach; 3.5.1.E Integration Capabilities; 2.2	What systems, both internal and external, does NCCCS need the new GMS to integrate with? Can you provide details for the integration (capability, data, etc.)?	The State anticipates that the new Grants Management System (GMS) will integrate with a combination of State enterprise systems, program-specific systems, and institutional systems. The environment is hybrid and decentralized, requiring flexible integration capabilities. Core / Required Integration

		Agency Background		Purpose: Authentication and single sign-on (SSO) Capability: SAML 2.0 (required), OIDC/OAuth (limited/future) Data: User identity attributes (e.g., name, email, role context) Direction: One-way authentication (IdP → GMS) Program & Data Systems Title II MIS (Advansys): Purpose: Student-level program data for WIOA Title II Capability: RESTful APIs (preferred), batch file exchange (CSV/XML via SFTP) Data: Participant demographics, enrollment, outcomes, performance metrics Direction: Primarily one-way (MIS → GMS), with potential limited bi-directional use cases Frequency: Batch (e.g., nightly/periodic) or API-based where applicable Institutional Systems (Decentralized Across NCCCS) Ellucian Banner / Ellucian Colleague (ERP / SIS): Purpose: Institutional student and organizational data Capability: REST APIs (e.g., Ellucian Ethos) – where available SOAP services (legacy) Secure file exchange (CSV/XML via SFTP) Data: Enrollment, course/program participation, institutional identifiers, limited financial context (if applicable) Direction: Primarily one-way (Institution → GMS) Frequency: Batch (e.g., nightly/periodic); near real-time where supported Additional / Supporting Systems (As Applicable) Financial / Grants / State Systems: Purpose: Budget, allocation, or financial reconciliation (if required) Capability: API or file-based integration (varies) Data: High-level financial data, allocations, expenditures Direction: To be defined during discovery Analytics / Reporting Tools (e.g., Power BI): Purpose: External dashboards and reporting Capability: Data extracts, APIs, or data warehouse integration

				Data: Aggregated and detailed reporting datasets Direction: GMS → analytics tools Frequency: Scheduled refresh or near real-time where appropriate Integration Expectations Vendors must support: Hybrid integration architecture (API + file-based) Configurable data exchange mechanisms to accommodate institutional variability Secure data transmission aligned with State standards Data validation, error handling, and reconciliation processes Ability to evolve toward increased API-based integration over time Summary: The GMS must integrate with NCID (required), the Title II MIS, and decentralized institutional systems (Banner/Colleague), along with potential financial and analytics systems. Integrations will be primarily one-way, batch-oriented, with flexibility for API-based and limited bi-directional exchanges depending on use case.
160	3.0 RFP Requirements and Specifications	3.3.4 Integration Approach; 3.5.1.E Integration Capabilities	What version of your financial management system is currently being used? Please provide the current modules that are implemented within the financial management system? Also, can you provide the expectation for the type of integration required, e.g., web services, file-based, one-way, or bi-directional data flow?	
161	3.3	3.3.6; 3.5.1.I(2); 3.5.1.I(3)	Can you provide an estimate of the volume of data to be converted and migrated into the new Grants Management System? Does the expected migration include active grants or historical grants ? If historical grants, could you specify the retention period?	No financial software will be required from the vendor. Only financial tracking of grant funds.

162	3.3	3.3.6	What is the current format of this grant data? Please provide an example row of data and/or database schema.	Moodle.
163	2.0 / 3.0	2.1 Introduction; 2.2 Agency Background; 3.5.1.B.ii Local Program System Intake/Registration; 3.5.1.B.vii Permission Roles	Please provide the following breakdown: · How many NCCCS staff will access/log into the grants management system more than 20 hours a month? · How many NCCCS staff will access/log into the grants management system less than 20 hours a month? · How many internal staff only review applications? · How many Grantee/Recipient users will need access to the grants management system? · Can you please list the Grantee/Recipient users? · Will students use the system beyond completing the forward-facing student intake form?	: The State provides the following estimated user breakdown to support planning. Final counts may vary and will be refined during implementation. NCCCS staff (>20 hours/month): Approximately 20–30 users (e.g., program administrators, fiscal staff, system administrators) NCCCS staff (<20 hours/month): Approximately 10–25 users (e.g., leadership, occasional reviewers, support staff) Internal staff (review-only): Approximately 10–20 users (subset of the above, with read-only or limited review permissions) Grantee/Recipient users: Approximately 200–350 users total (across 58 community colleges and additional community-based organizations) Grantee/Recipient user types include: Local provider administrators Program staff Fiscal/budget staff Data entry/support staff User counts will vary by organization size and structure. Student users: Students are not primary users of the system. If applicable, they may interact only with limited, forward-facing components (e.g., intake or data collection forms). Students will not have full system access or ongoing user accounts. Summary: The system will support a mix of state users (primarily 30–55 total) and 200–350 local provider users, with students having minimal, limited interaction only where required for intake purposes.
164	6.0 Vendor Information and Instructions	6.3.3 Offer Submittal	For Ariba portal uploads, are there any requirements or limitations on file sizes or file names (e.g., character lengths of file names.)	The State does not define additional requirements or limitations beyond those established by the Ariba portal for file uploads. Vendors should adhere to Ariba system constraints, including any limits on: File size File name length and character restrictions

				Accepted file formats It is the vendor's responsibility to ensure that all submissions comply with Ariba platform requirements at the time of upload. Summary: No State-specific constraints are imposed; vendors should follow standard Ariba portal upload requirements and limitations.
165	5.0 Evaluation	5.2 Evaluation Criteria	Could NCCCS provide more detail on the evaluation criteria and the subcriteria? Specifically, what factors will be assessed and what weighting will be assigned to each?	The State has outlined high-level evaluation criteria in the RFP; however, detailed subcriteria and exact scoring weights are not being further specified at this time. Proposals will be evaluated based on a combination of factors that typically include: Technical approach and solution functionality Vendor experience and qualifications Implementation approach and project plan Cost and overall value Compliance with RFP requirements While specific weighting is not provided, vendors should assume a balanced evaluation that considers both technical merit and cost, with strong emphasis on the solution's ability to meet the State's functional, security, and integration requirements. Summary: Detailed subcriteria and weights are not being disclosed; vendors should focus on delivering a comprehensive, compliant, and high-value proposal aligned with all RFP requirements.
166	2.3 / 3.5	3.5.1.A Grant Management System Specifications; 3.5.1.B.vii Permission Roles	Will users be assigned exclusively to one program, or will certain users require access to both WIOA Title II and Perkins V. R	Will users be assigned exclusively to one program, or will certain users require access to both WIOA Title II and Perkins V.
167	2.3 / 3.5	2.3 Summary of Problem Statement; 3.5.1.A.v Integrated	Will workflow and approval processes be standardized across both WIOA Title II and Perkins V, or will each program require different workflows.	The State anticipates that there will be some common workflow elements across programs (e.g., application submission, review, approval, and award processes); however, WIOA Title II and Perkins V will require program-specific workflows to accommodate differing federal requirements, policies, and business processes. The system must support:

		Workflow Approvals		Configurable workflows that can be tailored by program Ability to define program-specific steps, roles, and approval hierarchies Reuse of common workflow components where appropriate Flexibility to modify workflows over time as requirements evolve Summary: Workflows will be partially standardized but ultimately program-specific, requiring a solution that supports flexible, configurable workflow design across multiple programs.
168	Attachment B: Department of Information Technology Terms and Conditions	Section 1, 10) Payment Terms	Must the vendor supply personnel timesheets along with deliverables as a requirement for payment? Can this be waived for milestone / FFP payment.	The State does not require personnel timesheets as a standard condition for payment under a firm-fixed price (FFP) contract. For milestone-based or FFP payments, compensation will be tied to the successful completion and State acceptance of defined deliverables, rather than time and materials. As such: Timesheets are not required for payment tied to deliverables/milestones Vendors must provide evidence of completion and meet acceptance criteria for each deliverable The State reserves the right to request supporting documentation as needed to verify performance Summary: Yes—timesheets can be waived for milestone/FFP payments, with payment based on deliverable completion and acceptance rather than level of effort.
169	Section 2: Terms and Conditions Applicable to Software as a Service (SaaS) and/or Vendor Hosted Solutions	6) Performance Review and Accountability	What are the requirements to request a waiver of the 10% final retention language? Does this need to be pre-award or upon contract negotiations?	Waiver requests should be identified pre-award in the proposal and will be considered during contract negotiations, subject to State approval.
170	Section 2: Terms and Conditions Applicable to Software as a Service (SaaS) and/or Vendor Hosted Solutions	13) Security of State Data, e)(iii)(1)(b)	If the Service Provider cannot offer encryption at rest, what is the required limit for cyber security liability insurance coverage for any loss resulting from a data breach?	If The State expects vendors to meet baseline security requirements, including encryption at rest, in alignment with State security standards. The inability to provide encryption at rest would be considered a significant risk and potential non-compliance with required security controls. The RFP does not define a separate or increased cybersecurity liability insurance threshold tied specifically to the absence of encryption at rest. Required insurance coverage levels, including cyber liability, are defined in the standard State contract terms. Vendors should:

				Comply with all State security requirements (e.g., NC SISM) Maintain required cyber liability insurance coverage as specified in the contract Clearly identify any exceptions or deviations in their proposal for State review Summary: No alternate insurance threshold is provided; however, encryption at rest is expected, and failure to meet this requirement may impact compliance and evaluation.
171	3.0 RFP Requirements and Specifications	3.5.1.B.ii Local Program System Intake/Registration; 3.5.1.E Integration Capabilities	Where will the NCCCS at-a-glance student snapshot data reside? Where will the snapshot be run from?	The at-a-glance student snapshot data is expected to be sourced from the Title II MIS (Advansys), which serves as the system of record for student-level data. The snapshot itself may be: Accessed within the grants management system via integration with the MIS, or Rendered through reporting/visualization layers that consume MIS data (e.g., APIs, data extracts, or dashboards) The State anticipates that: Authoritative student data will remain in the MIS The grants management system will consume and display relevant snapshot data as needed to support application review, monitoring, and decision-making Summary: Student snapshot data will reside in the MIS (Advansys) and be accessed by or surfaced within the grants management system through integration, rather than being independently maintained as a separate data source within the GMS.
172	3.0 RFP Requirements and Specifications	3.5.1.I Project Implementation, especially 3.5.1.I(2) phased statewide rollout	Given the 12 months implementation period, does the NCCCS prefer a phased deployed (separate preaward and award/post-award releases or one grant program at a time)?	Yes, the State prefers a phased implementation approach within the 12-month period to reduce risk and support effective adoption. The State is open to vendor-recommended phasing strategies, which may include: Pre-award and post-award functionality releases, or Program-based rollout (e.g., implementing one grant program such as WIOA Title II first, followed by others like Perkins V) At a minimum, the State anticipates: An initial phase (pilot) focused on core functionality

				Incremental releases to expand functionality and/or additional programs Opportunities for user validation, feedback, and refinement between phases Vendors should propose a phased deployment strategy that aligns with the 12-month timeline and minimizes disruption to ongoing grant cycles. Summary: Yes—phased deployment is preferred. The State is flexible on approach (functional or program-based) and expects vendors to propose the most effective phased implementation plan.
173	3.0 RFP Requirements and Specifications	3.5.1.B.ii Local Program System Intake/Registration; 3.5.1.E.i–ii Integration Capabilities	Can the NCCCS please describe the student local program intake? Specifically, what information is uploaded/downloaded to the Student Information System?	The student local program intake process is conducted by local providers (primarily community colleges and CBOs) and captured in the Title II MIS (Advansys), which serves as the system of record for student-level data. Data Collected at Intake (entered into MIS): Local providers collect and enter standardized data elements required for federal (NRS) and state reporting, including: Participant demographics (e.g., age, gender, race/ethnicity) Eligibility and barrier information (e.g., employment status, low income, special populations) Program enrollment details (e.g., program type, entry date, instructional level) Initial assessment results (e.g., educational functioning level) Contact and identifying information (non-SSN identifiers where applicable) Data Flow to/from Student Information Systems (e.g., Banner/Colleague): Integration between local Student Information Systems (SIS) and the MIS may vary by institution, but generally includes: Data sent to MIS (SIS → MIS): Enrollment and course participation data Program registration or attendance indicators (where applicable) Data received by SIS (MIS → SIS): Typically limited; MIS is the primary system of record for Title II data, and SIS updates are not universally required Some institutions may consume select data for internal reporting or reconciliation Integration Characteristics: Primarily one-way (SIS → MIS) Typically batch-based (e.g., periodic uploads), though API-based integration may exist in some environments Data exchange formats may include CSV/XML or API (JSON) depending on institutional capability

				Summary: Student intake data is collected locally and stored in the MIS, with SIS integration primarily supporting limited, one-way data sharing into the MIS. The grants management system is expected to consume this data via integration, not replace the intake process or serve as the system of record for student data.