



NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Solicitation Addendum

Solicitation Number: 41-501490

Solicitation Description: NC Disaster Management Portal

Solicitation Opening Date and Time: February 26, 2026, at 4:00 PM ET

Addendum Number: 1

Addendum Date: February 19, 2026

Contract Specialist or Purchasing Agent: Natalie Parraghi, natalie.parraghi@nc.gov

1. Return one properly executed copy of this addendum with bid response or prior to the Bid Opening Date/Time listed above.

2. The solicitation is hereby modified as follows:

M1. The date and time for offer opening deadline is extended to February 26, 2026, at 4:00 PM ET as follows:

Table with 3 columns: Solicitation Section, Original Solicitation Language, Updated Solicitation Language. Rows include Cover Page, 1.0 ANTICIPATED PROCUREMENT SCHEDULE, and 6.3.3 OFFER SUBMITTAL.

M2. Section 6.3.2 OFFER ORGANIZATION is updated to add three (3) items to the index list as follows:

For Vendor Completion:

Within each section of its offer, Vendor should address the items in the order in which they appear in this RFP. Forms, attachments or exhibits, if any provided in the RFP, must be completed and included in the appropriate section of the offer.

The offer should be organized and indexed in the following format and should contain, at a minimum, all listed items below.

- a) Signed Execution Page AND all pages of this solicitation document in ONE (1) PDF (with exception of attachment I, which is submitted as a separate document). This includes: Attachments A and B, Completed Description of Offeror form (Attachment C), Completed Cost Form (Attachment D), Completed and Signed Vendor Certification Form (Attachment E), Completed Location of Workers Utilized by Vendor Form (Attachment F), Completed References (Attachment G), Completed Financial Review Form/Financial Statements (Attachment H)

- b) Completed Attachment I: Vendor Response RFP Themes and Features Spreadsheet (*Vendor's response to specifications (3.5)—MS Excel Workbook*)
- c) Security Vendor Readiness Assessment Report (VRAR) (3.2)
- d) Architecture Diagrams (3.3.1)
- e) Detailed Project Timeline (3.3.2)
- f) Response to Enterprise Specifications (3.3.3 – 3.3.8)
- g) Proposed Payment Schedule (4.2)
- h) Errata and Exceptions, if any (6.2.5)
- i) Vendor's License and Maintenance Agreements, if any (7.4)
- j) Vendor may attach other supporting materials that it feels may improve the quality of its response. These materials should be included as items in a separate appendix.
- k) Signed receipt page of RFP Addendum 1

3. The following are questions received about the solicitation and the State's answers to the questions.

*REMAINDER OF PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.*

Question #	Solicitation Section	Solicitation Subsection	Vendor Question	State's Response
1	3.5.2	Epic 1.4	Please clarify whether the Portal is expected to consume content directly from the existing NC Drupal CMS via API only, or whether bi-directional content synchronization (including authoring workflows) is anticipated for MVP.	Consuming content directly from the existing NC Drupal CMS via API is an option. However, we are looking at Vendors to recommend options and those options will be evaluated by technical subject matter experts.
2	3.3.3	Identity and Access Management	Please confirm the required Identity Assurance Level (IAL) and Authentication Assurance Level (AAL) for MVP integration with NCID, and whether higher assurance levels are anticipated in future phases.	The Vendor solution must integrate with NCID for authentication for the MVP, but will require Identity Assurance Levels higher than IAL1 for future phase.
3	3.5.3	Technical Implementation Notes	Will the State provide a preliminary inventory of downstream agency systems (including integration methods such as API, SFTP, manual export) prior to award to assist vendors in estimating integration complexity?	The State will not provide an inventory of downstream agency systems prior to award. Vendors are recommended to provide pricing per application for API integration vs. manual export.
4	3.5.3	Feature 2.1.14	Does the State currently maintain an enterprise-level constituent data model that vendors must align to, or is the vendor expected to propose the canonical intake data model for MVP?	An enterprise-level constituent data model is not currently maintained. Vendors can propose the canonical data model for MVP and after contract award, will work with the Enterprise Data Office and Privacy Office to refine the data model.
5	3.5.3	Epic 2.3	For intake status transparency, what specific data elements are expected to be surfaced from downstream agency systems (e.g., routed, received, in review), and will agencies expose these via API during MVP?	For part 1 of the question, refer to Features 1.3.2, 2.3.3, 2.3.4, 2.3.5 and 2.3.6.  For part 2 of the question, not all agencies will expose their APIs for MVP. We could target at least one agency for MVP implementation.
6	3.2	Security Specifications	Please confirm whether the Portal will process Highly Restricted data under the Statewide Data Classification Policy and whether additional agency-specific security controls beyond NIST 800-53 are anticipated.	Confirmed. The portal will collect and process data that is considered "Highly Restricted" including but not limited to data such as SSN, Bank account info, Insurance Info, Full name, home address, contact email, phone. Security controls beyond NIST 800-53 are a possibility but unlikely.
7	3.5.3	Feature 2.3.9	Does the State currently utilize a preferred enterprise email and SMS delivery provider, or should vendors propose a messaging platform as part of their solution?	Proofpoint SER for email relay notification and M365 for Email based user notifications. We would like a proposal for SMS Platform
8	3.5.2	Feature 1.3.1	What level of access to agency subject matter experts and system documentation will be available during the initial discovery phase, and will that occur prior to MVP timeline commencement?	Subject matter experts from appropriate agencies will be available during the initial discovery phase to enable the Vendor to meet the MVP timeline.
9	1	Anticipated Procurement Schedule	Please confirm whether the June 1, 2026 MVP Go-Live target applies to both Theme 1 and Theme 2 if awarded to a single vendor, or whether phased go-live by Theme is acceptable.	Yes, applies to both Theme 1 and Theme 2.

10	5.1	Source Selection	If separate vendors are selected for Theme 1 and Theme 2, how does the State anticipate coordination of shared services such as notification frameworks, identity integration, and security governance?	In case of separate vendors, State's Project Manager will ensure collaboration and coordination among both Vendors and the State team.
11	3.5.3	Feature 2.3.11	Will the State provide specific retention schedules for disaster intake records during MVP, or should vendors propose a compliant retention framework aligned to G.S. 121 and G.S. 132?	Vendors should propose a compliant retention framework aligned to G.S. 121 and G.S. 132.
12	3.3.8	Accessibility	Does the State require formal VPAT submission at proposal stage, or will preliminary accessibility documentation suffice with formal certification prior to award?	Preliminary accessibility documentation will suffice with formal certification prior to award.
13	3.2.2	Security Assessments	If a vendor provides both hosting and application services, is a single SOC 2 Type 2 report sufficient, or does the State require separate certifications for hosting and application layers?	State requires separate certifications for hosting and application layers. ISO 27001/HITRUST, FedRAMP/GovRAMP are accepted.
14	3.3.5	Disaster Recovery and Business Continuity	Are there defined uptime SLAs expected for the Portal during declared disaster events beyond standard 99.9% availability, and are surge performance metrics required?	We do not have defined uptime SLAs, but will evaluate based on Vendor's solution capabilities. Refer to Feature 2.2.1 for surge management.
15	Attachment D	Section 4	Should vendors propose technical foundations in MVP that anticipate optional future capabilities such as identity proofing enhancements and advanced analytics, even if not scored in evaluation?	Vendors may propose technical foundations in MVP that anticipate optional future capabilities.
16	3.3	3.3.3 – 3.3.8	6.3.2 (Offer Organization) explicitly lists Architecture Diagrams (3.3.1) and the Detailed Project Timeline (3.3.2) as required submission components but does not reference Sections 3.3.3 through 3.3.8. Can the Agency confirm whether Vendors are required to provide written narrative responses addressing Sections 3.3.3 through 3.3.8 as part of their proposal submission?	Yes, Vendors should provide written narrative responses addressing RFP Sections 3.3.3 through 3.3.8, which are Enterprise Specifications, as part of their proposal submission (refer to M2 in item 2 of this addendum for modification of 6.3.2 verbiage) Vendors should submit this portion of their proposal response that addresses RFP sections 3.3.3-3.3.8 by uploading attachment(s) in Section 5.3 of the sourcing tool.
17	7.2	Financial Statements / Attachment H	For privately held companies that do not publicly disclose detailed financial statements or balance sheet data at the level requested in Attachment H, will the Agency accept alternative evidence of financial stability, such as an audited summary letter from a certified public accountant, a Dun & Bradstreet report, in lieu of providing full financial statements and detailed financial schedules?	Yes, IAW RFP Section 7.2, subsections b) and c), this alternative evidence is acceptable.

18	3.2, 3.3, 7.2	3.2.1, 3.2.2, 3.3.1  Financial Statements / Attachment H	If a Vendor has previously submitted a completed Vendor Readiness Assessment Report (VRAR), the required Architecture Diagrams, and financial data to the State of North Carolina within the past twelve (12) months and the proposed solution architecture has not materially changed, may the Vendor reference the previously submitted materials for sections 3.2.1, 3.2.2, 3.3.1 and Attachment H, or is a new submission required specifically for RFP 41-501490?	Regarding VRAR, architecture diagrams and financial data, Vendors must submit a new submission specifically for this RFP 41-501490 rather than reference previously submitted materials.
19	3.5 / Theme 1 & Theme 2	MVP Scope	For MVP Phase 1 Go-Live on June 1, 2026, what are the minimum required capabilities and deliverables for Theme 1 and Theme 2? Please identify must-have vs. optional features.	As shown in the Portal High Level Vision diagram on Page 7 of the RFP the minimum viable product or Phase one includes the Epics and Features of Themes 1 & 2.
20	3.5 / Theme Awards	Themes	DIT reserves the right to make multiple awards for Theme 1 and Theme 2. Does the State prefer a single integrated solution across both Themes, or separate best-of-breed awards? How will proposals spanning both Themes be evaluated?	We are looking at best-of-breed awards for each theme and if it happens to be one Vendor that is acceptable as well. Proposals will be evaluated based on Section 5.0 EVALUATION.
21	3.5.3 / Theme 2	Case Management	Is the portal expected to provide full case management functionality, or only constituent intake and routing to downstream agency systems? What downstream systems are anticipated post-intake?	For MVP, we are looking at constituent intake and routing to downstream agency systems. The solution offered by the Vendor will need to integrate with a variety of downstream agency case management systems. The goal of this project is to create a unified technology infrastructure and encourage collaboration among agencies to mitigate the present state of fragmented services, requiring individuals to visit multiple agency websites with varying designs and procedures.
22	3.3.4 / Integration Approach	NC Platforms	What APIs and integration mechanisms are currently available for Digital Commons and NC.GOV/Drupal content platforms? Should the portal primarily syndicate content from Drupal or serve as the authoritative publishing layer?	The portal should syndicate existing content from the platform. API integration: <a href="https://www.drupal.org/docs/core-modules-and-themes/core-modules/jsonapi-module/api-overview">https://www.drupal.org/docs/core-modules-and-themes/core-modules/jsonapi-module/api-overview</a>
23	1.3 / Discovery	Platform Diagnostics	What documentation, environments, and SME access will be provided during the initial disaster recovery service audit and platform diagnostics? When will discovery begin after award?	Subject matter experts from appropriate agencies will be available during the initial discovery phase to enable the Vendor to meet the MVP timeline. Discovery should begin immediately after award.

24	3.2 / Security Specifications	High-Risk Data	What specific data elements and workflows will involve Medium or High Risk classified data, and what compliance artifacts (FedRAMP, SOC 2 Type 2, ISO 27001, etc.) are required at submission versus prior to award?	Highly Restricted info such as: SSN, Banking account info, Insurance Info, PII such as: Full name, home address, contact email, phone.  The VRAR document specifies which compliance artifacts are needed. Compliance artifacts are due within 7 days of bid opening.
25	3.2 / Hosting	Infrastructure	Does the State anticipate the portal being hosted on State infrastructure, Vendor-managed cloud, or a hybrid model? Are there preferred hosting patterns for handling high-risk data?	The portal should be hosted on State infrastructure
26	3.3.3 / Identity and Access Management	NCID	Which user roles must authenticate via NCID (public residents, case workers, admins)? What identity assurance level (IAL) is required for intake/application workflows in MVP?	All user roles should leverage NCID for authentication. The Vendor solution must integrate with NCID for authentication for the MVP, but will require Identity Assurance Levels higher than IAL1 for future phase.
27	4.0 / Cost Form & Licensing	Pricing Assumptions	Should offerors assume use of existing statewide license agreements where possible? Please clarify which enterprise tools/platforms are already licensed and available for notifications, analytics, or CRM capabilities.	Offerors should assume use of existing statewide license agreements. Depending on the solution offered by the Vendor, State has available tools/platforms such as Microsoft 365, CRM, Authentication and Identity Verification, Case Management, Content Management, e-Signature, etc.
28	7.11 / Project Management & Support	Operations	What are the expected support model and SLA requirements post-Go-Live, including incident response during disaster events and transition of operations to State personnel?	Vendors should recommend the level of support required to support their proposed solution.
29	Overall	Overall	How are NC Request for Proposal #:19-RFP-1587901118-PTW DISASTER CASE MANAGEMENT SERVICES, issued July 18, 2025 (not yet awarded) and this RFP connected? Or does this RFP supersede the July RFP?	This solicitation is not related to referenced RFP 19-RFP-1587901118-PTW.

30	Section 3.5.1 (General Business and Technical Specifications)	Epic 1.2 Content Publishing Governance	<p>The RFP language suggests the proposed system may be used repeatedly for multiple disaster events. Can the State clarify the anticipated frequency and scale of events that would trigger activation of the system?</p> <p>Specifically:</p> <p>Is the system intended to function as an “on-call” solution activated as needed?</p> <p>Does the State intend to procure a largely commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) solution, or is a higher degree of customization anticipated?</p> <p>If customization is expected, is it limited to configurable elements such as workflows, user roles, and branding, or does the State anticipate more comprehensive, event-specific system modifications for each activation?</p>	<p>No one can predict when natural disasters or man-made disasters impact the State causing an emergency situation. Platforms should be available to support these situations at a moment's notice.</p> <p>Vendors should propose a solution that builds upon and reuses existing State's platform services.</p>
31	Section 3.5.1 — General Business and Technical Specifications	Epic 1.5 — Technical Governance and Standards	<p>The RFP references vendor responsibilities related to implementation support, documentation, and enablement activities. Can the State provide additional clarification on the anticipated level of effort for training associated with the Portal solution?</p> <p>Specifically, does the State expect training to be limited to administrative and content management users as part of MVP delivery, or should vendors anticipate broader training for multiple agency user groups and ongoing operational support? Additionally, please clarify whether training deliverables are expected to include live instructor-led sessions, recorded materials, train-the-trainer support, or other formal training components.</p>	<p>Vendors should recommend the training and knowledge transfer and ongoing support required for the proposed solution. Options such as Train-the-trainer and recorded training materials are acceptable.</p>

32	Overall	Overall	<p>The RFP describes the Portal as a solution that may be activated in support of disaster incidents and State of Emergency events. Can the State clarify whether the platform is intended to be primarily event-driven and deployed on an as-needed basis, or operated as a continuously available system?</p> <p>Additionally, does the State anticipate an active or upcoming disaster recovery event or program that will require use of the platform immediately upon Notice to Proceed (NTP), or will initial implementation focus on readiness and configuration for future activations?</p>	<p>No one can predict when natural disasters or man-made disasters impact the State causing an emergency situation. Platforms should be available to support these situations at a moment's notice.</p>
33	Attachment D	Section 3	<p>Attachment D, Section 3 requires vendors to propose recurring cost pricing for optional renewal terms (Years 2–5) at the time of proposal submission.</p> <p>Can the State confirm whether the annual pricing submitted at award will remain fixed for each option year if exercised, even if the scope of services or system requirements expand over time?</p> <p>If material scope changes occur in future years, will there be an opportunity to adjust pricing through a contract amendment or other mechanism, or will vendors be held to the option-year pricing established at the time of award?</p>	<p>The Vendor will be held to the pricing provided in Section 3 of Attachment D, or the Best and Final Offer if applicable, if/when an option year is exercised.</p> <p>If material scope changes occur at any time, to include expansion of services or system requirements, those changes must be formalized in a contract amendment executed by the State and Vendor and there will there be an opportunity to adjust pricing in the contract amendment.</p>
34	Section 3.5.1 – Epic 1.4 (Integration Patterns with Existing NC Platforms);	Section 3.5.3 – Epic 2.1 Technical Implementation Notes	<p>Can the State provide clarification regarding which existing State systems of record the Portal will be required to integrate with during Phase 1 (MVP) and in future phases?</p> <p>Specifically, beyond NCID, Digital Commons, and the Drupal CMS platform, can the State identify anticipated downstream agency case management systems or enterprise platforms that will serve as systems of record for disaster recovery intake and status data?</p> <p>Additionally, does the State anticipate integrations with any statewide enterprise platforms (e.g., identity, CRM, data warehouse, or analytics systems) beyond those identified in Epic 1.4?</p>	<p>Offerors should assume use of existing statewide license agreements. Depending on the solution offered by the Vendor, State has available tools/platforms such as Microsoft 365, CRM, Authentication and Identity Verification, Case Management, Content Management, e-Signature, etc.</p> <p>For the MVP, the State does not anticipate requiring integrations with additional statewide enterprise platforms other than those listed in Epic 1.4, but this could change depending on Vendor's proposed solution.</p>

35	3.5.1	General Business and Technical Specifications	Will the State require the ability to support a contact center where Constituents can call in and talk to an agent that will create their profile and intake form?	Refer to Feature 2.1.5.
36	Project Timeline and Delivery	Section 1.0	Is the June 1, 2026 date fixed, or is there flexibility if discovery reveals additional complexity?	The State would like to implement MVP by June 1st 2026. Vendors can recommend what they can implement in the given timeline.
37	Project Timeline and Delivery	Section 1.0	There is a 15 day protest period. Please clarify if the selected vendor can start work immediately upon award or must wait until after the protest period is over?	Vendor can start work immediately after contract award.
38	Project Timeline and Delivery	Section 1.0	The schedule indicates a contract award on March 31, 2026, with a "Go-Live" for MVP Phase 1 by June 1, 2026. This leaves exactly two months for discovery, development, and testing. Given the two-month window between contract award and Go-Live, what is the State's priority list for 'core capabilities' if the full MVP scope cannot be met by June 1st?	The State would like to implement MVP by June 1st 2026. Vendors can recommend what they can implement in the given timeline.
39	Project Timeline and Delivery	Section 3.5.1	Section 3.5.1 mentions 'structured discovery and validation activities'. Does the State expect discovery to be completed within the 60-day window, or has some discovery already been performed by the Agency?	The State would like to implement MVP by June 1st 2026. Vendors can recommend what they can implement in the given timeline. Subject matter experts from appropriate agencies and any advanced discovery information will be available during the discovery phase. Discovery will begin immediately after award.
40	Project Timeline and Delivery	Feature 1.5.1	Feature 1.5.1 requires architecture and tech stack approval by the Enterprise Architecture Team before implementation. How will the State ensure this approval process does not delay the June 1st Go-Live?	Subject matter experts from the Enterprise Architecture Team will work with us to provide timely approvals to meet the MVP Go Live date.
41	Project Timeline and Delivery	Section 1.0	What is the anticipated format, duration, and evaluation weight of oral presentations for finalists (March 9-10, 2026)?	Vendor oral presentations can be virtual. The State will provide an agenda of specific items to be included for the oral presentations along with the duration (anticipated to be no more than 4 hours). The State may evaluate oral presentations and product demonstrations as part of the Vendors' respective offer, but oral presentations are not separately evaluated as their own weighted category. Refer to RFP section 5.0 Evaluation for details on evaluation process.
42	Project Timeline and Delivery	Section 1.0	Is a phased rollout to different user groups or geographic regions acceptable, or must it be a full statewide launch on June 1, 2026?	The State would like to implement MVP by June 1st 2026. Vendors can recommend what they can implement in the given timeline.
43	Project Timeline and Delivery	Section 3.5.1	Would the State consider a pilot program with a limited user base before full statewide deployment?	The State would like to implement MVP by June 1st 2026. Vendors can recommend what they can implement in the given timeline.

44	Mobile & User Experience	Section 2.2	Section 2.2 highlights a 'unified digital experience'. Does the State prioritize a native mobile app experience for constituents to enable features like offline form caching or push notifications, or is the Phase 1 MVP strictly limited to mobile-responsive web?	The State is interested in the Vendors' creative response to accomplish a unified digital experience.
45	Mobile & User Experience	Section 2.3	Section 2.3 highlights that disasters often impact network infrastructure. Does the State have specific performance requirements for low-bandwidth or offline submission capabilities within the portal?	Vendor's proposed solution is expected to function under conditions that may be presented in any State of Emergency scenarios.
46	Technical Integrations & Architecture	Section 2.1	Can the State provide detailed architecture diagrams of existing platforms (NCID, Digital Commons, NC.GOV Drupal CMS)?	Subject matter experts from appropriate agencies will be available during the initial discovery phase to enable the Vendor to meet the MVP timeline.
47	Technical Integrations & Architecture	Section 3.3.3	What are the specific technical specifications, protocols, and authentication flows for NCID integration?	Subject matter experts from appropriate agencies will be available during the initial discovery phase to enable the Vendor to meet the MVP timeline. Discovery should begin immediately after award.
48	Technical Integrations & Architecture	Section 3.3.3, 3.5.2 Feature 1.4.1	What are the technical specifications of Digital Commons? What APIs, services, or capabilities are available for integration?	Subject matter experts from appropriate agencies will be available during the initial discovery phase to enable the Vendor to meet the MVP timeline. Discovery should begin immediately after award.
49	Technical Integrations & Architecture	Feature 2.2.9	Feature 2.2.9 mentions a data synchronization strategy. Is the State looking for real-time bi-directional sync with agency systems of record, or is a one-way push from the Portal to the agency sufficient for the June 1st Go-Live?	Vendors can recommend what they can implement in the given timeline.
50	Technical Integrations & Architecture	Feature 2.3.10	Feature 2.3.10 envisions a 'reusable shared service' for notifications. Does the State expect the vendor to build this as a standalone microservice that other NC agencies can call via API independently of the Disaster Portal?	Yes.
51	Technical Integrations & Architecture	Section 3.5.2 Epic 1.1	Does the State have any existing notification systems, alert systems, SMS gateways, or email platforms that should be leveraged?	Offerors should assume use of existing statewide license agreements. Depending on the solution offered by the Vendor, State has available tools/platforms such as Microsoft 365, CRM, Authentication and Identity Verification, Case Management, Content Management, e-Signature, etc.
52	Technical Integrations & Architecture	Section 3.5.2 Feature 1.1.3	Should the portal integrate with federal emergency alert systems (IPAWS, Wireless Emergency Alerts)?	Vendors proposed solution should allow for such an integration.
53	Technical Integrations & Architecture	Feature 2.1.11	Feature 2.1.11 requires routing data to 'downstream systems'. Can the State provide the percentage of Phase 1 agencies that currently support modern REST APIs versus those requiring manual file exports (SFTP)?	This will be identified during the discovery phase.

54	Technical Integrations & Architecture	Section 3.5.3	Section 3.5.3 states a list of downstream systems will be provided during the discovery phase. Can the State provide an initial list now to help vendors assess the complexity of the 'secure routing' requirements (Feature 2.1.1)?	This will be identified during the discovery phase.
55	Technical Integrations & Architecture	Section 3.5.3 Feature 2.1.11	Is technical documentation available for downstream agency systems?	This will be identified during the discovery phase.
56	Technical Integrations & Architecture	Section 3.5.3 Feature 2.1.11	Are there known technical constraints or limitations in agency systems that vendors should plan around?	These could be uncovered during discovery.
57	Technical Integrations & Architecture	Section 3.5.3 Feature 2.1.11	Are any downstream agencies planning system modernizations that might affect integration approaches?	This will be identified during the discovery phase.
58	Technical Integrations & Architecture	Section 3.3.4	Are there existing data sharing agreements between agencies that govern how constituent data can be shared?	While there are existing data sharing agreements between agencies, we intend to capture constituent opt-in / opt-out preferences in the Portal.
59	Technical Integrations & Architecture	Feature 1.4.1	Feature 1.4.1 requires integration with the State's existing Drupal CMS. Are there existing APIs/Web Services available for this, or will the vendor be responsible for developing the integration layer on the Drupal side? If an API exists, what are the detailed API specifications for content retrieval from the existing Drupal CMS? Is there existing API documentation?	<a href="https://www.drupal.org/docs/core-modules-and-themes/core-modules/jsonapi-module/api-overview">https://www.drupal.org/docs/core-modules-and-themes/core-modules/jsonapi-module/api-overview</a>
60	Technical Integrations & Architecture	Section 3.5.2 Feature 1.4.1	What version of Drupal is currently in use for NC.GOV? What modules, extensions, or customizations exist?	10.6, enterprise multisite implementation with extensive custom and contrib module ecosystem.
61	Technical Integrations & Architecture	Section 3.3.6	Section 3.3.6 asks for data migration approaches. Can the State quantify the volume and format of existing 'current data' that needs to be loaded into the new portal?	For Data migration, consider content from websites with disaster related data such as NC Emergency Management, NC DHHS, ReadyNC, etc. We want Vendors to tell us what can be accomplished for MVP by June 1.
62	Technical Integrations & Architecture	Section 5.1	In Section 5.1 the State reserves the right to award Theme 1 and Theme 2 to separate vendors. If split, which vendor will be responsible for the overarching system architecture and shared API standards?	The Vendors are expected to recommend an overarching system architecture and shared API standards. The State will approve and own the overarching system architecture and shared API standards.
63	Technical Integrations & Architecture	Section 3.5.3 Feature 2.1.14	To facilitate faster recovery, must the Portal's data model align with specific FEMA Individual Assistance (IA) or HUD CDBG-DR reporting schemas in Phase 1?	Yes.

64	technical Integrations & Architecture	Section 3.5.2 Feature 1.1.4	What GIS systems or mapping services does the State currently use? Should these be integrated?	The State of NC uses the Esri suite of GIS software. Esri's ArcGIS REST Services (orthoimagery, parcels, addresses, and roads) are commonly used throughout the State and should be integrated within the portal. There are many additional REST services available via NCOneMap.gov, the State's GIS Open Data Portal.
65	technical Integrations & Architecture	Section 3.3.4	What data exchange standards (XML schemas, JSON schemas, HL7, FHIR, etc.) are currently in use across State agencies?	Data exchange standards are typically specific to the domain. The state offers guidance for a number of best practice in data exchange. Recommendation includes REST/JSON API, OpenAPI, and XML/SOAP supporting the broadest interoperability. For example, for health data domain the state employs - HL7 and FHIR data exchange standards for health care data in HIEA. For common use across multiple state agencies in various business cases, XML, JSON, and delimited batch files are in practice.  We request solicitation partner propose how it will approach data exchange and interface within the solution proposal.
66	technical Integrations & Architecture	Section 3.5.3 Feature 2.1.15	Beyond English, what languages must be supported? Is machine translation acceptable or is human translation required?	Vendor solution should support translations for multiple languages. Refer to Feature 2.1.15. Machine translation is acceptable however the Vendor should have a way to verify accuracy of the machine translation.
67	Security & Compliance	Section 3.5.3	Section 3.5.3 mentions NIST standards for fraud mitigation. Does the State require a specific Identity Assurance Level (IAL) for 'Authenticated Constituents' beyond the standard NCID login?	The Vendor solution must integrate with NCID for authentication for the MVP, but will require Identity Assurance Levels higher than IAL1 for future phase.
68	Pricing & Contractual	Section 6.1.5	Section 6.1.5 mentions a 1.75% transaction fee on 'goods ONLY'. Since this is primarily a 'Cloud-based business process as a service', does the State classify the subscription/SaaS license as a 'good' subject to this fee?	No, the State does not classify a subscription/SaaS license within this procurement as a good since this is a procurement under Commodity Code: 811623 for Cloud-based business process as a service. The 1.75% transaction fee will not be assessed to this procurement.
69	Pricing & Contractual	Section 7.3	Section 7.3 mentions monetary penalties for delays exceeding 45 days from Go-Live. How will penalties be assessed if the delay is caused by dependencies on State-provided integrations (e.g., NCID or Digital Commons)?	Vendors are not held accountable for delays caused by the State.

70	Pricing & Contractual	Attachment B, Section 3, Paragraph 3	Attachment B, Section 3, Paragraph 3 requires key personnel to be approved by the State. To meet the aggressive 60-day window, will the State provide a concurrent review of proposed staff during the evaluation period to ensure immediate kick-off upon award?	Expedited background checks can help meet the timeline. We can also accept background checks performed by the offeror as long as they have been performed in the past year.
71	1		Given the 60 day implementation timeline is there flexibility in redefining what constitutes an MVP?	The State would like to implement MVP by June 1st 2026. Vendors can recommend what they can implement in the given timeline.
72	2.1		Section 2.1 indicates the State anticipates iterative delivery informed by discovery and validation activities, while Section 7.3 references a June 1 Go-Live date for MVP Phase 1. Can the State clarify what minimum capabilities must be operational on June 1 to satisfy the Go-Live requirement, and whether the State will define success criteria for MVP acceptance prior to contract award?	Vendors can recommend what they can implement in the given timeline.
73	3.5.2	Feature 1.2.1	The RFP references Content Strategy and Governance. Could you clarify the current state and level of support expected? For example, is a comprehensive content audit across all sites and communication channels required, along with a defined strategy and formal governance model, or is lighter optimization and support of existing processes anticipated?	The State prefers a comprehensive content strategy and formal governance model across all disaster related sites and communication channels.
74	3.5.2	Feature 1.1.2	Do you have an existing centralized master 'person' constituent record that would serve as the system of record for portal users, or would this initiative establish a new identity repository?	The Vendor solution should leverage data from NCID and NC eLink ( <a href="https://it.nc.gov/programs/nc-government-data-analytics-center/gdac-services/nc-elink">https://it.nc.gov/programs/nc-government-data-analytics-center/gdac-services/nc-elink</a> ) before trying to establish a new identity repository.
75	3.5.3	Feature 2.1.14	Is the existing data model aligned to support migration into the base solution without significant re-architecture?	An enterprise-level constituent data model is not currently maintained. Vendors can propose the canonical data model for MVP and after contract award, will work with the Enterprise Data Office and Privacy Office to refine the data model.
76	3.5.3	Feature 2.1.14	What data gaps exist that would limit personalization, notifications, or other automation at scale?	Without an existing enterprise-level constituent data model, we do not know what gaps exist.
77	3.5.2	Feature 1.1.2	If 'person' data exists, can you speak to the current data and consent quality of existing email addresses and mobile phone numbers to be included in an initial data load into the system?	The Vendor solution should leverage data from NCID and NC eLink ( <a href="https://it.nc.gov/programs/nc-government-data-analytics-center/gdac-services/nc-elink">https://it.nc.gov/programs/nc-government-data-analytics-center/gdac-services/nc-elink</a> ) before trying to establish a new identity repository. We will not be doing an initial data load into the system.

78	.5.3	Feature 2.1.9	Have you obtained legal guidance regarding consent requirements for sending disaster recovery notifications via email and SMS, and how are these communications classified (transactional, public safety, etc.)?	Refer to Features 1.1.1 and 2.1.9. Specific verbiage for consent will be approved by Legal Counsel. The Vendor's proposed solution should allow for different types of communication classifications.
79	3.5.3	Feature 2.1.9	Theme "Enhanced Constituent Engagement and Communication" and respecting user consent. Do you have an existing contact and consent preference center and vendor like OneTrust that that you would want to re-use?	The State does not have an existing contact and consent preference center.
80	3.5.3	Feature 2.1.9	If consent has not been established at scale, is there an expectation that this portal will act as the source of truth and manage opt-in and opt-out preferences?	This portal will act as the source of truth and manage opt-in and opt-out preferences.
81	3.5.3	Feature 2.3.9	Do you expect integration with existing county channel Alert vendors (SMS, voice, email, TTY/TDD, etc.)?	The solution should be capable of integration with existing county channel Alert vendors (SMS, voice, email, TTY/TDD, etc.)
82	3.5.3	Feature 2.3.9	Have IP configuration and short code registration for email and SMS channels already been planned or established, or would this initiative be responsible for standing up and configuring those components?	This initiative be responsible for standing up and configuring those components.
83	3.5.3	Feature 2.3.9	Do you expect delivery of notifications to other channels than email and SMS at a State level?	The solution should be capable of delivering notifications via email, SMS, phone call, social media or other channels.
84	3.5.2	Feature 1.4.1	Can the State indicate whether existing constituent research, usability studies, call center data, or analytics from current disaster recovery digital channels will be made available to the awarded vendor to inform MVP design decisions, and if so, in what form and timeline?	Subject matter experts from appropriate agencies will be available during the initial discovery phase to enable the Vendor to meet the MVP timeline.
85	3.5.2	Feature 1.4.1	Are there other States that have Disaster Management Portals that you consider a model for the State of NC?	No.
86	3.5.2	Feature 1.4.1	The RFP references integration with NC.gov and Digital Commons platforms. Does the State have an existing design system, component library, or brand standards that the portal must conform to? And if so, is that documentation available to vendors prior to award?	Yes - <a href="https://zeroheight.com/6cc837e20/p/428274-digital-commons-style-guide">https://zeroheight.com/6cc837e20/p/428274-digital-commons-style-guide</a>
87	5	5.1	indicates the State reserves the right to award Theme 1 and Theme 2 to separate vendors. If the State exercises this option, how does the State anticipate managing the integration between Theme 1 (communication and content layer) and Theme 2 (intake and routing layer)?	In case of separate vendors, State's Project Manager will ensure collaboration and coordination among both Vendors and the State team.

88	3.5.3	2.1.15	references language support for intake submissions. Can the State indicate which languages beyond English are required for MVP, and whether the State has existing translated content or approved translation vendors that the portal solution should leverage?	Vendor solution should support translations for multiple languages. Refer to Feature 2.1.15. Machine translation is acceptable however the Vendor should have a way to verify accuracy of the machine translation.
89	3.5.3	2.1.11	States that the State will provide the list of downstream systems and their integration capabilities during the discovery phase. Can the State indicate approximately how many downstream systems are anticipated to be in scope for MVP routing, and whether any preliminary integration documentation is available to vendors prior to contract award?	Details about the downstream systems would be shared during the discovery phase. We could target at least one agency for MVP implementation.
90	3.5.2	1.4.2	The RFP requires integration with NCID for both authenticated constituent flows and anonymous constituent access. Will a sandbox or testing environment access be available to awarded vendors from the first day of contract performance?	Yes
91	3.3	3.3.8	To the degree to which the solution integrates with existing system and websites, we expect that content and/or experiences created by our proposed solution is expected to comply with industry accessibility standards. We do not expect to remediate accessibility issues on the containing pages or sites that host this imported content. Is this a correct understanding of your expectations.	Yes, this is per our expectations.
92		3.3.8	Do you currently use any accessibility tools such as Siteimprove?	We use DubBot: <a href="https://dubbot.com/">https://dubbot.com/</a>
93	3.3	3.3.4	What external data feeds (weather APIs, public safety systems, GIS/location data, etc.) are required, and how are they currently ingested and governed?	These are good examples of data feeds, however these are currently not ingested and governed.
94		3.3.6	Please define 'current data'? Provide more description including current website(s), data feeds, data sources. Would the expectation for MVP include all data/content migrated by June 1?	For Data migration, consider content from websites with disaster related data such as NC Emergency Management, NC DHHS, ReadyNC, etc. We want Vendors to tell us what can be accomplished for MVP by June 1.
95		2.1	Does the State have the page template designs and information architecture created for the Disaster Relief Portal (DRP) or is that considered part of the scope? Would the leverage any existing Drupal based themes, templates and modules?	Yes, the state leverages a custom Drupal theme -- that codebase could be shared and leveraged by this solution.
96		2.1	Explain the expected roles and responsibilities of the Drupal development for the portal.	The vendor would be responsible for the custom development necessitated by implementation of this solution. It would be subject to code and security review by the state in nonproduction environments prior to approval.

97	6.3	2	<p>(Pgs. 22 to 23) The solicitation states that the offer should be “organized and indexed” per the index list provided in Section 6.3.2. Item 6.3.2.a asks for the “Signed Execution Page AND all pages of this solicitation document in ONE (1) PDF (with exception of Attachment I, which is submitted as a separate document).”</p> <p>Can the State please clarify if the expectation is 1.) or 2.):          1.) All 66 pages of the solicitation in its entirety (with completed attachments therein) are returned.          2.) All pages of the completed attachments (A through H) are returned.</p>	<p>The first expectation # 1) is accurate.          The single PDF required of 6.3.2 a) is referring to return of the 66-page PDF solicitation document, to include Vendor execution/signature on page 1, and completion of Attachments C-H within the single 66-page PDF.</p>
98	6.3	2	<p>(Pg. 23) Can the State please clarify where the Enterprise Specifications (or Sections 3.3.2, 3.3.3, 3.3.4, 3.3.5, 3.3.6, 3.3.7, and 3.3.8) should be placed in the index?</p>	<p>See M2 in item 2 (pages 1-2) of this addendum for modification of 6.3.2 verbiage.</p>
99	6.3	2	<p>(Pg. 23) Can the State please clarify if the Enterprise Specifications are to be delivered separately from the single PDF defined in 6.3.2.a?</p>	<p>The Vendor's response to Enterprise Specifications should be delivered in a separate document(s) from the single PDF required of 6.3.2 a).</p> <p>The single PDF required of 6.3.2 a) is referring to return of the 66-page PDF solicitation document, to include Vendor execution/signature on page 1, and completion of Attachments C-H within the single 66-page PDF.</p>
100	6.3	2	<p>Can the State please clarify if any material falling under 6.3.2.h should be 1.) or 2.):          1.) Included as part of the single PDF defined in 6.3.2.a.          2.) Included as a separate, second PDF.</p>	<p>See M2 in item 2 (pages 1-2) of this addendum for modification of 6.3.2 verbiage. RFP Section 6.3.2 h) has been re-lettered to j).</p> <p>Any material falling under 6.3.2 j) should be submitted as separate document(s) from the single PDF required of 6.3.2 a), and those attachments falling under 6.3.2 j) should be uploaded to section 5.4 of the sourcing tool.</p>
101	3.5	1	<p>(Pgs. 12 to 13) Can the State please clarify if we are allowed to make changes to Attachment I (such as adding an additional column to display the feature descriptions)?</p>	<p>Within Attachment I, please provide your responses in the empty cells in columns B and C in each of the remaining tabs of this document. Information that does not reasonably fit in a cell may be included in a supplemental document referenced in the appropriate cell.</p>

102	2.0 Purpose of RFP	2.6 Contract Type	The RFP references the anticipation of iterative delivery of MVP capabilities with a 6/1 go-live date. Will the State please confirm the vendor is asked to develop a solution roadmap for Phase 1(MVP) that starts with a go-live of 6/1 but occurs across a timeline to be determined after requested discovery/validation activities?	The State would like to implement MVP by June 1st 2026. Vendors can recommend what they can implement in the given timeline.
103	3.2 Security Specifications	Solutions Not Hosted on State Infrastructure	Are penetration tests required prior to MVP go-live?	To meet the aggressive timeline, we could do an accelerated scan and assessment if full penetration tests cannot be fully completed prior to MVP go-live. There would need to be some form of technical scanning and configuration security review completed by NCDIT.
104	3.3 Enterprise Specifications	3.3.6 Data Migration	Please provide additional details related to what data is expected to be migrated including type of data, size, number of tables and/or source systems to enable consistent migration solutioning.	For Data migration, consider content from websites with disaster related data such as NC Emergency Management, NC DHHS, ReadyNC, etc. We want Vendors to tell us what can be accomplished for MVP by June 1.
105	3.5 Business and Technical Specifications	Theme 1 & 2	For Themes 1 and 2, are each of the epics and their corresponding features, as outlined in the business and technical specifications, considered in scope for the MVP and expected to be delivered as part of go-live on 6-1?	Yes.
106	3.5 Business and Technical Specifications	3.5.3 Theme 1, Feature 1.5.1	Please define and describe the Enterprise Architecture review and approval process, to enable allocation of effort to meet MVP go-live.	Subject matter experts from the Enterprise Architecture Team will work with us to provide timely approvals to meet the MVP Go Live date.
107	3.5 Business and Technical Specifications	3.5.3 Theme 2, Feature 2.1.3	Should vendors assume NCID will support this pattern directly, or should vendors propose an interim identity bridging approach for MVP?	Yes, NCID will support this pattern.
108	3.5 Business and Technical Specifications	3.5.3 Theme 2, Feature 2.1.5	Please confirm that third-party representatives should be authenticated using NCID?	Yes.
109	7.8 Security and Background Checks	Security and Background Checks	Is the NCDIT open to receive certifications of background checks performed by the Offeror, instead of the State conducting the background checks itself?	Expedited background checks can help meet the timeline. We can also accept background checks performed by the offeror as long as they have been performed in the past year.
110	Table 3.5.1-B	Anonymous Constituent	For anonymous intake submissions, does the NCDIT have minimum identity proofing or fraud mitigation thresholds expected in MVP beyond consent capture and NIST-aligned controls?	No.
111	Attachment D: Cost Form	Item #4	Please provide specifics on the training and knowledge transfer needs. What types of users will need to be trained (administrators, Disaster Recovery Coordinator, etc.)? How many users are expected to be trained? Is there a preferred training model? What type of documentation do you expect vendors to produce?	Vendors should recommend the training and knowledge transfer required for the proposed solution. Options such as Train-the-trainer and recorded training materials are acceptable.

112	Section 3.5.2 / Attachment D	Feature 1.4.1 (Integration with Digital Commons)	The RFP states the solution must integrate with the State's Digital Commons (Drupal) platform. If the Vendor proposes building the portal modules <i>within</i> the existing Digital Commons environment, should the Vendor mark "Hosting" and "Infrastructure" costs as "\$0" or "N/A" in Attachment D, assuming the State provides the hosting environment?	Yes.
113	Section 3.5.3	Feature 2.1.11 (Routing)	To ensure accurate pricing for the "June 1 MVP" integration effort, can the State identify the specific backend systems targeted for Phase 1? Specifically, will the portal need to interface with NC FAST (ePass), WebEOC, or a FEMA-related system, and are REST APIs currently available for these targets?	We could target at least one agency for MVP implementation.
114	Section 3.5.2	Feature 1.4.1 (Integration with Digital Commons)	Does the State allow Vendors to install custom modules or API connectors within the Digital Commons (Drupal) environment to facilitate real-time data exchange/triggers with external messaging platforms (e.g., Adobe Journey Optimizer or similar)?	Yes, pending approval from subject matter experts associated with the existing environment.
115	Section 1.0	Anticipated Procurement Schedule	Given the aggressive timeline of approximately 60 days between Contract Award (March 31) and MVP Go-Live (June 1), is the State willing to accept a "Phased MVP" approach where critical intake functions go live on June 1, while advanced integrations or complex dashboard analytics follow in a subsequent sprint (e.g., 30 days later)?	The State would like to implement MVP by June 1st 2026. Vendors can recommend what they can implement in the given timeline.
116	Section 3.5.3	Theme 2, Epic 2.3 (Status Transparency)	For the June 1 MVP Go-Live, does the State expect full automated API integration with downstream agency systems for status updates, or will the State accept manual CSV/flat-file data exchange for the initial release while APIs are developed?	The State would like to implement MVP by June 1st 2026. Vendors can recommend what they can implement in the given timeline.
117	Section 3.2.2 / 3.3.3	Identity and Access Management	The RFP requires integration with NCID. For a solution that utilizes an external Customer Data Platform (CDP) or Communication Platform (e.g., for SMS/Email orchestration), does the State permit the synchronization and storage of Constituent Contact Data (Phone/Email) and Preferences within a FedRAMP-authorized commercial cloud environment, or must this data remain exclusively within State-hosted infrastructure?	The state would consider a FedRAMP-authorized commercial cloud environment as long as the application layer as well as hosting platform are in scope for the FedRAMP certification and all other security reviews (VRAR, scans, etc.) are completed with no concerns highlighted. Note: An IaaS vendor (e.g. AWS) cannot provide a certification for a SaaS provider.

118	Section 3.5.2	Feature 1.4.1 (Digital Commons Integration)	Does the State envision the Disaster Portal as a separate web application (e.g., subdomain) that consumes Drupal content via API, or is the Vendor expected to build modules/pages <i>inside</i> the existing Drupal CMS environment?	The State is open to exploring the viability of both approaches.
119	Section 3.3.3	Identity and Access Management	Regarding NCID integration, does the State support standard OIDC or SAML 2.0 protocols for constituent authentication, and is the NCID environment currently ready for integration with a new service provider?	The State supports standard OIDC or SAML 2.0 protocols. NCID is available for new integrations at any time
120	Section 3.5.2	Theme 1 - General	Is the State open to the use of Generative AI (LLMs) for internal constituent-facing features such as "Smart Search" or "Content Translation," provided the solution meets the FedRAMP Moderate/High security controls referenced in Section 3.2.2?	Yes
121	3.3.1 / 3.5.3	Architecture Diagrams / Feature 2.1.11	Section 3.3.1 requires the Vendor to submit detailed architecture diagrams. To ensure the proposed solution's interoperability and accurate pricing for the integration effort, can the State provide a high-level Logical Integration Architecture or System Context Diagram for the targeted downstream Systems of Record? Specifically, Offerors need to understand the current connectivity landscape (e.g., VPN requirements, firewall zones, or API gateway existence) between the State's internal network and external cloud services.	Details about the architecture and downstream systems would be shared during the discovery phase.
122	3.5.2	Feature 1.4.1	To ensure rapid deployment for the June 1 Go-Live, does the State expect the Solution to strictly utilize the existing NC Digital Commons design system and pattern library (CSS/styles), or is the Vendor expected to conduct a net-new creative design and prototyping phase for the MVP? If the latter, how many reviewers will be providing feedback.	Yes, the existing design system should be leveraged.
123	3.5.2	Feature 1.4.1	Regarding the integration with Digital Commons (Drupal), what is the expected division of labor? Does the State grant the Vendor access to develop and configure modules directly within the Digital Commons environment (Dev/Test), or is the Vendor's role limited to providing code/specifications for the State's internal IT team to implement?	Both approaches are viable. Vendor access can be provisioned to allow development and configuration of modules in the existing environment.

124	6.3.2	Offer Organization	The format of the offer listed in 6.3.2 does not seem to include a technical proposal where offerors can respond to the requirements of the solicitation (e.g. 3.3.3 Identify and Access Management, 3.3.4 Integration Approach, etc.). Can NCDIT please confirm where in the offer format, vendors should include a proposal that addresses all sections labeled "for vendor completion"?	See M2 in item 2 (pages 1-2) of this addendum for modification of 6.3.2 verbiage.
125	3.2.1 and 3.2.2	Security Specifications / Solutions Not Hosted on State Infrastructure	The RFP states that the Portal will handle data classified as High Risk (Highly Restricted) and must comply with NIST SP 800-53 controls. Can the State please provide examples of the types of highly restricted data that will be processed by the new disaster management solution?	Highly Restricted info such as: SSN, Banking account info, Insurance Info, PII such as: Full name, home address, contact email, phone.
126	Section 6.3.2		The format of the offer listed in 6.3.2 does not seem to include a section where offerors can respond to the requirements of the solicitation (e.g. 3.3.3 Identify and Access Management, 3.3.4 Integration Approach, etc.). Can NCDIT please confirm where in the offer format, vendors should include a narrative response that addresses all sections labeled "for vendor completion"?	See M2 in item 2 (pages 1-2) of this addendum for modification of 6.3.2 verbiage.
127	1.0	1.0	The anticipated schedule shows contract award on March 31, 2026, and MVP Phase 1 go-live on June 1, 2026 (~60 days post-award). Is this go-live date firm, or is there flexibility if discovery reveals additional complexity (e.g., integration challenges)?	The State would like to implement MVP by June 1st 2026. Vendors can recommend what they can implement in the given timeline.
128	3.3- Enterprise Specifications	3.3.4	What existing systems or connectors (eg Boomi) does the State have that our MVP can leverage to accelerate delivery? What can we reuse?	Refer to 3.1.5 Enterprise Licensing. In addition, State may have additional agreements and licenses that would be shared with the awarded Vendor during the discovery.
129	General	General	Can you tell us more about the goals for the future use cases related to the Constituent Portal experience? What services does the State seek to offer after disaster recovery?	Even though the state may target one agency for MVP implementation, the Vendor's proposed solution must support integration with all agency programs and services.
130	General	General	Can the state provide a list of agencies and programs need to be supported by this MVP solution?	Even though the state may target one agency for MVP implementation, the Vendor's proposed solution must support integration with all agency programs and services.
131	3.3- Enterprise Specifications	3.3.4	Can the state share a detailed list of the expected integrations for the MVP solution (eg FEMA)?	We could target at least one agency for MVP implementation.
132	General	General	For MVP Phase 1, are there prioritized disaster types (e.g., hurricanes, floods), geographies, or specific programs that structured intake forms (Feature 2.1.6) should target initially?	There are no prioritized disaster types. The platform should have the ability to support disaster related services for all disaster types, geographies and programs.

133	3.5- Business & Technical Specification		What version of Drupal is in use, and are there documented APIs, content APIs, or preferred patterns for external consumption/versioning?	Drupal 10.6, with the core JSON API enabled: <a href="https://www.drupal.org/docs/core-modules-and-themes/core-modules/jsonapi-module">https://www.drupal.org/docs/core-modules-and-themes/core-modules/jsonapi-module</a>
134	Portal High Level Vision		The high-level vision diagram and future capabilities table show expansions (e.g., case management integrations). Are there any non-MVP capabilities that must be architected for in Phase 1 to enable seamless future expansion (e.g., reusable APIs, data models)?	The vendor solution should be flexible and highly integratable with a variety of agency work flows and new capabilities.
135	3.3- Enterprise Specifications	3.3.8	What languages are required for MVP (e.g., Spanish mandatory), and is static translated forms sufficient?	Vendor solution should support translations for multiple languages. Refer to Feature 2.1.15.
136	3.5- Business & Technical Specification	Feature 2.1.14	Feature 2.1.14 references a standardized constituent data model. Will the State provide this model (fields, formats, validation rules) during discovery, and are there any required alignments with federal standards?	An enterprise-level constituent data model is not currently maintained. Vendors can propose the canonical data model for MVP and after contract award, will work with the Enterprise Data Office and Privacy Office to refine the data model.
137	3.5- Business & Technical Specification	Feature 1.1.2	For notifications, what channels are required for MVP (e.g., email mandatory, SMS optional)? Are there preferred state-contracted providers for SMS/email delivery, or restrictions on third-party services?	The State would like to implement MVP by June 1st 2026. Vendors can recommend what they can implement in the given timeline.
138	3.5- Business & Technical Specification	Feature 1.3.1	Feature 1.3.1 requires vendors to conduct an initial disaster recovery service audit and platform diagnostics during discovery. What level of access will be provided to existing systems, documentation, and SMEs?	Subject matter experts from appropriate agencies will be available during the initial discovery phase to enable the Vendor to meet the MVP timeline.
139	Portal High Level Vision		Page 7, Portal High Level Vision - Can the State share more details on the suite of services it seeks to expand to, beyond Phase 1 MVP that will be included in the future Constituent Services Experience Enhancements?	The vendor solution should be flexible and highly integratable with a variety of agency work flows and new capabilities.
140	General	General	Can the State provide the full list of disaster recovery programs, products and services that the vendor may be expected to integrate with? If not the full list, can you please an estimate on the number of integrations.	The State will not provide an inventory of disaster recovery programs prior to award. Vendors are recommended to provide pricing per application for API integration vs. manual export.
141	General	General	What are the boundaries between the portal and downstream agency systems (e.g., eligibility, adjudication, payments)?	Downstream agency systems will continue to be responsible for eligibility, adjudication and payments.
142	General	General	Is the portal expected to support future phases beyond the MVP? If so, what are the anticipated capabilities?	The vendor solution should be flexible and highly integratable with a variety of agency work flows and new capabilities.
143	3.3- Enterprise Specifications	3.3.3	What standards and protocols must be supported for identity and access management?	The State supports standard OIDC or SAML 2.0 protocols for identity and access management.
144	3.3- Enterprise Specifications	3.3.4	What integration approaches are preferred (APIs, adaptors, SFTP, manual export, etc.)?	The vendor solution should support real-time API and batch/SFTP integrations.

145	3.3- Enterprise Specifications	3.3.5	What are the requirements for disaster recovery, backup, and business continuity?	Section 3.3.5 refers to the Business Continuity of the Vendor's proposed solution. We will evaluate based on Vendor's solution capabilities.
146	3.3- Enterprise Specifications	3.3.6	What is the expected approach for data migration and conversion?	The vendor should describe the approaches available for data migration and conversion within the proposed solution.
147	3.3- Enterprise Specifications	3.3.8	What accessibility standards must be met (WCAG 2.1, Section 508, VPAT)?	Refer to Section 3.3.8
148	3.3- Enterprise Specifications	3.3.7	What are the desired outcomes and measurable indicators for validating success (e.g., engagement metrics, task success rates, backlog removal timeline)?	Refer to Table 3.5.1-A
149	3.5- Business and Technical Specifications		What are the key pain points to be addressed in each phase (e.g., notification segmentation, intake backlog, status transparency)?	Refer to Table 3.5.1-A
150	3.5- Business and Technical Specifications		What are the requirements for constituent self-service, intake, and case management?	Vendors should respond to Specifications listed in Section 3.5
151	3.5- Business and Technical Specifications		What language support is required for intake and constituent communications?	Vendor solution should support translations for multiple languages. Refer to Feature 2.1.15. Machine translation is acceptable however the Vendor should have a way to verify accuracy of the machine translation.
152	3.2- Security Specifications		What security certifications are required (FedRAMP, SOC 2 Type 2, ISO 27001, HITRUST)?	Third Party Attestation Report includes SOC 2 Type 2, FedRAMP/GovRAMP, and ISO 27001/HITRUST. Note: An IaaS vendor (e.g. AWS) cannot provide a certification for a SaaS provider.
153	3.2- Security Specifications		What are the requirements for annual security/risk assessments (NIST 800-53 controls)?	To comply with the State's Security Standards and Policies, State agencies are required to perform annual security/risk assessments on their information systems using NIST 800-53 controls. This requirement additionally applies to all Vendor-provided, agency-managed Infrastructure as a Service (IaaS), Platform as a Service (PaaS), and Software as a Service (SaaS) solutions which will handle data classified as Medium Risk (Restricted) or High Risk (Highly Restricted) data.
154	3.2- Security Specifications		What are the requirements for handling high-risk data and compliance with NC Statewide Data Classification and Handling policy?	Refer to <a href="https://it.nc.gov/programs/cybersecurity-risk-management/esrmo-initiatives/statewide-information-security-policies">https://it.nc.gov/programs/cybersecurity-risk-management/esrmo-initiatives/statewide-information-security-policies</a>
155	3.3- Enterprise Specifications	3.3.2	What is the expected implementation schedule and timeline for deliverables?	The Vendor is expected to propose a timeline and deliverables for the MVP to go live on June 1st 2026.

156	General	General	What are the requirements for project management, staffing, and transition to Division personnel?	Refer to Section 7.11 for Project Management Requirements. The Vendor is expected to propose the level of project management, staffing and transition to Division personnel offered as part of their response.
157	General	General	What are the requirements for ongoing support, training, and knowledge transfer?	Vendors should recommend the training and knowledge transfer and ongoing support required for the proposed solution. Options such as Train-the-trainer and recorded training materials are acceptable.
158	4.0- Cost of Vendor's Offer		Are there recurring costs for optional renewal terms (Years 2-5)?	It will depend on the Vendor's proposed solution. Refer to Section 3 – Recurring Costs for Optional Renewal Terms (Years 2-5) within Attachment D: Cost Form
159	4.0- Cost of Vendor's Offer		Are there optional future phase capabilities that should be priced separately?	If the Vendor has a recommendation for optional future phase capabilities, it would be helpful for the State to understand the pricing.
160	4.0- Cost of Vendor's Offer		What is the required payment schedule and acceptance criteria for deliverables?	<u>Payment Schedule</u> : The Vendor is expected to propose their payment schedule and Deliverables for the MVP, and include pricing for those Deliverables. Vendors are reminded that all payments will be based upon acceptance of one or more Deliverables (reference RFP Section 4.2 PAYMENT SCHEDULE). <u>Acceptance Criteria</u> : Refer to Paragraph 9) ACCEPTANCE PROCESS within Attachment B, Section 1 for details of the acceptance process.
161	Section 3 – Scope of Work	3.1 Phased Delivery	For Phase 1 / MVP, how does the State define “Go-Live” (e.g., pilot, limited geography, limited agencies, or statewide availability)?	GoLive would be defined by the State in collaboration with the vendor as it relates to whether the expected outcomes of each theme have been met.
162	Section 3 – Scope of Work	3.2 Theme 1 – Communication & Information	Can the State clarify whether the MVP requires vendors to author content within the Portal itself, or only to integrate with and surface content authored and managed in existing State platforms (e.g., NC.GOV, Digital Commons, Drupal CMS)?	MVP requires Vendors to surface content authored and managed from existing State and Federal websites with Disaster content.
163	Section 3 – Scope of Work	3.2 Theme 1 – Communication & Information	Does the State expect the MVP to include the full content governance model (roles, approval workflows, lifecycle management), or is the expectation to deliver a baseline framework to be expanded in future phases?	Please refer Feature 1.2.1
164	Section 3 – Scope of Work	3.3 Theme 2 – CSCM Intake Support	For MVP, is the Portal expected to support a single standardized intake model across agencies, or multiple program-specific intake schemas routed to downstream systems?	The goal of this project is to create a unified technology infrastructure and encourage collaboration among agencies to mitigate the present state of fragmented services, requiring individuals to visit multiple agency websites with varying designs and procedures

165	Section 3 – Scope of Work	3.3 Theme 2 – CSCM Intake Support	For intake routing, can the State clarify whether all downstream agency systems are expected to support real-time API integrations, or whether batch/SFTP or other integration patterns will be acceptable for MVP?	The vendor solution should support real-time API and batch/SFTP integrations.
166	Section 3 – Scope of Work	3.3 Theme 2 – CSCM Intake Support	What level of intake status visibility is expected for constituents during MVP (e.g., received, routed, next steps), and which status indicators are explicitly out of scope to avoid implying eligibility or benefit decisions?	Please refer to Features 1.3.2, 2.3.3, 2.3.4, 2.3.5 and 2.3.6. Not all agencies will expose their APIs for MVP. We could target at least one agency for MVP implementation.
167	Section 3 – Scope of Work	3.3 Theme 2 – CSCM Intake Support	Does the MVP require State or agency users to perform any case updates or workflow actions within the Portal, or is the Portal limited to intake tracking, visibility, and reporting only?	Refer to Section 3.5 for Scope of Work.
168	Section 3 – Scope of Work	3.4 Discovery & Validation	Can the State clarify which discovery outputs are expected during MVP (e.g., service audit, integration inventory, data model definition, future-state roadmap), versus those intended for later phases?	We want Vendors to tell us what can be accomplished for MVP by June 1. Vendors are encouraged to propose structured discovery and validation activities that reduce delivery risk, clarify integration readiness, and inform refinement of MVP capabilities.
169	Section 4 – Technical Requirements	4.1 Architecture & Design	Does the State have preferred architectural patterns or standards (e.g., reference architectures, approved platforms, reusable services) that vendors should align to when proposing the MVP solution?	The use of reference architectures, architectural patterns, etc. should be documented in the vendor's proposal and as part of the finalized solution documentation.  After contract award, Architecture Review Board will approve the overarching system architecture and engage as necessary.
170	Section 4 – Technical Requirements	4.2 Integration Requirements	Will the State provide a preliminary list of downstream systems and integration capabilities prior to MVP build, or is this information expected to be fully surfaced during discovery?	Will be surfaced during discovery.
171	Section 5 – Project Management	5.1 Governance & Delivery	What governance structure does the State expect during MVP delivery (e.g., product owner, architecture review board, content governance body), and how frequently will decisions and approvals be required?	In case of separate vendors, State's Project Manager will ensure collaboration and coordination among both Vendors and the State team. The Product Owner will be engaged throughout the MVP lifecycle. Digital Solutions team will provide input on content governance throughout the MVP lifecycle. Architecture Review Board will approve the overarching system architecture and engage as necessary.
172	Section 6 – Evaluation	6.2 Evaluation Criteria	For MVP evaluation, how does the State weight solution modularity, reuse, and architectural alignment versus breadth of functionality delivered in Phase 1?	This will be considered as part of how well the Vendor's offer conforms with the Specifications and how the offered solution meets features and desired business outcomes.

173	Section 6 – Evaluation	6.3 Oral Presentations	For oral presentations or demonstrations, does the State expect vendors to demonstrate only MVP-scope capabilities, or may vendors also reference future-phase capabilities for context?	The State will provide an outline of agenda items to be used for Vendor demonstrations.
174	Section 3 – Scope of Work	3.3 Theme 2 – CSCM Intake Support	Does the State currently maintain documented intake and routing processes for disaster recovery programs across agencies, or is the vendor expected to document and standardize these processes as part of MVP discovery?	To clarify, this RFP focuses on improving how constituents interact with government services during a state of emergency by creating a unified technology infrastructure and encouraging collaboration among agencies. Vendors should assume responsibility for documenting and recommending standardized processes during MVP.
175	Section 3 – Scope of Work	3.2 Theme 1 – Communication & Information	Are content authoring, review, approval, and publishing processes already documented within the State, or is the vendor expected to document and formalize these processes as part of the MVP content governance framework?	These processes are part of the Digital Commons Platform.
176	Section 5 – Project Management	5.1 Governance & Delivery	Does the State have existing documented cross-agency coordination and escalation processes for disaster recovery, or should vendors assume responsibility for documenting and recommending standardized processes during MVP?	To clarify, this RFP focuses on improving how constituents interact with government services during a state of emergency by creating a unified technology infrastructure and encouraging collaboration among agencies. Vendors should assume responsibility for documenting and recommending standardized processes during MVP.
177	Section 4 – Technical Requirements	4.2 Integration Requirements	Are operational processes for intake failure handling, retries, and exception management already documented by the State, or is the vendor expected to document and define these operational procedures as part of MVP delivery?	The vendor expected to document and define these operational procedures as part of MVP delivery.
178	Section 3 – Scope of Work	3.4 Discovery & Validation	Should documented business and operational processes (e.g., intake, routing, content publishing, escalation) be considered formal MVP deliverables, or are they intended as internal discovery artifacts only?	Yes, these could be considered as MVP deliverables. The Vendor is expected to propose a timeline and deliverables for the MVP to go live on June 1st 2026.
179	Section 3 – Scope of Work	3.1 Phased Delivery (or 3.4 Discovery & Validation)	Does the State intend for the Disaster Management Portal to align to any existing disaster response or recovery operating frameworks (e.g., Emergency Support Functions), or should vendors assume the solution remains framework-agnostic and configurable to support multiple agency operating models?	The vendor solution should be flexible and highly integratable with a variety of agency work flows and new capabilities.
180	Section 5 – Project Management	5.1 Governance & Delivery	Can the State clarify whether there is a designated lead business stakeholder or agency responsible for prioritization and decision-making for the Portal during MVP, or whether governance is intended to be shared across multiple agencies and enterprise teams?	There will be a designated lead business stakeholder responsible for prioritization and decision-making for the Portal during MVP.

181	Section 3 – Scope of Work	3.1 Phased Delivery (or 3.4 Discovery & Validation)	For Phase 1 / MVP, can the State clarify which internal stakeholder groups or agencies are expected to actively participate (e.g., content owners, intake recipients, governance participants), and whether MVP engagement is limited to a defined subset of agencies or intended to include all disaster-recovery stakeholders?	We could target at least one agency for MVP implementation. Stakeholders and Subject matter experts from appropriate agencies will be available during the initial discovery phase to enable the Vendor to meet the MVP timeline.
182	General	General	Are you looking for a custom built solution or a COTS solution? If you are looking for COTS solution, how are you handling ongoing licensing past year 1?	The State intends to leverage existing technology investments to minimize additional recurring licensing costs.
183	Section 3 – Scope of Work	3.3 Theme 2 – CSCM Intake Support	If historical intake or case data exists in agency systems from prior disasters, is there an expectation that any portion of this data be surfaced or referenced within the Portal during MVP, or is historical data access out of scope for Phase 1?	Historical intake or case data from prior disasters will not be surfaced or referenced within the Portal during MVP and is out of scope.
184	Section 4 – Technical Requirements	4.2 Integration Requirements	Are there any existing pilot, legacy, or interim solutions that the MVP Portal is expected to replace or coexist with, and if so, are data transition or coexistence strategies expected as part of Phase 1?	Not replace but coexist. The vendor solution should be flexible and highly integratable with a variety of agency work flows and new capabilities.
185	Section 4 – Technical Requirements	4.1 Architecture & Design	Does the State anticipate leveraging automation or AI-assisted capabilities (e.g., repeated task automation, workflow orchestration, intake triage, content classification) as part of the MVP or future phases, and if so, should vendors design the MVP architecture to be AI-ready while limiting Phase 1 delivery to non-AI core functionality?	The vendor solution should be flexible and highly integratable with a variety of agency work flows and new capabilities. Leveraging automation and AI-assisted capabilities is acceptable.
186	Section 3 – Scope of Work	3.3 Theme 2 – CSCM Intake Support	For intake routing and operational visibility, does the State expect purely rules-based workflows for MVP, or is there interest in exploring AI-assisted triage or prioritization in future phases once governance and data maturity allow?	The vendor solution should be flexible and highly integratable with a variety of agency work flows and new capabilities. Leveraging automation and AI-assisted capabilities is acceptable.
187	Section 4 – Technical Requirements	4.2 Integration Requirements	Does the State anticipate any integration, data exchange, or coordination with federal systems (e.g., FEMA Individual Assistance or Public Assistance programs) as part of the Phase 1 / MVP solution, or should vendors assume that any FEMA-related integration is out of scope for MVP and considered a future-phase capability?	We could target at least one agency for MVP implementation. Stakeholders and Subject matter experts from appropriate agencies will be available during the initial discovery phase to enable the Vendor to meet the MVP timeline.
188	Section 3 – Scope of Work	3.3 Theme 2 – CSCM Intake Support	For Phase 1 intake, does the State expect the Portal to capture or transmit information intended for federal disaster assistance programs (e.g., FEMA), or is MVP intake limited to State-managed programs only?	The vendor solution should be flexible and highly integratable with a variety of agency work flows and new capabilities.

189	3.0 Requirements and Specifications	3.3.6 Data Migration	To accurately estimate the level of effort for data migration, can the State provide the approximate volume of records and the number of distinct legacy data sources that must be loaded into the solution?	For Data migration, consider content from websites with disaster related data such as NC Emergency Management, NC DHHS, ReadyNC, etc. We want Vendors to tell us what can be accomplished for MVP by June 1.
190	3.0 Requirements and Specifications	3.5.2 Theme 1: Feature 1.4.1	Regarding the integration with the existing Drupal CMS, what version of Drupal is currently in use, and are there existing REST or JSON/API endpoints already configured for content retrieval?	10.6, with the core Drupal JSON API available.
191	7.0 Other Requirements and Special Terms	7.11 Project Management	Does the State anticipate the Vendor Project Manager and broader team members will be required to be on-site or is the expectation for mostly remote delivery?	The State is open to either option. Refer to RFP Attachment F.
192	3.0 Requirements and Specifications	3.3.3 Identity & Access Management	The RFP mentions externalizing identity via NCID; does the State expect the portal to support Social Login (e.g., Google or Apple) for anonymous constituents through a federation with NCID, or is NCID the exclusive authentication provider?	NCID is the exclusive authentication provider.
193	3.0 Requirements and Specifications	3.3.4 Integration Approach	Are there specific State-standard API gateways or middleware (e.g., MuleSoft, Azure API Management) that the solution must use for the proposed integration patterns?	Boomi API Gateway is the recommended solution for API management. The current Application/Data Integration Standard is available on the DIT website: <a href="https://it.nc.gov/resources/state-it-policies#Technology-5615">https://it.nc.gov/resources/state-it-policies#Technology-5615</a>
194	3.0 Requirements and Specifications	3.3.5 Disaster Recovery	For Recovery Time Objective (RTO) and Recovery Point Objective (RPO) metrics, does the State have a predefined "Tier" of criticality (e.g., Tier 1 - 4 hours RTO) that this portal must meet during an active State of Emergency?	We do not have pre-defined RTO, RPO tiers, but will evaluate based on Vendor's solution capabilities.
195	3.0 Requirements and Specifications	3.3.5 Business Continuity	Does DIT coordinate with the State Emergency Management Agency regarding Business Continuity? Or, is Business Continuity intended to refer to DIT's ability to maintain its mission essential functions versus all State departments and agencies as part of this project?	Section 3.3.5 refers to the Business Continuity of the Vendor's proposed solution.
196	3.0 Requirements and Specifications	3.3.5 Disaster Recovery	Does the State have a Business Impact Analysis? If so, when was the most recent update? If not, is a BIA included in the expected deliverables?	Section 3.3.5 refers to the Business Continuity of the Vendor's proposed solution.
197	3.0 Requirements and Specifications	3.3.5 Disaster Recovery	Does a DRP exist and require update (or enhancement)? Or is the awardee expected to develop a DRP?	Section 3.3.5 refers to the Business Continuity of the Vendor's proposed solution.

198	3.0 Requirements and Specifications	3.3.5 Disaster Recovery	Does disaster recovery testing plan exist? Or is the awardee expected to develop a multi-year testing plan?	Section 3.3.5 refers to the Business Continuity of the Vendor's proposed solution.
199	3.0 Requirements and Specifications	3.3.5 Disaster Recovery	Does DIT currently have to capability for functional fail-over testing?	Section 3.3.5 refers to the Business Continuity of the Vendor's proposed solution.
200	3.0 Requirements and Specifications	3.5.1 General Specifications	The RFP states the portal is not the system of record for eligibility. How does the State define the "informational only" status of the backlog views if a constituent sees a conflict between the Portal status and a downstream agency system?	Refer to Features 2.2.9 and 2.3.8.
201	3.0 Requirements and Specifications	3.5.2 Theme 1 (Feature 1.1.3)	Regarding pushing content based on location and event type, will the State provide access to GIS data layers or a specific Geo-fencing service to enable targeted notifications?	There are state-maintained GIS layers that can be made available via API, as well as other REST services available via NCOneMap.gov, the State's GIS Open Data Portal.
202	3.0 Requirements and Specifications	3.5.3 Theme 2 (Feature 2.1.3)	Can the State clarify the requirements for "just-in-time" account creation? Specifically, should this trigger an automated NCID registration workflow for the constituent?	While the anonymous user is providing data for intake, we may have captured majority of the data fields needed for NCID registration. The intent is to capture missing data elements such as "username" and "password" to then redirect the user to a pre-filled NCID registration form.
203	3.0 Requirements and Specifications	3.5.3 Theme 2 (Feature 2.1.4)	For fraud mitigation, is the State looking for the vendor to provide third-party service (beyond the identity proofing enhancements mentioned in section 4) as part of this phase or to utilize an existing State-owned fraud detection service?	The Vendor is expected to leverage the State's NCID Identity Proofing Service.
204	3.0 Requirements and Specifications	3.5.3 Theme 2 (Feature 2.3.9)	Does the notification framework need to utilize a specific State-contracted SMS/Email gateway (e.g., GovDelivery or AWS Pinpoint), or should the vendor propose their own?	Proofpoint SER for email relay notification and M365 for Email based user notifications.
205	3.0 Requirements and Specifications	3.3.4 Integration Approach	Does the state have an estimated number of agencies or programs that the Disaster Management Portal will need to integrate with?	We could target at least one agency for MVP implementation. The vendor solution should be flexible and highly integratable with a variety of agency work flows and new capabilities.
206	3.0 Requirements and Specifications	3.3.4 Integration Approach	Can the state confirm if it is the intent for this portal to support the management of cases after intake for any disaster programs?	While the MVP does not require this, Vendors can propose the merits of their solution beyond the scope of the MVP.

207	2.0 Purpose of RFP	2.4 Contract Term	The RFP indicates that pricing and scope for years 1 through 5. Where should the respondent outline the scope of these services within the provided RFP response structure? Are there specific requirements the State is looking to have addressed within the maintenance and support section?	Refer to Attachment D of the RFP.
208	2.0 Purpose of RFP	2.6 Contract Type	The RFP outlines the need for an approximately 60-day window for delivery. However, this notes the need for potential for incremental delivery and feedback. Should the response account for additional release windows beyond the 6/1 go-live?	We want Vendors to tell us what can be accomplished for MVP by June 1.
209	6.0 Vendor Information and Instructions	6.3.2 Offer Organization	The response structure does not specifically outline how the respondent should include an overall narrative as well as response to specific sections such as 3.3.3 - 3.3.8 as well as any optional services. Should these be included under section h of the response or is there a separate approach summary/overview that should be included elsewhere in the response?	See M2 in item 2 (pages 1-2) of this addendum for modification of 6.3.2 verbiage.  3.3.3-3.3.8 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vendors should provide written narrative responses addressing RFP Sections 3.3.3- 3.3.8 as part of their proposal submission, IAW 6.3.2 f).</li> <li>• Vendors should submit this portion of their proposal response that addresses RFP sections 3.3.3-3.3.8 by uploading attachment(s) into Section 5.3 of the sourcing tool.</li> </ul> Optional Services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RFP Section 6.3.2 h) has been re-lettered to j) and addresses optional supporting materials.</li> <li>• Vendors can submit other supporting materials that it feels may improve the quality of its response by uploading attachment(s) into Section 5.4 of the sourcing tool.</li> </ul>
210	3.5 Business and Technical Specifications	3.5.1 General Business and Technical Specifications	Is the intention that all of the epic and features inclusive of the 'MVP' definition or is there a potential to split these out into separate releases? Are there other criteria that the State will use to define successful completion of the MVP?	We want Vendors to tell us what can be accomplished for MVP by June 1.
211	1.0 Anticipated Procurement Schedule	-	Given the scale of the response, would the State be willing to provide an extension to the RFP response submission deadline?	No
212	3	3.1.4	For 6/1 MVP Go-Live, is a new and distinct CRM required?	While the MVP does not require this, Vendors can propose the merits of their solution beyond the scope of the MVP.
213	3	3.1.4	Based on 6/1 MVP Go-Live, please clarify the backend connections required for integration.	The vendor solution should be flexible and highly integratable with a variety of agency work flows and new capabilities.

214	3	3.1.4	Does the State currently have Generative AI (GenAI) models enabled and available for use by the proposed solution compliant with the security component of the RFP? If so, please identify the platform(s) in use (e.g. Amazon Bedrock or others).	<p>Current policies for the use of Artificial Intelligence within the State of North Carolina are available on the DIT website: <a href="https://it.nc.gov/resources/state-it-policies#ArtificialIntelligence-5614">https://it.nc.gov/resources/state-it-policies#ArtificialIntelligence-5614</a></p> <p>Currently, the only Generative AI / large language model (LLM) that is formally approved for ALL agencies is Microsoft Copilot. There are instances of other GenAI/LLM models (through AWS and GCP) in use at some agencies that could possibly be used in support of this RFP but those details will need to be scoped further.</p>
215	3	3.5.1	What is the approximate volume and format of existing disaster recovery content in terms of data, public materials, and case management systems that would need to be migrated or integrated into the portal at 6/1 MVP Go-Live?	For Data migration, consider content from websites with disaster related data such as NC Emergency Management, NC DHHS, ReadyNC, etc. We want Vendors to tell us what can be accomplished for MVP by June 1.
216	3	3.5.2	Will the NC digital commons provide all required design material for the 6/1 MVP Go-Live?	NC Digital Commons will provide theme source code.

---

*REMAINDER OF PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.*

---

---

**Failure to acknowledge receipt of this addendum may result in rejection of the response.**

Check ONE of the following options:

- Bid has not been mailed. Any changes resulting from this addendum are included in our bid response.
- Bid has been mailed. No changes resulted from this addendum.
- Bid has been mailed. Changes resulting from this addendum are as follows:

**Execute Addendum:**

**Offeror:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Authorized Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Name and Titled (Typed):** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_