Joint Compact Commissions

Statement of Objectives for the Joint Occupational Licensure Compacts Data System

1.0 Background and Purpose

1.1 Background

The Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology, Counseling, and Occupational Therapy Compact Commissions are inter-state government agencies responsible for administering the licensure compacts of their respective professions. Licensure compacts serve to facilitate access to services from licensed professionals across state lines and enhance public protection.

The Joint Compact Commissions are made up of representatives from all states that are compact members. The Joint Commissions are currently seeking the joint development of a data system to operationalize.

*For more information on compacts and compact commissions, see the Appendix.

1.2 Problem

Individual states use unique licensing systems that cannot easily, quickly, or securely share information for the purpose of expanding access to healthcare by enabling more individuals to practice in multiple states via an interstate compact.

2.0 Scope

2.1   Product Vision

We are improving access to healthcare and protecting the public by facilitating the ability of qualified professionals to practice across state borders through an interstate licensing compact.

The Joint Compact Commissions intend that the software delivered under this task order will be released as open source. The Contractor will have to obtain permission from the Joint Commissions before delivering software under this task order that incorporates any software that is not free and open source. The Contractor must post all developed code to a Git repository designated by the Joint Commissions.

2.2   Anticipated Period of Performance, Budget, and Ceiling Price

The not to exceed ceiling on this contract will be $863,000 for the one-year period of performance.

The joint commissions will pursue additional funding to build further features and functions of the data system which may include an additional two one-year option periods under this contract. The joint commissions anticipate a development team of 4-9 people for the project.

3.0   Objectives

3.1   Backlog

The set of preliminary user stories set forth below will be the starting point for the development of software to be provided under this contract. These preliminary user stories are provided only for illustrative purposes, and do not comprise the full scope or detail of the project. The Joint Commissions expect that the Contractor will work closely with the Product Owner to perform regular user research and usability testing and to develop and prioritize a full gamut of user stories as the project progresses.

Individual user stories may be modified, added, retracted, or reprioritized by the Joint Commissions at any time, and the Joint Commissions expect that the user stories will be continuously refined during the development process.

Priority User Stories
- As a practitioner, I want to be able to go online, apply for the interstate privilege to practice, pay the fees and get a confirmation my privilege has been issued.
- As a Compact Executive Director I want to ensure member states can access relevant information so that privileges to practice can easily be issued and states know when a new privilege has been purchased for their state.

- As a state licensing professional, I want to be able to track financial transactions with the compact for my state so that my auditor will be happy.
- As a practitioner, I want to know when my compact privilege expires and receive an expiration notice so that I can renew it.

State Licensing Officials/Administrator/Investigators
- As a state licensing official, I want to come to work in the morning and get a confirmation that my state's data updated to the Compact overnight.
- As an investigator I want to make sure the NPDB reports or other disciplinary documents have been submitted so that compact records reflect this information.
- As an administrator, I want to pull expiration dates so I know all licensees are active.
- As an administrator in a compact member state, I want to be notified when a practitioner's status changes so that I can confirm they are practicing legally
- As an administrator I want to be able to verify that a compact user has completed the jurisprudence exam so that I can assure public safety.
- As a board administrator I want to upload relevant disciplinary data so that other boards can see those records.
- As an administrator I want to have an easy method to submit data to the compact database so that staff time is used efficiently\
- As a member state, I want to view real-time investigatory & disciplinary action information so that I can make licensure decisions

State Licensing Professional/Practitioner
- As a state licensing professional I want to be able to see who is practicing in my state so that I can take action if needed.
- As a practitioner, I want to be able to inform insurance providers of where I hold a compact privilege so that I can submit a claim.
- As a practitioner, I want to get a privilege to practice within 72 hours so that I can start my new job.
- As a practitioner, I want to go to the compact website so that I can obtain a privilege to practice in another state.
- As a practitioner I want to easily obtain a compact privilege so that my time is spent efficiently.
- As an applicant I want to apply for compact privilege so that I may practice in a new state.
- As a military member/spouse I want to be able to verify my military affiliation so that I can take advantage of the compact offers those with military affiliation
- As a privilege applicant I want to be able to look up requirements in other states so that I can see what I need to do to apply for a privilege.

<u>Compact Commission</u>
- As a Compact ED I want to ensure practitioners can apply for privileges to practice so that they can practice across state lines, improving access to care.
- As a commissioner I want to be able to report to the state board compact statistics in our state so that they can be aware of the benefits the compact is providing.

<u>Clients/Consumers/Other Stakeholders</u>
- As a client, I want to be able to see in what states my provider is licensed so that I can use their services when I go on vacation or when I move.
- As a consumer I want to find out who has a privilege to practice in my state so that I can find an eligible practitioner.
- As an insurance provider I want to be able to see compact privileges, including past privileges, so that I can process insurance claims

3.2 List of Deliverables with Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP)

The following chart sets forth the performance standards and quality levels the code and documentation provided by the Contractor must meet, and the methods the Joint Commissions will use to assess the standard and quality levels of that code and documentation.

Deliverable	Performance Standard(s)	Acceptable Quality Level	Method of Assessment

Tested Code	Code delivered under the order must have substantial test code coverage. Version-controlled Joint Commissions GitHub repository of code that comprises product that will remain in the government domain.	Minimum of 90% test coverage of all code. All areas of code are meaningfully tested.	Combination of manual review and automated testing
Properly Styled Code	[GSA 18F Front-End Guide](#)	0 linting errors and 0 warnings	Combination of manual review and automated testing
Accessible	Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 2.1 AA standards	0 errors reported using an automated scanner and 0 errors reported in manual testing	https://github.com/pa11y/pa11y

Deployed	Code must successfully build and deploy into staging environment.	Successful build with a single command	Combination of manual review and automated testing
Documented	All dependencies are listed and the licenses are documented. Major functionality in the software/source code is documented. Individual methods are documented inline in a format that permit the use of tools such as JSDoc. System diagram is provided.	Combination of manual review and automated testing, if available	Manual review

Secure	OWASP Application Security Verification Standard 3.0	Code submitted must be free of medium- and high-level static and dynamic security vulnerabilities	Clean tests from a static testing SaaS (such as Snyk or npm audit) and from OWASP ZAP, along with documentation explaining any false positives
User research	Usability testing and other user research methods must be conducted at regular intervals throughout the development process (not just at the beginning or end).	Research plans and artifacts from usability testing and/or other research methods with end users are available at the end of every applicable sprint, in accordance with the contractor's research plan.	The Joint Commissions will manually evaluate the artifacts based on a research plan provided by the contractor at the end of the second sprint and every applicable sprint thereafter.

4.0   Contract Place of Performance and Contract Type

The Contractor may choose the location(s) from which to perform the required software development services. The Contractor should be available during the core working hours of the compact commissions 10 a.m. – 4 p.m. U.S. E.T.

The contract will be a time and material contract with a not-to-exceed ceiling of $863,000. The not-to-exceed ceiling may be amended by the compact commissions based on additional budget allocations to the project.

5.0 Operating Constraints (Non-functional Requirements)

5.1 Environment

Software solution must be designed for a standard, commercial-grade cloud-based environment that has a secured government environment available (i.e., the software solution must be designed for Azure Government).

5.2 Personnel Skills and Knowledge

Key Personnel – The Contractor must designate both a Project Manager (PM) and a Technical Lead as Key Personnel for this project. The PM will be a direct liaison to the Joint Commissions' product team and will be responsible for the supervision and management of all of the Contractor's personnel. The Technical Lead must have a full understanding of the technical approach to be used by the Contractor's development team and will be responsible for ensuring that the Contractor's development team follows that approach.

5.3 Special Clauses

Data Rights and Ownership of Deliverables – the Joint Commissions intend that all software and documentation delivered by the Contractor will be owned by the Compact Commissions. This software and documentation includes, but is not limited to, data, documents, graphics, code, plans, reports, schedules, schemas, metadata, architecture designs, and the like; all new open source software created by the Contractor and forks or branches of current open source software where the Contractor has made a modification; and all new tooling, scripting configuration management, infrastructure as code, or any other final changes or edits to successfully deploy or operate the software.

To the extent that the Contractor seeks to incorporate any software that was not first produced in the performance of this task order in the software delivered under this task order, the Joint Commissions encourage the Contractor to incorporate either software that is in the public domain, or free and open source software that qualifies under the Open Source Definition promulgated by the Open Source Initiative. In any event, the Contractor must promptly disclose to the Joint Commissions in writing, and list in the documentation, any software incorporated in the delivered software that is subject to a license.

If software delivered by the Contractor incorporates software that is subject to an open source license that provides implementation guidance, then the Contractor must ensure compliance with that guidance. If software delivered by the Contractor incorporates software that is subject to an open source license that does not provide implementation guidance, then the Contractor must attach or include the terms of the license within the

work itself, such as in code comments at the beginning of a file, or in a license file within a software repository.

In addition, the Contractor must obtain written permission from the Joint Commissions before incorporating into the delivered software any software that is subject to a license that does not qualify under the Open Source Definition promulgated by the Open Source Initiative. If the Joint Commissions grant such written permission, then the Contractor's rights to use that software must be promptly assigned to the Joint Commissions.

Disclosure of Foreign Government Interests - No contract will be awarded to an entity controlled by a foreign government. The Offeror shall disclose any interest a foreign government has in the Offeror when that interest constitutes control by a foreign government as defined by 48 CFR 252.209-7002. If the Offeror is a subsidiary, it shall disclose any reportable interest a foreign government has in any entity that owns or controls the subsidiary, including reportable interest concerning the Offeror's immediate parent, intermediate parents, and the ultimate parent.

6.0   Instructions and Evaluation

6.1   Submission Instructions

All proposals must be sent to the Compact Commissions via The Council of State Governments by email no later than 5:00 p.m. U.S. ET on November 20, 2023. Proposals may be directed to Isabel Eliassen at ieliassen@csg.org. Failure to adhere to submission instructions may result in bidder disqualification.

Answers to questions received by November 6, 2023 will be posted on the websites of the ASLP Compact, Counseling Compact, and OT Compact by November 10, 2023.

An applicant webinar will be hosted on October 5, 2023. Interested Offerors may register at the following link: https://csg-org.zoom.us/meeting/register/tZwucOGtrzosH9zXysa3hu7DG9VS3VVzGEEi.

6.2   Instructions for Proposals

Technical Submissions

Technical submissions must consist of a technical proposal of no more than four (4) pages, a staffing plan of no more than three (3) pages plus resumes and signed letters of intent to participate, and references to one or more source code samples, preferably open source. Technical submissions may also include user research plans and design

artifacts of no more than 30 pages combined. Technical proposals and staffing plans must be submitted using 12-point type.

The technical proposal must set forth the Offeror's proposed approach to providing the services required, including the base software (if any) and programming language(s) the Offeror proposes to use. The technical proposal must also make clear that the Offeror understands the details of the project requirements. The technical proposal must also identify potential obstacles to efficient development and include plans to overcome those potential obstacles. The technical proposal must also include a description of the Offeror's plans, if any, to provide services through a joint venture, teaming partner, or subcontractors.

The staffing plan must set forth the Offeror's proposed approach to staffing the requirements of this project, including the titles of each of the labor categories proposed and proposed level of effort for each member of the Offeror's development team. The staffing plan must also identify the proposed Project Manager and proposed Technical Lead by name and include a resume for each. Those resumes must include a brief description of the experience and capability for each individual, but cannot exceed one (1) page in length each. Offerors proposing Key Personnel who are not currently employed by the Offeror or a teaming partner must include a signed letter of intent from the individual proposed as Key Personnel that he/she intends to participate in this project for at least one (1) year. The staffing plan must also set forth the extent to which the proposed team for this project was involved in the development of the source code referred to in the next paragraph.

The staffing plan must set forth and explain the extent to which the Offeror will provide individuals with experience in at least each of the following areas:

Agile development practices

- Automated (unit/integration/end-to-end) testing
- Continuous Integration and Continuous Deployment
- Refactoring to minimize technical debt
- Application Protocol Interface (API) development and documentation
- Open-source software development
- Cloud deployment
- Open-source login/authentication services
- Product management and strategy
- Usability research, such as (but not limited to) contextual inquiry, stakeholder interviews, and usability testing
- User experience design

- Sketching, wireframing, and/or prototyping, and user-task flow development
- Visual design
- Content design and copywriting
- Building and testing public facing sites and tools

The references to one or more source code samples must be either links to Git repositories (either credentialed or public) or to equivalent version-controlled repositories that provide the Joint Commissions with the full revision history for all files. If an Offeror submits a link to a private Git repository hosted with GitHub, the Joint Commissions will provide the Offeror with one or more GitHub user identities by email, and the Offeror will be expected to promptly provide the identified user(s) with access to the private Git repository.

The source code samples should be for projects that are similar in size, scope, and complexity to the project contemplated here. The source code must have been developed by either (i) the Offeror itself, (ii) a teaming partner that is proposed in response to this RFQ, or (iii) an individual that is being proposed as Key Personnel for this project. The Joint Commissions would prefer that the source code samples have been for recent projects involving teams of approximately 4–9 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) personnel.

If the references to source code samples provided do not include associated references to user research plans and design artifacts demonstrating how ongoing user research was incorporated into the project, then the Offeror must submit a user research plan and design artifacts relating to at least one (1) of the source code samples provided.

Price Submissions

Price submissions must set forth a loaded hourly rate that represents the Offeror's estimate of the cost to the Joint Commissions for the development services and travel expenses (if any) required for each period of performance (the initial one year term, and the subsequent two one-year optional terms). Offerors should provide the price proposal in an Excel workbook and include the labor categories and staffing levels used to calculate the loaded hourly rate. The Joint Commissions expect that the labor categories and staffing levels set forth by the Offeror in the Excel workbook will be consistent with the Offeror's staffing plan.

The Contractor will be compensated at the loaded hourly rates. The Joint Commissions intend to evaluate proposals and award based on initial proposals, and therefore the Offeror's initial proposal should contain the Offeror's best terms.

Interviews

The Offerors with the most highly rated written submissions will each be invited to participate in an interview as part of the evaluation process. Each interview will be conducted remotely via video connection and/or teleconference. The Joint Commissions will communicate with certain Offerors to schedule the dates and times of interviews. The Joint Commissions will, upon invitation to the selected Offerors, set the total time for the interview, expected to be 1-2 hours.

Each interview will include an unstructured question and answer session, during which Offerors will be asked questions about the technical aspects of their proposal and their approach to software development. The Joint Commissions expect these interviews will assist the Joint Commissions to assess the technical abilities of the proposed development team and to better understand the proposed technical approach described in the Offeror's written submission. Both of the Offeror's proposed Key Personnel must participate in the interview.

The Introductions phase of each interview will last approximately 10% of the interview time, during which the Offeror and Joint Commissions interview team members will introduce themselves.

The Open Technical Session of each interview will last approximately 80% of the interview time, during which the Offeror interview team will respond to the Joint Commissions questions related to the technical aspects of the Offeror's proposal. Offerors will NOT be able to use or present any slides, graphs, charts, or other written presentation materials, including handouts. There will be no follow-up session for further questions after this part of the interview.

The Closing Remarks phase of each interview will last approximately 10% of the interview time, during which the Offeror may make a short presentation summarizing the Offeror's responses to the Joint Commissions' questions.

Interviews will not constitute discussions. Statements made during an interview will not become part of the agreement.

Basis of Award and Evaluation Factors

Each submission received by the Joint Commissions will be evaluated for technical acceptability. Submissions that are determined to not be technically acceptable after the Offeror has been given the opportunity for clarification will not be evaluated further.

Quotes must be realistic with respect to technical approach, staffing approach, and total price. Quotes that indicate a lack of understanding of the project requirements may not be considered for award. Quotes may indicate a lack of understanding of the project requirements if the staffing plan does not use a realistic mix of labor categories and hours, or if any proposed hourly labor rates are unrealistically high or low.

The Joint Commissions will evaluate quotes that are technically acceptable on a competitive best value basis using a trade-off between technical and price factors. Technically acceptable submissions will be evaluated based on four (4) evaluation factors. These factors are (1) technical approach, (2) staffing approach, (3) similar experience, and (4) price. The three (3) technical, non-price evaluation factors, when combined, are significantly more important than price. The Joint Commissions may make an award to an Offeror that demonstrates an advantage with respect to technical, non-price factors, even if such an award would result in a higher total price to the Joint Commissions. The importance of price in the evaluation will increase with the degree of equality between Offerors with respect to the non-price factors, or when the Offeror's price is so significantly high as to diminish the value to the Joint Commissions of the Offeror's advantage in the non-price factors.

Technical Approach

In evaluating an Offeror's technical approach, Joint Commissions will consider (a) the quality of the Offeror's plans to provide the open source, agile development services required, including user research and design, (b) the extent of the Offeror's understanding of the details of the project requirements, and (c) the extent to which the Offeror has identified potential obstacles to efficient development, and has proposed realistic approaches to overcome those potential obstacles.

Staffing Approach

In evaluating an Offeror's staffing approach, the Joint Commissions will consider (a) the skills and experience of the Key Personnel and other individuals that the Offeror plans to use to provide the required services, (b) the mix of labor categories that will comprise the Offeror's proposed development team, and (c) the Offeror's proposed number of hours of services to be provided by each member of the Offeror's proposed development team.

Similar Experience

In evaluating an Offeror's similar experience, the Joint Commissions will consider the extent to which the Offeror has recently provided software development services for

projects that are similar in size, scope, and complexity to the project described in this RFQ, and the quality of those services. In evaluating the quality of those services, the Joint Commissions will consider, among other things, the revision history for all files in the source code samples provided. The Joint Commissions will also consider the user research and design-related artifacts that were associated with the source code samples provided or submitted separately. Past projects in which the Offeror demonstrated efficiencies in software development time will also be an important factor. In considering an Offeror's similar experience, the Joint Commissions may also consider information from any other source, including Offeror's prior customers and public websites.

Price

In evaluating an Offeror's price, the Joint Commissions will consider the total of the Offeror's estimated costs for the development services, and travel expenses proposed (if any), the total period of performance. This total amount should be reflected in the Excel workbook described in the Price Submission subsection.

Appendix – Additional Information on Compacts

- Compact commissions are supra-state and sub-federal and are permitted pursuant to both the compacts and contracts clause of the U.S. Constitution.
- States are on average a member of over forty compacts.
- The compact commissions have independent rulemaking authority to effectuate the administration and enforcement of the terms of the compact for their respective professions.
- Compact commissions are comprised of delegates from each compact member state.