RESPONSE TO RFI
STATE OF HAWAII
INTERNET PORTAL MANAGER

Office of Enterprise Technology Services
August 9, 2017

Company: RevaComm
Prepared by: Brett Kimura, VP Operations
                      bkimura@revacomm.com
                      (808) 784-2282

Derek Ichiyama
State Portal Program Manager
Office of Enterprise Technology Services
1155 Punchbowl Street, Room B20
Honolulu, HI 96813
derek.t.ichiyama@hawaii.gov

Mr. Ichiyama,

Please find our submittal for RFI No.: ETS.FY18.RFI.001, RFI for Internet Portal Manager and Service Provider.

Leveraging our 27 years of experience in Hawaii building websites, web applications, and various web portals for the commercial and public sectors, we look forward to being of service to you and the State of Hawaii in helping to shape a new and enhanced Internet Portal. This is an extremely exciting opportunity for us and we hope that we can work with you and your organization in adding scalability and efficiency to the portal and its users, both internal and external, all while creating a true enterprise platform. We know that our collective expertise can increase the value of the service the portal provides the State and can to instill additional code, software, and IT management best practices to improve quality of service, efficiency and productivity, and reduce operations risk.

Through teamwork, technology, service and a commitment to excellence, we are confident that together we will shape a vision that will help the State of Hawaii leverage technology to serve the people better and more efficiently.

As the State goes through this process, please do not hesitate to contact me at (808) 784-2282 or via email at bkimura@revacomm.com should there be any more insight RevaComm can provide. We will be glad to help in any way that we can.

Mahalo,

Brett Kimura
VP, Operations

a) **From your past experience, has the State identified all the major components necessary to pursue an RFP for a new Internet portal provider? If not, please provide information on other necessary components.**

We may have missed this in the RFI, or misinterpreted the information provided, if so we apologize, but other major components of providing a portal to the State of Hawaii we believe to be missing in the RFI and supporting addendum are:
- Hosting
- Identity and Access Management (IAM)
- Enterprise Content Management (ECM)
- Information Assurance (Cybersecurity, Risk Management, Business Continuity, Disaster Recovery, Governance, etc.)
- Integration to other applications that sit outside the portal
- Integration of applications built by other vendors that should integrate or interface with portal/portal information (both in the portal and outside the portal)
- End-user Adoption Plan (State Employees and Public)
- End-user Support/Help Desk (State Employees and Public)
- Training

b) **Are there potential problems and risks that the State may encounter during this project?**
- Change Management – Not achieving critical mass in user adoption to new technology is the #1 reason that software projects fail. Having a strong migration and adoption plan for external users and internal stakeholders will be paramount.
- Timeframe – If the State of Hawaii does not own the code or have perpetual licenses to the software, cutting over to a new vendor without the ability to incrementally transition services over time will be very risky. If a partial or complete rebuilt is required, the timeframe to transition could be quite lengthy.
- Relationship Management – If a new vendor is brought in, new relationships need to be formed with existing stakeholders and a Turnover of Information (TOI) will need to occur from the exiting vendor to the new vendor. Structured turnover documentation needs to be created and agreed upon by both vendors to ensure the smoothest transition.
- Enterprise Architecture (EA) – The portal should fit within the State's current EA plan since it spans the entire enterprise. Integration points will need to be identified since the portal will most likely integrate or interface with multiple applications across the State. Assuming that the State and ETS is continuously rolling out new services and improving technical infrastructure the plan developed at the beginning of the project may need to be modified to fit an evolving IT infrastructure. The selected vendor needs to function as a part of the

States team as services span 18+ Departments & City/Counties majority of which seem to pull data from sources outside the portal.

c) **Based on your review of the requirements described, can you describe the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats associated with a solution(s) you suggest?**

We have listed generalized strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats based on solutions we have proposed in the past. No specific solution is being proposed. The response below is based on our own strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats we see and can bring to the project.

Strengths
- Getting User Buy-in - Working with stakeholders to identify what's important to them and identify the things that are and aren't working. Creating a migration and adoption plan and incrementally roll out new features and services to ensure users aren't overwhelmed.
- Enterprise Content Management – Any solution we suggest would mostly likely have some type of Enterprise Content Management solution in the middle. One area of weakness we see in other state contracts we've worked or bid on is the lack of ability for individual agencies to have control over their content and how users interact with their content. While governance is important in this aspect, so is giving department and division stakeholders the ability to self-manage. The current WordPress solution lacks the depth needed to support the entire state both from a Content Management and an information design standpoint. Division level websites are left with having to stick their site navigation in the right most column making it very clunky and difficult to navigate.
- User Experience – We pride ourselves in putting the user's experience first. We would design the site to fulfill the needs of the:

  1. Public end-user
  2. Site administrators
  3. Government stakeholders and service providers.

  Taking all users into consideration at the onset of the project makes the portal experience intuitive for users to conduct business with the State and streamline and automate as much of the business processing as possible.
- Determining Return on Investment (ROI) - Ability to track and analyze effectiveness of processes and the streamlining an automation of digitized process to determine ROI.
- Software Development Best Practices – Continuous Integration & Continuous Deployment, Automated Unit & Front End Testing, Code Reviews,

- ADA Compliance – ADA Compliance has been a focus of ours and we pride ourselves in beautiful and accessible websites and web applications.

Weaknesses

Opportunities
- Ability to update and refresh the State portal. Integrate stakeholder and end-user feedback through interviews and questionnaires to make significant improvement where it matters.
- Implement agile methodologies to ensure specifications and requirements are gathered correctly and course of action changes occur earlier, rather than later to reduce cost/timeline overruns or incorrect understanding of needs.
- Ability to consolidate accounts for various types of information, across all departments. Create a single state user account to authenticate and apply to every service the state provides. Will also provide and retain insights as to what residents are doing and what services are important to them.
- Revamp user interface to make division level information accessible and intuitive. We currently see a lot of issues with division-level website and information provided.
- Launch a website platform that has true staging capabilities. Current WordPress CMS does not have this ability and applications seem disparate and not integrated.
- Standup CI/CD process for state portal and all services that run on top of it. Standardize systems, processes, and documentation.
- Consolidate security and standardize technology stack to allow security tasks and components to scale. Leverage cloud providers that already meet security standards and remove some of the need to have that placed on State IT staff so they can be more strategic.
- Architect the technology solution to meet current needs but can scale to meet future needs by leveraging cloud infrastructure.

Threats
- Existing Vendor Cooperation – If the State does not own all the code, software, and supporting IT infrastructure, and the project is awarded to a new vendor, the exiting vendor could be a barrier to ensuring a smooth transition should they not cooperate, be able to provide code, provide access to current systems, and/or lack sufficient documentation.
- Lack of participation to support a self-funded model – In a self-funded model, Department, Division, and City/County participation is a necessity to ensure that the portal receives a consistent revenue stream to maintain, support, and

enhance services. Should stakeholders opt out of services, there may not be enough revenue to sustain this model.

d) **Can you provide a preliminary plan and timeline on how the existing services could be migrated to a new vendor without interrupting services?**

There is a lot more information needed to determine a timeline. For example, it is unknown if The State owns all of code/software and hardware/IT infrastructure, or if it's being license, leased, or provided as SaaS. These unknowns make it difficult to determine any possible timeframe for migration of services.

Generally for a project this size, (a lot of assumptions being made here) 3-6 months would be dedicated to conducting discovery and analysis to understand what is in place now and come to an agreement as to what the future state should be. After agreeing upon the proposed future state, the next 4-6 months would be dedicated to the development of a web portal architecture and on implementation a PMIS for tracking progress and getting feedback of the entire implementation/turnover. Once the core foundation is set and assuming the State owns or has licenses for all the code and IT infrastructure, determinations will be made as to what will be migrated, ported, rebuilt, or left out. A comprehensive plan will then be developed that would probably span 1 to 2 years to execute on.

e) **Can you provide any ideas or suggestions about how such problems and risks should be addressed in an RFP for Internet portal services?**
   - Being as transparent as possible in the RFP process.
   - Create a requirement for Adoption and Change Management Plan, this would be the most important part of the scope of work.
   - Sharing who owns the code & IT infrastructure, and what provisions have been made with the current vendor if the State doesn't own it.
   - Provide an extensive list as to:
     - What is the current IT infrastructure of each system e.g. Where is it hosted? Is it physical or virtual? What is the size of the data? What its technology platform(s)/stack(s), what systems it integrates/interfaces with and whether that system is currently part of the portal?
     - Which code bases and systems the State currently owns, or holds perpetual licenses to.
     - Note which systems have been documented, to what extent, and provide samples.
     - Identify the systems that have unique login/accounts and not directly integrated with hawaii.gov
   - Prioritizing the list of systems by importance

- Identifying COTS solutions that can be implemented to suit needs while still providing flexibility to integrate/interface with other systems.

f) **In order to determine the feasibility of developing a new Internet portal solution, can you provide a "ball park" cost estimate associated with the proposed solution(s) identified in your response, including start-up costs, implementation costs, maintenance, etc.? The information will be used for planning purposes only and should not be construed as part of any future RFP solicitation.**

To make the improvements outlined in the RFI, a ball park estimate would be around 5-10 million.

g) **As an alternative to using or relying on just one vendor for the solution, are there possible solutions using a combination of vendors, where the State would interface with a main vendor and the others would be subcontractors or independent contractors? If so, please describe.**

Yes, the state could identify a program manager first who will work on the plan, strategy and architecture with the state, and collectively, or through the main vendor, subcontract specific sections to other vendors, or COTS providers, to provide specific functionality for the required sections.

h) **Do you have any additional comments/information that you feel would be beneficial to the State in deciding on a solution for the services outlined in this RFI?**

- As far as funding models go there are three options we see, self-funded (current), fixed prices, or hybrid self-funded model. A hybrid model would be self-funded but with cap on the maximum total fees gained by the vendor. In this model the state wouldn't be required to put up any money up front. The awarded vendor would finance the effort, with the ability to recapture fees plus interests through the revenue generated from the portal. This recapture on fees could be based solely on the revenue that is generated by transaction fees, if applicable, in the way the current model does. The total fees (base cost to the state + interest depending on how long it will take to regain fees) can be determined prior to starting work on any service. If the State requires a service that doesn't have any fees associated with it, the State and awarded vendor can decide to regain cost from other transaction fees or move to a firm fixed price amount.
- In the scenario that multiple vendors are used, per question g, the State should consider the possibility of contracting the main vendor as a program manager that conducts discovery, strategy, architecture, and planning as a separate

contract prior to awarding any contract to other vendors for development. This way a detailed scope can be provided that has a lot of the ambiguity removed so all vendors can provide a competitive apples-to-apples cost analysis on the design, development, hosting, security, and maintenance & support portion of the contract. That program manager could also be responsible for management of the project and coordination of all vendors.