Seeking Innovative Business Education Providers to Help Upskill a 140K+ Federal Workforce (FEDS140K)

Responses to Questions

- Thank you very much for expressing interest in this RFI. Answers to questions are posted below.
- Please monitor the sam.gov site for the latest updates on this RFI. We recommend using the search term "FEDS140K" to locate the latest content related to this RFI (including updated documents, advance information about conference calls, etc.)

Category	Question	Proposed Answer
Application	1. How do the Financial Management employees drive their development today?	There is significant variability across the federal government in how employee development is driven. Typically, each year, employees participate in a career planning as part of their annual performance management process or via other specific career development processes such as self-assessments against competency models. With support from their managers, they develop development goals and for the year and discuss any developmental needs they may have in being able to reach those goals. At mid-year, at end-of year, or as needed, they document results relative to their development plan. In addition to the annual career planning process (above), employees have agency-specific processes they follow to identify and request training needed for employee development. The specific process followed varies across agencies and include use of internal training available within the agency, as well as via external training providers. Other developmental initiatives/programs exist across the government; however, these vary significantly. They include opportunities for structured mentoring, coaching, seeking detail opportunities (temporary assignments to work in different capacities/offices/agencies to broaden exposure), fellowships, and training cohorts. In part, this Career Planning and Training Tool initiative is an initial attempt towards more standardization of the career development for Financial Management employees.
Approach	2. Are there specific CPE that need to be	Some Federal financial management employees do need to obtain CPE to maintain proficiency for certifications and to

	completed by learners each year? If so, which ones? And what is the annual percentage of the population that must complete this?	meet other requirements associated with being a Certified Public Accountant. It is generally specific to the organization and the individual. It is not tracked government-wide, and no data is available.
Approach	3. As noted in the Utility/Access section, would a tiered pricing model based on number of users be a viable alternative to the p-card model? If it would not be viable alternative, please provide considerations as to why not.	The purchasing design of this Version 1.0 initiative leverages the concept that purchases under $10,000 may be made using the government purchase card. Purchases under the $10,000 limit can typically be made with minimal local agency approval required. Purchases above that $10,000 threshold require additional processes and controls. These controls can include a requirement for bids, formal RFQs, additional layers of review/involvement, coordination with multiple departments, etc. We would be interested in hearing about tiered pricing models. For tiered pricing above $10K, regular agency purchasing procedures would apply (this might introduce additional unwieldy complexity into this pilot effort as described above).
Approach	4. How do supervisors currently receive information about their employees' developmental needs?	It is a highly variable process across the government. In general, it typically follows one of these paths: • The employee self-identifies training they need to maintain their knowledgebase or improve upon it. This typically comes about as part of the annual goal setting or performance review process. They then bring it to the attention of local management and request funding for the training. If budget allows, funding is usually granted. • Alternatively, a supervisor may recognize a training need for their employee(s) and arrange for training. • Agencies also identify mandatory training needs for all employees (e.g., ethics training, IT security training)
Approach	5. How do the Financial Management employees receive information on their competency gaps?	Typically, competency gaps are either self-identified by the employee, or noted by the supervisor. Generally, it is done as part of career development discussions or the annual goal setting and performance evaluation process.

		The initiative outlined in the RFI and described within the Application package, represents an effort to provide more guidance, structure, and learning tools to support this process.
Approach	6. How is proficiency evaluated for learners today against the 54 competencies?, e.g., self-assessment tool, performance eval against job description?	Learners are not currently evaluated against the 54 competencies systematically across the federal government. There have been some pilots in agencies working with the Office of Personnel Management. Incorporating these 54 competencies into a self-assessment and training-access portal (this effort) is a new initiative. Nothing similar exists now across government within the Financial Management community.
Approach	7. How will competency skill gap training opportunities be presented to learners? i.e., as a complete list, focused topics/content, etc.	This first iteration of this initiative is a Version 1.0 that is very basic in design. If successful, we would hope to expand functionality and scope – and perhaps pull in other functional communities (e.g., IT professionals, Data professionals). As envisioned, Federal employees would access the tool / web portal by using filters (filters available would include job type, job level, competencies) to identify the skills and knowledge they need to be proficient and advance their career. As an example, a GS-13 Accountant looking for information about the knowledge and skills needed for their level would: • Go to the web portal • Filter on Job Series (“Accountant”) and filter on “Mid-level Employee” (a GS-13 is a mid-level employee). • They would then be presented with information describing the 54 tailored competencies that are relevant for that specific job series and employee level. They could further filter on each of the 54 competencies. • Within each of the 54 individual competencies they would see written guidance on the knowledge and skills they should have to master for each competency. o Embedded within each competency’s guidance would be a web link to specific vendor training that could help them master that competency.

		○ If the employee identifies a knowledge/skills gap that they want to fill, they could click on the link which would take them directly to the vendor site which would have information about the course, pricing, etc. ○ If they wish to purchase the course, they will then request purchase approval using their agency specific policies and procedures. In other scenarios, the same GS-13 may use the tool and the filters to identify the skills, knowledge, and training needed for a lateral transition into another job series, or to advance their career (i.e., same job series, but higher GS-level).
Approach	8. How will the career map embedded links be maintained?	After initial selection of the vendors with which to partner, and after initial upload of the links within the tool/portal, we will work out an update/maintenance process with vendors. We are very open to suggestions for how this might be most efficiently performed. Current thinking is that we would have a weekly or monthly update process.
Approach	9. In addition to the MOU, will the contracting officer be able to sign a License Agreement covering Intellectual Property rights, security etc.?	The design of this initiative should make it such that this question would not be relevant and coordination with Contracting Officers is not required. We can address this more in greater detail in our upcoming call.
Approach	10. In order to propose appropriate pricing approach, will the following information be provided: # of users, # of courses, duration for program?	The submitter for this question may not completely understand the proposed model for this Version 1.0. We will address this topic in greater detail during our upcoming call.
Approach	11. May a responder add additional rows and/or slightly reformat the mapping matrix adding a row for each specific level of	Yes

	competency, i.e., Accounting Analysis Level 1 Awareness - multiple rows inserted with each row representing a different option	
Approach	12. What has the CFO Council done to garner support for the move towards a common financial education marketplace?	This initiative is part of a larger 10-year plan to modernize the federal financial workforce and is one of several pilots whose success will be assessed to determine future plans. CFO.gov has more background regarding workforce modernization efforts.
Approach	13. What is the actual annual per person spend vs. the projected $1,000/per person?	We do not have actual spend; however, we did officially survey agencies to come up with the estimated $1,000 spend per person.
Approach	14. What is the current state of the Career Planning Tool?, i.e., it exists and is in use?	It is currently in development. We hope that it will be ready to activate in Q1 of CY2022.
Approach	15. What is the desired date to launch the prototype tool/content?	We are aiming for Q1 of CY2022
Approach	16. What is the expectation for a supervisor to use the tool for evaluation and development needs identification a part of the prototype?	The primary intent of the tool is to give employees a tool to better plan their own knowledge/skills development and make it easier for them to identify quality training. Secondarily we will encourage supervisors to use the tool to aid in career planning and performance assessment for their employees.
Approach	17. What is the expectation for learner training status data to be provided (i.e., started, in-progress, completed, passed, failed, etc.)?	Our light-weight version 1.0 concept does not envision supplying that information within the tool. However, we are open to ideas and suggestions. Version 1.0 is intended to be a pilot effort / proof of concept. If there is enough usage from employees and enough quality content from vendors, it is potentially likely that the concept could receive additional funds and scope greatly expanded.
Approach	18. What is the expectation of the partner(s) to monitor	There is no expectation that the vendor partners would need to monitor spend on behalf of the government.

	the $1,000 spend for each learner?	
Approach	19. What minimum usage levels has the CFO Council put in place to measure success?	Performance metrics are still being determined. We are open to suggestions.
Approach	20. What statistics are currently tracked for learner training consumption across the 140,000+ employees today?	There are no statistics currently tracked for this population.
Approach	21. Who/what entity will be the decision maker/accountable project owner?	The CFO Council Workforce Modernization Executive Steering Committee (ESC).
Context	22. What expectation is there that the ~5 partners selected collaborate on content options?	The selected partners/vendors may collaborate however, it is our hope that such collaboration would not stifle content innovation or favorable pricing conditions for the government. Ongoing innovation and attractive content pricing will be core factors in whether this initiative succeeds.
Application	23. How is work performance tracked?	It varies largely across the government. In general, supervisors work with their employees to set annual goals for their employees. At mid-year, and year-end, the supervisors evaluate progress on goals and in meeting performance standards. At mid-year, interim feedback is shared with employees. At year-end, final evaluation feedback is shared with employees and a score is assigned (1-5) to rate the employees performance. Each agency has its own system for tracking goals, performance and ratings.
Approach	24. Concur with this initiative to attract out source resources.	Thank you for the feedback.
Context	25. Are you looking solely for organizations with pre-existing course catalogs or would you be open to working with a consultancy to specifically develop course content and	At this point in time, we are only looking to work with organizations that have already-existing content that aligns with the competencies. However, once, the vendors are selected, we may work with them collaboratively to develop specific course content that is needed by our community.

	catalog specific to your needs?	
Context	26. Are you still accepting applications?	Please refer to the latest iteration of the posted RFI as dates may change. The current deadline is February 25th. There has been a very significant "uptick" of interest within the government focused on Workforce Modernization. As a result of that interest, it is possible the date may be further extended. Please continue to monitor cfo.gov and sam.gov for the latest information. We will also monitor the feedback we receive and may make adjustments to design as a result.
Approach	27. How does this effort compliment the Office of the Undersecretary of Defense's Financial Management Initiative for a Learning Management System?	We are in coordination and collaboration with the DoD. We have contacts with DoD embedded on our planning team. Both groups are pursuing separate initiatives and pilots – but exchanging information and data and looking for synergies.
Context	28. Are you looking for training and development only or career pathing through a holistic talent management system?	This is a Version 1.0 initiative looking to create a system that would incrementally build towards delivering both services. The initial version is intended to provide evidence that our novel approach can succeed. If successful, we would likely aim to expand the features and userbase. We will discuss further on the call.
Context	29. Are you looking to access content only, or content and an LMS that would provide the delivery to enable consumption and tracking from the TTEPs ?	There current Version 1.0 envisions accessing content only.
Context	30. Competency management and Individual Development Plans are important requirements but does the CFO Council anticipate Certification	Not currently with the Version 1.0 design envisioned. However, those features/options could be potentially included in later iterations if there is a cost-effective business case.

	management to be part of the desired solution?	
Context	31. Of the 140,000 users that will be consuming content, what is the frequency, or how many times per 12 month period would an individual consume a course or training object?	This initiative uses substantially new approaches that we believe haven't been tried before in government-wide training. It makes forecasting usage impossible for us. We think several factors will play a role in determining usage and how well this initiative accelerates or fails. • Pricing - Employees generally have a flexible spend of approximately $1000 that they can apply towards self-identified training. If the courses offered are high quality, but relatively inexpensive, that may translate into several purchases over the course of the year. Note – departments and agencies also have separate training budgets, however, we don't have data on that. • Quality Content – If vendors provide quality content (e.g., engaging, applicable, practical) it will draw in greater usage (e.g., word-of-mouth, increased championing by leadership) and perhaps great investment by government. • Achieving a "Virtuous Cycle" - We will need to attract federal users to the site. In other words, we centrally, cannot mandate usage. Our CFO Community has at times pledged to support this effort and drive (in various ways) participation by their organizations. How frequently and how much employees participate will depend, in part, on the "virtuous cycle effect". After launch, if users and management see positive benefit from the guidance and training content, they will likely become even stronger vocal proponents, champions, and users. With increasing user traffic by federal employees, our hope is that vendors would see a benefit in investing in new and stronger content, further encouraging increased federal traffic. Overall, if we demonstrate that this is a viable approach for delivering career guidance and training, we think that other segments of our federal workforce will also want to partake in this initiative.

Context	32. What kind of platform will be used?	For the version 1.0 effort, essentially a proof of concept, we will be using a simple construct on a Federalist website. On the upcoming call we hope to present a visualization of this effort.
Approach	33. Many of these subject areas (i.e. Data Management) are very broad. Can you release any information on what the desired outcomes are for employees following completion of a competency-area course?	First a general note - For the version 1.0 effort, our ambitions are relatively modest. We'd like to prove the viability of this overall approach and get *enough* satisfied user traffic, and for vendors to see sufficient revenue, where both parties (Government and Vendor) see clear business cases for further investing in and expanding on this model. We expect over time that the competency guidance will be fleshed out and further refined. Our hope is that the training identified for each competency and maturity level will be applicable in scope and provide practical knowledge to the employees to help them master each competency / maturity level. It's possible that for some competencies and maturity levels, multiple courses may be needed to achieve that objective. Regarding desired outcomes on completing the course: • We hope that the employee receives the knowledge and training that help them master a given competency/maturity level. We also hope that they are so satisfied with the training/experience that they share that enthusiasm with their management, peers, and subordinates. • Regarding CPE Credit, Badging, Certificates of Completion, Degree Credit, etc. for individual users – we do not yet have a set vision for how these factors could be incorporated. This initiative is relatively organic in that we wish to first achieve success with a relatively "simple" Version 1.0 pilot effort. If the concept is successful (user satisfaction, management satisfaction, vendor satisfaction), it is our hope that the scope of the effort would be further expanded. These features could be included in version 1.0 if there is an inexpensive, non-resource intensive, approach that would allow this to be implemented. • If this version 1.0 approach is successful, future iterations, beyond 1.0, could greatly expand the initiative making it much more robust.

Seeking Innovative Business Education Providers to Help Upskill a 140K+ Federal Workforce (FEDS140K)

Responses to Questions

Context	34. What is the average per person training budget for all employees? How does the per person training budget differ based on employee level and function?	Based on surveys done with our community, we believe each employee has approximately $1000 in discretionary funds to apply towards their own training. Additionally, departments and agencies also generally have additional funds, however, we do not have data on the precise amount. We have no data on the second question.
Context	35. How many courses does the government expect any one given finance employee to take in a year?	Impossible for us to predict at this point in time given the unknowns. We do not know how the courses will be priced by vendors. We do not know how well those courses will be received by users.
Context	36. Is there a way to increase the spending per individual to more than $1,000 / year through other sources?	This question is beyond our ability to directly answer. However, if this initiative is successful as a version 1.0 proof of concept, we can speculate that the business case for greater investment / spending would be obvious. Employees receiving great training become more effective justifying greater investment in training. As stated earlier, our understanding is that departments/agencies also have access to additional training funds that could be channeled through this initiative. We believe the true value of this initiative to vendors is the growth potential if initial version 1.0 is very successful.
Context	37. Does the government anticipate providing section or course minimum enrollment guarantees so that training providers can forward contract for the instructor and other support needed to run the course at breakeven levels?	We cannot provide guarantees at this time and likely would be difficult in the future as well. Version 1.0 represents a proof-of-concept attempt. If successful, we would envision organically building and expanding upon it – making the offerings/capabilities much more robust. For the version 1.0 effort we are primarily targeting vendors that already have existing content and courses that would only need to be scaled up to accommodate our users. The type of content may include instructor led, self-paced, or other.
Context	38. Is there a preference for asynchronous, live virtual or on ground?	There is no preference by the launch team. As this is a version 1.0 proof-of-concept effort, we are trying to go into this with a flexible approach and an open mind as to what might be

		successful. However, due to the pandemic and greater behavioral shift to remote work, it is likely that virtual learning will be a preference of our users across government.
Context	39. If there is a desire for on ground delivery – is there a preference for on a university campus location, a government location or elsewhere?	There is no preference. As this is a version 1.0 proof-of-concept effort, we are trying to go into this with a flexible approach and an open mind as to what might be successful. Given the pandemic, we do anticipate a preference by our agencies and users for remote/hybrid learning. Please also see the Application Package for other guidance.
Application	40. On the Curriculum Map under Time Commitment, do we show the course length in days under "Calendar Duration"? Do we show actual contact hours with the students under "Actual Duration"?	With this initiative we are trying to be flexible in anticipating all the different types of courses/content that might be proposed. It is possible that some courses may be instructor-led and involve multiple sessions. As an example, if an instructor-led course will take place over a period of 10 weeks, then the “Calendar Duration” would be 10 weeks. “Actual Duration” could either be “N/A” or an estimate of the trainee’s expected time commitment to complete the course (example: estimate 80 hours of cumulative effort on behalf of the employee/trainee). In the “Additional Information” column, the vendor can input any clarifying comments. Please also see the Application Package for other guidance.
Application	41. On the Curriculum Map, what do we show under "Favorable Prices?". Is this a yes or no question, or do we show our discounted prices?	From the “Application Package” document page 15: “For the “Favorable Pricing column we are looking for an indicator as to whether you will be able to extend favorable pricing terms to the government. Favorable pricing terms are not a requirement, however, if favorable pricing is extended, it will make it easier for us to market your courses to our core federal audience.” As an example, a form of “best price” discount or guarantee, might help make vendor course offerings more attractive to our userbase and make it easier/more likely for management at agencies to champion particular course offerings.
Application	42. On the Curriculum Map, what do we show under Applicable Performance Levels? Do we show the number of hours of training at each level.	From the “Application Package” document page 15: “Indicate which performance levels apply to the course being inputted (recommend using “X” or “Y”). • Note - The five performance levels are intended to indicate the employee progression steps for mastering

		a given competency ("Awareness" - incrementally up to "Expert").
		  ○ As an example – an Accounting 101 course might address the competency "Accounting Analysis) (row 5, column B) and performance levels 1 and 2.
		  ○ Accounting 201 course might address the same competency, but be more applicable to level 3.
		• You may manually insert as many rows as needed within a given competency."
		
		Additional Information:
		• The 54 competencies are identified in column "B".
		• Each competency is further subdivided into "Performance Levels" (column "C")
		• To illustrate how the competencies and performance levels relate:
		  ○ An Accountant (their given Job Series), focusing on the "Accounting Analysis" Competency would need to achieve mastery of Performance Levels 3 and 4. This is because they are a GS-13, which is a mid-level employee. If they had not yet mastered 3 and 4, they would then potentially seek out training that aligns with and helps them master performance levels 3 and 4.
		• Different performance levels (1-5), within each competency, become applicable as the employee progresses from being a junior employee, to mid-level, to senior-level.
		• Employees with an eye on advancing, may set their sights on higher performance levels than their current GS Level. As an example, a mid-level employee, may look to see what performance levels are applicable, for a given competency, at the senior-level. This might help them plan their career and identify training and guidance that would help them climb the career ladder.

Application	43. On the Curriculum Map, what do we show under Course Justifications? Do we show the reasons why our course aligns with	From the "Application Package" document page 15: "In this column, please specifically describe how your given course aligns with the specific CFOC competency and selected level(s)." Stated differently, describe how your course helps an employee develop knowledge about a competency and set them up to perform well for a given performance level(s).

	the competency definition?	Correct – we're looking for a description of how your proposed course aligns to a given competency and performance level(s). This description will help us better understand why your course is being proposed and how it will add value to the employee in attempting to master the given performance level and competency.
Context	44. Across all of the education content that you select, would you like for learners to be presented with review content that is tailored to their specific individual needs so that their education process adapts to their strengths and weaknesses?	We suspect that may be more complexity than our version 1.0 proof-of-concept can accommodate; however, we are open in interested in innovative ideas and proposals.
Context	45. Do you have existing content internally (case studies, best practices, reports, etc.) that you would like to have automatically turned into curricula?	No.
Context	46. For the courses you are integrating, do you want students to be able to have access to an unlimited number of automatically generated quality questions about the content so they can assess specifics of what they're learning well and struggling with?	While intriguing, we would need to better understand how it fits within the constraints of our version 1.0 design. It would be considered "in total" as part of the vendors application package and in comparison, to the merits and value of other proposed applicants.
Context	47. Are any special certifications required to be considered for this opportunity?	No.

Seeking Innovative Business Education Providers to Help Upskill a 140K+ Federal Workforce (FEDS140K)

Responses to Questions

Context	48. Does the Learning & Development vendor need to have courses specific to financial affairs?	The courses should be applicable to the job series, competencies and performance levels.
Context	49. How is success going to be measured? What is the performance/ROI of currently employed solutions?	This is a new initiative and a good proof of concept of a very novel approach – that we believe has not been attempted by the government previously. This is an experiment to see if vendors will step forward with quality applicable content that users, and management, will find engaging and effective. Success metrics have yet to be defined, however, we are open to suggestions from the vendors. We expect that there will be learning and adapting by both sides as/if the initiative evolves. We view this effort as a mutually beneficial initiative. Vendors would potentially benefit by increased access to potential “students” and revenue. The government would benefit from a more capable and effective workforce that can more easily access tailored content. If successful, we could see this initiative receiving greater funding and interest from our leadership and the ability to pull in larger segments of the workforce. We have no data on the “performance/ROI of currently employed solutions”.
Context	50. Will there be a set-aside/preference for small businesses?	Because the pilot is not itself an acquisition but an informational tool to support agencies in their acquisitions, no set-asides or preferences apply to the pilot itself. However, set-asides and socioeconomic preferences remain available to agencies placing orders in accordance with regular agency rules.
Application	51. Course descriptions are lengthy and putting them into the spreadsheet will make it unwieldly for review. Please confirm bidders can instead insert a link in the cells that takes the government to the bidders’ website to view the detailed description	This would be acceptable. We are trying to execute an efficient application review process, and this would help us in conducting that.

Seeking Innovative Business Education Providers to Help Upskill a 140K+ Federal Workforce (FEDS140K)

Responses to Questions

Application	52. For Column L in Appendix 3, please confirm that the “Price” is supposed to be for one employee taking one course.	Confirmed. You may also add comments/context in column “AB” if additional/other pricing options are available. We are generally aiming for simplicity with the Version 1.0 effort. Individual pricing options seem to be the simplest option for this. However, we are interested in considering other approaches and options.
Application	53. For Column M in Appendix 3 “Favorable Pricing,” what is the government’s definition of “favorable pricing” for the purpose of this requirement?	From the “Application Package” document page 15: “For the “Favorable Pricing” column we are looking for an indicator as to whether you will be able to extend favorable pricing terms to the government. Favorable pricing terms are not a requirement, however, if favorable pricing is extended, it will make it easier for us to market your courses to our core federal audience.” As an example, a form of “best price” discount or guarantee, might help make vendor course offerings more attractive to our userbase and make it easier/more likely for management at agencies to champion course offerings.
Application	54. How many people from each bidder can participate in the review panel presentation?	The meeting will be virtual, and we have not set a limit.
Application	55. How many representatives from each bidder can participate in the interview phase?	The meeting will be virtual, and we have not set a limit.
Application	56. On the posting in SAM, it indicates 5-7 awardees. However, in the RFI on page 7 it says, “up 5 awardees”, and on page 10 it says, “5 or fewer organizations.” Please clarify the intended number of awardees.	Thank you for identifying this inconsistency. We will update it so that the upper threshold is “7”.
Approach	57. Does the government intend to expand this concept to other functional areas beyond Financial	Our focus is first on demonstrating a successful version 1.0 effort. The speed with which user traffic and favorable experiences accumulate will likely govern how quickly this initiative could expand. Given that this is a very new concept/approach we don’t yet have concrete expectations on

	Management within the 2-year Version 1.0 period, or would this occur after the first two years upon a review of the Version 1.0's success?	timing. We expect that both the government and the participating vendors will likely learn from and adapt. We do know however, that the workforce is a key priority for the government at the highest levels and the first pillar of the President's Management Agenda.
Approach	58. Please provide the percentage breakdowns of junior, mid, and senior-level employees who may be accessing this site in the FM community?	We do not have that data. Also, we anticipate that usage will initially be higher by the civilian agencies as opposed to those within DoD.
Context	59. Please confirm whether the central website-based hub being developed for the FM Career Map and Planning Tool is being built "in-house" (i.e., using government resources) or whether the work is to be contracted out.	Version 1.0 is currently being developed in-house so that it will be ready to roll out after we select the vendors. We hope to include a wireframe walkthrough of the very simple construct during our upcoming call. Later versions, beyond 1.0, may be contracted out.
Other	60. Please provide bidders, before November 4, a view of the interactive web page career map so that we can understand the imbedding of web links and other information. This view will also help us see how the information would look to an individual.	Apologies, there have been delays associated with the external tie-ins to the President's Management Agenda and other government-wide workforce initiatives. We are slightly behind schedule. We do anticipate providing that information during our upcoming call.
Other	61. The instructions say that bidders can enter multiple courses into Column D per Competency identified	We are okay with that suggestion.

	in Column B. For easy review, we recommend allowing the bidder to duplicate the entire row for each competency, and then provide one course per row.	
Application	62. Please allow small and start up educational companies that are not content providers, but can address some of the challenges in the federal workspace.	Thank you for that suggestion. As mentioned above, we will look into potentially incorporating a consideration for small business. At this moment we are only looking for content partners with existing / scalable content.
Application	63. Training needs to evolve with the workforce, each Dept and Agency should be able to inherit and edit training content to fit their organization's need, XYZ Company can do that, but we don't create content, we build learning technology. No space for that.	Thank you for the input.
Approach	64. Please make opportunities for small innovative EdTech companies that won't get drowned by other large companies. At our company, we are small, but we have built a platform for training with interactive decisions, points, and crowdsourcing.	Thank you for that suggestion. As mentioned above, we will look into potentially incorporating a consideration for small business. At this moment we are only looking for content partners with existing / scalable content.
Context	65. How can companies that innovate in the educational technology space participate? XYZ	Thank you for your input. At the moment we are only looking for content providers.

	company makes it easy for content providers to create engaging educational scenarios that are interactive, but we're not content providers.	
Context	66. Is it limited to only content providers?	At the moment we are only looking for content providers.
Other	67. Consider innovation incubator program.	Thank you for your input.
Application	68. Do companies need to bid on all 54 core training areas?	"Bid" probably isn't the term we would use. We see it as us looking for training vendors, with applicable pre-existing content, that can scale mostly current offerings to meet the needs of our workforce and align with our competencies. We'll select vendors to collaborate with that best meet the needs as outlined in the application package document.
Application	69. If we bid on a subset of core training areas, can we add training areas during the contract period?	"Bid" isn't the term we would use. However, we do anticipate that selected training vendors will expand their offerings over time (add in more courses / content; update existing content) within the portal. We may also expand the job series and add new competencies, thereby creating a larger "market" for training vendor services.
Context	70. Will the agency be releasing this solicitation as a total small business set-aside? If not, what is the reasoning for the unrestricted purchase?	Because the pilot is not itself an acquisition but an informational tool to support agencies in their acquisitions, no set-asides or preferences apply to the pilot itself. However, set-asides and socioeconomic preferences remain available to agencies placing orders in accordance with regular agency rules.
Context	71. I am interested in getting involved in this initiative and would like to find out more.	Thank you. Right now, we're only working with Federal volunteers to help build out this initiative. That said, through this initiative we do hope to establish a collaborative relationship with the approximately 7 selected vendors where we work together to improve this model.
Context	72. Is the government looking for a solution of both people to do the training and an innovative new IT	Right now, we're looking mainly for content providers that can provide engaging training content that best meets the needs of our specific community (job series, GS-levels, competencies, and performance levels). We are not looking for a platform for Version 1.0.

	platform to provide the training? As those are usually two separate initiatives.	
Context	73. Is the Government looking for a Udemy, Coursera, or Moodle type training platform?	We are not looking for a platform at the moment. We will provide more information about our Version 1.0 approach at the upcoming Call.
Application	74. When is signature required on the "Memorandum of Understanding"? (Appendix 6)	We envision executing the MOU after the 5-7 training vendors have been identified.
Approach	75. FedRAMP is important because it ensures consistency in the security of the government's cloud services—and because it ensures consistency in evaluating and monitoring that security. Therefore, we recommend you require all TTEP applicants (continued) who offer cloud-based solutions to be FedRAMP-moderate authorized or in process at the time of application.	We do not anticipate requiring FedRAMP certification for version 1.0.
Approach	76. Does the Working Group (WG) intend to align staff to manage any administrative tasks associated with this initiative (e.g., tracking, reporting, etc.); and/or does the WG intend to rely on TTEPs for all administrative activities?	For version 1.0, which is essentially a proof of concept, we have limited resources and are attempting to implement this initiative in a very streamlined fashion. We do have staff that will support administrative tasks, however, we are hoping to make that aspect of this initiative as lightweight as possible. Our overall goal is to demonstrate that this public-private collaboration approach is feasible. That is, that the government works to determine its training/competency needs and then uses competition to source that training out to the most capable and cost-effective providers. After we

		demonstrate that this approach is viable, we can seek to expand features and expand coverage. To the extent that we can utilize/gather standard data, that is easily available across all of the selected training providers, to help with tracking and reporting, we believe that would be beneficial to both the government and the training vendors.
Approach	77. Many Commercial-Off-The-Shelf (COTS) providers do business with the 24 CFO agencies. To avoid waste of taxpayer dollars, we recommend the WG and selected COTS TTEPs co-develop and execute processes that reduce the risk of redundant spend (continued)	We will consider your suggestion. However, a key design feature of this version 1.0 approach is the idea that competition will encourage innovation and favorable pricing.
Approach	78. Regarding Section 508 conformance, we recommend you require all TTEP applicants who offer cloud-based Thank you – we will consider this suggestion. Special Attention by Legal Same logic as in my comment on item 75. solutions to provide an Electronic Information Technology (EIT) Accessibility Capability Statement at the time of application.	We do not anticipate requiring FedRAMP certification for version 1.0.

Approach	79. We recommend that you require all TTEP applicants to disclose any security breaches resulting in data theft within the past 3 years, and that you carefully review their privacy notices related to personal data; (continued)... ...but not limited to: how they collect personal data, how they use personal data, and disclosures of personal data. Further, we recommend all potential TTEPs provide a statement at the time of application outlining what methods and/or capabilities will be employed to proactively manage this risk.	We do not anticipate requiring FedRAMP certification for version 1.0.
Approach	80. What level of involvement will the Learning and Development (L&D) Functions within each agency have in this initiative?	To-date we have coordinated lightly with several different agencies Learning and Development functions. As this initiative succeeds, and demonstrates viability, we will broaden that coordination. Our coordination so far has been with OMB, OPM, the Chief Human Capital Officer's Council, other Executive Officers Councils (e.g., CIO Council, CDO Council) and in small part, with the Chief Learning Officer's Council.
Approach	81. What measures will be implemented to prevent individuals from purchasing resources that they may already have access to through their respective L&D function?	We are not aware of any measures.
Context	82. How does the Career Planning / Education Portal	We do not have visibility into all the work that is being done by agency-specific L&D functions. This effort is intended to create an upskilling opportunity across the whole-of-government.

	Solution differ from the work that is being done and resources procured by Agency-specific L&D Functions?	
Context	83. If a TTEP will be a data source, what protocol and/or measures will the TTEP be required to follow to safeguard Personal Identifiable Information (PII)?	TTEPs will probably collect employee PII in the course of registering the employees for courses. Under the Privacy Act, this does make them agents for the agency with whom they have the contract requiring the collection of the PII – in most cases, *the contract* being the *individual p-card purchase*. Given how the pilot is structured, GSA itself, will not be involved in the handling of employee PII (we will not, for example, collect or store PII).
Context	84. Regarding the web links that will be embedded within your workforce career skills guide (i.e., mapping), do you have any specific formatting requirements, if any? For example: font type, font size, etc.	This will be determined later.
Context	85. RFI document states: "In partnering with us, we'll also make available data and feedback from the Version 1.0 effort…" What specific data to you intend to collect and from what source(s)?	This is an organic, new endeavor. We do not yet know what data we will have access to. However, our interests are in making this effort successful and we will want our training vendors to have access to the data that might better inform their services. In using the term "organic" we refer to our approach methodology which will be to collaborate with the training vendors. As they, and we, learn what is effective we will adapt.
Context	86. RFI document, pg. 1, 5th paragraph states: "If this effort is successful, the two-year Version 1.0 (estimated duration) would be converted into an ongoing initiative…". What is the success	At a high level we believe success criteria will center on: • Usage rates • Demonstrated effectiveness of training and career guidance delivered • Consumer feedback • Vendor feedback • Management feedback

	criteria and how will it be evaluated/measured?	• Resource/scaling efficiencies achieved using this framework when compared to other Learning Management System/Upskilling frameworks • The effectiveness of expanded, add-on, features
Context	87. Will the WG require (or prefer) administrative access to the TTEP's learning delivery platform for the purposes of tracking & reporting?	We do not see this as a likely request that we would ever make.
Context	88. Please clarify your pricing requirements in detail.	Please see earlier answers.
Other	89. What type of pricing does OFCO prefer? Minimum by class size (volume) or per person pricing?	We view this version 1.0 initiative as focused primarily at the individual learner. We are seeking pricing for individual options. However, the vendor may include descriptions of other options in the material they submit.
Context	90. Question on pricing. Our Exec Ed Financial Management Certificate costs 9,000, if each employee has an annual budget of 1,000 will the government provide funding for the remaining cost?	It is not a commitment that we can make on behalf of the different agencies. However, to answer your question in general terms, agencies do occasionally make extra funds available for targeted employees, and the amount cited is within what we consider to be feasible spend amounts. We have no specific data to back that up, however, it is based on our multi-agency team's collective experience.
Context	91. I was a federal leader in the USG who focused on upskilling and workforce transformation. I'm interested in learning more. I'm also interested in responding to the RFI however I cannot locate info on federalregister.gov	The RFI information is posted in two locations. It is on sam.gov and it can be located by searching for the text string "FEDS140K". It can also be found on the cfo.gov website.
Context	92. Does the government already have a learning portal	Portal development is in progress, and we hope to preview wireframes at our upcoming call.

	built that currently provides a course roadmap?	