Public Service Commission
Commission de la fonction publique du Canada

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION ON
Assessment of Various Scheduling Technologies & Solutions for the Public Service Commission (PSC)

REF #: 23-0028

RFI DATE: October 30, 2023

CLOSING DATE AND TIME: November 15, 2023, by 14:00 EST

1. Nature of Request for Information
   This is not a bid solicitation. This RFI will not result in the award of any contract; therefore, potential suppliers of any goods or services described in this RFI should not earmark stock or facilities, nor allocate resources, because of any information contained in this RFI. Nor will this RFI result in the creation of any source list; therefore, whether any potential supplier responds to this RFI will not preclude that supplier from participating in any future procurement. Also, the procurement of any of the goods and services described in this RFI will not necessarily follow this RFI.

   1.1 Response Costs
   The PSC will not reimburse any respondent for expenses incurred in responding to this RFI.

2. **Introduction**

   2.1 Background and Purpose of this Request for Information (RFI)
   The intent of this Request for Information (RFI) is to solicit feedback from the industry on all aspects detailed in the draft Statement of Work (SOW; see Section 3 of this document) and to determine the ability of Vendors who provide assessment scheduling solution development and any integration services required to deliver the services according to the detailed specifications. A more specific list of questions for Vendors is also provided.

   2.2 Overview
   The Public Service Commission (PSC) delivers assessment and testing services to hiring managers in client organizations across the Canadian Federal Public Service (CFPS). This includes but is not limited to Second-Language Evaluations (SLE) oral assessments for staffing and developmental purposes. Over forty thousand SLE oral assessments are requested annually to assess job applicants by trained PSC assessors.

   As part of the ongoing modernization of its products and services, the PSC is undertaking a multi-year renewal project to improve its SLE assessment process. This process will improve the user-friendliness of the process, automate several

manual operations, improve process accessibility, deliver better services, and help reduce the time it takes to staff a position in the CFPS.

While the PSC will consider all information regarding the modernization of its assessment scheduling systems, the specific process of interest to this RFI is the scheduling of oral assessments between candidates and assessors. During the SLE oral assessment process, departments across the CFPS identify candidates for testing, whether they are already federal public servants, or members of the public applying for a CFPS position. Candidate information is sent by departments to the PSC, which schedules an oral assessment with one of the sixty assessors trained by the PSC. The scheduling information is communicated back to candidates and is used by the PSC in the day-to-day administration of these tests. Tests can be held in-person or using videoconferencing means.

2.2.1 Current Manual Process

Test scheduling is currently a manual process that depends on looking up the availability of assessors through their Outlook calendars. The candidate does not have input during the initial scheduling process – a time is proposed by the PSC, and the candidate, through their department, can request rescheduling if the proposed time is inconvenient. Such rescheduling also follows the manual process of looking up availability in the Outlook calendars of suitable assessors. Through a testing request, the department can request accommodation measures for a candidate, which consist of adapting a test to the candidate needs to remove barriers and provide a fair assessment. The process allowing the specialists to determine the accommodation measures for the candidate is managed through a separate scheduling system. Performance issues can affect this process – Since the PSC can administer up to 200 SLE oral assessments per day, any delay in the synchronization of calendar and appointment information can have an impact.

2.2.2 Future Digital Process

A new assessment scheduling solution will follow a client-driven design approach to place the emphasis on expected results rather than modifying the existing systems used to manage the process. It will be automated by default, allowing manual rescheduling only as an exception. It will provide to the PSC the flexibility required to respond to changes in the legislative, technological, or service environment, or to be applied to the scheduling of other tests. It will integrate accessibility practices to make the system usable by all in both French and English.

To deliver this new vision of assessment scheduling, the PSC will be assessing various technologies and solutions to deliver an options analysis and recommendation on the best way to proceed. As such, it is looking at platforms that can host such solutions, and at integration service providers to create and

launch solutions using these platforms. Integration with other PSC solutions offering adjacent services will be required. The PSC will be the sole point of contact with its clients in the CFPS. The Vendor will invoice the PSC for its services, and the PSC will recover the costs from its clients.

Following the award of a contract, in the initial planning, development and pilot stages, the Vendor will work with the PSC to integrate and align business processes according to the draft SOW. The Vendor will help the PSC launch a Minimal Viable Product with a restricted scope, and then work with the PSC to implement a roadmap of enhancements and any required adjustments arising from lessons learned before the PSC makes the service more widely available to its clients.

The PSC expects to take over the support of the assessment solution after launch to ensure its, maintenance, and future development. As such, vendors will be expected to work with PSC employees during the development and launch phase of the solution to ensure complete knowledge transfer, and do so according to the requirements and service standards described in the draft SOW.

2.3 <u>Objective of this Request for information (RFI):</u>

2.3.1 Provide industry with a preliminary set of high-level specifications, deliverables, schedule, and project scope;

2.3.2 Determine the ability of Vendors who provide assessment scheduling solution development and integration services to deliver the required services, and gauge their interest in doing so; and

2.3.3 Solicit input on the requirements and the preliminary criteria against which the proposals will be evaluated.

2.4 <u>IP Ownership</u>

All Intellectual Property Rights in the Foreground Information belong to Canada as soon as they come into existence. The Contractor has no right in or to any such Intellectual Property Rights in the Foreground Information, except any right that may be granted in writing by Canada.

3. **Instructions to Respondents**
The following subsections provide specific instructions for respondents.

3.1 <u>Treatment of Responses</u>

> 3.1.1 **Use of Responses**: Responses will not be formally evaluated. However, the responses received may be used by the PSC to develop or modify procurement strategies and/or draft SOW requirements. The PSC will review all responses received by the RFI closing date. The PSC may, in its discretion, review responses received after the RFI closing date;

> 3.1.2 **Review Team**: A review team composed of representatives from the PSC will review the responses. The PSC reserves the right to hire any independent consultant or use any government resources that it considers necessary to review any response. Not all members of the review team will necessarily review all responses;

> 3.1.3 **Confidentiality**: Respondents should mark any portions of their response that they consider proprietary or confidential. The PSC and its consultants will treat those portions of the responses as confidential to the extent permitted by the Access to Information Act;

> 3.1.4 **Post-Submission Review Meetings**: The PSC may request individual Post-Submission Review Meetings with respondents to provide clarity on information provided. If required, these will be held at the most appropriate location, to be determined later. The intent of these meetings will be to provide an opportunity for a discussion with respondents. Although respondents may request a meeting, and their request will be considered, the PSC will determine whether it requires additional information from any given respondent and will schedule meetings accordingly. All such requests, by respondents, should be forwarded to the Contracting Authority.

3.2 <u>Response Format</u>

Section 5. contains specific questions that are consecutively numbered. Respondents are asked to submit responses indexed by the specific RFI question number. Respondents are asked to repeat the question prior to their response for reviewer convenience. Respondents are requested to submit one soft copy of their response to the Contract Specialist (Carol.Hambleton@cfp-psc.gc.ca) by e-mail.

> 3.3.1 **Cover Page**: Respondents are requested to indicate the title of the response, the solicitation number, the volume number and the full legal name of the respondent, the name and address of the respondent, the name, address and telephone number of the respondent's contact.

3.3 <u>Numbering System</u>

Each question has its own unique number. It is prefixed with "Q" followed by a sequence number (e.g., Q1). Respondents are requested to prepare their response using a numbering system corresponding to the one in this RFI. All references to descriptive material, technical manuals, and any brochures included as part of the response, should be referenced accordingly.

3.4 Enquiries

Because this is not a bid solicitation, the PSC will not necessarily respond to all enquiries in writing or by circulating answers to all potential suppliers. However, respondents with questions regarding this RFI may direct their enquiries to the Contract Specialist identified herein.

3.5 Submission of Responses

Respondents should send responses electronically via e-mail to the Contract Specialist's address identified herein by the date specified on the front page of the RFI.

All requested information is to be provided to the Contracting Specialist on or before the closing date of the RFI.

3.6 Contracting Specialist

Contract Specialist email address: Carol.Hambleton@cfp-psc.gc.ca

4. **Draft Statement of Work**

4.1 Scope

4.1.1 To effectively schedule its SLE oral assessments to its clients (Canadian Federal Organisations), the PSC requires a 3rd-party vendor to help deliver an automated assessment scheduling system (including applicant self-scheduling);

4.1.2 The Vendor must demonstrate how their solution integrates seamlessly into PSC business processes and IT systems; and

4.1.3 The Vendor must provide this solution according to the requirements described in Section *3.5 Preliminary Requirements for Full Implementation of the Assessment Scheduling Solution*. These requirements include but are not limited to:

a. applicant self-scheduling;

b. integration with the PSC's technological architecture;

c. adherence to compliance requirements such as bilingualism, accessibility, IT Security and Information Management;

d. reporting on assessment scheduling; and

e. progressive development of a Minimal Viable Product (MVP) into a Minimal Acceptable Product (MAP) prior to the PSC handover.

The Task Summaries and Requirements provided in sections 3.4 to 3.7 below are provided only to clarify the general scope of work required and are not intended as comprehensive descriptions of tasks or deliverables.

4.2 <u>Background</u>

<u>Public Service Commission (PSC</u>)

The PSC's mission is to promote and safeguard a non-partisan, merit-based and representative public service that serves all Canadians. The Canadian Federal Public Service comprises over 250,000 employees, and receives over 400,000 applications yearly for externally advertised job processes from across Canada and abroad. In 2015-2016, more than 45,000 successful applicants joined the public service.

<u>Personnel Psychology Centre (PPC)</u>

With over 50 years of experience, the Personnel Psychology Centre (PPC) of the PSC is known internationally for the quality of its assessment products. The PPC's professionally developed assessment tools support the PSC's core mandate to ensure that appointments to the Canadian Federal Public Service are based on merit, representativeness, fairness and transparency. Over 200,000 PPC standardized assessments are administered yearly.

The PPC also helps hiring managers implement cost-effective human resource management solutions and supports various departments and agencies through its services and leadership in the areas of second language testing, competency-based assessment, leadership assessment, occupational, ability and aptitude testing, and internet-based testing in supervised and unsupervised settings.

Leadership assessment and related assessment products such as competency-based in-baskets and assessment centres represent a cornerstone of PPC's service offering. These products and services are offered for most levels of management and are often complemented with other key services such as counselling and coaching for executives and for employees aspiring to leadership positions.

<u>Modernization and Innovation</u>

The PSC develops innovative assessment tools and strategies for the Canadian Federal Public Service. In past years, this included a transition from paper-based testing to online testing, and the introduction of unsupervised internet testing. Automating assessment scheduling is a logical extension of these existing products and services that will improve the experience of assessors, administrators and job applicants alike. The PSC invests in such e-testing platforms for its own assessment tools, and also makes their e-testing platforms and services available to other government organizations for the purpose of hosting their professionally developed selection tests.

4.3 <u>Objective</u>

To implement a new system for assessment scheduling at the PSC that provides scheduling automation capabilities, integration of related systems, the opportunity for applicants to self-schedule and, if necessary, provide test accommodations without using a separate system.

4.3.1 Expected outcomes:

a. Reduce time and cost to schedule assessments: PSC administrators save time and resources that would have been devoted to manual scheduling and rescheduling;

b. Increased reliability and responsiveness of the scheduling system for all PSC administrators and assessors;

c. Integration of separate systems (such as the scheduling system, portal for departmental assessment request, system to provide accommodations, cost-recovery system interoperability) to provide a flexible and unified platform for assessment scheduling; and

d. Ability to extend assessment to other PSC assessments that require scheduling.

4.3.2 The benefits realized by the project will be:

a. **Test Takers** (Canadian public in Canada and overseas, Public Service employees, Persons with Priority Entitlements, Persons with Disabilities) will be able to schedule their SLE oral assessment directly, without being imposed a potentially unsuitable time. They will also benefit from the faster turnaround time to schedule their assessment;

b. **PSC Clients (Other Government Departments - OGDs)** – will take less time to work with candidates to schedule SLE oral assessments. Hiring managers and Human Resources (HR) Advisors will benefit from a reduced turnaround time to get applicant results, reducing time to staff;

c. **PSC Administrative Personnel** will not spend as much time manually scheduling SLE oral assessments, and will be able to rely on a system with fewer performance issues creating delays and duplication of effort; and

d. **PSC program owners** will be able to have access to reporting capabilities that allow having access to up-to-date information on volumes and to perform analysis, monitor service standards and progress, and use the data to improve the program.

4.4 Task Summaries by Stages

4.4.1 *Stage 1 - Planning*

Purpose of this stage:

a. To develop a common project work plan for PSC and Vendor resources to meet the PSC's Assessment Scheduling Development and integration Requirements.

Deliverables:

a. Project workplan

4.4.2 *Stage 2 - Development*

Purpose of this stage:

To integrate the Vendor (including staff, IT systems, and procedures) into the PSC business process, by:

a. Obtaining equipment, network accounts and security clearance for vendor staff;
b. Completing the IT work necessary to develop and integrate the assessment scheduling system (see data transfer requirements in section 3.5); and
c. Performing functional unit-testing, performance testing, user experience and user acceptance testing of the IT build.

Deliverables:

a. Business processes and systems required to deliver the assessment scheduling service, as per specifications.

4.4.3 *Stage 3 – Minimal Viable Product (MVP) rollout*

Purpose of this stage:

a. Perform Assessment Scheduling in the context of a Minimal Viable Product geared for essential scheduling functionality for real assessment scheduling cases; and
b. Perform analysis of MVP usage and implement recommendations arising from lessons learned.

Deliverables:

a. MVP use report;
b. Revised processes (as required); and
c. System updates (as required).

4.4.4 *Stage 4 – Full Implementation to Minimal Acceptable Product (MAP)*

Purpose of this stage:

a. Deliver the Minimal Acceptable Product (MAP) to PSC clients according to a development roadmap and requirements specified in the draft SOW, and make refinements after MVP usage;
b. Progressively scale up availability of assessment scheduling self-serve, offering it widely to PSC clients;
c. Progressively integrate all aspects of assessment scheduling (including reporting capabilities, accommodations request process, results sharing and links to cost recovery systems) according to MAP roadmap; and
d. Monitor for new pain points resulting from increased volume and the refinement of processes.

Deliverables:

a. Ongoing feedback and reporting of operational problems or challenges and test incident reports as required.

4.5 Preliminary Tasks and Requirements by Functional Specialty
These requirements are not exhaustive or final and are not meant to represent the exact specifications of the solution.

4.5.1 **Estimated Volume**

a. The volume of SLE Oral assessments is relatively high: In 2022-23, the PSC received 44,000 requests and administered 34,000 assessments (more than 150 assessments per business day), with more expected as the accumulated backlog of assessments that accumulated during the pandemic and the exemptions provided by the PSC will expire and be processed; and

b. The system is expected to serve up to sixty assessors, fifteen administrators and ten supervisors.

4.5.2 **Description of the Assessment Scheduling solution**
The following requirements are a top-level extract of business requirements developed within the PSC:

a. **Epic 1: Process Assessment Scheduling Request**
   i. Create/modify assessment scheduling request;
   ii. Submit/validate evidence supporting the need for the assessment;
   iii. Submit/validate candidate's prior second-language assessment results;

   iv. Request assessment accommodations;
   v. Manage account & account permissions;
   vi. Delegate access to another HR resource within the organisation;
   vii. Close/cancel assessment scheduling request; and
   viii. Search & filter assessment scheduling requests

b. <u>Epic 2: Schedule Assessment</u>

All Assessment Scheduling requirements must happen in real time, with no scheduling conflicts or double booking caused by system limitations.

   i. Specify date range;
   ii. View scheduling availability of the assessors;
   iii. Schedule/reschedule assessment;
   iv. Approve rescheduling request;
   v. Assign to a different assessor;
   vi. View schedule details;
   vii. Cancel appointment;
   viii. Receive scheduling request;
   ix. View/select available time slots; and
   x. Communicate with client/candidate.

c. <u>Epic 3: Administer Assessment</u>
   i. Retrieve assessment details;
   ii. Enter assessment results; and
   iii. Submit show/no-show information.

d. <u>Epic 4: Manage Results & Forms</u>
   i. Receive results notifications;
   ii. Release assessment results; and
   iii. Release feedback form.

e. <u>Epic 5: Produce & Extract Reports</u>
   i. Basic operational reports: Number of assessment scheduling appointments according to various criteria such as department, dates, assessment language; information about the candidates; data on rescheduled assessments; data on no-shows to assessments; and
   ii. More complex reports to meet managerial requirements in matters of process optimization, resource utilization, peak periods, time to complete assessments.

f. <u>Epic 6: Integration & Oversight</u>

Users are not required to manually reproduce data from one system to another.

    i. Notable elements of data integration requirements include financial cost-recovery information, accommodations information, candidate personal data and test results;

    ii. Timing and date selection in the calendar system must be in real time: if a date/time is chosen by a user that date/time is then reserved and cannot be selected/used by any other users;

    iii. Content of automated messages sent by the system must be modifiable by superusers and/or assessment admins; and

    iv. System must take into consideration and perform flawlessly across multiple time zones.

4.5.3 Description of a roadmap from Minimum Viable Product (MVP) to Minimum Acceptable Product (MAP).

These elements of a development roadmap are provided as preliminary ideas and will be refined with the vendor during development (not all iterations are part of the MAP and must be completed before the handover of the system from the vendor to the PSC):

a. While the MVP only needs to allow PSC administrators to make use of the automated scheduling capability, later development of the platform should expand this capability, first to departmental HR advisors, then to candidates in selected departments, then to all candidates;

b. While the MVP only needs to include basic reports, successive releases should provide additional, more fine-grained reporting capabilities;

c. While the MVP only needs to administer the Second-Language Evaluation (SLE) oral assessment, later iterations of the scheduling solution should be able to administer other tests conducted by the PSC for other departments; and

d. While the MVP only needs to be accessible to all users, later iterations of the solution should integrate the accommodation management capabilities of the Duty to Accommodate (DtA) system.

4.5.4 Reporting

a. The solution must be able to provide reporting on its data and activity, forboth business analysis and technical performance oversight. Whether this reporting takes places within the solution itself or through another solution through well-defined APIs and/or Data Dictionaries can be

specified in the system architecture. Data need to be accessible via export mechanisms.

4.5.5 Service Standard

a. Vendor must commit to delivering an assessment scheduling capacity in English and in French, with acceptable latency and synchronization delays with the assessor's personal calendars.

4.5.6 Accessibility

a. The assessment scheduling solution must be accessible to those using adaptive technologies, and follow relevant standards and best practices (e.g., for screen-reading technology). Consult the Government of Canada's Standard on Web accessibility for details: https://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pol/doc-eng.aspx?id=23601.

b. The assessment scheduling solution should perform well for most browsers and system configurations, including common accessibility settings. To remain accessible to those outside urban centres and densely populated areas with good connectivity services, the solution should not require high-speed internet.

4.5.7 Information Management

The solution must compliant with the following requirements of the ISO-16175-1:2020 standard:

a. Permit users to discover, access, create, capture, collaborate and share information and data, as set out in R1.1.1, R1.1.2, R1.1.3 and R1.1.4 of ISO-16175-1:2020;

b. Have the capacity to manage the retention and disposition of information and data in a procedural and auditable way, as set out in R2.1.1, R2.1.2, R2.1.3, R2.1.4, R2.1.5, R2.1.6 and R2.1.7 of ISO-16175-1:2020;

c. Support the use of metadata as an active, dynamic and integral part of the recordkeeping process, as set out in R1.2.1, R1.2.2, R1.2.3, R1.2.4, R1.3.1, and R1.3.2 of ISO-16175-1:2020;

d. Support the use of enterprise information and data taxonomies and classification structures to manage, store, search and retrieve information and data, as set out in R3.2.4 of ISO-16175-1:2020;

e. Support interoperability, as set out in R4.1.1, R4.1.2 and R4.1.3 of ISO-16175-1:2020;

f. Have the capacity for bulk import and export using open formats, as set out in R2.2.1, R2.2.2, R2.2.3, R2.2.4, and R2.2.5 of ISO-16175-1:2020;

g. Facilitate the secure management of information and data; and consideration of privacy and security categorization, as set out in R3.1.1, R3.1.2, R3.1.3, R3.1.4, R4.2.1, R4.2.2, R4.2.3 of ISO-16175-1:2020.

4.5.8 Technological Architecture

The PSC is open to considering a variety of technological platforms for its assessment scheduling solution, but is currently following these technological standards:

a. It develops its applications in Java, Python or PowerApps, using MS-SQL databases;
b. It supports a variety of hosting environments (HP-UX, Windows Server, RedHat, Azure).
c. Any new technological standard must be acceptable to a review within the PSC and align with GC IT Standards such as https://www.canada.ca/en/government/system/digital-government/government-canada-digital-standards.html;
d. Any cloud hosting platform proposed as part of the solution must be selected from the list of Cloud Service Providers (CSP) pre-approved by SSC at https://gc-cloud-services.canada.ca/s/gc-cloud-fa

4.6 Privacy & Security Requirements

Privacy and Security requirements that could be part of a potential RFP are, without being limited to, the following:

4.6.1 A valid Designated Organization Screening (DOS) with approved Document Safeguarding at the level of **PROTECTED B** is required, as issued by the Canadian Industrial Security Directorate (CISD), Public Works and Government Services Canada (PWGSC);

4.6.2 The Contractor/Offeror personnel requiring access to PROTECTED information, assets or work site(s) must EACH hold a valid **RELIABILITY STATUS**, granted or approved by the Canadian Industrial Security Directorate (CISD), Public Works and Government Services Canada (PWGSC);

4.6.3 The Contractor MUST NOT utilize its Information Technology systems to electronically process, produce or store PROTECTED information until the CISD/PWGSC has issued written approval. After approval has been granted or approved, these tasks may be performed up to the level of **PROTECTED B;**

4.6.4 Solution will be evaluated based on IT Security Risk Management from CSE https://www.cse-cst.gc.ca/en/node/265/html/22814 ;

4.6.5 Depending on the confidentiality, integrity and availability requirements, a set of security controls will be identified for the solution to support;

4.6.6 Subcontracts which contain security requirements are NOT to be awarded without the prior written permission of CISD/PWGSC;

4.6.7 The Contractor must obtain explicit, informed consent prior to initiating connection to the applicant's system; and

4.6.8 PROTECTED information, including PSC test data and applicant information, must be stored exclusively on Canadian servers.

4.7 Language Requirement

The solution must be available in English and French. Browser language detection can be used to detect language, but an explicit language toggle must be available in the URL, or through the interface for users to pick the official language of their choice.

5. **Evaluation Criteria**

Evaluation criteria of a potential system in a later RFP could include, but not be limited to, the following:

5.1.1 Capacity to provide appointment scheduling capabilities in English and French, in a wide range of testing times in time zones across Canada (and abroad in some cases) and in real time without significant delays;

5.1.2 Demonstrated capacity to administer automated scheduling in French and in English, in Canada;

5.1.3 Capacity to deliver a scheduling solution that meets PSC requirements;

5.1.4 Demonstrated ability to operate in a government selection context, including government IT systems (including reference check);

5.1.5 Preference for Vendors with nationally or internationally recognized security accreditations;

5.1.6 Preference for Vendors whose systems meet internationally recognized standards for accessibility, including the Government of Canada's standard; and

5.1.7 Ability to deliver scheduling features over and above what would be minimally required to satisfy the requirements specified in the draft SOW.

6. **Questions for Vendors**

When asked to describe, please limit answers to specific questions to a maximum of ten pages per question.

6.1 Feedback

Q1. Do any of the requirements listed in section *3.5 - Preliminary Requirements for Full Implementation of Assessment Scheduling Solution* need clarification to be fully understood?

Q2. Do any aspects of the requirements listed in section 3.5 limit your ability to or interest in submitting a response to a potential Request for Proposal? If so, why? And what changes would you propose to make it more achievable or appealing?

Q3. Are there any technical requirements or limitations of your proposed solution that PSC should be aware of when considering possible conflicts and compatibility with our systems?

Q4. Do you have feedback/questions regarding section *4. Evaluation Criteria*?

6.2 Your Services and Solution

Q5. What solution do you propose to meet the PSC's requirements for assessment scheduling?

Q6. Please describe the scale of your solution in general terms. How long have you been delivering scheduling solutions? What kind of capacity do you have to sustain concurrent scheduling? For example, how many do you administer per day, week or month?

Q7. Do you have experience working in high-stakes employment scheduling? With large private sector companies? With government organizations? Please describe.

Q8. How would you describe your capacity to deliver a scheduling solution in French and English?

Q9. Do you have a demonstrated capacity to deliver scheduling solutions to clients with specific accessibility requirements? What sort of options do you currently offer? Please describe.

Q10. What server hosting capability do you propose, including servers for storing information related to the scheduling details and the candidate's personal information?

Q11. How quickly are you currently able to offer self-scheduling for a new type of appointment for your existing clients? Is this process done automatically via IT systems, or is it manual? Can you confirm you have the capacity to schedule appointments automatically (via an IT system) or do you currently do that manually?

Q12. How do you currently allow clients to monitor the progress of their scheduling? Please describe.

Q13. Please describe your solution's process for managing and automating new scheduling requests. How much notice do you require to schedule an appointment for a client (on demand? 48 hours ahead of time?) How much notice would you require for an order of 100 tests to be self-scheduled?

Q14. What additional scheduling-related solution services do you offer that can or should be included in our requirements given our stated objective and context (assessments for high-stakes employment selection)? Possible value added: improved applicant and client experience, API-based interoperability, ease to adapt system to other types of appointments.

Q15. In your experience, how long does it take to integrate your solution within a client's infrastructure and business process? What are common challenges and ways of mitigating the risk of problems, delay. Do any of the requirements described in this document complicate matters?

6.3 Pricing
Q16. What pricing models do you typically use for similar requirements (e.g., Start-up cost + ongoing cost until Minimal Acceptable product delivery)?