

CHFA 296 Request for Proposals (“RFP”) for Website Design & Development Services as of August 28, 2026:

Question: The document lists "robust enterprise search functionality" - can you provide examples of capabilities you are looking for?

Answer: CHFA expects the proposed website to provide advanced search capabilities, including full-text search across published website content and documents. Proposers should describe the search capabilities available within their proposed solution, including supported filtering and search refinement options, document-content indexing, handling of archived content, and other relevant search features. Proposers should also identify any additional search functionality, such as synonym management, promoted results, spelling correction, search analytics, or similar capabilities, that are available as part of the proposed solution.

Question: Could you please confirm whether proposers are required to maintain and provide evidence of the full insurance limits at the time of proposal submission, or whether the selected vendor may increase coverage to the required limits upon award and prior to contract execution and commencement of services?

Answer: Evidence of insurance is not required for proposal submission.

Question: Are firms organized outside the United States eligible to submit if they commit to registering to do business in Connecticut before contract execution?

Answer: Feel free to provide a proposal. Selected firm(s) will be required to register with the State of Connecticut to do business in Connecticut.

Question: Is there a target contract award date, project commencement date, and target production launch date? Is there a target budget range that proposers should use when sizing the implementation and support options?

Answer: In accordance with paragraph 6 in the RFP, CHFA is hopeful that the selected firm will design, develop, and implement the website on or before April 26, 2027.

Question: The RFP asks firms that are not currently registered in Connecticut to indicate whether they will register if awarded. Please confirm that registration is not required at proposal submission.

Answer: Firms do not need to be registered with the Connecticut Secretary of State prior to submission.

Question: Approximately how many administrators, content authors, editors, reviewers, and approvers are expected to use the new CMS? Please describe the required roles, permissions, approval levels, and publishing workflows.

Answer: At this time, CHFA is unable to provide the requested information. Please refer to the RFP document for the information currently available to assist in the preparation of your proposal.

Question: Should the proposed platform support future microsites, campaign sites, program-specific sites, authenticated experiences, or additional CHFA-managed digital properties within the same CMS environment?

Answer: At this time, CHFA is unable to provide the requested information. Please refer to the RFP document for the information currently available to assist in the preparation of your proposal.

Question: Please provide the approximate number of web pages, news articles, events, documents, images, videos, forms, and other content records currently maintained on the website and anticipated for migration.

Answer: The sitemap contains approximately 360 unique URLs, including approximately 170 blog/article records. A preliminary crawl identified approximately 2,000 documents, 500 images, and 235 YouTube embeds. Form, event, and redirect counts have not been fully validated. Actual migration quantities will be determined through the content audit.

Question: Does CHFA expect all existing content to be migrated, or will CHFA identify content that should be retired, consolidated, archived, or rewritten? Please clarify the respective responsibilities of CHFA and the selected firm for content review, rewriting, approval, entry, formatting, and migration.

Answer: CHFA will work collaboratively with and assist the selected firm(s) in the conversion and remediation of legacy PDFs and other documents to accessible formats. Proposers should describe their approach, capabilities, and any tools or services available to support document accessibility remediation as part of the content migration process. Any assumptions regarding CHFA and firm(s) responsibilities should be clearly identified in the proposal.

Question: Is the selected firm expected to remediate all existing PDFs, Microsoft Office documents, forms, reports, presentations, and archived materials for accessibility, or only those assets selected for migration and publication on the new website?

Answer: CHFA does not anticipate that the selected firm will remediate all existing historical documents and materials. As part of the content inventory and migration process, CHFA will work with the selected firm(s) to identify and archive outdated, obsolete, and duplicate content. Only current and relevant assets selected for migration and publication on the new website will be expected to undergo accessibility review and, where necessary, remediation.

Question: Is the selected firm responsible for providing captions, transcripts, audio descriptions, or other accessibility remediation for existing video and audio content? If so, please provide the approximate number and total duration of multimedia assets in scope.

Answer: No.

Question: Please identify the existing production systems, databases, third-party platforms, and online applications that CHFA currently anticipates integrating with the new website. The RFP refers generally to existing production systems and other services but does not identify them.

Answer: Beyond the integration with CHFA's Single Family Loan Origination System (SF-LOS), CHFA does not currently have other direct application or system integrations with the public website. Other applications, services, forms, tools, or external resources referenced or accessed through the website are generally provided through direct links to external systems or iframe-embedded content.

Proposers should account for the continued ability to support appropriate external links and embedded content within the proposed website. As part of discovery and implementation, CHFA will work with the selected firm(s) to identify and validate the existing links, embeds, and related functionality that should be retained, replaced, or otherwise addressed in the new website.

Question: For each anticipated integration, please clarify whether the new website must display data, submit data, synchronize records, initiate workflows, authenticate users, embed an external application, or provide only a link to the applicable system.

Answer: The current website utilizes an API integration with CHFA's Loan Origination System (LOS) to retrieve and display mortgage interest rates in real time.

Other website data integrations, including participating-lender information, lender production reports, loan status lookup, and similar data-driven content, are currently supported through periodic flat-file data extracts generated from CHFA systems and securely transferred to the website hosting environment via SFTP for processing and display.

Proposers should account for these existing integration requirements in their proposed solution and describe the recommended approach for supporting them, including whether the existing API and SFTP-based methods could be rebuilt or whether alternative integration methods are recommended. Additional technical details and available interface documentation will be provided to the selected firm(s) as appropriate during discovery and implementation.

Question: Please provide an inventory of the forms and online applications that must be migrated, rebuilt, or integrated. For each, please indicate whether it includes workflow routing, document uploads, electronic signatures, approvals, payments, status tracking, or integration with another system.

Answer: Beyond the integration with CHFA's Single Family Loan Origination System (SF-LOS), CHFA does not currently have other direct application or system integrations with the public website. Other applications, services, forms, tools, or external resources referenced or accessed through the website are generally provided through direct links to external systems or iframe-embedded content.

Question: Please clarify the functionality CHFA expects from "robust enterprise search," including the content sources to be indexed, anticipated index volume, required filters and facets, document-content indexing, synonym management, promoted results, spelling correction, archived-content handling, and search analytics.

Answer: CHFA expects the proposed website to provide advanced search capabilities, including full-text search across published website content and documents. Proposers should describe the search capabilities available within their proposed solution, including supported filtering and search refinement options, document-content indexing, handling of archived content, and other relevant search features. Proposers should also identify any additional search functionality, such as synonym management, promoted results, spelling correction, search analytics, or similar capabilities, that are available as part of the proposed solution.

Question: Which languages, if any, must be supported at launch? Does CHFA anticipate human translation, automated machine translation, or a hybrid approach, and which party will be responsible for translating, reviewing, approving, and maintaining translated content?

Answer: English will be the primary language. CHFA may designate selected pages for English and Spanish publication. CHFA expects to obtain and approve human translations through its language-services vendor. The website firm will implement the architecture, templates, navigation, and workflows needed to support translated content.

Question: What budget or funding range has CHFA established for discovery, design, development, content migration, integrations, implementation, and launch? What is the expected annual budget range for hosting, licensing, maintenance, security monitoring, and support?

Answer: CHFA does not have a specific budget for this project.

Question: Please provide the scoring weights or relative importance assigned to each evaluation criterion, including experience, approach, cost, personnel, functionality, timeline, support, data conversion, and turnkey operation

Answer: CHFA does not have a weighted evaluation tool to share at this time.

Question: Does CHFA anticipate awarding the entire scope to one prime contractor, or dividing the work among multiple firms? If multiple awards are contemplated, how may the scope be divided?

Answer: Awarded contract(s) will be determined following review of all proposals.

Question: Are there fixed statutory, program, funding, or public communications deadlines the selected firm must meet?

Answer: No.

Question: Will Connecticut presence, state registration, Connecticut workforce, employee composition, or Connecticut civic participation receive scored evaluation credit? If so, under which criteria and at what weight?

Answer: These factors can be considered when making a decision.

Question: Approximately how many firms does CHFA expect to invite for interviews or demonstrations, and what will those sessions require?

Answer: At this point in the process, CHFA does not have enough information to answer this question.

Question: Approximately how many CHFA stakeholders and departments will participate in discovery, design reviews, content review, and approvals? What level of availability should proposers assume?

Answer: At this point in the process, this has not been determined.

Question: Does CHFA have existing user personas, audience research, usability findings, or customer feedback that can be shared?

Answer: CHFA does not share this type of information.

Question: For each primary audience (homebuyers, homeowners, renters, lenders, real estate professionals, housing counselors, developers, property managers, investors), what are the top three to five tasks users perform today?

Answer: At this time, CHFA is unable to provide the requested information. Please refer to the RFP document for the information currently available to assist in the preparation of your proposal.

Question: Which tasks do users currently struggle to complete or abandon, and what specifically is underperforming about the current site's design and user experience?

Answer: CHFA's website was developed many years ago and it is ready for an upgrade.

Question: Does CHFA expect research with external audiences, or will discovery be limited to internal stakeholder interviews? If external research is expected, will CHFA recruit participants and provide access to end users, or should the vendor recruit? Are customer lists or partner organizations available for recruitment?

Answer: Discovery will be limited to internal stakeholders.

Question: Are participant incentives expected, and should those costs be included in the proposal?

Answer: CHFA does not allow participant incentives.

Question: What key performance indicators (KPIs) will CHFA use to measure project success after launch?

Answer: At this point in the process, this has not been determined.

Question: Can CHFA provide an estimated inventory of the current site, including total pages, PDFs and documents, forms, videos and media assets, images, news and event records, and redirects?

Answer: CHFA is not providing a definitive asset count for migration at this time. The current website contains a significant amount of historical, outdated, duplicate, inactive, and unreferenced content and assets that are not anticipated to be migrated to the new website. Accordingly, current site-level counts would not necessarily represent the scope of content to be migrated.

As part of the discovery and content inventory process, CHFA will work with the selected firm(s) to review the existing website and identify the pages, documents, forms, videos, images, news and event content, redirects, and other assets that are current and relevant for migration. Content determined to be outdated or unnecessary will be excluded from migration and, where appropriate, archived by CHFA.

Question: Does an existing content inventory, sitemap export, crawl data, or CMS page listing exist that can seed the required inventory and audit, and what level of CHFA staff participation should firms assume?

Answer: CHFA will provide staff participation, subject-matter expertise, and final content decisions. The selected firm will conduct the crawl, structure the inventory, make recommendations, and support implementation.

Question: To what extent should firms anticipate restructuring and consolidating existing content versus migrating it substantially as-is into the new information architecture? Does CHFA have a target or acceptable range for page/content reduction?

Answer: CHFA anticipates meaningful restructuring and consolidation rather than an as-is migration. No required page-reduction target has been established. Recommendations should be based on user research, analytics, content quality, accessibility, and the proposed information architecture.

Question: Since CHFA anticipates providing most website content, should proposals include an optional price for content rewriting and plain-language optimization? If so, approximately how many pages should firms assume for pricing?

Answer: Firms should provide optional hourly or unit pricing for substantive copywriting, rewriting, and plain-language optimization. CHFA has not established a page quantity for this optional service. CHFA will provide and approve most substantive content.

Question: How many content owners, editors, reviewers, approvers, and administrators will be involved across departments, and what roles, publishing workflows, and governance model are required?

Answer: At this time, CHFA is unable to provide the requested information. Please refer to the RFP document for the information currently available to assist in the preparation of your proposal.

Question: Approximately how many existing PDFs and legacy documents must be migrated, and does CHFA expect the vendor to remediate them for accessibility or only migrate documents CHFA has already remediated?

Answer: CHFA does not anticipate that the selected firm(s) will remediate all existing historical documents and materials. As part of the content inventory and migration process, CHFA will work with the selected firm(s) to identify and archive outdated, obsolete, and duplicate content. Only current and relevant assets selected for migration and publication on the new website will be expected to undergo accessibility review and, where necessary, remediation.

Question: Does CHFA have an existing brand standards guide governing logo usage, color, typography, and other visual elements?

Answer: Yes, and CHFA will share the brand standards and guide with the selected firm(s).

Question: Should firms assume the branding assets and photography provided by CHFA are launch-ready, or should the scope include evaluating and recommending additional or updated assets?

Answer: CHFA will provide current brand assets and available photography. The firm should evaluate their suitability and may recommend additional photography, illustration, iconography, or licensed imagery. Any anticipated costs for new visual assets should be separately identified.

Question: Approximately how many distinct page templates or page types are currently in use on the CHFA website? Does CHFA anticipate consolidating or reducing that number as part of the redesign?

Answer: The existing template structure is not prescriptive. CHFA expects the selected firm to recommend a consolidated, flexible, component-based design system and an appropriate set of templates during discovery.

Question: Approximately how many staff will require CMS training, in what roles, and what delivery format does CHFA prefer (in person, live virtual, self-paced)? What documentation is expected?

Answer: At this time, CHFA is unable to provide the requested information. Please refer to the RFP document for the information currently available to assist in the preparation of your proposal.

Question: What is the current site search solution and how does it fall short? Should PDFs and other documents be indexed, and should search support faceted filtering by audience, program, document type, and date?

Answer: CHFA expects the proposed website to provide advanced search capabilities, including full-text search across published website content and documents. Proposers should describe the search capabilities available within their proposed solution, including supported filtering and search refinement options, document-content indexing, handling of archived content, and other relevant search features. Proposers should also identify any additional search functionality, such as synonym management, promoted results, spelling correction, search analytics, or similar capabilities, that are available as part of the proposed solution.

Question: Can CHFA provide analytics data covering most visited pages, top user journeys, mobile versus desktop traffic, internal search usage, document downloads, peak traffic, and seasonal patterns?

Answer: At this time, CHFA is unable to provide the requested information. Please refer to the RFP document for the information currently available to assist in the preparation of your proposal.

Question: For a U.S. LLC with no employees, what documentation would satisfy the Workers' Compensation requirement?

Answer: If selected, sole proprietor firm(s) will be required to provide proof of Worker's Compensation.

Question: Is there a preference for local vendors?

Answer: Connecticut presence is not one of the evaluation criteria.

Question: Will work be onsite or remote?

Answer: Remote work will be considered.

Question: We kindly request a 1-2 week extension of the proposal submission deadline to ensure a thorough and high-quality response.

Answer: There is an extension from the original posted due date.

Question: Are there existing departmental or multi-stage approval workflows that should be reflected in the proposed CMS solution?

Answer: No.

Question: Other than the one-page limitation specified for the Key Strengths and Qualifications response, are there any preferred overall page limits, formatting requirements, or proposal organization conventions that respondents should follow?

Answer: There are no other requirements in the manner with which proposals are submitted.

Question: Please identify the existing production systems, online form/application platforms, calculators, authentication services, and third-party applications expected to integrate with the new website, including available APIs, data-flow requirements, and any environments or technical documentation available to the selected firm.

Answer: The current website utilizes an API integration with CHFA's Loan Origination System (LOS) to retrieve and display mortgage interest rates in real time.

Other website data integrations, including participating-lender information, lender production reports, loan status lookup, and similar data-driven content, are currently supported through periodic flat-file data extracts generated from CHFA systems and securely transferred to the website hosting environment via SFTP for processing and display.

Proposers should account for these existing integration requirements in their proposed solution and describe the recommended approach for supporting them, including whether the existing API and SFTP-based methods would be retained or whether alternative integration methods are recommended. Additional technical details and available interface documentation will be provided to the selected firm(s) as appropriate during discovery and implementation.

Question: What initial contract term and renewal structure does CHFA anticipate, and will CHFA consider a pricing model that waives most implementation fees in exchange for a fixed multi-year annual SaaS, hosting, maintenance, and support subscription?

Answer: CHFA has not established a fixed contract term at this time. Proposers should provide available pricing and contract options for hosting, warranty, maintenance, and support, including annual and multi-year terms. Proposers should also describe available renewal and extension options, including any associated pricing structures, terms, or conditions.

Question: Does CHFA have existing interactive tools (mortgage calculator, affordability calculator, rent-vs-own calculator) that can be reused/re-skinned, or must these be built new?

Answer: CHFA owns and maintains its existing calculator tools. The selected firm will assess whether they should be reused, re-skinned, integrated, remediated, or rebuilt. Respondents should describe their approach and identify assumptions regarding redevelopment.

Question: Beyond the mortgage/affordability calculators, are there other complex interactive tools, forms, or dashboards on the current site that will require special accessibility remediation attention?

Answer: Yes. The site includes compliance, property, document, income-limit, rent-limit, and loan-status lookups, as well as embedded dashboards, maps, forms, and data visualizations. The selected firm will assess these tools during discovery and recommend appropriate accessibility remediation or integration approaches.

Question: Is there any preference given for in-person meetings or collaboration during this engagement?

Answer: CHFA anticipates using both virtual and in-person collaboration at its discretion.

Question: Section 6 requests recommendations for language translation. Does CHFA have target languages identified under its Language Access Plan, and is machine translation acceptable, or is human-translated content required?

English will be the primary language. CHFA may designate selected pages for English and Spanish publication. CHFA expects to obtain and approve human translations through its language-services vendor. The website firm will implement the architecture, templates, navigation, and workflows needed to support translated content.

Question: What websites, domains, subdomains, microsites, portals, or other digital properties are included in the scope? Is the scope limited to the unauthenticated pages?

Answer: Beyond the integration with CHFA's Single Family Loan Origination System (SF-LOS), CHFA does not currently have other direct application or system integrations with the public website. Other applications, services, forms, tools, or external resources referenced or accessed through the website are generally provided through direct links to external systems or iframe-embedded content.

Proposers should account for the continued ability to support appropriate external links and embedded content within the proposed website. As part of discovery and implementation, CHFA will work with the selected firm(s) to identify and validate the existing links, embeds, and related functionality that should be retained, replaced, or otherwise addressed in the new website.

Question: Does <https://www.chfa.org/sitemap.xml> accurately reflect the number of pages on the site? Are there any pages that exist on the live site but are deliberately excluded from the sitemap that we should account for in scoping?

Answer: CHFA is not aware of any live website pages that have been deliberately excluded from the current sitemap. Proposers may use the sitemap as a reference for estimating the current website scope; however, the sitemap should not be considered a definitive content inventory. The selected firm(s) will be expected to work with CHFA during discovery and content inventory to identify and validate the pages and content to be addressed as part of the website redesign and migration.

Question: In the Scope of Work section, under Discovery and Strategic Planning, it mentions having discovery sessions with stakeholders. Is there any way that we can speak with end users by survey means and/or user interviews?

Answer: Discovery sessions with stakeholders would only occur after firm(s) selection.

Question: Would it be possible to conduct user testing or tree testing for navigation modifications with end users?

Answer: No.

Question: Is there any existing research or marketing analysis available?

Answer: No.

Question: In addition to content strategy and migration are you seeking actual creation of new content and will need copywriting assistance?

CHFA expects to provide and approve most substantive content. The firm should provide content-strategy guidance, formatting, and implementation support. Optional pricing for copywriting, substantive rewriting, and plain-language optimization should be identified separately.

Question: Can CHFA provide access to the current calculator tools during discovery so we can assess integration versus rebuild?

Answer: CHFA owns and maintains its existing calculator tools. The selected firm will assess whether they should be reused, re-skinned, integrated, remediated, or rebuilt. Respondents should describe their approach and identify assumptions regarding redevelopment.

Question: CHFA will provide existing branding assets and photography, with the firm able to recommend additional imagery. Is there an existing photo library sufficient for a full site, or should proposals assume a meaningful gap that needs stock or original photography?

CHFA has an existing photography library and has access to stock photography via Adobe Stock but does not represent that it will satisfy every design need. The firm should evaluate available assets and recommend additions. Optional costs for stock photography, original photography, illustration, or other imagery should be separately identified.

Question: Can CHFA provide a full list of existing production systems and third-party platforms anticipated for integration?

Answer: At this time, CHFA is unable to provide the requested information. Please refer to the RFP document for the information currently available to assist in the preparation of your proposal.

Question: Is multi-language support (e.g., Spanish localization) required, and if so, should translation be manual or automated?

Answer: The website must be capable of supporting multilingual content. CHFA may designate selected pages for English and Spanish publication but does not anticipate full-site translation at launch. CHFA expects human translation and review through its language-services vendor.

Question: For proposal and pricing purposes, should vendors assume that all existing content will be migrated, or does CHFA anticipate reviewing, revising, consolidating, or removing outdated content as part of the project?

Answer: No. Proposers should not assume that all existing website content will be migrated to the new website. The current website contains outdated, inactive, duplicate, and other content that is no longer referenced or actively used. Such content is not anticipated to be migrated.

As part of the content inventory and migration process, CHFA will work with the selected firm(s) to review, identify, consolidate, and determine the content that remains current and relevant for migration and publication on the new website. Proposers should describe their approach and any assumptions used for estimating and pricing content inventory, assessment, cleanup, and migration activities.

Question: Are respondents expected to review and agree to CHFA's standard contract terms, or identify any requested exceptions, as part of the proposal submission? If so, can CHFA provide a copy of the applicable contract terms prior to the proposal deadline?

Answer: Respondents are not expected to review and agree to standard contract terms prior to submission.

Question: Should pricing include implementation, or recommendations only?

Answer: Pricing should include implementation costs.

Question: Will CHFA provide updated content, or should proposers assume support for rewriting, restructuring, and accessibility remediation of existing content?

Answer: No. Proposers should not assume that all existing website content will be migrated to the new website. The current website contains outdated, inactive, duplicate, and other content that is no longer referenced or actively used. Such content is not anticipated to be migrated.

As part of the content inventory and migration process, CHFA will work with the selected firm(s) to review, identify, consolidate, and determine the content that remains current and relevant for migration and publication on the new website. Proposers should describe their approach and any assumptions used for estimating and pricing content inventory, assessment, cleanup, and migration activities.

Question: Does CHFA anticipate ongoing staff onboarding sessions post-launch, or should training be limited to initial administrators and content editors?

Answer: The base scope should include initial role-based training and reusable materials sufficient for CHFA to onboard future users. Firms may separately propose optional refresher training, office hours, or ongoing onboarding support.

Question: Requested Information item 17 asks for a table of total employees with the number and percentage of minorities and women employed, and their titles. The RFP also states that responses are public records subject to disclosure under the Connecticut Freedom of Information Act, and that a response marked entirely confidential will not be accepted. For small firms, a table broken out by title would identify specific individuals and their self-reported demographic characteristics in a document that may be publicly disclosed. Does CHFA want that table included in the proposal itself, or would CHFA prefer it furnished separately on request?

Answer: All information provided to CHFA is subject to disclosure unless specifically exempt under Freedom of Information Act statutes.

Question: Will CHFA accept a combined technology professional liability and cyber policy that meets the professional and cyber limits listed in Exhibit C?

Answer: CHFA will consider alternate coverage as long as minimum requirements are met.

Question: Does CHFA anticipate finalist interviews or presentations?

Answer: It is anticipated that there will be finalists' interviews and/or presentations.

Question: Of the objectives outlined in the RFP, are there certain areas CHFA considers the highest priority for the new website, such as improving navigation and information discovery, modernizing the visual experience, improving accessibility, simplifying content management for staff, or enhancing functionality and integrations?

Answer: CHFA's highest priorities are improving navigation and information discovery, achieving accessibility compliance, modernizing the user experience, simplifying content management and governance, and reliably maintaining required forms, tools, data, and third-party integrations.

Question: Are there particular audiences or stakeholder groups that CHFA believes are currently underserved by the existing website or have the greatest difficulty finding the information and services they need?

Answer: At this time, CHFA is unable to provide the requested information. Please refer to the RFP document for the information currently available to assist in the preparation of your proposal.

Question: Does CHFA envision the project primarily as a modernization and restructuring of the existing website and functionality, or is CHFA open to a more substantial rethinking of the user experience, information architecture, and way users interact with CHFA's digital services?

Answer: CHFA has not designated one audience as most underserved.

Question: Are there any websites, whether public-sector or private-sector, that CHFA views as strong examples of the type of user experience, functionality, or visual direction it would like to achieve?

Answer: No.

Question: What CHFA governance structure will be used for the project? Who will serve as the day-to-day project owner, approximately how many stakeholders will participate in reviews, and who will have final approval authority for strategy, information architecture, design, functionality and launch?

Answer: At this time, CHFA is unable to provide the requested information. Please refer to the RFP document for the information currently available to assist in the preparation of your proposal.

Question: Does accessibility remediation apply to CHFA's entire existing document and multimedia archive, including PDFs, videos and captions, or only to content migrated or newly created as part of this project?

Answer: Remediation applies to content selected for migration and publication on the new website. CHFA does not expect remediation of the entire historical archive. Firms should separately price assessment and remediation of selected legacy documents and multimedia.

Question: Will affiliated companies, cloud providers, CMS/platform vendors or specialist accessibility/security firms be considered subcontractors requiring advance CHFA notification and approval?

Answer: CHFA does not have sufficient information to answer this question.

Question: Does CHFA prefer fixed-price implementation pricing, time-and-materials pricing or a hybrid structure? Should optional functionality, alternative platforms and other optional services be separately priced?

Answer: CHFA does not have a preference on pricing structure. Please provide fees for optional functionality, alternate platforms, and other optional services separately.

Question: Does CHFA prefer respondents to address the 26 Requested Information items in exact numerical order?

Answer: It's helpful in the evaluation process to answer the questions in the order they were asked but it is not a requirement.

Question: May a prime bidder include relevant experience and references from an affiliated entity when personnel from that entity will be assigned to the CHFA engagement?

Answer: Please include any experience and references you feel are appropriate.

Question: What are the primary key performance indicators CHFA wants to achieve within the first-year post-launch?

Answer: Anticipated KPIs include task completion, findability, search success, accessibility conformance, mobile usability, performance, completion of priority forms and tools, reduction in broken or outdated content, stakeholder satisfaction, and staff efficiency. Baselines and targets will be established during discovery.

Question: For the September 8 electronic submission, does CHFA prefer the technical response, cost proposal, cover letter, and completed exhibits as one combined PDF, or as separate files in a single email (not to exceed 25 MB)? Are executed signatures on Exhibit A and OPM Form 1 accepted electronically, or does CHFA require wet signatures?

Answer: CHFA prefers one PDF document if it does not exceed 25 MB. Forms can be electronically submitted as long as they notarized.

Question: The RFP reserves the right to request oral presentations. If CHFA exercises that option, will they be in person in Rocky Hill, CT, or virtual, and approximately when after the submission deadline?

Answer: CHFA does not have additional information regarding oral presentations at this time. If CHFA elects to request oral presentations as part of the evaluation process, the format, location (in-person or virtual), scheduling, and other applicable details will be communicated to the selected proposers at that time.

Question: What is the anticipated award date, and does CHFA expect the project to begin shortly after award?

Answer: We do not know what the award date is at this time. CHFA expects the project to begin shortly after contract execution.

Question: Can CHFA provide access to segments of its user base (e.g., homebuyers, lenders, developers, housing counselors) who can be available to the selected firm for user research and usability testing?

Answer: No.

Question: For the "Key Pages (Integration)" examples (homebuyer mortgage interest rates, compliance reporting and property look-up, multifamily interest rates, loan status for realtors): what backend systems produce this data today, are APIs or structured feeds available, and how frequently does the data change? Are any of these pages updated manually today?

Answer: The current website utilizes an API integration with CHFA's Loan Origination System (LOS) to retrieve and display mortgage interest rates in real time.

Other website data integrations, including participating-lender information, lender production reports, loan status lookup, and similar data-driven content, are currently supported through periodic flat-file data extracts generated from CHFA systems and securely transferred to the website hosting environment via SFTP for processing and display.

Proposers should account for these existing integration requirements in their proposed solution and describe the recommended approach for supporting them, including whether the existing API and SFTP-based methods would be retained or whether alternative integration methods are recommended. Additional technical details and available interface documentation will be provided to the selected firm(s) as appropriate during discovery and implementation.

Question: What online forms and application platforms are currently in use, and do any forms collect personal or sensitive information subject to specific security, routing, or retention requirements?

Answer: Beyond the integration with CHFA's Single Family Loan Origination System (SF-LOS), CHFA does not currently have other direct application or system integrations with the public website. Other applications, services, forms, tools, or external resources referenced or accessed through the website are generally provided through direct links to external systems or iframe-embedded content. Sensitive information is generally handled by integrated tools and not collected or stored directly within the CMS. Detailed requirements will be reviewed during discovery.

Proposers should account for the continued ability to support appropriate external links and embedded content within the proposed website. As part of discovery and implementation, CHFA will work with the selected firm(s) to identify and validate the existing links, embeds, and related functionality that should be retained, replaced, or otherwise addressed in the new website.

Question: Are any authenticated (logged-in) experiences in scope — for example lender, developer, or partner portals — or is the entire site public and anonymous?

Answer: No.

Question: Does CHFA use an email marketing/newsletter or CRM platform that the site should integrate with (e.g., signup forms, distribution of alerts)?

Answer: CHFA currently uses Constant Contact for email communications and newsletter subscriptions. The new website should support appropriate subscription forms and related integrations. CHFA is not currently requiring implementation of a new CRM.

Question: What are the site's current average and peak traffic levels (e.g., monthly sessions/pageviews, and known peak events such as rate changes or program announcements)?

Answer: CHFA is currently compiling GA4 traffic information, which may not be available before the proposal deadline. Available analytics will be shared with the selected firm during discovery. Respondents should identify traffic and capacity assumptions used in their hosting proposals.

Question: Could you please confirm whether <https://www.chfa.org/> is the current website that will be redesigned and replaced as part of this project?

Answer: Yes, this is the current website that will be redesigned and replaced.

Question: Could CHFA provide any available information regarding the anticipated UAT process, including key stakeholder groups, review periods, and final acceptance process?

Answer: At this time, CHFA is unable to provide the requested information. Please refer to the RFP document for the information currently available to assist in the preparation of your proposal.

Question: In evaluating the requested references for similar and substantial services, would CHFA also consider a working demonstration built specifically for this solicitation as evidence of relevant capability?

Answer: It's helpful to have relevant and similar services during the initial review of proposals. It's likely the demonstrations will only be requested from short-listed firms.

Question: Can CHFA provide current analytics access or a representative GA4 export for traffic, search behavior, and top-task analysis?

Answer: At this time, we are unable to provide the requested information. Please refer to the RFP document for the information currently available to assist in the preparation of your proposal.

Question: Does CHFA expect multilingual functionality at launch, or should the new architecture be designed to accommodate future translation/multilingual capabilities?

Answer: The architecture must accommodate multilingual content. English will be the primary language at launch, with selected pages potentially published in Spanish. CHFA does not anticipate translating the entire website at launch.

Question: Are there any known security, privacy, procurement, records-retention, or other technology standards that vendors should account for beyond those specifically identified in the RFP?

Answer: Respondents must comply with the requirements identified in the RFP and all applicable federal and Connecticut requirements. Additional CHFA security, privacy, records-retention, and technology requirements will be reviewed with the selected firm during discovery and contracting.

Question: If a small amount of lower-priority legacy content cannot be fully remediated by the primary launch date, would CHFA consider a phased launch approach, provided that all critical/high-priority content and required accessibility standards are satisfied?

Answer: CHFA may consider a phased launch approach or lower legacy priority content.

Question: What content volume and systems should firms include in the fixed-fee migration scope?

Answer: Firms should assume audit of approximately 360 URLs and 2,000 documents; migration of up to 200 standard pages, 200 structured records, and 1,000 approved accessible documents; and integration of the systems identified in this addendum. Additional migration and remediation should be separately priced.

Question: Will CHFA allow the attachments to be signed with Adobe E-Sign for the required forms and cover letter given the required electronic submission process? The RFP does not specify either way on this point.

Answer: Cover letters can be signed electronically. However, documents requiring notarization should be notarized.

Question: What is the current library function for documents, pdfs, etc.? Are they arranged in a system (i.e. Documentum or other document management system) or direct load to the existing site?

Answer: Documents, PDFs, and other website content are currently uploaded and managed directly within the existing hosted CMS. CHFA does not currently utilize a separate document management system for public website content. Proposers should describe the document and content management capabilities available within their proposed CMS, including any recommended approach for organizing, managing, and publishing documents.

Question: Who owns the decision on what gets migrated, archived, or retired, and what process and timeline will that determination follow?

Answer: This will be a CHFA decision.

Question: What review process will CHFA use to work through the 360-page site inventory (pages last updated as far back as 2017) to assign Migrate/Update/Archive status to each page? To what extent are firms expected to participate in the review — providing recommendations, doing the actual content rewriting, or purely executing decisions CHFA has already made?

Answer: The firm will develop the inventory, assess content, and recommend migrate/update/archive/retire classifications. CHFA subject-matter experts will review recommendations, prepare or approve substantive updates, and make final decisions. The firm will then migrate, format, and validate approved content.

Question: Does CHFA have Freedom of Information Act (or Connecticut's equivalent public-records) obligations that require some or all archived assets to remain publicly available or retrievable on request? If so, that requirement needs to shape the archive plan in Q28 rather than being solved after the fact.

Answer: The CHFA website is not considered as a primary repository for records.

Question: For service-oriented assets with ongoing costs — e.g., a faceted search platform, external application subscriptions — will those recurring costs be covered directly by CHFA through separate contracts/subscriptions, or should they be included as line items within this contract? This matters specifically for recurring subscriptions that get integrated into the site's design and functionality, since they carry cost obligations beyond the initial build.

Answer: Firms must identify and separately itemize all recurring costs required for their proposed solution. Existing services contracted directly by CHFA may remain separate. New subscriptions necessary for the proposed website should be included unless the proposal clearly identifies and explains an alternative contracting assumption.

Question: What content or functionality sits behind the member login at www.chfa.org/members/login? It doesn't appear in the public sitemap and has no browsable index page, so we can't see it from outside —

roughly how many member accounts/roles need to be supported, and should this area be rebuilt with the same account-provisioning model (CHFA-provisioned, no self-registration)?

Answer: CHFA's current website utilizes a proprietary CMS provided and supported by the vendor accessed via www.chfa.org/members/login?. At this time, CHFA is unable to provide the count or roles for member accounts accessing the CMS.

Question: We traced the RFP's "existing production systems" reference to los.chfa.org ("SF-LOS," CHFA's Single Family Loan Origination System for lenders) via the Lenders nav — can CHFA confirm this is the system referenced, and describe whether anything beyond the current simple outbound link (e.g., single sign-on, a data feed, a deeper API integration) is expected on the new site?

Answer: CHFA utilizes separate business systems and portals outside of the public website. These systems are accessed from the website through standard links or deep links that direct users to the applicable external business portal. Unless otherwise specified in the RFP, integration with these external systems beyond providing and maintaining the appropriate links is not anticipated to be within the scope of the website redesign.

Question: Are there any integrations not listed in the solicitation doc we should consider for the response (analytics, devops, marketing)?

Answer: No. Please refer to the RFP document for the information currently available to assist in the preparation of your proposal.

Question: Will CHFA require an independent third-party accessibility audit, certification, Accessibility Conformance Report, or VPAT in addition to the selected firm's automated and manual testing and compliance documentation?

Answer: No.

Question: Please identify the mortgage, affordability, rent-versus-own, and other calculators or interactive tools CHFA expects to retain, replace, integrate, or develop. Please also confirm whether CHFA owns and can provide the existing source code, formulas, business rules, data sources, and required disclosures.

Answer: CHFA owns and maintains its existing calculator tools. The selected firm will assess whether they should be reused, re-skinned, integrated, remediated, or rebuilt. Respondents should describe their approach and identify assumptions regarding redevelopment.

Question: Please clarify whether the proposed document libraries require version control, approval workflows, retention schedules, expiration dates, automated archival, records-management functionality, or integration with an existing document management system.

Answer: No. CHFA does not currently require the proposed website document libraries to provide version control, approval workflows, retention schedules, expiration dates, automated archival, records-management functionality, or integration with an existing document management system.

Question: What is the anticipated contract term for hosting, warranty, maintenance, and support, and what renewal or extension options does CHFA expect to include?

Answer: CHFA has not established a fixed contract term at this time. Proposers should provide available pricing and contract options for hosting, warranty, maintenance, and support, including annual and multi-year terms. Proposers should also describe available renewal and extension options, including any associated pricing structures, terms, or conditions.

Question: What CMS and hosting platform support the current website? Does CHFA have a preferred CMS, cloud provider, technology stack, or licensing model, or should the vendor recommend the platform?

Answer: CHFA's current website utilizes a proprietary CMS provided and supported by the vendor. CHFA does not have a preferred CMS, technology stack, or licensing model for the replacement website. Proposers should recommend a platform that best meets CHFA's functional, technical, security, accessibility, maintainability, and long-term support requirements. Where appropriate, proposers may present multiple platform options and should describe the benefits, limitations, licensing requirements, hosting approach, and associated costs of each option.

Question: Please identify all existing and planned integrations, and for each indicate whether it is API-based, an embedded application, a third-party hosted solution, or an SSO integration; whether APIs and technical documentation are available; and whether real-time data exchange is required. Please include the systems behind the key pages listed in the RFP, including mortgage and multifamily interest rates, compliance reporting and property lookup, and realtor loan status.

Answer: The current website utilizes an API integration with CHFA's Loan Origination System (LOS) to retrieve and display mortgage interest rates in real time.

Other website data integrations, including participating-lender information, lender production reports, loan status lookup, and similar data-driven content, are currently supported through periodic flat-file data extracts generated from CHFA systems and securely transferred to the website hosting environment via SFTP for processing and display.

Proposers should account for these existing integration requirements in their proposed solution and describe the recommended approach for supporting them, including whether the existing API and SFTP-based methods would be retained or whether alternative integration methods are recommended. Additional technical details and available interface documentation will be provided to the selected firm(s) as appropriate during discovery and implementation.

Question: For the mortgage, affordability, and rent-versus-own calculators, are the current tools built in-house, licensed, or embedded third-party products? What are their data sources, and which should be retained, replaced, or newly developed?

Answer: CHFA owns and maintains its existing calculator tools. The selected firm will assess whether they should be reused, re-skinned, integrated, remediated, or rebuilt. Respondents should describe their approach and identify assumptions regarding redevelopment.

Question: Please provide an inventory of current online forms and applications, including purpose, complexity, data destinations, routing and authentication requirements, and underlying platforms.

Answer: Beyond the integration with CHFA's Single Family Loan Origination System (SF-LOS), CHFA does not currently have other direct application or system integrations with the public website. Other

applications, services, forms, tools, or external resources referenced or accessed through the website are generally provided through direct links to external systems or iframe-embedded content.

Proposers should account for the continued ability to support appropriate external links and embedded content within the proposed website. As part of discovery and implementation, CHFA will work with the selected firm(s) to identify and validate the existing links, embeds, and related functionality that should be retained, replaced, or otherwise addressed in the new website.

Question: Are there separate loan servicing, application, or investor portal systems outside the public website? Where is the scope boundary (embedded forms and deep links only, or deeper integration)?

Answer: CHFA utilizes separate business systems and portals outside of the public website. These systems are accessed from the website through standard links or deep links that direct users to the applicable external business portal. Unless otherwise specified in the RFP, integration with these external systems beyond providing and maintaining the appropriate links is not anticipated to be within the scope of the website redesign.

Question: Who currently provides website development, CMS support, hosting, and maintenance to CHFA? Is that vendor eligible to compete, when does the current contract expire, and may CHFA disclose its value?

Answer: SVANACO, Inc. d/b/a Americaneagle.com developed the current website beginning in 2015 and they are eligible to compete in this RFP.

Question: What CMS does your team currently use? What are some things your team likes about your CMS that you want to present in a new CMS? What are some things your team does NOT like about the CMS? What is the approximate page and document count, expected content migration volume, and the systems or forms that must be integrated?

Answer: CHFA's current website utilizes a proprietary CMS provided and supported by the vendor. CHFA does not have a preferred CMS, technology stack, or licensing model for the replacement website. Proposers should recommend a platform that best meets CHFA's functional, technical, security, accessibility, maintainability, and long-term support requirements. Where appropriate, proposers may present multiple platform options and should describe the benefits, limitations, licensing requirements, hosting approach, and associated costs of each option.

Question: Assuming it meets your requirements, is your team open to using an open-source CMS?

Answer: Yes.

Question: Does your team currently use a content delivery network (CDN) / web application firewall (WAF) you'd like to integrate with the new CMS? Or would you be looking for your new vendor to provide one? If you do have a CDN / WAF - what is it?

Answer: No.

Question: Are you currently using anything to actively scan and monitor content quality & accessibility issues? If so, are there any gaps in the workflow you're looking to improve upon? If not, is this a solution your team is interested in?

Answer: No.

Question: FedRAMP is mentioned- is that a requirement for any CMS & hosting?

Answer: FedRAMP authorization is not a requirement for the proposed CMS or hosting environment. However, if the proposed solution, hosting platform, or applicable services have FedRAMP authorization or otherwise align with FedRAMP requirements, proposers should identify the applicable authorization level and provide relevant details as part of their proposal.

Questions: If a company is registered in the United States, but project delivery is performed by a combination of U.S.-based and offshore team members, would that be acceptable under the RFP requirements?

Answer: CHFA may consider this arrangement.

Question: For the required SOC 2 Type II report or equivalent, may the report cover the proposed cloud and managed hosting provider if we remain contractually accountable for the service, or must the proposer itself hold a SOC 2 Type II report?

Answer: SOC 2 Type II report covering the proposed cloud hosting platform satisfies CHFA's requirement.

Question: Would use of a managed hosting provider be considered subcontracting that requires prior CHFA approval? If so, should that approval be requested with the proposal or after selection?

Answer: The use of a managed hosting provider will be considered as subcontracting and should be defined and requested within the proposals.

Question: May a respondent satisfy the hosting security requirement through a managed cloud or hosting partner's current SOC 2 Type II report, while the vendor remains responsible for the complete solution and managed service?

Answer: SOC 2 Type II report covering the proposed cloud hosting platform satisfies CHFA's requirement.

Question: Does CHFA have a preferred content management system, technology stack, cloud provider, or licensing model? Are there any platforms, technologies, hosting providers, or licensing models that CHFA will not consider?

Answer: CHFA does not have a preferred CMS, technology stack, or licensing model for the replacement website. Proposers should recommend a platform that best meets CHFA's functional, technical, security, accessibility, maintainability, and long-term support requirements. Where appropriate, proposers may present multiple platform options and should describe the benefits, limitations, licensing requirements, hosting approach, and associated costs of each option.

Question: Does CHFA anticipate requiring user registration, authenticated portals, role-based access, single sign-on, or integration with an existing identity provider as part of the initial implementation or future roadmap?

Answer: SSO and directory integration capabilities are within the scope of this project. Proposers should describe the SSO and identity/directory integration capabilities supported by their proposed solution, including compatibility with industry-standard identity providers.

Question: Will any website forms, applications, calculators, or integrations collect, process, transmit, or store personally identifiable information, financial information, mortgage information, applicant information, or other sensitive or regulated data? If so, please identify the applicable security, retention, and privacy requirements.

Answer: No.

Question: May respondents propose a fully managed hosting solution delivered through a disclosed third-party cloud or managed-hosting partner? If so, will a current SOC 2 Type II report covering the proposed hosting environment and managed services satisfy the requirement, or must the responding firm itself hold the report?

Answer: SOC 2 Type II report covering the proposed cloud hosting platform satisfies CHFA's requirement.

Question: Are there restrictions on remote performance, offshore personnel, data access outside the United States, or the use of approved subcontractors?

Answer: CHFA requires that all website content and associated data be hosted and stored within the United States. Proposers should confirm that their proposed hosting environment, including primary hosting, backups, disaster recovery, and other data storage locations, will maintain CHFA data within the United States.

Question: Will CHFA accept standard carve-outs from the ownership clause for commercial platform software, third-party products, open-source components, and pre-existing vendor tools, with CHFA owning all custom code, designs, configurations, and documentation created for this project?

Answer: Yes. CHFA will accept a standard pre-existing intellectual property carveout under which CHFA retains ownership of its content, data, custom visual designs, project-specific configurations, and deliverables, while the vendor retains ownership of its pre-existing SaaS platform, reusable components, tools, frameworks, and generalized enhancements.

Question: Section 6 specifies WCAG 2.1 Level AA while the deliverables section specifies WCAG 2.2 Level AA. Which standard governs testing, documentation, and final acceptance?

Answer: CHFA confirms that **WCAG 2.2 Level AA** shall govern the accessibility requirements for the final website deliverable. References to WCAG 2.1 Level AA in the Accessibility section should be interpreted as superseded by the WCAG 2.2 Level AA requirement identified in the Project Deliverables section. Proposers should design, develop, test, and deliver the website in conformance with WCAG 2.2 Level AA.

Question: Has an accessibility audit of the current website been completed within the past three years, and can the findings be shared?

Answer: No.

Question: Does CHFA currently use an accessibility monitoring tool such as Siteimprove, Monsido, or DubBot that should be retained, replaced, or integrated?

Answer: No.

Question: Must the production environment and data remain within the United States? Are specific cloud providers, regions, security frameworks, or data residency requirements mandatory?

Answer: Yes.

Question: Are there minimum RTO, RPO, backup retention, vulnerability remediation, or security incident notification requirements that the proposed hosting solution must meet?

Answer: CHFA has not established specific Recovery Time Objective (RTO) or Recovery Point Objective (RPO) requirements for the website. Proposers should define the RTO and RPO provided as part of their proposed hosting and disaster recovery solution and describe the associated backup, recovery, and business continuity capabilities. Proposers should also describe the standards, policies, service levels, and capabilities available as part of their proposed solution, including backup frequency and retention, vulnerability identification and remediation practices, and security incident notification and response procedures.

Question: Does CHFA require annual penetration testing or vulnerability assessments as part of ongoing support, and should those costs be included?

Answer: CHFA does not currently anticipate conducting or commissioning separate annual penetration testing or vulnerability assessments of the hosted website environment. However, CHFA expects the hosting provider to maintain an established security assessment program that includes periodic penetration testing and/or vulnerability assessments, as appropriate, and to maintain applicable SOC 2 certification/attestation.

Question: Will a SOC 2 Type II report covering the proposed cloud hosting platform satisfy CHFA's requirement, or must the prime contractor also provide SOC 2 coverage for its managed services? What equivalent independent audit documentation will CHFA accept?

Answer: SOC 2 Type II report covering the proposed cloud hosting platform satisfies CHFA's requirement.

Question: Items 11–13 require respondents to propose warranty and SLA terms. Does CHFA have minimum requirements for warranty duration, support hours, and response or resolution times that firms should use for pricing?

Answer: No.

Question: For the SOC 2 Type II requirement, is the report of the managed hosting provider sufficient, or must the bidding company itself hold SOC 2 Type II certification?

Answer: SOC 2 Type II report covering the proposed cloud hosting platform satisfies CHFA's requirement.

Question: Can vendor provide entire services from offshore location (outside US geography)?

Answer: CHFA requires that all website content and associated data be hosted and stored within the United States. Proposers should confirm that their proposed hosting environment, including primary hosting, backups, disaster recovery, and other data storage locations, will maintain CHFA data within the United States.

Question: Would CHFA be interested in proposals that include AI-powered website assistance capabilities to improve digital self-service outcomes? If so, should respondents include optional pricing and implementation approaches for these capabilities as part of their proposed solution?

Answer: CHFA has not established any project-specific policies or requirements regarding the use of generative artificial intelligence for the services outlined in this RFP. Proposers may describe any use of generative AI or AI-assisted tools anticipated in performing the scope of work, including the purposes for which such tools would be used and the applicable human review and quality-control processes.

Question: Would CHFA consider value-added proposals that include comprehensive accessibility transition services, such as enterprise-wide digital accessibility audits, remediation planning, accessibility governance frameworks, staff training, and ongoing monitoring services beyond the scope of the public website? If so, should these services be proposed as optional items or as part of the core solution?

Answer: No.

Question: For a solution utilizing enterprise SaaS and managed cloud platforms for content management and hosting, will CHFA accept the applicable SOC 2 Type II reports and security attestations of the proposed CMS and managed hosting providers, together with the proposer's security policies, secure development practices, and documented shared-responsibility model?

Answer: Yes.

Question: Can CHFA provide a high-level inventory of the existing production systems expected to integrate with the new website, including available APIs, data sources, authentication methods, and relevant third-party platforms?

Answer: The current website utilizes an API integration with CHFA's Loan Origination System (LOS) to retrieve and display mortgage interest rates in real time.

Other website data integrations, including participating-lender information, lender production reports, loan status lookup, and similar data-driven content, are currently supported through periodic flat-file data extracts generated from CHFA systems and securely transferred to the website hosting environment via SFTP for processing and display.

Proposers should account for these existing integration requirements in their proposed solution and describe the recommended approach for supporting them, including whether the existing API and SFTP-based methods would be retained or whether alternative integration methods are recommended. Additional technical details and available interface documentation will be provided to the selected firm(s) as appropriate during discovery and implementation.

Question: Can CHFA identify the online forms and application platforms currently in use and clarify whether the selected firm is expected primarily to integrate existing forms and applications into the new experience or replace/rebuild any of these capabilities?

Answer: The current website utilizes an API integration with CHFA's Loan Origination System (LOS) to retrieve and display mortgage interest rates in real time. The multifamily rates are updated inside the CMS.

Other website data integrations, including participating-lender information, lender production reports, loan status lookup, and similar data-driven content, are currently supported through periodic flat-file data extracts generated from CHFA systems and securely transferred to the website hosting environment via SFTP for processing and display.

Question: The Accessibility section references WCAG 2.1 Level AA, while the Project Deliverables section requests documentation demonstrating WCAG 2.2 Level AA compliance. Should proposers use WCAG 2.2 Level AA as the required conformance standard for the new website?

Answer: CHFA confirms that **WCAG 2.2 Level AA** shall govern the accessibility requirements for the final website deliverable. References to WCAG 2.1 Level AA in the Accessibility section should be interpreted as superseded by the WCAG 2.2 Level AA requirement identified in the Project Deliverables section. Proposers should design, develop, test, and deliver the website in conformance with WCAG 2.2 Level AA.

Question: The RFP establishes CHFA ownership of website code, content, and project deliverables. Please confirm that the use of commercially licensed CMS, hosting, search, and other SaaS/platform services is acceptable, with CHFA owning the custom-developed source code, content, data, designs, configurations, and project deliverables, while the underlying commercial platforms remain subject to their standard licensing terms.

Answer: Yes. The use of commercially licensed CMS, hosting, search, SaaS, and other third-party platform services is acceptable, subject to CHFA's review and approval of the proposed solution and applicable licensing terms.

Question: Will CHFA accept a standard pre-existing intellectual-property carveout under which CHFA owns its content, data, custom visual designs, project-specific configurations, and deliverables, while the vendor retains ownership of its pre-existing SaaS platform, reusable components, tools, and generalized enhancements and licenses those elements to CHFA?

Answer: Yes. CHFA will accept a standard pre-existing intellectual property carveout under which CHFA retains ownership of its content, data, custom visual designs, project-specific configurations, and deliverables, while the vendor retains ownership of its pre-existing SaaS platform, reusable components, tools, frameworks, and generalized enhancements.

Question: Must the respondent's own SOC 2 Type II report expressly cover both its application operations and managed services, or may the requirement be satisfied through a combination of the cloud hosting provider's SOC 2 Type II report, the respondent's security control documentation, and other independent attestations?

Answer: SOC 2 Type II report covering the proposed cloud hosting platform satisfies CHFA's requirement.

Question: Does CHFA have a preference or requirement regarding data residency (e.g., hosting within the United States) for the cloud hosting environment?

Answer: CHFA requires that all website content and associated data be hosted and stored within the United States. Proposers should confirm that their proposed hosting environment, including primary hosting, backups, disaster recovery, and other data storage locations, will maintain CHFA data within the United States.

Question: Does CHFA consider the hosting platform provider's SOC 2 Type II and ISO/IEC 27001:2022 attestations sufficient to satisfy the Section 10 requirement, when accompanied by the proposing firm's own documented information security policies, access controls, patch management procedures, and security incident notification procedures covering the managed services layer? Or does CHFA require a SOC 2 Type II examination of the proposing firm itself?

Answer: SOC 2 Type II report covering the proposed cloud hosting platform satisfies CHFA's requirement.

Question: Hosting platform providers typically furnish their SOC 2 Type II reports to customers under a non-disclosure agreement. Given that proposals are subject to disclosure under the Connecticut Freedom of Information Act, does CHFA prefer that proposers (a) reference the provider's trust center and public certification statements in the proposal and furnish the full report separately upon request, (b) submit the report marked as Confidential Information under the RFP's FOIA provision, or (c) another method?

Answer: The proposal can reference the provider's trust center and public certification statements in the proposal and furnish the full report separately upon request

Question: The RFP states that services shall not be subcontracted without prior notification and approval from CHFA. Does CHFA consider a managed hosting platform provider such as WP Engine to be a subcontractor for purposes of this provision, or a technology platform disclosed within the proposal?

Answer: No.

Question: Section 6 requires conformance with WCAG Version 2.1, Level AA. The Project Deliverables section (Testing and Quality Assurance) requires documentation demonstrating compliance with WCAG Version 2.2, Level AA. Please confirm which version governs for purposes of design, testing, and final acceptance.

Answer: CHFA confirms that **WCAG 2.2 Level AA** shall govern the accessibility requirements for the final website deliverable. References to WCAG 2.1 Level AA in the Accessibility section should be interpreted as superseded by the WCAG 2.2 Level AA requirement identified in the Project Deliverables section. Proposers should design, develop, test, and deliver the website in conformance with WCAG 2.2 Level AA.

Question: Will CHFA require independently verified conformance reporting for documents and pages, or is vendor self-attestation with supporting test artifacts sufficient?

Answer: The selected firm(s) will be required to provide accessibility confirmation or equivalent documentation confirming and documenting the website's compliance with the applicable accessibility requirements, including WCAG 2.2 Level AA.

Question: The RFP identifies Homebuyer Mortgage Interest Rates, Compliance Reporting and Property Look-up, Multifamily Housing Interest Rates, and Loan Status Information for Realtors as integration pages. Are these driven by internal CHFA systems? Will technical documentation or API specifications be made available to the selected firm, and can interested firms receive a high-level description of these interfaces during the proposal period?

Answer: Yes.

Question: Regarding the mortgage, affordability, and rent-versus-own calculators: are these currently licensed from a third party, and if so, would CHFA prefer continued licensing or replacement with newly developed tools?

Answer: CHFA owns and maintains its existing calculator tools. The selected firm will assess whether they should be reused, re-skinned, integrated, remediated, or rebuilt. Respondents should describe their approach and identify assumptions regarding redevelopment.

Question: Our hosting partner, WP Engine, maintains SOC 2 Type II compliance for infrastructure and managed hosting. Is that sufficient to satisfy the RFP's SOC 2 requirement, or does CHFA require the contracted firm itself to hold a SOC 2 attestation independent of its hosting provider?

Answer: SOC 2 Type II report covering the proposed cloud hosting platform satisfies CHFA's requirement.

Question: What database systems or external APIs need to feed search indexing, dynamic lists, or portal applications?

Answer: Only content within the CMS is in scope for search capabilities.

Question: Does the enterprise search need to index external repositories, or is it strictly content within the CMS?

Answer: Only content within the CMS is in scope for search capabilities.

Question: Is there a preferred CMS stack (e.g., Drupal, WordPress, headless/Jamstack), or would you like us to recommend one?

Answer: CHFA's current website utilizes a proprietary CMS provided and supported by the vendor. CHFA does not have a preferred CMS, technology stack, or licensing model for the replacement website. Proposers should recommend a platform that best meets CHFA's functional, technical, security, accessibility, maintainability, and long-term support requirements. Where appropriate, proposers may present multiple platform options and should describe the benefits, limitations, licensing requirements, hosting approach, and associated costs of each option.

Question: What are the hosting, uptime, security, and environment requirements (e.g., AWS, Pantheon, Acquia)?

Answer: CHFA has not established specific hosting platforms, uptime thresholds, security standards, or environment requirements beyond those otherwise identified in the RFP. Proposers should describe the standard hosting environment, uptime commitments, security controls, infrastructure, and service levels provided as part of their proposed solution.

Question: Are there specific accessibility goals (e.g., strictly WCAG 2.1 AA, or state-mandated guidelines)?

Answer: CHFA confirms that **WCAG 2.2 Level AA** shall govern the accessibility requirements for the final website deliverable. References to WCAG 2.1 Level AA in the Accessibility section should be interpreted as superseded by the WCAG 2.2 Level AA requirement identified in the Project Deliverables section. Proposers should design, develop, test, and deliver the website in conformance with WCAG 2.2 Level AA.

Question: Can CHFA identify any integrations requiring more than an iframe, embed code, or standard third-party script—for example APIs, data feeds, production systems, application/form platforms, calculators, or other system-to system integrations? Can CHFA provide an inventory of the systems referenced on the four 'Key Pages (Integration)' listed on page 13?

Answer: The current website utilizes an API integration with CHFA's Loan Origination System (LOS) to retrieve and display mortgage interest rates in real time.

Other website data integrations, including participating-lender information, lender production reports, loan status lookup, and similar data-driven content, are currently supported through periodic flat-file data extracts generated from CHFA systems and securely transferred to the website hosting environment via SFTP for processing and display.

Proposers should account for these existing integration requirements in their proposed solution and describe the recommended approach for supporting them, including whether the existing API and SFTP-based methods would be retained or whether alternative integration methods are recommended. Additional technical details and available interface documentation will be provided to the selected firm(s) as appropriate during discovery and implementation.

Question: Do "Loan Status Information for Realtors," "Compliance Reporting and Property Look-up," or Lender resources require authenticated user accounts? Is SSO/directory integration (Entra ID, Okta) in scope?

Answer: No, these areas do not require authenticated user accounts. SSO and directory integration capabilities are within the scope of this project. Proposers should describe the SSO and identity/directory integration capabilities supported by their proposed solution, including compatibility with industry-standard identity providers.

Question: If authenticated areas exist: describe them, with approximate user counts and who administers accounts?

Answer: No.

Question: Where is long-form training video currently hosted (YouTube, Vimeo, other)? Is captioning/transcription of existing and new video the vendor's responsibility, or CHFA's?

Answer: CHFA anticipates that long-form video content will continue to be streamed through third-party video hosting platforms, including YouTube, rather than hosted directly within the website environment. Proposers should describe their experience and capabilities in integrating and supporting third-party video hosting and streaming services, including accessibility features such as captioning.

Proposers should also identify any recommended services, tools, or approaches for video accessibility and remediation, along with any associated implementation, licensing, remediation, or ongoing service costs. The specific requirements for remediation of existing video content will be evaluated with the selected firm(s) as part of the content review and migration process.

Question: Can CHFA describe how the current calculators and look-up tools are implemented — for example, features of the current CMS platform, custom code, or embedded third-party tools — and confirm whether CHFA holds the rights necessary to carry them forward to a new platform?

Answer: CHFA owns and maintains its existing calculator tools. The selected firm will assess whether they should be reused, re-skinned, integrated, remediated, or rebuilt. Respondents should describe their approach and identify assumptions regarding redevelopment.

Question: Should the selected firm perform content rewriting and consolidation in addition to the content audit and migration, or will CHFA provide finalized content with the vendor primarily responsible for migration, formatting and implementation?

Answer: CHFA will collaborate with the selected firm(s) in identifying the content to be migrated and in supporting the conversion and remediation of selected documents to accessible formats.

Question: Please provide an inventory of existing production systems, third-party applications and integrations that must be retained, replaced or rebuilt, including available APIs and technical documentation where applicable.

Answer: The current website utilizes an API integration with CHFA's Loan Origination System (LOS) to retrieve and display mortgage interest rates in real time. The multifamily rates are updated inside the CMS.

Other website data integrations, including participating-lender information, lender production reports, loan status lookup, and similar data-driven content, are currently supported through periodic flat-file data extracts generated from CHFA systems and securely transferred to the website hosting environment via SFTP for processing and display.

Question: For the pages identified as "Examples of Key Pages (Integration)," should the selected firm rebuild the underlying functionality, integrate with existing systems or data sources, embed existing tools, or continue linking to external applications? What systems currently support the compliance/property lookup, mortgage and multifamily interest rates, and loan-status functionality?

Answer: The current website utilizes an API integration with CHFA's Loan Origination System (LOS) to retrieve and display mortgage interest rates in real time. The multifamily rates are updated inside the CMS.

Other website data integrations, including participating-lender information, lender production reports, loan status lookup, and similar data-driven content, are currently supported through periodic flat-file data extracts generated from CHFA systems and securely transferred to the website hosting environment via SFTP for processing and display.

Question: How many online forms and applications are in scope? What types of data do they collect, where is that data stored, and are authentication, single sign-on, e-signature, payment or document-upload capabilities required?

Answer: Beyond the integration with CHFA's Single Family Loan Origination System (SF-LOS), CHFA does not currently have other direct application or system integrations with the public website. Other applications, services, forms, tools, or external resources referenced or accessed through the website are generally provided through direct links to external systems or iframe-embedded content. Sensitive information is generally handled by integrated tools and not collected or stored directly within the CMS. Detailed requirements will be reviewed during discovery.

Question: Does CHFA intend to retain its current search provider and configuration, or should respondents propose a replacement enterprise-search solution? Should search index PDFs, archived content and/or content maintained in external systems?

Answer: No, CHFA does not intend to retain its current search provider and configuration. CHFA expects the proposed website to provide advanced search capabilities, including full-text search across published website content and documents. Proposers should describe the search capabilities available within their proposed solution, including supported filtering and search refinement options, document-content indexing, handling of archived content, and other relevant search features. Proposers should also identify any

additional search functionality, such as synonym management, promoted results, spelling correction, search analytics, or similar capabilities, that are available as part of the proposed solution.

Question: Will CHFA provide access during discovery to existing Google Analytics, Google Search Console, SEO reporting and other website-performance data so that the selected firm can establish benchmarks and develop migration and redirect requirements?

Answer: Yes.

Question: The Scope of Work references WCAG 2.1 Level AA, while the Project Deliverables reference WCAG 2.2 Level AA. Which accessibility standard will govern project acceptance? Does CHFA require independent third-party certification, an Accessibility Conformance Report/VPAT, or use of a specific accessibility-testing platform?

Answer: CHFA confirms that **WCAG 2.2 Level AA** shall govern the accessibility requirements for the final website deliverable. References to WCAG 2.1 Level AA in the Accessibility section should be interpreted as superseded by the WCAG 2.2 Level AA requirement identified in the Project Deliverables section. Proposers should design, develop, test, and deliver the website in conformance with WCAG 2.2 Level AA.

CHFA does not require the use of a specific accessibility testing platform. However, the selected firm(s) will be required to provide an accessibility conformance report or equivalent documentation confirming and documenting the website's compliance with the applicable accessibility requirements, including WCAG 2.2 Level AA.

Question: Will a cloud or managed-hosting provider's SOC 2 Type II report satisfy CHFA's requirement, or must the prime bidder independently hold a SOC 2 Type II report covering its managed services?

Answer: SOC 2 Type II report covering the proposed cloud hosting platform satisfies CHFA's requirement.

Question: Does CHFA have specific requirements for Recovery Time Objective, Recovery Point Objective, geographic data residency, penetration testing or other security testing beyond those identified in the RFP?

Answer: CHFA has not established specific Recovery Time Objective (RTO) or Recovery Point Objective (RPO) requirements for the website. Proposers should define the RTO and RPO provided as part of their proposed hosting and disaster recovery solution and describe the associated backup, recovery, and business continuity capabilities. Any available service levels, commitments, or options associated with RTO and RPO should also be identified in the proposal. Please refer to the RFP document for the information regarding data residency and penetration testing to assist in the preparation of your proposal.

Question: For the SOC 2 Type II requirement, is a report covering the proposed cloud hosting platform acceptable?

Answer: SOC 2 Type II report covering the proposed cloud hosting platform satisfies CHFA's requirement.

Question: The RFP's Accessibility section requires WCAG 2.1 Level AA, while the Project Deliverables section requires WCAG 2.2 Level AA. Can CHFA confirm which version governs the deliverable, or should we commit to both (2.1 Level AA at minimum, delivered to 2.2 Level AA where it does not conflict)?

Answer: CHFA confirms that **WCAG 2.2 Level AA** shall govern the accessibility requirements for the final website deliverable. References to WCAG 2.1 Level AA in the Accessibility section should be interpreted as superseded by the WCAG 2.2 Level AA requirement identified in the Project Deliverables section. Proposers should design, develop, test, and deliver the website in conformance with WCAG 2.2 Level AA.

Question: Is the homebuyer and multifamily interest rate display a live system integration, or is it updated manually on a periodic basis? If it is an integration, from which source system?

Answer: The current website utilizes an API integration with CHFA's Loan Origination System (LOS) to retrieve and display mortgage interest rates in real time. The multifamily rates are updated inside the CMS.

Other website data integrations, including participating-lender information, lender production reports, loan status lookup, and similar data-driven content, are currently supported through periodic flat-file data extracts generated from CHFA systems and securely transferred to the website hosting environment via SFTP for processing and display.

Question: Section 10 requires the selected firm to provide fully managed hosting supported by a current SOC 2 Type II report. Will a named managed-hosting provider be considered a subcontractor requiring prior notification and approval under Requested Information #4?

Answer: SOC 2 Type II report covering the proposed cloud hosting platform satisfies CHFA's requirement.

Question: Please confirm that open source software is acceptable for this project, and whether any State of Connecticut IT standards constrain the CMS choice. Given the Ownership section's requirement that CHFA own the entire rights to the website code, please confirm CHFA will accept that an open-source CMS and community-contributed modules remain under their existing open source licenses (e.g., GPL), with custom code and software patches delivered under an open source license granting CHFA full rights to use, modify, and distribute the code.

Answer: CHFA's current website utilizes a proprietary CMS provided and supported by the vendor. CHFA does not have a preferred CMS, technology stack, or licensing model for the replacement website. Proposers should recommend a platform that best meets CHFA's functional, technical, security, accessibility, maintainability, and long-term support requirements. Where appropriate, proposers may present multiple platform options and should describe the benefits, limitations, licensing requirements, hosting approach, and associated costs of each option.

Question: What policies does CHFA have regarding the use of generative artificial intelligence to assist with or automate tasks outlined in the scope of work, assuming all outputs are subject to human review?

Answer: CHFA has not established any project-specific policies or requirements regarding the use of generative artificial intelligence for the services outlined in this RFP. Proposers may describe any use of generative AI or AI-assisted tools anticipated in performing the scope of work, including the purposes for which such tools would be used and the applicable human review and quality-control processes.

Question: Can CHFA provide the current CMS/platform, hosting environment, and version information?

Answer: CHFA's current website utilizes a proprietary CMS provided and supported by the vendor. CHFA does not have a preferred CMS, technology stack, or licensing model for the replacement website. Proposers should recommend a platform that best meets CHFA's functional, technical, security, accessibility,

maintainability, and long-term support requirements. Where appropriate, proposers may present multiple platform options and should describe the benefits, limitations, licensing requirements, hosting approach, and associated costs of each option.

Question: Does CHFA require a CHFA-controlled cloud tenancy, or is a managed SaaS/PaaS hosting model acceptable?

Answer: A managed SaaS/PaaS hosting model is acceptable.

Question: What are CHFA's required Recovery Point Objective (RPO) and Recovery Time Objective (RTO) targets for the public website?

Answer: CHFA has not established specific Recovery Time Objective (RTO) or Recovery Point Objective (RPO) requirements for the website. Proposers should define the RTO and RPO provided as part of their proposed hosting and disaster recovery solution and describe the associated backup, recovery, and business continuity capabilities. Any available service levels, commitments, or options associated with RTO and RPO should also be identified in the proposal.

Question: Does CHFA have a preferred identity or SSO solution for CMS administrators and content editors?

Answer: No.

Question: For the SOC 2 Type II requirement, does the report need to cover the website firm's managed services in addition to the cloud hosting environment?

Answer: SOC 2 Type II report covering the proposed cloud hosting platform satisfies CHFA's requirement.

Question: Can CHFA share existing technical documentation for chfa.org — ASP.NET version/framework, CMS (if any), database platform and version, hosting environment, custom applications, APIs, scheduled jobs, and other server-side dependencies? We can see the site runs on ASP.NET, but not enough to know whether it's an off-the-shelf CMS on SQL Server, a one-off/homegrown application layer built specifically for CHFA, or ASP.NET paired with a different commercial CMS. Architecture diagrams, source repository access, database schema docs, API docs, and dev/staging environment access at any point during discovery would resolve this.

Answer: CHFA's current website utilizes a proprietary CMS provided and supported by the vendor. CHFA does not have a preferred CMS, technology stack, or licensing model for the replacement website. Proposers should recommend a platform that best meets CHFA's functional, technical, security, accessibility, maintainability, and long-term support requirements. Where appropriate, proposers may present multiple platform options and should describe the benefits, limitations, licensing requirements, hosting approach, and associated costs of each option.

Question: Does CHFA expect a full replacement of the current ASP.NET platform, or is there openness to a hybrid architecture that retains existing back-end .NET applications/services (e.g., loan processing, calculators, authentication) while rebuilding only the public-facing site on the new CMS?

Answer: CHFA's current website utilizes a proprietary CMS provided and supported by the vendor. CHFA does not have a preferred CMS, technology stack, or licensing model for the replacement website. Proposers should recommend a platform that best meets CHFA's functional, technical, security, accessibility,

maintainability, and long-term support requirements. Where appropriate, proposers may present multiple platform options and should describe the benefits, limitations, licensing requirements, hosting approach, and associated costs of each option.

Question: What is CHFA's current hosting setup (provider, environment type, contract end date), and who currently manages DNS and domain records — so we can plan a clean cutover without disrupting mail or subdomains that may depend on the current setup?

Answer: At this time, CHFA is unable to provide the requested information. Please refer to the RFP document for the information currently available to assist in the preparation of your proposal.

Question: Who is currently responsible for server/cloud infrastructure updates and patching — is that handled by the hosting entity, or would that responsibility shift to this contract? We need to know whether ongoing infrastructure maintenance is something CHFA already has covered or something we need to price in.

Answer: Responsibility for server/cloud infrastructure maintenance, including applicable updates and patching, will reside with the hosting entity under the resulting contract. Proposers should include all associated hosting costs in their proposal, including ongoing infrastructure maintenance, updates, patching, monitoring, and related hosting services necessary to maintain the proposed environment. Any services, limitations, or additional costs not included in the standard hosting charges should be clearly identified in the proposal.

Question: Similarly, are database updates and administration currently handled by the hosting entity, or would DB administration fall inside the scope of this contract?

Answer: The scope of the resulting contract is expected to include CMS administration, hosting, and the associated management and maintenance of the underlying hosting environment. To the extent that database administration, updates, patching, maintenance, backup, or other database-related services are required to support the proposed CMS and hosting solution, those responsibilities should be included within the vendor's scope of services.

Question: Where does CHFA store its authoritative source files today — is there an existing enterprise document management system (SharePoint, Documentum, network share, etc.)? Given the volume and file sizes typically involved, would CHFA prefer the CMS to integrate with that system rather than hosting documents natively, which is generally not optimal for large-file, high-volume libraries?

Answer: CHFA maintains a separate enterprise document management system. The website content is not considered as the repository.

Question: Are firms expected to migrate or rebuild these embedded applications and integrations into the new site, or only to ensure the new CMS can host or link out to them as-is?

Answer: The current website utilizes an API integration with CHFA's Loan Origination System (LOS) to retrieve and display mortgage interest rates in real time.

Other website data integrations, including participating-lender information, lender production reports, loan status lookup, and similar data-driven content, are currently supported through periodic flat-file data extracts generated from CHFA systems and securely transferred to the website hosting environment via SFTP for processing and display.

Proposers should account for these existing integration requirements in their proposed solution and describe the recommended approach for supporting them, including whether the existing API and SFTP-based methods could be rebuilt or whether alternative integration methods are recommended. Additional technical details and available interface documentation will be provided to the selected firm(s) as appropriate during discovery and implementation.

Question: Should these upload workflows continue routing through ShareFile, or should the new site accept and store uploads directly?

Answer: CHFA anticipates continuing to utilize secure file-sharing platforms, such as ShareFile, for workflows involving document uploads, file submissions, and secure drop boxes. The new website is not expected to serve as the primary repository for these types of uploaded files.

Direct submissions through the website are generally expected to be limited to basic web forms, such as newsletter or notification sign-ups, contact/inquiry forms, and similar low-risk data collection. Proposers should describe how their proposed solution will support integration or linking to secure file-sharing platforms, as well as the security controls available for any forms or information submitted directly through the website.

Question: Are there malware/virus scanning or other security requirements for files uploaded through the site?

Answer: Yes. The proposed hosting environment should provide appropriate security controls to scan files uploaded through the website for malware, viruses, and other malicious content. Any additional security services or associated costs should be clearly identified in the proposal.

Question: Beyond ShareFile, are there fillable forms on the site used to collect data for official applications (e.g., loan or program applications)? If so, do those submissions connect to any external systems — a loan origination system, CRM, or database — once submitted?

Answer: No.

Question: Since forms and uploads may contain PII, what are the storage requirements? Can that information be stored within the CMS, or is there a requirement that submitted data be processed and stored elsewhere? If elsewhere, does that destination system already exist, is it secure, and are uploads and form submissions required to be encrypted in transit and at rest — is encryption a stated requirement, or an assumption we should build in regardless?

Answer: CHFA anticipates continuing to utilize secure file-sharing platforms, such as ShareFile, for workflows involving document uploads, file submissions, and secure drop boxes. The new website is not expected to serve as the primary repository for these types of uploaded files.

Direct submissions through the website are generally expected to be limited to basic web forms, such as newsletter or notification sign-ups, contact/inquiry forms, and similar low-risk data collection. Proposers should describe how their proposed solution will support integration or linking to secure file-sharing platforms, as well as the security controls available for any forms or information submitted directly through the website.

Question: Will all retained assets be migrated as-is, or will content older than a certain date be archived instead? If archived, where will that content be stored, and is standing up/maintaining that archive part of this contract's scope?

Answer: Only current and relevant assets selected for migration and publication on the new website will be expected to undergo accessibility review and, where necessary, remediation.

Content designated for archival will be downloaded and retained internally by CHFA and will not be required to remain published, hosted, or otherwise maintained within the new website environment. Accordingly, ongoing hosting, accessibility remediation, maintenance, or support of archived content is not expected to be included within the contract scope.

Question: How will CHFA determine which existing URLs must be preserved, and does project scope include URL consolidation, content archival, and 301 redirect mapping as part of the information architecture and content strategy?

Answer: CHFA will work collaboratively with the selected firm(s) during the discovery, information architecture, and content assessment phases to identify existing URLs and determine which should be preserved, consolidated, archived, or retired.

Proposers should include within their proposed approach the appropriate methodology for URL assessment and consolidation, content archival, and development of 301 redirect mappings necessary to support the transition to the new website, maintain continuity for users, and minimize broken links and adverse search engine impacts.

Question: Beyond SF-LOS and Google Analytics, can CHFA provide an inventory of the existing systems, applications, APIs, forms, data feeds, mapping tools, calculators, and third-party services that currently integrate with or support the website, and indicate which are expected to remain in the new implementation?

Answer: Beyond the integration with CHFA's Single Family Loan Origination System (SF-LOS), CHFA does not currently have other direct application or system integrations with the public website. Other applications, services, forms, tools, or external resources referenced or accessed through the website are generally provided through direct links to external systems or iframe-embedded content.

Proposers should account for the continued ability to support appropriate external links and embedded content within the proposed website. As part of discovery and implementation, CHFA will work with the selected firm(s) to identify and validate the existing links, embeds, and related functionality that should be retained, replaced, or otherwise addressed in the new website.

Question: Does the WCAG compliance requirement extend to remediating existing PDF documents and forms, or only to newly built pages and templates?

Answer: Yes. CHFA will work collaboratively with and assist the selected firm(s) in the conversion and remediation of legacy PDFs and other documents to accessible formats. Proposers should describe their approach, capabilities, and any tools or services available to support document accessibility remediation as part of the content migration process. Any assumptions regarding CHFA and firm(s) responsibilities should be clearly identified in the proposal.

Question: Is there an existing accessibility audit or VPAT for the current site that could establish a baseline?

Answer: No.

Question: Does CHFA have any existing cloud or hosting contract, subscription, or relationship in place today (e.g., an existing Azure or AWS enterprise agreement, or an existing managed-hosting vendor) that the new hosting solution should align with, migrate onto, or avoid duplicating — regardless of which CMS platform is ultimately selected?

Answer: No.

Question: For existing PDFs and downloadable documents, does CHFA expect the selected firm to remediate legacy documents for accessibility, or will CHFA provide accessibility-ready replacement files?

Answer: CHFA will work collaboratively with and assist the selected firm(s) in the conversion and remediation of legacy PDFs and other documents to accessible formats. Proposers should describe their approach, capabilities, and any tools or services available to support document accessibility remediation as part of the content migration process. Any assumptions regarding CHFA and firm(s) responsibilities should be clearly identified in the proposal.

Question: What platform hosts CHFA's current video content, should long-form training video be streamed from a third-party platform (e.g., YouTube/Vimeo) or hosted directly, and is captioning/remediation of the existing video back-catalog in scope?

Answer: CHFA anticipates that long-form video content will continue to be streamed through third-party video hosting platforms, including YouTube, rather than hosted directly within the website environment. Proposers should describe their experience and capabilities in integrating and supporting third-party video hosting and streaming services, including accessibility features such as captioning.

Proposers should also identify any recommended services, tools, or approaches for video accessibility and remediation, along with any associated implementation, licensing, remediation, or ongoing service costs. The specific requirements for remediation of existing video content will be evaluated with the selected firm(s) as part of the content review and migration process.

Question: Does CHFA expect the selected firm to host the production website, or must it be deployed to CHFA-owned or State-managed infrastructure?

Answer: CHFA expects the selected firm to host the production website

Question: Will CHFA provide accessible source documents for migration, or should vendors include remediation of legacy PDFs and other documents within the migration budget?

Answer: CHFA will work collaboratively with and assist the selected firm(s) in the conversion and remediation of legacy PDFs and other documents to accessible formats. Proposers should describe their approach, capabilities, and any tools or services available to support document accessibility remediation as part of the content migration process. Any assumptions regarding CHFA and firm(s) responsibilities should be clearly identified in the proposal.