Kentucky AI Workforce Readiness Network RFP Questions & Answers

Note: *Please periodically check the SCWDB Request for Proposal page (found here: https://southcentralworkforce.com/request-for-proposals). On this page, you can link to a current list of all submitted questions and responses.*

1. **May a respondent submit a proposal for only one of the two services described in the RFP—specifically Service B, AI-Powered Career Readiness—or must a responsive proposal address both Service A and Service B?**

   Respondents should submit proposals addressing the full scope of services described in the RFP, including both Service A – AI Industry Accelerator and Service B – AI-Powered Career Readiness. The RFP is structured to procure a coordinated training model that includes both components. Respondents should therefore demonstrate their capacity and proposed approach for delivering both services, including all five occupational pathways associated with Service A.

2. **If proposals for only one service are permitted, will those proposals be evaluated independently against the applicable portions of the evaluation criteria, or will preference be given to respondents proposing the full scope?**

   As noted above, SCWDB expects respondents to propose delivery of the full scope of the RFP, including both Service A and Service B. Proposals will be evaluated using the evaluation criteria identified in Section 8 of the RFP, including the respondent's understanding of the Network, technical approach, curriculum quality, occupational pathway design, implementation capacity, and cost effectiveness.

3. **Of the anticipated 980 unique participants, does SCWDB have an estimated distribution between participants expected to receive Service A, AI Industry Accelerator, and Service B, AI-Powered Career Readiness?**

   SCWDB does not currently have an estimated distribution between the two services. The Network is being designed to encourage eligible participants to take advantage of both the AI-Powered Career Readiness Workshop and an AI Industry Accelerator pathway when appropriate. However, SCWDB recognizes that participant needs will vary and that some individuals may complete only one of the two services.

   As stated in Section 4.1 of the RFP, the anticipated 980 unique participants is a **planning target and not a guaranteed minimum**. Actual participation in each service will depend upon referrals, individual participant needs, available funding, and implementation across participating Local Workforce Development Areas.

4. **Does SCWDB have preliminary estimates of expected participation across the five AI Industry Accelerator pathways: Manufacturing, Construction, Logistics, Healthcare, and Business Operations?**

   No. SCWDB has not established preliminary participation estimates or a projected percentage distribution among the five AI Industry Accelerator pathways.

   The five pathways were selected because they represent major industry sectors and occupational opportunities across Kentucky and provide broad applicability for a multi-region workforce initiative.

Actual pathway participation will be driven by participant employment goals, prior work experience, local labor-market conditions, employer demand, and referrals from participating Local Workforce Development Areas.

Respondents should therefore propose a delivery model that can accommodate variable demand across all five pathways rather than assuming a predetermined distribution.

5. **How many Kentucky Local Workforce Development Areas does SCWDB currently anticipate participating in the Network, and is there a preliminary estimate of the geographic distribution of in-person versus live-remote delivery?**

   At this time, nine of Kentucky's ten Local Workforce Development Areas, representing 97 counties, have provided Letters of Support for the proposed Kentucky AI Workforce Readiness Network. Final participation will remain subject to the grant award, available funding, and implementation agreements with participating workforce areas.

   SCWDB anticipates that live-remote instruction will be the most common and routine delivery method, allowing the Network to provide frequent and timely access to training across a large geographic area.

   In-person delivery is expected to be used strategically, particularly in connection with significant Rapid Response events, large-scale layoffs, plant closures, or other circumstances where concentrated groups of affected workers can benefit from onsite services. Respondents should nevertheless maintain the capacity to provide both live-remote and in-person instruction as required by the RFP.

6. **May a contractor incorporate a proprietary career-readiness technology platform into the live workshop experience and provide participants with continued access to that platform after the workshop, provided all required access is included in the proposed price and participants are not required to purchase software or subscriptions?**

   Yes. Respondents may propose the use of a proprietary career-readiness technology platform as part of the live instructional experience and may include continued participant access following completion of the workshop.

   Any proposed platform should be clearly described in the proposal, including its instructional purpose, licensing requirements, duration of participant access, accessibility features, data-retention practices, privacy protections, and any associated costs. All required participant access should be included in the respondent's proposed pricing unless otherwise clearly identified.

   Consistent with the RFP, participants may not be required to purchase software, subscriptions, equipment, or other technology as a condition of participation unless expressly approved and funded by SCWDB. Any platform used must also comply with applicable SCWDB requirements regarding privacy, data security, accessibility, and the handling of participant information.

7. **Regarding Section 9.12, can SCWDB clarify its anticipated treatment of pre-existing proprietary software, curriculum, instructional methodologies, and other intellectual property that a**

contractor brings to the engagement, as distinguished from materials developed specifically for the Kentucky AI Workforce Readiness Network?

SCWDB does not intend to require a contractor to transfer ownership of pre-existing proprietary software, curriculum, instructional methodologies, platforms, tools, or other intellectual property that the contractor owned or developed independently prior to this engagement.

Respondents should clearly identify any pre-existing or proprietary materials that they propose to use in delivering the services and describe any licensing, access, use, or other restrictions that would apply.

For curricula, materials, tools, or other deliverables developed or materially customized specifically for the Kentucky AI Workforce Readiness Network, final ownership and licensing terms will be addressed during contract negotiations. SCWDB anticipates requiring sufficient rights to review, administer, monitor, and continue the Network during the contract period and, where appropriate, after the contract concludes.

Respondents are encouraged to clearly distinguish in their proposals between:

- pre-existing proprietary intellectual property;
- third-party licensed products or platforms; and
- materials or deliverables that would be newly developed or substantially customized under the proposed contract.

Any final agreement regarding ownership, licensing, modification, reuse, statewide access, and post-contract use will be documented in the executed contract.

8. For the per-completed-participant pricing requested in Appendix B, should respondents propose their own definition and documentation standard for participant completion, or does SCWDB anticipate establishing a uniform completion standard during contracting?

SCWDB anticipates establishing and approving a uniform completion standard for each workshop as part of contract implementation and curriculum approval.

Respondents should describe in their proposals their recommended completion criteria and documentation practices, including attendance requirements, participation in required activities, assessments or demonstrations of learning, and any other criteria the respondent believes are appropriate for determining successful completion.

The final completion standard will be reviewed and approved by SCWDB and incorporated into the approved curriculum and contract requirements. The standard will be applied consistently for purposes of participant records, certificates of completion, performance reporting, and invoicing.

As required by the RFP, the Contractor must maintain verified attendance and completion records sufficient to support participant-level invoicing, grant monitoring, and audit requirements. A participant

will not be considered a completed participant for payment purposes solely because the individual registered for or attended a portion of a workshop.

---

9. **Is a respondent required to maintain a physical office in Kentucky, or may an out-of-state prime provide the live remote component and deploy qualified instructors locally for required in-person delivery?**

Response:
No. The RFP does not require a respondent to maintain a physical office in Kentucky. An out-of-state organization may serve as the prime contractor, provided it demonstrates the capacity to meet all requirements of the RFP, including live remote delivery, timely in-person delivery across participating Kentucky workforce regions, appropriate instructor coverage, administrative and financial capacity, and compliance with applicable federal, state, and SCWDB requirements.

Respondents should clearly describe how they will ensure sufficient instructor availability, local or regional deployment capacity, travel responsiveness, and continuity of services throughout the contract period.

10. **Are subcontractors or teaming partners permitted for occupational pathway specialization and local in-person facilitation, provided the prime retains accountability for curriculum, quality, reporting, and performance?**

Response:
Yes. Subcontractors and teaming partners are permitted. Respondents should identify proposed subcontractors or partners in their proposal and clearly describe their roles, qualifications, and responsibilities.

Consistent with Section 9.4 of the RFP, subcontractors must be disclosed and approved by SCWDB, and the prime contractor will remain fully responsible for contract performance, compliance, records, reporting, quality assurance, and payment of subcontractors.

SCWDB recognizes that a teaming model may be particularly useful for providing occupational-pathway expertise or geographically distributed in-person instruction.

11. **Does SCWDB expect respondents to propose all five occupational pathways—manufacturing, construction, logistics, healthcare, and business operations—at initial award, or may a bidder demonstrate a scalable core model with named pathway specialists activated by demand?**

Response:
Respondents are expected to address all five occupational pathways in their proposal. The RFP requires respondents to provide an outline and sample lesson segment for each pathway, and the selected contractor will ultimately be required to provide approved curricula for both workshops and all five pathways before participant delivery.

A respondent may, however, propose a scalable staffing and delivery model in which qualified pathway specialists are activated based upon participant demand. SCWDB does not expect every pathway to be delivered at the same frequency. The proposal must demonstrate that the respondent has a credible, timely, and sufficiently developed approach for delivering **each of the five pathways** when needed.

12. **Are there target cohort sizes, geographic service areas, or minimum in-person delivery frequencies that should be assumed for pricing before the September 4 addenda are issued?**

Response:
SCWDB has not established a required standard cohort size. As stated in the RFP, respondents should identify their recommended, minimum, and maximum class sizes for both live remote and in-person instruction. SCWDB does not guarantee minimum enrollment for any individual workshop or scheduled session.

The Network is intended for statewide or multi-region delivery. Nine of Kentucky's ten Local Workforce Development Areas, representing 97 counties, have currently provided Letters of Support; however, final geographic participation will depend upon the grant award, available funding, and participating LWA commitments. SCWDB anticipates that live remote instruction will be the most common routine delivery format, while in-person delivery may be used strategically for circumstances such as significant Rapid Response events, large layoffs, plant closures, or other concentrated participant needs.

SCWDB has not established a minimum frequency for in-person delivery. For pricing purposes, respondents should clearly identify their assumptions regarding cohort size, travel, minimum enrollment, cancellation charges, and any other conditions affecting price.

13. **Beyond attendance and completion, which employment or skill outcomes will carry the greatest weight in contractor performance evaluation?**

Response:
The RFP does not establish a separate weighted formula for post-award contractor performance outcomes beyond the proposal evaluation criteria in Section 8. Contractor performance will be evaluated principally on those outcomes and responsibilities that are within the contractor's reasonable control.

In addition to accurate attendance and completion documentation, SCWDB expects particular emphasis on:

- participant satisfaction and demonstrated or perceived skill gain;
- quality and relevance of instruction;
- instructor effectiveness and scheduling reliability;
- accessibility and participant engagement;

- timely and accurate reporting;
- continuous curriculum improvement based on participant and employer feedback; and
- compliance with data, privacy, documentation, and grant requirements.

The RFP also establishes a broader Network goal of helping participants obtain employment or paid work-based learning within six months of enrollment. However, SCWDB recognizes that employment outcomes depend on the combined efforts of the participating LWAs, Career Advisors, employers, participants, and other partners.

---

14. May an out-of-state U.S. for-profit corporation serve as prime contractor if it can deliver live remote instruction and satisfy all program requirements, or is a Kentucky presence required?

Response:
Yes. The RFP does not require the prime contractor to maintain a physical office or other established presence in Kentucky. An out-of-state U.S. for-profit corporation may serve as the prime contractor provided it can satisfy all requirements of the RFP, including live remote and in-person delivery, instructor availability, administrative and financial capacity, reporting, accessibility, data-security requirements, and compliance with applicable federal, state, and SCWDB requirements.

Respondents should demonstrate how they will provide reliable statewide or multi-region service, including the ability to deploy qualified instructors for in-person delivery when requested. The RFP expressly permits private businesses and qualified teams or partnerships to respond.

15. May a prime use qualified instructors or subject-matter subcontractors, and if so, are there specific minimum instructor credentials or prior-workforce-training experience requirements?

Response:
Yes. A prime contractor may use qualified instructors, subcontractors, or subject-matter experts. Proposed subcontractors should be disclosed in the proposal and will be subject to SCWDB approval. The prime contractor remains fully responsible for contract performance, compliance, records, quality, and payment.

The RFP does not prescribe a specific degree, certification, or professional license for individual instructors. However, the respondent must demonstrate qualified instructional staff with relevant AI literacy, workforce, industry, and facilitation experience, as well as the ability to provide engaging live instruction to adult learners with varied backgrounds and digital skill levels. The organization must also have at least three years of relevant experience in adult education, workforce training, career-readiness instruction, AI/digital-skills training, or closely related services.

Respondents should therefore explain how the qualifications and experience of each proposed instructor or subject-matter specialist support the particular services or occupational pathways they will deliver.

16. **Is there a stated contract ceiling, target budget, expected participant volume, or minimum delivery capacity bidders should use for pricing?**

Response:
SCWDB has not established a final contract ceiling or target budget for this procurement. Final funding and service volume will depend upon the Reskill DWG award, SCWDB's allocation or subaward, participating LWA commitments, negotiated pricing, and actual participant referrals.

For planning purposes, the RFP identifies an anticipated capacity of approximately **980 unique participants** during the contract period. Participants may complete the AI-Powered Career Readiness Workshop, an AI Industry Accelerator pathway, or both. The 980-participant figure is a planning target only and does not guarantee a minimum number of participants, completions, classes, referrals, or payments.

SCWDB does not guarantee a minimum enrollment for any individual workshop or scheduled session.

17. **For the healthcare occupational pathway, is the Board seeking general responsible-AI/workflow literacy for healthcare workers, or training tied to specific clinical systems or regulated clinical decision-making?**

Response:
The healthcare pathway is intended to focus primarily on responsible AI literacy and practical administrative or operational workplace applications, rather than training participants to use AI for regulated clinical decision-making.

The RFP identifies illustrative healthcare content such as nonclinical and administrative workflows, communication, scheduling, documentation support, information organization, privacy awareness, and appropriate limits on AI use.

Across all pathways, the curriculum must emphasize human review, fact-checking, verification, privacy, cybersecurity, confidentiality, employer policies, and appropriate workplace use.

Accordingly, SCWDB is not requiring training tied to a particular electronic health record, clinical AI system, or licensed clinical decision-making process. A proposed healthcare curriculum centered on operational/workforce productivity, privacy, accuracy, safe prompting, human oversight, and appropriate boundaries on AI use would be consistent with the intent of the RFP.

18. **Are live demonstrations or an existing LMS/content platform required at proposal submission, or may bidders propose a live instructor-led curriculum and supporting digital materials that are finalized during implementation?**

Response:
An existing LMS or fully developed proprietary content platform is not required at the time of proposal submission.

Respondents are required to provide representative sample materials with their proposals, including slides, participant activities, assessment items, certificate or badge examples, and an example instructor guide.

The proposal should also describe the respondent's technical approach, curriculum design, proposed tools, delivery model, participant engagement, staffing, and implementation plan. Final curricula, instructor guides, participant materials, learning objectives, exercises, assessments, accessibility review, and completion requirements are expected to be finalized and approved during implementation and before the first participant delivery.

SCWDB may invite finalists to participate in an interview or live training demonstration as part of the evaluation process, but such a demonstration is not identified as a mandatory component of the initial proposal submission.

A respondent may therefore propose a live instructor-led curriculum supported by digital materials that will be further developed, customized, and approved during the implementation period.

---

19. **May a recently formed legal entity satisfy the three-year minimum through the experience of its founder/key personnel or affiliated/predecessor entities?**

Response:

Yes, SCWDB may consider clearly documented relevant experience of key personnel, affiliated entities, or predecessor organizations when evaluating the three-year experience requirement, particularly where the respondent can demonstrate meaningful continuity of leadership, personnel, operations, or service delivery.

The proposal must clearly distinguish between experience performed by the responding legal entity and experience performed by an individual, affiliate, or predecessor organization. Respondents should not attribute prior work to the newly formed entity if that entity did not actually perform the work.

SCWDB will consider the totality of the respondent's demonstrated experience and current organizational capacity. Reliance on prior individual or affiliated-entity experience does not relieve the prime respondent of responsibility for demonstrating that the current organization has the staffing, systems, financial capacity, management structure, and ability necessary to successfully perform the contract.

20. **May Appendix C references include engagements performed by key personnel, affiliates, or predecessor entities?**

Response:

Yes. Appendix C references may include relevant comparable engagements performed by key personnel, affiliated organizations, or predecessor entities when those engagements are being relied upon to demonstrate the qualifications and experience of the proposed project team.

Each reference must clearly identify:

- the organization or individual that actually performed the work;
- that party's relationship to the current respondent;
- the role of the proposed key personnel in the referenced engagement; and
- the nature and scope of the comparable services provided.

Respondents are encouraged to provide references that most directly demonstrate the experience and capacity of the individuals and organizations that will actually perform the proposed services. SCWDB reserves the right to consider the degree to which referenced experience is attributable to the prime respondent itself when evaluating organizational experience and capacity.

Appendix C requires three references for comparable work completed within the last five years, but it does not expressly state that all three contracts must have been held directly by the current prime legal entity.

21. Can an experienced subcontractor satisfy the three-year qualification, or must the experienced organization be the prime?

Response:

A respondent may use a teaming or subcontracting structure to demonstrate the experience and capacity of the proposed delivery team. SCWDB will consider the relevant experience of substantive subcontractors and team members when evaluating whether the proposed team possesses the qualifications necessary to perform the scope of work.

The experienced organization is not necessarily required to serve as the prime respondent solely because it provides qualifying technical or instructional experience. However, the prime respondent must demonstrate sufficient overall organizational, administrative, financial, management, and contract-management capacity to serve as the accountable contracting entity.

The proposal should clearly identify each subcontractor or teaming partner, the services it will perform, its qualifications, and how responsibilities will be managed. Consistent with the RFP, all subcontractors remain subject to SCWDB approval, and the prime contractor remains fully responsible for performance, compliance, records, and payment.

---

22. Is there an anticipated contract budget, funding ceiling, or preferred pricing structure for the AI Industry Accelerator and Career Readiness services?

Response:
Please see the response to **Question 16** in the previously published Questions & Answers.

As previously stated, SCWDB has not established a final contract ceiling or target budget for this procurement. Final funding and service volume will depend upon the Reskill DWG award, SCWDB's allocation or subaward, participating LWA commitments, negotiated pricing, and actual participant referrals.

For planning purposes, the RFP identifies an anticipated capacity of approximately 980 unique participants during the contract period. The RFP requests scalable pricing, including per-completed-participant pricing, cohort or session pricing where applicable, volume discounts, in-person delivery costs, and disclosure of other assumptions that may affect total cost.

23. **Is there an estimated number of participants/cohorts expected annually, and any expected split between in-person and live-remote delivery?**

Response:
Please also see above responses to **Questions 3, 5, 12, and 16**.

SCWDB has identified approximately 980 unique participants over the anticipated contract period as a planning target but has not established an annual participant target or guaranteed number of cohorts. The 980-participant figure is not a guaranteed minimum number of referrals, completions, classes, or payments.

SCWDB has also not established a predetermined split between in-person and live-remote delivery. As previously stated, live-remote instruction is anticipated to be the most common and routine delivery method, while in-person instruction is expected to be used strategically, including for significant Rapid Response events, large layoffs, plant closures, or other situations involving concentrated groups of affected workers.

Respondents should propose a scalable delivery and pricing model that can accommodate variations in participant volume, cohort size, geography, and delivery modality.

24. **May a proposer use a blended delivery model in which live instruction is supported by AI-enabled practice, feedback, and workflow tools between sessions?**

Response:
Yes. A respondent may propose a blended instructional model in which required live instructor-led training is supplemented by AI-enabled practice, feedback, digital resources, workflow tools, or other learning activities before, between, or following live sessions.

Consistent with the RFP, however, supplemental technology or self-directed activities may support but not replace the required live instruction unless expressly approved by SCWDB.

Any proposed technology should be clearly described in the proposal, including its instructional purpose, accessibility, licensing or subscription requirements, privacy and data-security practices, duration of participant access, and associated costs. Participants may not be required to independently purchase software, subscriptions, or equipment unless expressly approved and funded by SCWDB.

Please also see the response to **Question 6** regarding the use of proprietary career-readiness technology platforms.

25. Are subcontractors or specialist instructors permitted, and if so, are there particular disclosures or forms required at proposal time?

Response:
Please see above responses to **Questions 10, 15, and 21**.

Yes. Respondents may use subcontractors, teaming partners, specialist instructors, or subject-matter experts. The prime respondent remains fully responsible for contract performance, curriculum quality, compliance, reporting, records, and payment.

At proposal submission, respondents should identify proposed subcontractors in the Proposal Cover Sheet and describe relevant subcontractors, specialist instructors, or teaming arrangements within the applicable technical approach, staffing, organizational-capacity, and work-plan sections of the proposal. Respondents should identify each party's proposed role, responsibilities, qualifications, and relationship to the prime respondent.

SCWDB has not established a separate subcontractor form beyond the proposal requirements contained in the RFP. Any subcontractors ultimately used under the contract will remain subject to SCWDB review and approval.

26. For the occupational pathways—manufacturing, construction, logistics, healthcare, and business operations—does SCWDB expect separate pathway curricula at launch, or may a common AI foundation be paired with pathway-specific applied modules?

Response:
A common foundational AI curriculum paired with distinct pathway-specific applied modules is an acceptable approach, provided the resulting training satisfies all requirements of the RFP for each of the five occupational pathways.

SCWDB recognizes that foundational topics—such as responsible AI use, prompting, verification, privacy, cybersecurity, bias awareness, human oversight, and appropriate workplace use—may appropriately be shared across multiple pathways.

However, each pathway must also contain sufficient occupation-specific applications, scenarios, exercises, and examples to demonstrate meaningful relevance to workers and employers in Manufacturing, Construction, Logistics, Healthcare, and Business Operations.

As stated in the response to Question 11, respondents are expected to address all five pathways in their proposal. The selected contractor must be capable of providing approved curriculum for all five pathways before participant delivery, although pathway specialists and individual pathway offerings may be activated based on actual participant demand.

27. Are there minimum prior-contract size, years-in-business, or workforce-training reference requirements beyond those stated in the RFP?

Response:
No. SCWDB has not established additional minimum requirements for prior contract value, organizational age, or workforce-training references beyond the qualifications and submission requirements stated in the RFP and clarified in the previously published Questions & Answers.

Please see particularly the responses to **Questions 19, 20, and 21** regarding recently formed entities, experience attributable to key personnel or predecessor/affiliated organizations, references, and teaming arrangements.

SCWDB will evaluate the totality of each respondent's demonstrated experience, proposed personnel, organizational and financial capacity, relevant references, technical approach, and ability to successfully perform the proposed scope of work. A larger prior contract value or longer organizational history is not, by itself, an additional threshold requirement unless expressly stated in the RFP.

---

28. Employer / Industry Validation

Question: Section 3.4 calls for an initial design and validation process with SCWDB and designated employers or industry representatives. Does SCWDB expect respondents to provide evidence of employer or industry validation as part of the proposal, or is it acceptable to describe a proposed validation process that would be completed with SCWDB-designated employers and industry representatives during implementation?

Response:

It is acceptable for respondents to describe a proposed employer and industry validation process that would be completed during implementation in collaboration with SCWDB and designated employers or industry representatives.

SCWDB does not require respondents to provide completed employer validation for all proposed curricula at the time of proposal submission. However, proposals should demonstrate a clear understanding of employer-driven curriculum design and describe how the respondent will obtain, document, and incorporate employer or industry feedback into the AI-Powered Career Readiness Workshop and each of the five AI Industry Accelerator pathways.

Respondents may include existing employer partnerships, prior validation activities, letters of support, advisory relationships, or other evidence of industry engagement if available, and such information may help demonstrate relevant experience and capacity. However, this is not a prerequisite for responsiveness unless otherwise required by the RFP.

The selected contractor will be expected to participate in the formal design and validation process with SCWDB-designated employers or industry representatives during implementation and to incorporate approved feedback before and throughout service delivery.

29. Digital Badge / Micro credential

Question: The RFP states that a digital badge or micro credential option is strongly preferred. Would a contractor-issued, competency-based digital badge or certificate of completion satisfy this preference, or is SCWDB seeking a third-party or externally accredited credential?

Suggested Response:

SCWDB is not requiring a third-party or externally accredited credential for this procurement.

A contractor-issued, competency-based digital badge or microcredential may satisfy the RFP's stated preference, provided it represents meaningful completion or demonstrated competency and provides participants with a usable record of the skills or learning outcomes achieved.

At a minimum, the RFP requires participants to receive a certificate of completion. A digital badge or micro credential is strongly preferred as an enhancement to that requirement. Respondents should describe the proposed credentialing approach, including:

- the skills or competencies represented;
- the criteria required to earn the badge or credential;
- how completion or competency will be verified;
- whether the credential can be digitally shared or verified by employers; and
- any licensing, platform, or per-participant costs.

SCWDB will evaluate the value and credibility of the proposed credential in the context of the overall curriculum and participant experience. Third-party recognition, external accreditation, or employer recognition may strengthen a proposal, but is not required.

---

30. Participant Distribution

Question: Of the approximately 980 anticipated unique participants, does SCWDB have a planning estimate for the percentage expected to participate in the AI-Powered Career Readiness Workshop, an AI Industry Accelerator pathway, or both?

Response:
Please see the responses to **Questions 3, 16, and 23**.

SCWDB does not currently have a planning estimate for the percentage of participants who will complete only the AI-Powered Career Readiness Workshop, only an AI Industry Accelerator pathway, or both services.

The Network is intended to encourage eligible participants to take advantage of both services when appropriate, but individual participation will depend upon participant needs, employment goals,

referrals, available funding, and the individualized service approach used by the participating Local Workforce Development Area.

The approximately 980 unique participants identified in the RFP remains a planning target and does not represent a guaranteed distribution among the two services. Respondents should therefore propose a scalable delivery and pricing model that can accommodate variation in service utilization.

31. Occupational Pathway Demand

Question: Should respondents assume that all five AI Industry Accelerator pathways—manufacturing, construction, logistics, healthcare, and business operations—must be continuously available throughout the contract period, or may delivery frequency be adjusted based on participant referrals and employer/LWA demand?

Response:
Please see the responses to **Questions 4, 11, and 26**.

Respondents must demonstrate the capacity to provide all five occupational pathways, and approved curriculum for all five pathways must be available before participant delivery begins.

However, SCWDB does **not** expect each pathway to be delivered at the same frequency or on a continuous fixed schedule. Individual pathway frequency may be adjusted based on participant referrals, employment goals, employer demand, participating LWA needs, and other implementation considerations.

Respondents should propose a delivery model that allows each pathway to be made available within a reasonable timeframe when demand exists while avoiding unnecessary delivery of sessions for which there is insufficient participant demand.

32. Technology Access

Question: Should respondents assume that participants will have access to computers, reliable internet connectivity, and any required AI platforms or accounts during SCWDB/LWA-hosted training, or should respondents include technology access and AI-platform licensing within proposed pricing?

Response:
Respondents should not assume that every participant will have an individual computer, active email account, personal AI subscription, or ability to establish a new technology account.

For in-person training hosted by SCWDB or a participating LWA, the host will generally coordinate an appropriate training location with standard internet connectivity and basic presentation equipment when available. However, available technology may vary by location.

Respondents must clearly identify in their proposal any required:

- participant devices;
- internet or bandwidth requirements;

- software or AI platforms;
- user accounts;
- licenses or subscriptions; and
- specialized equipment or technology.

Any technology or licensing costs necessary to deliver the respondent's proposed instructional model should be clearly identified in the proposed pricing.

Please also see **Questions 6 and 24** regarding proprietary platforms and supplemental AI-enabled learning tools. Participants may not be required to independently purchase software, subscriptions, or equipment unless expressly approved and funded by SCWDB.

33. Curriculum and Intellectual Property

Question: For curriculum, instructional materials, frameworks, tools, templates, or other intellectual property developed by the contractor prior to award, may the contractor retain ownership while granting SCWDB appropriate rights to use materials developed or customized under the contract?

Response:
Please see the response to **Question 7**.

Yes. SCWDB does not intend to require a contractor to transfer ownership of pre-existing proprietary curriculum, instructional materials, frameworks, tools, templates, platforms, methodologies, or other intellectual property developed independently prior to this engagement.

Respondents should clearly identify pre-existing proprietary intellectual property in their proposals and describe any applicable licensing, access, use, modification, or post-contract restrictions.

For materials developed or materially customized specifically for the Kentucky AI Workforce Readiness Network, final ownership and licensing terms will be established through contract negotiation. SCWDB anticipates requiring sufficient rights to review, administer, monitor, use, and continue the Network as appropriate.

Final intellectual-property and licensing provisions will be documented in the executed contract.

34. Certificates and Digital Credentials

Question: The RFP identifies certificates of completion and expresses a preference for digital badges or micro credentials. Would a contractor-issued digital credential or micro credential be acceptable, provided the contractor can document completion standards and verification procedures, or does SCWDB anticipate a specific third-party credentialing requirement?

Response:
Please see the previously provided response regarding Digital Badge / Micro-credential.

SCWDB does **not** require a specific third-party or externally accredited credential.

A contractor-issued, competency-based digital badge or micro-credential is acceptable provided the respondent can clearly describe:

- the skills or competencies represented;
- the criteria required to earn the credential;
- how participant completion or competency is verified;
- how the credential may be documented or shared; and
- any associated platform, licensing, or participant costs.

A certificate of completion remains a minimum requirement. A meaningful digital badge or micro credential is strongly preferred as an enhancement to that requirement. Third-party accreditation or employer recognition may strengthen a proposed credential but is not required.

35. Instructor and SME Staffing

Question: Must every proposed instructor and occupational-pathway subject-matter specialist be identified by name in the proposal, or may respondents identify key personnel at proposal submission and add qualified instructors or SMEs during implementation subject to SCWDB approval?

Response:
Please see the responses to **Questions 15 and 25**.

Respondents should identify the key personnel who will have primary responsibility for contract management, curriculum development, instructional leadership, quality assurance, and other major functions, and should provide sufficient information to allow SCWDB to evaluate the qualifications and capacity of the proposed team.

SCWDB does not require every potential instructor or subject-matter specialist who may ultimately provide services during the entire contract period to be identified by name at proposal submission.

Respondents may add or substitute qualified instructors or occupational-pathway SMEs during implementation, provided replacement personnel meet the qualifications and experience appropriate to the services being provided and comply with any applicable staffing or approval requirements established in the final contract.

Respondents should also explain their staffing model, instructor coverage, recruitment or replacement process, and how they will maintain consistent instructional quality throughout the contract period.

36. Payment Structure

Question: Does SCWDB anticipate payment primarily on a per-completed-participant basis, or may respondents separately price items such as initial curriculum development/customization, mobilization, cohort delivery, and participant completion?

Response:
Please see the responses to **Questions 16 and 22**.

SCWDB prefers a pricing structure that provides clear, scalable costs tied to verified deliverables and participant completion, but respondents may separately price appropriate components of the proposed scope.

As identified in the RFP, respondents may propose costs for items including:

- one-time curriculum development, customization, implementation, or launch;
- per-completed-participant delivery;
- alternative cohort or session pricing;
- in-person delivery;
- approved travel;
- technology, software, licensing, or digital credential costs; and
- other optional services clearly separated from the base proposal.

Respondents should clearly explain all pricing assumptions and distinguish one-time costs, fixed costs, unit costs, participant-based costs, and any costs requiring separate authorization.

Final payment terms and contract structure will be determined during contract negotiation and must comply with applicable federal funding requirements.

37. Cancellations and Minimum Enrollment

Question: The August 24 Q&A asks respondents to state assumptions regarding minimum enrollment and cancellation charges. Does SCWDB have a preferred advance cancellation window or minimum participant threshold that respondents should use when developing pricing?

Response:
Please see the responses to **Questions 12, 16, and 23**.

SCWDB has not established a preferred advance cancellation window or required minimum participant threshold for purposes of proposal pricing.

Respondents should identify their own recommended:

- minimum, preferred, and maximum class sizes;
- minimum enrollment requirements, if any;
- minimum cohort or session charges;
- advance cancellation or rescheduling requirements;

- cancellation charges, if any; and
- other conditions that could affect pricing when enrollment is lower than anticipated.

SCWDB does not guarantee minimum enrollment for any individual workshop or scheduled session. Respondents are encouraged to propose reasonable and flexible terms that recognize the referral-driven nature of the Network and SCWDB's objective of providing participants with timely access to training.

Proposed cancellation and minimum-enrollment terms will be considered as part of the overall evaluation of pricing, scalability, flexibility, and cost effectiveness.

---

38. Subcontractors / Teaming Arrangement for In-Person Kentucky Delivery

Question: May a proposer use subcontractors or a teaming arrangement to satisfy the in-person Kentucky delivery requirement while the prime provides curriculum, instructor-led virtual delivery, responsible-AI content, and program oversight?

Response:
Yes. Please see the responses to **Questions 10, 15, 21, and 25**.

SCWDB permits the use of subcontractors, teaming partners, specialist instructors, and subject-matter experts. A proposer may use such a structure to support required in-person delivery in Kentucky while the prime contractor provides curriculum development, live remote instruction, responsible-AI content, program management, quality assurance, reporting, and other contract functions.

The proposal should clearly identify each proposed subcontractor or teaming partner, describe its role and qualifications, and explain how the prime will coordinate and oversee performance. Consistent with the RFP, subcontractors must be disclosed and approved by SCWDB, and the prime contractor remains fully responsible for contract performance, compliance, records, reporting, quality, and payment.

The teaming structure must still demonstrate the capacity to provide both live-remote and in-person services across participating Kentucky workforce regions as required by the RFP.

39. Out-of-State Proposer / Kentucky Physical Presence

Question: Is an out-of-state proposer eligible if it can demonstrate a compliant in-state delivery model for required in-person services, or is an existing Kentucky physical presence required at proposal submission?

Response:
Yes. Please see the responses to **Questions 9 and 14**.

An out-of-state proposer is eligible to serve as the prime contractor. The RFP does **not require an existing Kentucky office, facility, or other physical presence at the time of proposal submission**.

The respondent must, however, demonstrate a credible and compliant delivery model that satisfies all RFP requirements, including the ability to provide timely in-person services within Kentucky when needed, maintain appropriate instructor coverage, support statewide or multi-region delivery, and meet all administrative, financial, accessibility, data-security, and compliance requirements.

An in-state delivery model may be accomplished through the respondent's own personnel, approved subcontractors, or qualified teaming partners, provided the prime contractor retains full responsibility for contract performance.

_____

40. **Question:** What is the anticipated number of participants expected to enroll in the AI Industry Accelerator versus the AI-Powered Career Readiness component, and what average cohort size should proposers assume for pricing purposes?

Response: Please see Questions 3, 12, 16, 23, and 30. SCWDB has not established an anticipated distribution between the two services or a standard average cohort size for pricing purposes. Respondents should use their own reasonable class-size and pricing assumptions and clearly disclose those assumptions in their proposals.

41. **Question:** Should the proposed per-completed-participant rate include all costs associated with occasional in-person delivery, including instructor travel and lodging, or may those costs be invoiced separately when in-person training is requested by SCWDB or a Local Workforce Development Area?

Response: Please see Questions 16, 22, and 36. Respondents are not required to include all occasional in-person travel and lodging costs within the per-completed-participant rate. The RFP permits respondents to separately identify in-person delivery costs and approved travel. Respondents should clearly state what is included in their unit pricing, what would be billed separately, and any travel assumptions or limitations. Final payment terms will be established during contract negotiation.

42. **Question:** For purposes of the per-completed-participant pricing model, how will SCWDB define a "completed participant"? For example, will completion be based on attendance requirements, completion of assessments, receipt of a certificate or credential, or another defined standard?

Response: Please see Question 8. SCWDB anticipates establishing and approving a uniform completion standard for each workshop during implementation and curriculum approval. Respondents should propose recommended completion criteria and documentation practices. The final standard may include attendance, required activities, assessments or demonstrations of learning, and other approved criteria. Registration or partial attendance alone will not qualify as completion for payment purposes.

---

43. Three-Year Minimum Qualification / Newly Formed Prime

Question: For the minimum qualification requiring at least three years of relevant experience, may a newly formed prime respondent satisfy this requirement through the documented relevant experience of its key personnel and/or disclosed, approved subcontractors or teaming partners, provided the prime remains fully responsible for performance and compliance?

Response:

Please see the responses to **Questions 19 and 21**, as clarified herein.

SCWDB will consider the relevant experience of key personnel, predecessor or affiliated entities, subcontractors, and teaming partners when evaluating the overall qualifications and capacity of the proposed delivery team. However, the prime respondent remains responsible for demonstrating compliance with the minimum qualifications stated in Section 5.1 of the RFP, including the requirement for at least three years of relevant experience.

A newly formed prime respondent should clearly distinguish between experience performed by the legal entity itself and experience attributable to its key personnel, predecessor or affiliated organizations, subcontractors, or teaming partners. Such experience may support SCWDB's evaluation of the respondent's overall capacity, but should not be represented as experience of the prime legal entity if that entity did not perform the work.

The prime respondent must also independently demonstrate sufficient organizational, administrative, financial, management, and contract-management capacity to serve as the accountable contracting entity.

44. Appendix C References / Work Performed Before Formation of the Prime

Question: Relatedly, for the three comparable references required in Appendix C, may references reflect comparable work performed by those key personnel or approved subcontractors/team members before formation of the prime respondent, if the proposal clearly identifies the individual or organization that performed the referenced work and its role on the proposed team?

Response:

Please see the response to **Question 20**.

Yes. Appendix C references may include comparable work performed by key personnel, predecessor or affiliated organizations, subcontractors, or teaming partners when that experience is being relied upon to demonstrate the qualifications of the proposed project team.

The proposal should clearly identify:

- the individual or organization that actually performed the referenced work;
- that party's relationship to the current prime respondent;
- the role that individual or organization will have on the proposed team; and
- the nature and scope of the comparable work performed.

Respondents should not attribute such work to the newly formed prime legal entity if the prime did not actually perform the work.

Appendix C requires three references for comparable work completed within the last five years, but it does not state that all three references must be contracts directly held by the prime respondent.

_____

45. Fully Remote Delivery
Question: Is a fully remote delivery model acceptable, or must proposers provide an in-person delivery component within South Central Kentucky?
Response:
Please see **Questions 5, 9, 12, 14, 23, 38, and 39**.

A fully remote-only delivery model would **not satisfy the RFP as written**. Although SCWDB anticipates that live-remote instruction will be the most common and routine delivery method, respondents must demonstrate the capacity to provide **both live-remote and in-person instruction** when requested. In-person delivery is not limited specifically to South Central Kentucky; the Network is intended for statewide or multi-region implementation.

A respondent may satisfy the in-person requirement through its own personnel or through disclosed and approved subcontractors or teaming partners, provided the prime remains fully responsible for performance.

46. Participant Volume / Cohort Size by Pathway
Question: Is there an estimated participant volume or expected cohort size by occupational pathway for pricing purposes?

Response:
Please see **Questions 4, 12, 16, 23, 30, 31, and 40**.

SCWDB has **not established projected participant volume by occupational pathway or a standard cohort size for pricing purposes**. Actual pathway demand will depend upon participant referrals, employment goals, employer demand, participating LWA needs, and other implementation factors.

Respondents should state their recommended, minimum, and maximum class sizes and clearly identify all related pricing assumptions.

47. Subcontract Instructors / Subject-Matter Experts
Question: May a proposer use qualified subcontract instructors or subject-matter experts while retaining responsibility for curriculum, platform, quality assurance, and program management?

Response:
Yes. Please see **Questions 10, 15, 25, and 38**.

Respondents may use qualified subcontractors, specialist instructors, and subject-matter experts. Proposed subcontractors must be disclosed and are subject to SCWDB approval. The prime contractor remains fully responsible for curriculum, quality, compliance, reporting, records, program management, and overall contract performance.

48. Prior Contract Value / Organizational History / WIOA-DOL Experience
Question: Are there minimum prior workforce-training contract values, years of organizational operating history, or specific WIOA/DOL past-performance requirements that proposers must demonstrate?

Response:
Please see **Questions 15, 27, 43, and 44**.

SCWDB has not established a minimum prior contract value or a specific minimum number of years in business beyond the qualifications stated in the RFP. The RFP does require at least three years of relevant experience and requires the respondent to demonstrate sufficient organizational, administrative, financial, and instructional capacity.

Prior experience serving dislocated workers, RESEA participants, Rapid Response customers, Unemployment Insurance claimants, or WIOA participants is identified as a **preferred qualification**, not a separate minimum eligibility requirement.

Respondents should also refer to **Questions 43 and 44** for the controlling clarification regarding newly formed entities, team experience, and references.

49. Proposer-Provided Learning Platform
Question: Is use of a proposer-provided learning platform permitted for curriculum delivery, labs, assessment, learner progress tracking, and reporting, provided required data/privacy controls are met?

Response:
Yes. Please see **Questions 6, 18, 24, and 32**.

A proposer-provided learning or technology platform may be incorporated into the instructional model, including for supplemental learning activities, assessments, practice, and learner support, provided

the platform complies with applicable accessibility, privacy, security, licensing, and data-handling requirements.

However, two qualifications apply:

- technology or self-directed content may supplement, but generally may not replace, the required live instructor-led training; and
- systems used for participant registration, attendance, surveys, data transfer, or official reporting must comply with SCWDB approval and data-security requirements.

Respondents should clearly describe the platform, its functions, licensing, data practices, accessibility, and associated costs.

50. Vendor Registrations / Insurance / Kentucky Business Requirements
Question: Are there required vendor registrations, insurance limits, or Kentucky-specific business qualifications that must be completed before proposal submission rather than before contract execution?

Response:
The RFP does **not identify specific insurance limits or a separate Kentucky physical-presence requirement that must be satisfied before proposal submission**.

At proposal submission, respondents must complete the required assurances and certifications and must be legally authorized to conduct business and provide the proposed services. The RFP also requires applicable disclosures regarding matters such as debarment, conflicts of interest, litigation/audit findings, and other required certifications.

The RFP states that the selected contractor will be required to maintain insurance and accept indemnification and risk-allocation terms acceptable to SCWDB; specific final requirements may therefore be established during contract negotiation. Likewise, subcontractors must be disclosed and approved in writing.

Accordingly, respondents should disclose their current legal and organizational status and identify any registrations, authorizations, or other requirements that would need to be completed before contract execution or commencement of services. Any required federal, state, or SCWDB approvals must be satisfied before SCWDB issues a notice to proceed.

---

51. Contract Budget / Ceiling / Target Price Range
Question: Is there an anticipated total contract budget, ceiling, or target price range for the initial term through June 30, 2029?

Response:
Please see **Questions 16, 22, and 36**.

SCWDB has **not established a final contract ceiling, total contract budget, or target price range** for the anticipated term through June 30, 2029. Final funding and service volume will depend upon the Reskill DWG award, SCWDB's allocation or subaward, participating LWA commitments, negotiated pricing, and actual participant referrals.

Respondents should provide transparent and scalable pricing consistent with the pricing requirements in the RFP.

52. Out-of-State Prime Contractor
Question: May an out-of-state organization serve as the prime contractor if it can satisfy the required in-person delivery footprint in Kentucky?

Response:
Yes. Please see **Questions 9, 14, and 39**.

The RFP does not require the prime contractor to maintain an existing Kentucky office or physical presence. An out-of-state organization may serve as prime provided it demonstrates the ability to satisfy all RFP requirements, including timely in-person delivery within Kentucky when needed.

53. Subcontractors for In-Person or Specialized Instruction
Question: Are subcontractors permitted for in-person facilitation or specialized occupational-pathway instruction, and if so, are there any required disclosures or limits?

Response:
Yes. Please see **Questions 10, 15, 25, 38, and 47**.

Subcontractors, teaming partners, specialist instructors, and subject-matter experts are permitted. Proposed subcontractors must be disclosed, their roles and qualifications described, and they are subject to SCWDB approval. The prime contractor remains fully responsible for performance, compliance, records, reporting, quality, and payment.

The RFP does not establish a numerical limit on the number of subcontractors.

54. Required WIOA/DWG or Government-Funded Past Performance
Question: Is there a minimum required level of prior workforce-board, WIOA/DWG, or government-funded training past performance, or may comparable enterprise/education AI training experience satisfy the experience requirement?

Response:
Please see **Questions 15, 27, 43, 44, and 48**.

The RFP does not require a minimum amount of prior WIOA, DWG, workforce-board, or government-funded training experience as a separate threshold qualification.
Section 5.1 requires at least three years of relevant experience in adult education, workforce training, career-readiness instruction, AI/digital-skills training, or closely related services. Accordingly, comparable enterprise, educational, or other AI/digital-skills training experience may be relevant to satisfying the experience requirement if it is sufficiently comparable to the services contemplated by the RFP.

Experience serving dislocated workers, RESEA participants, Rapid Response customers, UI claimants, or WIOA participants is identified as a **preferred qualification**, rather than a minimum requirement.

55. Digital Learning Platform / AI Practice Environment
Question: Are bidders permitted to include a supporting digital learning platform, AI practice environment, assessments, learner analytics, and reusable training resources as part of the proposed delivery model, provided the required instruction remains live and instructor-led?

Response:
Yes. Please see **Questions 6, 18, 24, 32, and 49**.

Respondents may incorporate supporting digital platforms, AI practice environments, assessments, learner resources, and related technology into their proposed instructional model, provided the required instruction remains live and instructor-led and all applicable accessibility, licensing, privacy, security, and data-management requirements are satisfied.

Respondents should clearly describe the platform, its instructional purpose, data practices, participant access, licensing, costs, and any proposed use for learner progress or reporting.

56. Learner Volumes by Pathway, Cohort, Region, or Year
Question: Are there minimum or estimated learner volumes by pathway, cohort, region, or year that should be used for pricing?

Response:
Please see **Questions 3, 4, 12, 16, 23, 30, 31, 40, and 46**.

No. SCWDB has not established guaranteed or estimated participant volumes by individual pathway, cohort, region, or year. Approximately 980 unique participants over the contract period is the overall planning target, but it is not a guaranteed minimum.

Respondents should develop scalable pricing and clearly state their assumptions regarding class size, minimum enrollment, pathway demand, and delivery modality.

57. Travel and Facility Costs
Question: Are travel and facility costs expected to be included in the proposed unit pricing, or may they be priced separately?

Response:
Please see **Questions 16, 22, 36, and 41**.

Respondents may separately identify in-person delivery and approved travel costs, including applicable instructor travel and lodging, rather than incorporating all such costs into the per-completed-participant rate. Respondents should clearly state what is included in each unit price and what would require separate authorization or invoicing.

For in-person delivery, SCWDB or the participating LWA will generally coordinate an appropriate training location with standard internet connectivity and basic presentation equipment when available.

If the respondent's delivery model requires specialized facilities, equipment, technology, or other costs beyond what is normally provided by the host, those requirements and costs should be clearly identified in the proposal.

---

58. Participant Volume and Pricing
Question: The RFP references an estimated participant volume. For proposal pricing, should respondents treat that figure solely as a planning estimate with payment tied to actual authorized/enrolled/completed participants, or does SCWDB prefer a fixed-price structure based on the estimate?

Response:
Please see **Questions 16, 22, 36, 40, 51, and 56**.

The approximately **980 unique participants is a planning estimate only** and is not a guaranteed volume or commitment. SCWDB does not expect respondents to treat the estimate as a guaranteed fixed-price quantity.

SCWDB prefers scalable pricing tied to verified deliverables and participant completion, although the final contract may use fixed-price, unit-price, cost-reimbursement, or another federally allowable structure established during negotiation. Payment will be based on the final contract terms and actual authorized services rather than the 980-participant planning estimate alone. The RFP expressly allows both participant-based and other pricing components.

59. Completion Evidence
Question: Will SCWDB prescribe a required definition of participant completion and required supporting fields/evidence, or may respondents propose a completion standard and reporting schema for SCWDB approval during implementation?

Response:
Please see **Questions 8 and 42**.

Respondents should propose recommended completion criteria and documentation practices. SCWDB will establish and approve the uniform final completion standard during implementation and curriculum approval.

The final standard may include attendance, required activities, assessments or demonstrations of learning, and other approved criteria. It will be used consistently for participant records, certificates, reporting, and invoicing. Registration or partial attendance alone will not constitute completion for payment purposes.

60. Participant Data Systems
Question: Does SCWDB expect the selected contractor to maintain the system of record for participant enrollment/attendance/completion, or should the contractor integrate/export required evidence into an SCWDB or workforce-area system of record?

Response:
The RFP does not designate a contractor-provided platform as the sole system of record for the Network.

The contractor will be responsible for maintaining accurate attendance, completion, and supporting documentation and for providing timely participant-level data required for invoicing, monitoring, reporting, and audit. Systems used for participant registration, attendance, surveys, data transfer, and official reporting must be approved by SCWDB.

Respondents may propose technology or systems that support these functions, but should describe their ability to securely export, transfer, or integrate required information into SCWDB-approved or participating workforce-area systems and processes. Final system-of-record and data-transfer requirements will be established during implementation.

61. Live Remote Delivery
Question: Are there required videoconferencing platforms, identity/attendance verification methods, recording requirements, or restrictions that respondents should price and design around for routine live-remote instruction?

Response:
The RFP does not prescribe a specific videoconferencing platform, require routine recording of sessions, or establish a particular identity-verification technology.

Respondents should propose an appropriate live-remote delivery approach and explain how they will verify attendance, support participant engagement and accessibility, and comply with applicable privacy and data-security requirements.

The contractor must maintain verified attendance and completion records and provide those records within the required reporting timeframe. Any technology proposed for use must comply with SCWDB requirements regarding privacy, accessibility, licensing, data retention, and security.

If a respondent proposes recording sessions, the proposal should identify that practice and address participant notice, privacy, retention, access, and security.

62. In-Person Delivery and Travel
Question: Should travel for SCWDB-authorized in-person delivery be included within the proposed participant/fixed pricing, or may respondents identify travel as a separately controlled, pre-authorized reimbursable cost?

Response:
Please see **Questions 36, 41, and 57**.

Respondents may separately identify travel and other in-person delivery costs rather than including all such costs in the per-completed-participant rate.

Proposals should clearly state which travel costs are included in unit pricing, which would be separately invoiced, and any assumptions or limitations. Any separately billed travel or related costs would be subject to the final contract terms and appropriate SCWDB authorization.

63. Intellectual Property
Question: For reusable pre-existing software, curriculum frameworks, assessment methods, and instructional infrastructure used to deliver the program, will SCWDB accept a structure in which the contractor retains pre-existing IP while Kentucky-specific deliverables and usage rights are identified separately in the final agreement?

Response:
Yes. Please see **Questions 7 and 33**.

SCWDB does not intend to require transfer of ownership of pre-existing proprietary software, curriculum, methodologies, frameworks, tools, or other intellectual property developed independently before the engagement.

Respondents should clearly identify pre-existing IP and applicable restrictions. Ownership, licensing, reuse, modification, statewide access, and post-contract rights associated with materials developed or materially customized specifically for the Kentucky AI Workforce Readiness Network will be addressed in the final contract.

64. Subcontractors / Advisors Not Yet Finally Engaged
Question: If a respondent proposes qualified backup instructors or subject-matter experts who are not yet contractually committed at proposal submission, is it acceptable to identify their proposed roles/status and complete final engagement, screening, and SCWDB approval before performance?

Response:
Please see **Questions 10, 15, 25, 35, 38, 47, and 53**.

Yes, provided the proposal clearly distinguishes between committed personnel and proposed, contingent, or backup resources and provides sufficient information for SCWDB to evaluate the respondent's staffing capacity and delivery approach.

The RFP does not require every potential instructor or SME who may serve during the contract period to be under contract or identified by name at proposal submission. Respondents should identify key personnel and describe proposed instructor coverage, backup staffing, qualifications, and replacement processes.

Any individual or organization ultimately serving as a subcontractor must be disclosed and approved in accordance with the RFP before performing subcontracted services. Respondents should not represent proposed or contingent personnel as formally committed if that commitment has not yet been secured.

_____

65. Financial / Administrative Capacity Evidence
Question: What specific documentation, if any, should a respondent submit with its proposal to demonstrate present financial and administrative capacity (for example, financial statements, bank reference, operating budget, organizational controls, or other evidence)?

Response:
The RFP does not require a specific financial-capacity attachment, such as audited financial statements, a bank reference, or an operating budget, as a mandatory proposal submission item.

Respondents should address financial and administrative capacity within the **Organizational Experience and Capacity** section of the proposal by describing their financial and administrative systems, staffing, federal-grant experience, relevant audit or litigation findings, and capacity to begin and administer the proposed services. The RFP specifically requires administrative and financial systems sufficient for federally funded contracting, documentation, invoicing, monitoring, and audit.

Respondents may include additional documentation they believe is useful to demonstrate current capacity, but such documentation is not specifically required unless otherwise stated in the RFP.

SCWDB may request additional information or clarification during the evaluation or contracting process.

66. Insurance
Response: Please see Question 50. The RFP requires the selected contractor to maintain insurance acceptable to SCWDB, but it does not establish specific coverage limits or require certificates of insurance as part of the proposal submission.

67. Invoicing and Payment Timing
Question: What invoice cadence and payment terms should respondents assume for pricing and working-capital planning? May approved one-time implementation/customization costs be invoiced against defined implementation milestones before participant completions begin?

Response: See **Question 36** regarding payment structure.

68. Registrations
Response: Please see Question 50.

_____

69. Minimum Experience
Question: .Section 5.1 requires at least three years of relevant experience. Will SCWDB evaluate this requirement at the level of the proposing entity, the proposed team including subcontractors, or key personnel?

Response:
See **Questions 19, 21, and 43**.

Question 43 is the controlling clarification: the prime respondent remains responsible for demonstrating compliance with the minimum qualifications in Section 5.1, while SCWDB may also consider relevant experience of key personnel, predecessor/affiliated entities, subcontractors, and teaming partners when evaluating the overall qualifications and capacity of the proposed team.

70. References
Question: Appendix C requires three references for comparable work completed within the last five years. Should the reference set reflect the prime respondent only, or may it reflect the proposed team as a whole, including subcontractors?

Response:
Please see **Questions 20 and 44**.

Appendix C references may reflect comparable work performed by key personnel, predecessor/affiliated organizations, subcontractors, or teaming partners, provided the proposal clearly identifies who actually performed the work and that party's role on the proposed team.

71. Organizational Capacity for Teamed Proposals
Question: Where a proposal is submitted by a team, will SCWDB evaluate organizational capacity and federal-funds readiness under the 15-point criterion at the level of the prime respondent, or across the proposing team as a whole?

Response:
SCWDB may consider the qualifications, experience, staffing, and technical capacity of the **proposed team as a whole** when evaluating the 15-point Experience, Qualifications, and Organizational Capacity criterion.

However, because the prime respondent will be the accountable contracting entity, the prime must independently demonstrate sufficient organizational, administrative, financial, management, and contract-management capacity to perform its responsibilities under the contract. This includes systems sufficient for federally funded contracting, documentation, invoicing, monitoring, and audit.

Accordingly, subcontractor or teaming-partner experience may strengthen the overall proposal, but it does not eliminate the prime respondent's responsibility to demonstrate adequate financial and administrative capacity. The RFP expressly makes the prime responsible for all subcontractors and deliverables.

72. Intellectual Property and Editable Materials
Question: For respondents contributing pre-existing proprietary frameworks, would SCWDB consider a statewide, nonexclusive license sufficient for contract administration and continuity while the contractor retains ownership of its pre-existing intellectual property? Relatedly, does SCWDB expect editable source files for all materials, or would reviewable versions be acceptable for proprietary components subject to negotiated licensing terms?

Response:
Please also see **Questions 7, 33, and 63**.

Yes. SCWDB would consider a licensing structure under which the contractor retains ownership of pre-existing proprietary intellectual property while granting SCWDB sufficient rights to administer, monitor, and continue the Network. The precise scope of any statewide, nonexclusive license—including duration, modification rights, reuse, access, and post-contract use—will be addressed during contract negotiation.

Section 3.4 requires **"editable or reviewable"** copies of curricula, slide decks, participant materials, assessments, and instructor guides, subject to negotiated intellectual-property and licensing terms. Accordingly, SCWDB does not require editable source files for every proprietary component if reviewable versions, together with the negotiated license rights, provide SCWDB sufficient access for contract administration, monitoring, quality assurance, and continuity.

73. Kentucky Presence
Question: Is a Kentucky office, Kentucky business registration, or Kentucky-based partner required or preferred for award?

Response:
Please see **Questions 9, 14, 39, 50, and 52**.

A Kentucky office or Kentucky-based partner is not required. An out-of-state respondent may serve as prime provided it can meet all delivery and compliance requirements, including in-person service within Kentucky when needed.

The RFP does not identify an existing Kentucky physical presence as a preferred scoring factor. Any required business registrations or authorizations must be satisfied as applicable before contract performance.

74. Participant Planning Assumptions
Question: Section 4.1 identifies an anticipated capacity of 980 unique participants. Can SCWDB share the planning assumptions behind that figure, including the anticipated split among participants completing the AI-Powered Career Readiness workshop, an AI Industry Accelerator pathway, or both, and any estimated distribution across the five occupational pathways?

Response:
Please see **Questions 3, 4, 16, 23, 30, 40, 46, and 56**.

SCWDB has not established a planning percentage for participants completing Service A, Service B, or both, nor a projected distribution among the five occupational pathways. The approximately 980 unique participants is an overall planning target only.

75. Participating Areas and Delivery Mix
Question: Can SCWDB provide an estimated number of participating Local Workforce Development Areas or geographic regions expected to require in-person delivery, and an anticipated percentage mix of live remote versus in-person training across the contract period?

Response: See Questions 5, 12, and 23.

Nine of Kentucky's ten Local Workforce Development Areas, representing 97 counties, had provided Letters of Support at the time of the earlier response. Final participation remains contingent on funding and implementation agreements.

SCWDB has not established a percentage split between live-remote and in-person delivery or a fixed number of regions that will require in-person services. Live remote is expected to be the most common routine delivery method, with in-person delivery used strategically for Rapid Response events, large layoffs, plant closures, and other concentrated needs.

76. Prior Identification of Providers
Question: Did SCWDB's Reskill DWG application to the U.S. Department of Labor identify a specific training provider, curriculum, or delivery partner?
Response:
No provider has been selected or pre-awarded through the Reskill DWG application process. The purpose of this RFP is to conduct a competitive procurement for the training services described in the solicitation.

To the extent the grant application included illustrative program concepts, curriculum approaches, potential delivery models, or planning assumptions, those descriptions do not constitute selection of a contractor or preference for a particular respondent. All responsive proposals will be evaluated under the criteria established in Section 8 of the RFP.

77. Payment Structure and Completed Participant
Question: Will SCWDB pay any portion of one-time curriculum development, customization, or implementation costs prior to first participant delivery, or is all compensation tied to verified participant completions? Additionally, how will SCWDB define a completed participant for invoicing purposes, whether by attendance threshold, assessment performance, or both?

Response: See **Questions 8, 36, 42, 58, 59, and 67**.

The RFP permits separate one-time implementation/customization pricing as well as per-completed-participant pricing. Respondents may propose milestone-based invoicing for approved implementation costs, but final payment terms will be established through contract negotiation.

SCWDB will establish the final uniform completion standard during implementation. Registration or partial attendance alone will not constitute completion.

78. AI Platforms and Licensing
Question: Does SCWDB expect the selected contractor to provide participant access to paid AI platforms, or may curricula be designed primarily around approved free or institutionally available tools? Does SCWDB maintain a current list of approved or prohibited AI platforms that respondents should reference when designing exercises and technology budgets?

Response: See **Questions 6, 24, 32, 49, and 55**.

SCWDB does not require respondents to base the curriculum on paid AI platforms. Respondents may propose the use of free, institutionally available, licensed, or proprietary tools, provided the proposed technology supports the instructional objectives and complies with applicable accessibility, privacy, security, licensing, and data-handling requirements.

If the respondent's proposed instructional model requires paid licenses, subscriptions, or accounts, those requirements and associated costs must be clearly identified in the proposal. Participants may not be required to independently purchase software, subscriptions, or equipment unless expressly approved and funded by SCWDB.

The RFP does not identify a fixed list of approved or prohibited commercial AI platforms. However, it does prohibit entering personally identifiable information, confidential employer information, protected health information, or other restricted data into public or unapproved AI systems. Respondents should describe their proposed tool-selection criteria and safeguards. Final platform approval and any additional restrictions may be established during implementation.

79. Credentials
Question: Section 3.1 states that digital badge or microcredential options are strongly preferred. Is SCWDB seeking a third-party credential, a contractor-issued digital badge, or either approach? Is accreditation, continuing education approval, or recognition by an external credentialing body required?

Response:
Please see **Questions 29 and 34**.

A third-party or externally accredited credential is not required. A contractor-issued, competency-based digital badge or micro credential is acceptable if the respondent can document the competencies represented, completion or verification standards, and associated costs. Accreditation, continuing-education approval, or external credentialing-body recognition is not a requirement.

80. Montana LLC / Ownership Structure
Question: May an out-of-state Montana LLC with this ownership structure serve as prime contractor?

Response:
Please see **Questions 9, 14, 39, 52, and 73** regarding out-of-state prime contractors.

The RFP does not require the prime contractor to be organized in Kentucky or maintain a Kentucky office. A Montana LLC may serve as the prime respondent provided it is legally authorized to provide the proposed services and can satisfy all applicable RFP, federal, state, financial, administrative, delivery, and compliance requirements.

The RFP does not establish a separate restriction based solely on the ownership structure of an otherwise eligible U.S. business entity. However, the respondent must disclose its legal entity and ownership/governance information as required by the proposal and must satisfy applicable debarment, registration, contracting, and other federal or state requirements. If the referenced ownership structure involves non-U.S. owners or affiliates, respondents should clearly disclose that structure so SCWDB can determine whether any grant-specific or contracting requirements apply before award.

81. Jordan-Based Personnel / Live-Remote Instruction
Question: May Jordan-based key personnel or instructors deliver the live-remote components if a U.S./Kentucky teaming partner provides the required in-person coverage?

Response:
Please also see **Questions 10, 15, 25, 35, 38, 47, and 53** regarding teaming arrangements, subcontractors, and instructors.

The RFP does not expressly require live-remote instructors or key personnel to be physically located in the United States. A respondent may propose qualified personnel located outside the United States as part of its delivery team, provided the overall proposal satisfies the RFP's staffing, instructional-quality, accessibility, scheduling, data-security, and in-person delivery requirements.

Any such arrangement must be clearly disclosed, including the location, role, qualifications, employment or subcontracting relationship, and responsibilities of the proposed personnel. The prime contractor remains fully responsible for performance and compliance.

Importantly, use of personnel outside the United States does not automatically authorize those personnel to access participant-level or other restricted information. The RFP requires confidential information to be limited to authorized personnel, requires appropriate administrative and technical safeguards, and requires SCWDB-approved systems for participant registration, attendance, surveys, data transfer, and reporting.

Any geographic restrictions on data access, system access, or personnel that arise from the final federal grant award, state requirements, SCWDB security requirements, or the executed contract will control.

82. Registrations, Insurance, Tax Forms, and U.S.-Only Requirements
Question: Please confirm whether any Kentucky Certificate of Authority, SAM/UEI registration, U.S. tax form, insurance certificate, or U.S.-only data-access/personnel requirement must be completed before proposal submission, rather than before contract execution.

Response:
Please see **Questions 50 and 68**.

The RFP **does not** expressly require respondents to submit, as part of the proposal:
- a Kentucky Certificate of Authority;
- evidence of SAM/UEI registration;
- a federal tax form such as a W-9;
- a certificate of insurance; or
- documentation establishing that all personnel or data access are U.S.-only.

At proposal submission, **however**, the respondent must make the certifications and disclosures required by the RFP, including that it is legally authorized to conduct business and provide the proposed services and that the respondent and its principals are not debarred or otherwise excluded from federal transactions.

The selected contractor must maintain all registrations and certifications required for the federally funded transaction, satisfy applicable legal authorization requirements, and maintain insurance acceptable to SCWDB. The RFP also makes contract execution contingent upon required state and federal approvals.

Accordingly, registrations, tax documentation, insurance documentation, and other contracting credentials not expressly required with the proposal may be finalized or verified during the pre-award/contracting process, but must be in place when required by applicable law, federal grant requirements, or the executed contract before performance or payment.

---

83. Public Records / Proprietary Proposal Material
Question: What procedures should a respondent follow to designate portions of its proposal as confidential, proprietary, or trade-secret material, including pre-existing curriculum, sample instructional materials, platform descriptions, pricing assumptions, and other protected business information? Please clarify the extent to which proposals may be subject to the Kentucky Open Records Act or other public-disclosure requirements, whether SCWDB will notify a respondent before

releasing material designated as proprietary/confidential, and whether a separately redacted public copy is requested or permitted.

Response:
Section 10.3 states that proposals may be subject to the Kentucky Open Records Act and other disclosure requirements. Respondents should clearly identify any information they claim to be confidential, proprietary, or otherwise exempt from disclosure and should provide the legal basis for that claim. SCWDB cannot guarantee that information marked confidential or proprietary will be withheld and will make disclosure determinations in accordance with applicable law.

Respondents should identify protected material as specifically as practicable rather than marking an entire proposal confidential. This may include pre-existing curriculum, sample instructional materials, proprietary methodologies, platform or system descriptions, trade secrets, or other business information for which the respondent asserts a lawful exemption.

The RFP does not currently require a separate redacted public copy, nor does it establish a mandatory pre-release notification procedure. A respondent may submit a separately redacted copy for SCWDB's convenience, provided the complete unredacted proposal is also submitted and the redactions are clearly identified and supported by the respondent's asserted legal basis. Submission of a redacted copy does not determine whether the information is legally exempt from disclosure.

SCWDB will retain final responsibility for responding to any public-records request in accordance with applicable law.

84. Required Proposal Samples / Pre-Existing Proprietary IP
Question: May a respondent clearly identify required sample materials as pre-existing proprietary intellectual property and submit them solely for evaluation purposes without granting SCWDB ownership, publication rights, modification rights, or broader reuse rights merely by submitting them with the proposal?

Response:
Please also see **Questions 7, 18, 33, 63, and 72**.

Yes. Respondents may identify required proposal samples—including slides, participant activities, assessment items, certificate or badge examples, instructor guides, and similar materials—as pre-existing proprietary intellectual property where applicable. The RFP requires representative sample materials for evaluation, but submission of those samples does not, by itself, transfer ownership of the respondent's pre-existing intellectual property to SCWDB.

The RFP expressly states that pre-existing proprietary materials must be identified and that final ownership, licensing, modification, reuse, statewide access, and post-contract rights will be negotiated.

Accordingly, respondents should clearly distinguish:

- pre-existing proprietary sample materials submitted for evaluation;
- third-party licensed materials; and
- materials that would be newly developed or materially customized specifically for the Kentucky AI Workforce Readiness Network.

SCWDB does not intend that submission of a proprietary sample alone grant publication, modification, ownership, or broader reuse rights beyond those necessary to evaluate the proposal. Any additional rights required for contract performance or continuity will be addressed in the executed contract.

85. Payment Timing / Assignment of Receivables
Question: Does SCWDB anticipate a standard invoice-payment period after receipt and acceptance of a compliant invoice, and does SCWDB anticipate any restriction on assignment of properly earned contract receivables to a financing institution?

Response:
Please also see **Questions 36 and 67** regarding invoicing and payment structure.

The RFP anticipates monthly invoicing or another cadence established through contract negotiation, but it does not establish a specific Net 30, Net 45, or other payment period after receipt and acceptance of a compliant invoice. Final invoice-review and payment terms will be included in the executed contract.

SCWDB has also not established in the RFP a specific provision permitting or prohibiting assignment of contract receivables to a financing institution. Any proposed assignment of earned receivables would be subject to the executed contract, applicable federal and state requirements, grant conditions, and any required SCWDB notice or approval.

Respondents should not assume that an assignment is authorized merely by submission of a proposal. If assignment of receivables is material to a respondent's financing plan, the respondent may identify that assumption or requested clarification in its proposal, and any permissible assignment terms would be addressed during contract negotiation.