

**STATE OF WASHINGTON
OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION**

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
RFP No. 2020-14: Grant Management System
Addendum 02**

Note to potential respondents:

This addendum is intended to revise, clarify and become part of RFP No. 2020-14, issued August 26, 2019.

All amendments, addendums, and notifications will be posted on the [OSPI website](#) (if this was an open procurement) and released via the Washington Electronic Business Solution ([WEBS](#)) website.

QUESTION: Attachment A, Page 15 – Form Builder Package, For the web pages built by the Form Builder Package, what validations are currently supported (e.g. Required Field, Field Domain, Show/Hide of Conditional questions based on prior answers). What additional validations does OSPI require be available in the proposed Form Builder Package?

ANSWER: There are no specific requirements for a Form Package Builder. This is simply a desired concept based on analysis of the current system. Ideal forms builder will allow for user friendly interface. i.e. (Drag and drop fields) Validations may vary greatly depending on the type of form package. System currently supports required fields and show/hide of conditionals however too often changes require developer involvement.

QUESTION: In Attachment A, Page 33, a Budget Page shows the grid for an IDEA 18-19 budget. Related to that:

- a. Are the Objects of Expenditure, and Activity List on that page common across all budgeted Form Packages? Can OSPI provide the master list of these dimensions
- b. How is the 15% set-aside for CCEIS denoted in the budget?
- c. Is any narrative information included to support the budget cell amounts?
- d. How are Equitable Share reservations captured in the budgeting process?
- e. For programs like ESEA, how are transferred funds (e.g. from Title II-A to Title I-A) considered in the Budgeting process?
- f. Are there separate budgets for Current Year Funds (Original) and for Carryover Funds?

ANSWER: Attachment A is really to provide some overview of the current system and analysis that was done to highlight current pain points. Specifics of how budgets, calculations and other items that exist as a part of current form packages can be discussed during a discovery phase of the project with the successful vendor. If there are questions more specific to a certain outlined requirement from Attachment B, we can do our best to answer those at this time.

QUESTION: Functional Requirement ID under Applicant, FRO511 states that Applicants need the ability to Edit or Revise an application after submission to the OSPI. Does OSPI have this functionality currently? How are risks of Reviewed, but not yet approved data being modified to an unacceptable status handled?

ANSWER: This could be controlled by OSPI users based on status. This functionality would need to exist during the review portion should the program be looking for additional information. Program staff could have ability to make a field editable or non-editable or revert/change a status in order to make an application editable. Details of how/when this functionality could be used would need to be discussed internally so that this would not create any risks during the application process.

QUESTION: Attachment B – System (Non-Functional) Requirements – numbers NFR900 and NFR901 – can OSPI expand on what they are seeking here, and who the intended audience of these views are? Is it any user?

ANSWER: This functionality would likely be for any user. NFR901 would benefit the applicant the most in having a quick view of the summary while working through completing an application. Both of these requirements would be for reference purpose. A quick view of the form package/summary info in order for the user to know what Form Package is currently being built or completed.

QUESTION: The RFP states “*The system implemented by this project should also provide more robust reporting and performance monitoring capabilities in order to better manage grant funding with a goal of tying expenditures to performance outcomes and consolidating plans across programs to reduce duplication*”.

We have identified requirements in Attachment B that speak to the ability to generate reports, but do not see requirements that address performance monitoring capabilities with the goal of tying expenditures to performance outcomes and consolidating plans across programs. Is performance planning and monitoring within scope of this RFP? If so, please provide requirements for this functionality.

ANSWER: No specific reporting requirements have been defined for this RFP. Reporting functionality would be something we’re interested in evaluating during a demonstration. Ideally the system would have robust and user-friendly reporting capabilities. We’ll be looking for insight in a demonstration as to how reports are generated, how robust and complex they can be, what role is typically responsible/able to build reports, what can be done out of the box versus what may need customization from the vendor, etc.

QUESTION: Does OSPI have any requirements or limitation in accepting zipped files as an attachment to an email?

ANSWER: OSPI does not have requirements or limitations on accepting zip files.

QUESTION: We understand that OSPI is requesting vendors not to include confidential or proprietary information. Our Software License Agreement, which we consider confidential, typically becomes an attachment to the contract. Does OSPI require the Software License Agreement be attached to the RFP response or submitted at the time of contract negotiations?

ANSWER: OSPI does not require an SLA to be attached to the RFP. It is up to the Bidder to determine what information they wish to disclose at this time. SLA will be required at the time of contract negotiations.

QUESTION: Of the 40-50 Program Staff identified as Form Package Builders, does OSPI anticipate that some of these program staff will need to design more complex form packages

that would include complex validations, advanced budgeting details, etc.? For training purposes, please identify the number of Program Staff that would require more training to complete advance form packages.

ANSWER: Unable to determine up front where lines between roles will exist. These decisions may fall on individual programs to decide once they've demoed and been trained on the new system. Minimal viable solution will be that system administrators (3-5 staff) will be trained on the ability to build the most complex validations and calculations into form packages. Vendor should describe their recommended training model in the proposal based on the complexity of the system and the number of proposed users.

QUESTION: Does OSPI require a MS Project Plan be submitted with the Project Approach/Methodology?

ANSWER: No specific format required for this proposal. This should mainly reflect the Bidder's methodology for project planning/implementation. i.e. What types of phases and order of events does the Bidder suggest? High level estimates of timelines are not required and may depend on the confidence of the Bidder to provide an estimate at this time. Maybe the planned approach includes a discovery and planning phase before the project plan can be completed? Focus on the approach for completing the project versus the details.

QUESTION: Did OSPI review existing grant management systems in the form of demonstrations, access to demo sites of vendors or view other state education agencies grant management systems as part of the requirements gathering for this RFP? If so, which systems were reviewed, demonstrated, or accessed?

ANSWER: OSPI performed some market research to see what potential COTS systems existed in the marketplace. The only demonstration that OSPI took place in was to see the state of Wisconsin's WISE Grants system. This system, however, was a custom built and maintained solution and not a viable candidate for this project.

QUESTION: Will the state please provide an attendee list (individual name and business name) of those who participated in the Pre-bid conference via the webinar?

ANSWER: OSPI will not be providing a list of attendees.

QUESTION: On page 17 in Attachment A, Appendix A2 (School Districts' comments) in the "Struggles" section, there's a statement: "Grants are rigid...there is not transparency." Are you saying there *should* be no transparency, or that iGrants didn't have it but it is desired? If it *is* desired, what is it that you're looking for?

ANSWER: As this is feedback from the School District, I can't clarify exactly what is desired. I know that Districts are looking for increased transparency regarding year to year form packages. I don't believe they are able to view in iGrants prior year's applications. Due to many of these applications being competitive, obviously there are required limitations in visibility between Districts.

QUESTION: On page 18 in Attachment A, "Functional: Budget Allocation" in what way are you looking to improve the Budget Revision comment box? Is this to be just data, or are you looking for functionality to reallocate funds, etc?

ANSWER: Added functionality for reallocation and transferability is desired but not required. Current system has limited functionality when it comes to handling budgets and expenditures.

QUESTION: Are you looking for a platform, upon which you can build your Form Package Workflows, or a delivered solution (i.e. all workflows build). If the latter, is there a timeframe/ramp up to get the 300+ workflows built?

ANSWER: OSPI wants the ability to build our own workflows. Much of this would be training staff and administrators on how to build form packages.

QUESTION: Do you want iGrant to be the front-end, and if so, can an html iframe be embedded in iGrant?

ANSWER: OSPI is looking to replace the current iGrants system. OSPI currently host iGrants onsite and would like to move to a vendor hosted solution.

QUESTION: Out of the 200 internal users, how many would be “workflow admins” (create/modify workflows and forms) and how many would be “workflow users” (Launch workflows, fill out forms, etc)

ANSWER: OSPI has 60+ individual programs at OSPI, many with their own grants. Ideally we would train them to create and launch their own forms. External users would be the applicants filling out forms, which would be 300 or so districts with ~2000 users.

QUESTION: What types of integration are there with their existing systems? APIs? Database connectors?

ANSWER: The current system authenticates users through a SQL database. We would be looking for a similar solution to handle our external users authentication in the new system. 2-3 other SQL databases are utilized to pull existing District data from other systems into iGrants.

QUESTION: Can we get the Word document used by PMs to communicate the iGrant form package to the iGrants staff.

ANSWER: There is no specific Word document used. Word, along with email is just one of the methods used by PM's to communicate changes to form packages year to year.

QUESTION: Sample survey is not accessible,
<http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/3957955/33f8baaaebad>

ANSWER: Similar to previous question, this is just another method for communicating changes to form packages. We'd like to remove this piece of the process and replace it with the PM being able to directly edit and create the form package vs relying on the iGrants system admin to make the change.

QUESTION: In the iGrants system current flow, under point 6 there is a mention of outlook folder. Is there a shared folder created for each Form package? Please elaborate.

ANSWER: The iGrants system administrator manages requested form changes via Outlook folders. We'd like to improve this process by, as mentioned above, move the responsibility of

building/editing form packages to the Program Managers, but also likely standing up an internal issue log where users can submit more technical requests.

QUESTION: Under iGrant Workflow - School districts apply and submit grants. There is mention of school login to EDS and iGrants. Are iGrants pages linked in EDS system.

ANSWER: The current iGrants system exists in our suite of EDS applications. EDS applications are all locally hosted and accessed using our EDS authentication portal. i.e. User requests access to EDS/iGrants application. User is given a role that allows them to access the application and is associated with an Organization which controls what data they see once in the system.

QUESTION: Under iGrants Workflow Issues - "Does not auto populate information": What information needs to be auto populated. For the "Autosave", we are assuming the entire form package application is saved as a draft. On what frequency the autosave should be triggered?

ANSWER: District's would like to have the system auto-populate data from Grants system or other existing systems. i.e. District can create a profile with base information that can be auto-populated from one application to another versus entering duplicate information for each application. Auto-save would be used for protection against system time outs. No desired frequency other than to auto-save more frequently than the system is set to timeout automatically.

QUESTION: Is every grant form package application requires approval from Director?

ANSWER: Departments are all structured differently but should have similar workflows for most form packages. A director or other assigned person would be given the role to give final approval of the drafted form package before it is published.

QUESTION: If not every grant form package requires director approval? Then PM need to approve it specifically or it is considered approval if PM completes review.

ANSWER: Department specific. Simply need the ability to assign the final approval/publish permissions to a specific person whether that be the PM or Director or another position within the department.

QUESTION: Under struggles with existing system. There is a mention of Difficulty with formulas. What formulas/calculations are in use and how are they associated with Form packages.

ANSWER: Difficulty is mainly due to PMs having to manually calculate certain fields. Ideally the system would better integrate with existing data we have in other systems and automate those calculations. Specific formulas and calculations vary greatly depending on the Grant and may change year to year.

QUESTION: Under suggestions to the new system. There is a mention of integrate with report card data. Where do we get the report card data.

ANSWER: Our report card data exists in a SQL based data warehouse. Users would like the ability to integrate with that data for reporting purposes.

QUESTION: For the requirement of "One location for attachments and other records". Is it required to maintain a CMS like SharePoint for all these documents?

ANSWER: Ideally file attachments and records would exist directly in the newly proposed system.

QUESTION: Standardized FPs - Refers to base template?

ANSWER: Refers mainly to Districts being forced to enter duplicate information. Mainly school information that already exists in another system which would preferably be auto-populated rather than forcing the applicant to enter manually for each and every new application.

QUESTION: Functional - Security: Link with inventory system, what is this inventory system, how do we interact with it.

ANSWER: SQL database.

QUESTION: Functional - Security: Flag issues happening with certain Districts: What kind of issues, can we get few examples.

ANSWER: Don't have specifics. This could be improved internally by implementing a better issue management system.

QUESTION: Multilingual support is required or only English is supported.

ANSWER: No specific requirement around multilingual. This ability would be added value however, if possible.

QUESTION: Do we need to support contextual help on every entity or page or FP and etc.

ANSWER: No specific requirement here. The ability to add hover over text box or similar methods to provide help to the user are desired.

QUESTION: How is the grants system interact with CLAIMS, CEDARS and Private participation? With a service endpoint or something.

ANSWER: These are all SQL based systems. OSPI IT will provide support in delivering necessary data through some sort of service.

QUESTION: What other external systems the iGrant systems connects with? Can we get the interfacing options in use currently.

ANSWER: Currently iGrants is hosted internally and only connects with other internal systems.

QUESTION: Are there any approved or prequalified COTS systems to be considered?

ANSWER: No specific systems have been preapproved. OSPI is open to the best proposed solution.

QUESTION: Any other form factors other than PC, needs to be supported. Like tablet, mobile and etc.,

ANSWER: No specific requirements for anything besides desktop.

QUESTION: From the RFP, we understand the system should handle category 2 data securely, however according to the WA state data classifications guidelines given here:

<https://www.doc.wa.gov/about/agency/docs/data-classification-standards.pdf> the data must be stored only on Department computing devices. Is there a department private cloud where we should host the system?

ANSWER: This document seems to be the Department of Corrections specific policy and interpretation regarding data standards. OSPI adheres to the Office of Cyber Security in regard to data security and design. As mentioned, the Apparent Successful Vendor may be required to participate in a State Security and Design Review.

QUESTION: In RFP Porting over the data is not priority, what is the plan to handle creating packages from previous year grants.

ANSWER: The responsibility for building initial form packages in the proposed system will fall on OSPI programs. The Vendor's responsibility is to demonstrate the ability to fulfill requirements related to form packages and to train users on how to create and manage form packages going forward. The system should also have the ability to reuse a prior year's form package once it exists in the system.

QUESTION: Any Data governance and protection regulations around hosting?

ANSWER: Regulations for data, security and hosting are outlined in Exhibit E, Section 2- Security of the RFP.

QUESTION: IS SSO (Single Sign On) required for the new Grants system

ANSWER: SSO would be ideal for internal users.

QUESTION: Approximate number of reports supported by the current system and the sample report formats

ANSWER: Current system utilizes a report tool to build ad-hoc reports. Reports can be generated in Excel or PDF.

QUESTION: Do we need to support adhoc reports generation by the new system

ANSWER: Ideal system would provide a report generation tool that allows for users to build custom reports.

QUESTION: Any specific UI Design language such as "Fluid" in use by the organization or we can come up with the COTS supported or vendor selected design formats

ANSWER: Nothing specific required.

QUESTION: Any guidelines around data retention and archival process

ANSWER: Data retention and archival requirements may differ by form package. Current iGrants system is the system of record but the data can be archived and retained elsewhere from the proposed system.

QUESTION: How do the existing systems disperse the funds? Is there a merchant account included or does it sync with a 3rd party merchant account or accounting system?

ANSWER: Current iGrants system integrates with a Grants Claims system where claims are handled. The Claims system provides data to our SAFS school apportionment and AFRS accounting system.

QUESTION: Would surveygizmo be required or is an internal system process acceptable for providing this info?

ANSWER: SurveyGizmo is not required. The proposed system should provide forms with conditional logic and reporting capability.

QUESTION: Would Outlook be required or can these contacts be maintained with the system?

ANSWER: Outlook integration is not required. Current system utilizes our internal user authentication database/application EDS which has a SQL backend. The proposed system should allow some sort of integration with EDS or a solution for replicating that data for user authentication.

QUESTION: For the review and Approve Grant Applications, isn't the budget already in the system?

ANSWER: Budget is not prepopulated. Grant administrator must build in the budget when creating new grant applications/form packages.

QUESTION: In the diagram for Review and Approve Grant Applications, can you please explain more about "Intuitive System" and what you're looking to gain? Is it more "rule based" requirements?

ANSWER: Intuitive system in this case is referring to a system that allows for easy forms building.

"The recommendation is to develop an intuitive functionality called Form Package Builder. This functionality would allow for Program Managers to dynamically design Form Packages with minimal intervention by the System Administrator. Every FP component (Contact Information, Assurances, Formula / Permutations) would become an object that can be populated automatically based on previous database entries or easily entered manually. The SysAdmin's role would be to verify that a FP is complete, assure new FPs conform with agreed-upon

standards, launch FPs upon Director approval and then send out an email announcement to ESD's and school districts.”

QUESTION: In Appendix B1 Section III you refer to a calculator. Is this required and if so what are the specs for it?

ANSWER: This is the ability to calculate a field based on both data entered into the iGrants system and preexisting data from another SQL based system.

QUESTION: In the Roles section, we're not clear on what the statement regarding Applicants is saying. Can you elaborate?

ANSWER: Our grant applicants include Washington State public school districts, private schools and other non-profit entities. These are considered our external system users. They require authentication to access the system which is currently being done through our EDS authentication system which handles user accounts/permissions. We'd be looking to replicate this authentication method, so our administrators are not forced to manage 2000+ users in multiple places.

QUESTION: In the Roles section, is there any connectivity to a Merchant Services account needed?

ANSWER: In this case we simply need to get data from the proposed system to our SAFS system and the State's AFRS accounting system.

QUESTION: In the Roles section, would you please elaborate more on what you're looking for the SysAdmin role?

ANSWER: Preference would be for the system admin to manage internal user accounts and permissions, have the ability to create/edit/delete forms, workflows, etc. They would manage and configure any type of automation, i.e. Alerts, notifications and provide general technical support for the system.

QUESTION: For Requirement FR023, would you please elaborate as we're not understanding your intent.

ANSWER: In our current system the System Admin is unable to search (Ctrl-F) an application (combination of instructional text + forms) prior to the application being published. Because some of these applications are lengthy, the preference is to have the ability to quickly and easily search for specific text in an application while it is in development.

QUESTION: For Requirement FRM222, is the intent to allow the import by the Applicant? Or is it to allow the import by Staff?

ANSWER: Intent is to allow internal staff to import.

QUESTION: For Requirement FRM 265, would you please elaborate? We don't know what is meant by the statement.

ANSWER: In the current system this particular field is either non-visible or a part of a backend calculation. Internal users would like the ability to view this field in the system.

QUESTION: For Requirement FRM 266, Is the carryover coming from existing data in the system, or an external source?

ANSWER: Current system does not count down or update the budget directly in the system. This causes difficulty in managing the most current disbursements and claims. Ideal system should provide Realtime budget updates within the system and transferability of funds which would be that carryover amount.

QUESTION: For Requirement FRC 461, is this the same item as FRM 265?

ANSWER: Same requirement, just a different user role. Currently the iGrants system and Grants Claims systems are separate applications. The ideal proposed system would combine grant applications and claims.

QUESTION: For Requirement FRC 462, is this the same item as FRM 266?

ANSWER: This is a separate requirement asking for the ability for applicants to request a waiver for carryover directly in the system. Keep in mind low requirements do not have to be directly addressed in Vendor Proposals if the proposed system cannot fulfil the requirement out of box.

QUESTION: For Requirement FRO 522, Our response will depend on if this includes access to select grants or applications? Does this require roles such as view only, view and edit, view - edit - create, view - edit - create- delete? Does this require roles that do not see specific fields or sections? Does this require roles that have limited functions such as approval to submit?

ANSWER: Roles would not change for applicant. The only specific permissions would be for the user to only view data/existing applications for their specific organization.

QUESTION: For Requirement FRS 638, is this the same carryover referenced in FRM 266?

ANSWER: Yes. The current system does not calculate the current totals.

QUESTION: For Requirement FRS 642, is this referring to the same indirect rates as FRM 265?

ANSWER: Yes, indirect rates are specific to Districts/Organizations and may change year to year. Rather than calculate this rate on the backend and not display the preference would be view within the system and to store this field in a database to maintain the year to year rates.

QUESTION: For Requirement FRS 646, would you please elaborate as we don't understand what you're looking for here?

ANSWER: Currently this is something that is calculated manually. Would like to automate this and create a new field/calculation using data within the system. Again, in the current model iGrants and Grants Claims are separate applications with minimal integration. Ideal proposed

system would combine functionality of the two applications into one or create direct integration with our Grants Claims system.

QUESTION: For Requirement FRS 647, Are you looking for the ability to reconcile expenditures vs budgets?

ANSWER: Yes.

QUESTION: For Requirement NFR 903, are you referring to allowing your staff to make changes to these environments, or just that these need exist for us to do our dev, testing, etc?

ANSWER: Internal users would not have access. Environments would only need to exist. Depending on the type of change we would like an internal developer resource or system admin to have access to the environments to test.

QUESTION: Whether companies from Outside USA can apply for this? (like,from India or Canada)

ANSWER: Outside companies can apply however system must be hosted in the United States.

QUESTION: Whether we need to come over there for meetings?

ANSWER: Meetings can be held remotely when applicable.

QUESTION: Can we perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside USA? (like, from India or Canada)

ANSWER: Tasks related to RFP can be completed remotely if necessary. Items during implementation, specifically internal user training would require Vendor to be onsite.

QUESTION: Can we submit the proposals via email?

ANSWER: Per section 6. Submission of Proposals, Consultant shall submit proposals as an attachment to an email to the RFP Coordinator.

QUESTION: Are grants essentially invite-only? Are multiple districts able to apply for each grant, or is each grant targeted towards one specific district or group?

ANSWER: There are both competitive and non-competitive grant. Each grant has different criteria to apply but all districts that meet the criteria are eligible to apply. The non-competitive divides funds up equally based on criteria versus a competitive where the organizations are vying for funding against one another.

QUESTION: Is the system intended to be used for OSPI to apply to grants itself, or only to provide grants?

ANSWER: OSPI serves at the grant administrator in this case. We provide grants for applicants (Districts and other entities) to apply for funding.

QUESTION: What are the expected user numbers—how many users will be in the system total? How many, of that number, will be in the system ‘full time’, or greater than 40 hours per month? How many would be ‘casual’ users (less than 40 hours per month)? How many reviewers? How many applicants? How many total applications do you receive over the course of the year?

ANSWER: Approximately 60-70 users (Program staff and administrators) internally and 2000 external users (applicants). Only a small number of that group 4-5 users would be working in the system over 40 hours per month. The other 55-60 users would be under 40 hours. Unsure on totals for applications, but we generally have around 100 form packages per year and over 300 unique applicants. Likely 1500-2500 total applications.

QUESTION: Will other stakeholders, for example Government, politicians, community partners, other agencies, require some level of access to the software? How many?

ANSWER: There could be a need for other partner agencies to serve as reviewers for certain grants. Currently this doesn’t occur in our system however this has come up as a potential future need. We would likely treat those users the same as we do our internal users and that number would likely not exceed 20.

QUESTION: To what extent will mobile devices be used?

ANSWER: The proposed solution is not required to work with mobile.

QUESTION: What data will be incorporated into the new system (what format, how much data, how many years)?

ANSWER: Not anticipating any data migration, however many of last year’s application forms would need recreated in the new system.

QUESTION: What reports would be required, how frequently, what format?

ANSWER: No specific requirement around type of reports. A powerful report generation tool is preferred where users could create custom reports. Reports would need exported into excel and/or pdf.

QUESTION: Can we get past emails or word documents used in the current system for reference? It helps us understand the form package layout and options supported in the form package and etc.,?

ANSWER: OSPI will provide this information to the ASB during the project discovery phase.

QUESTION: Can we get a sample survey, to better understand the form package creation details?

ANSWER: OSPI will provide this information to the ASB during the project discovery phase.

QUESTION: What type of authentication (OATH, SAML and etc.,) are supported by EDS?

ANSWER: OSPI maintains some things that use SAML but it is no longer an authentication method that we support. OSPI does support OpenID Connect which is an extension of OAuth2.

QUESTION: From the pre bid session, we understand that, all the existing systems have integration services available and follow the same authentication mechanism as EDS. Please confirm.

ANSWER: Confirmed, user roles and permissions are authenticated and managed through EDS

QUESTION: Can we please get calculations/formulas associated with one of the existing form package? To better understand the process followed today?

ANSWER: OSPI will provide this information to the ASB during the project discovery phase.

QUESTION: FRM209: Ability to manage Fiscal Year-Related Data and Controls – Can we get some details on the data and controls?

ANSWER: No specifics on the data. It would be reporting on data collected within the application. This is an OSPI program manager request. They want to be able to pull reports out of submitted applications with better detail than our current report tool does.

QUESTION: FRM232: Ability to add, edit and remove Assurances to Form Packages - We are assuming the assurances come from external system and any changes to the assurance in Grants system might not be updating the source system.

ANSWER: We have two types of assurances. Program Specific Assurances are simply pages included in the application (or form package) stating program specific requirements. General Assurances is stored on the iGrants website and NOT part of a specific form package/application. Entities are required to complete the General Assurances once per year and cannot submit a form package/application until it is completed.

QUESTION: FRM256: Ability to limit claims against approved budget and amount paid to-date – Is this something like overdraft protection?

ANSWER: This would limit claiming to the approved budgeted activities and objects. In other words, they cannot claim in an activity that was not budgeted and cannot exceed the budgeted amount by more than 10% of the total direct expenditure.

QUESTION: FRM262: Ability to obtain data for use in entering payment details to the Agency Financial Reporting System (AFRS) Toolbox – Where do we obtain this data from? The data here refers to some sort of handshake for the authentication/access and etc.?

ANSWER: Need to be able to get an extract of payment data from the Grants system for loading into the AFRS toolbox system.

QUESTION: FRC454: Ability to allow claims to be changed by OSPI Grants staff after submission by the grantee – What type of users are the Grant staff in this context? System

Admin or Grants PM?

ANSWER: Grant staff refers to Claims staff in this statement. They process monthly grant payments. Their role is closer to system administration than Grants PM but has unique responsibilities.

QUESTION: FRO507: Ability to select data entered in one application to be used within a formula in a different application for the same applicant – The requirement here is to allow copy/paste? Or refer one application from another application and access data?

ANSWER: OSPI can currently pull data from one form package into another form package by using specific formulas in our data element setup.

QUESTION: FRS639: Ability to display allocated budgets to applicants during the process of building a Form Package – Not clear on why/how we should show the allocated budgets to applicants during the form package building. We are assuming Form package is not accessible to applicants during creation process.

ANSWER: This is misconstrued. The budgets for applicants would not be available until after the form package is built.

QUESTION: Does OSPI have an approved budget for this new Grants Management System? If yes, can you provide that budget information to guide vendor decision-making and proposal response?

ANSWER: OSPI has approved a budget for this project. The details of that budget are not available at this time. Vendor cost proposal should reflect their best price to accomplish the work.

QUESTION: Is there a specific place in the proposal where OSPI would like vendors to include project-related assumptions? Do we include any pricing assumptions within the Pricing Worksheet?

ANSWER: Vendor can include assumptions where appropriate in their proposal or use this Q&A period for specific clarifications. Pricing worksheet is simply a template to assist, however Vendors are welcome to put forth the cost proposal however they see fit so long as it reflects the 5-year projected costs.

QUESTION: Please clarify how Annual License Costs should be represented in the worksheet?

ANSWER: Pricing worksheet can reflect tiered options, costs unique to Vendor's licensing/support model, etc. Pricing worksheet is simply a template to assist, however Vendors are welcome to put forth the cost proposal however they see fit so long as it reflects the 5-year projected costs.

QUESTION: Has OSPI previously entertained any system demonstrations and/or presentations from vendors? If so, which systems were seen and when?

ANSWER: OSPI performed some market research to see what potential COTS/MOTS/SaaS systems existed in the marketplace. The only demonstration that OSPI took place in was to see the state of Wisconsin's WISE Grants system. This system, however, was a custom built and maintained solution and not a viable candidate for this project.

QUESTION: Please provide a list of vendors who participated in the pre-bid conference.

ANSWER: OSPI will not be providing a list of attendees.

QUESTION: To provide proof of having a viable solution, does OSPI require a minimum number of vendor references be from other education-specific grant makers?

ANSWER: References or experience does not have to be specific to Education grants. Vendor should outline past experience involving the implementation, maintenance, support, etc. of Grant Funding or other similar systems.

QUESTION: Given the changing grants regulatory environment, does OSPI require vendors who have experience deploying Grants Management Systems at the Federal level?

ANSWER: This experience is not required. The Vendor proposed system must simply be able to adhere to/accommodate any Federal or State specific regulations.

QUESTION: Given the priority of securing public data and assets, does OSPI require any cloud-based, SaaS solutions to be provisioned on a FedRAMP-certified infrastructure?

ANSWER: No.

QUESTION: Please provide the volume of grants that will be managed in the system based on the current fiscal year. Please distinguish between Federal pass-thru funds and State funds.

ANSWER: These are outlined in Attachment C- 2019-20 Form Packages. Grants are identified as Federal Grant (Non-competitive), State Grant (Non-competitive), State Competitive, and Federal Competitive. There are also form packages that exist for the sole purpose of generating reports.

QUESTION: Does OSPI have a date/timeline in mind for when the system should be in production and usable by staff and subgrantees?

ANSWER: No specific timeline has been identified. Project should allow for necessary time for testing, training and other factors crucial to a successful implementation.

QUESTION: Does OSPI plan to have all its grant programs use the new system at the same time or has it explored a phased onboarding approach?

ANSWER: This may depend on resource availability within business units. OSPI is open to a phased approach and desires whatever approach that will best handle change management.

QUESTION: Please provide the technical details for both SAFS and AFRS. For example, what technology platform are they built on, what is their ability to interface with other systems, etc.

ANSWER: No SAFS system directly interacts, however the outputs from SAFS are used by the fiscal team for AFRS purposes.

OPSI currently accesses WaTech Web Intelligence service and setup jobs there to download AFRS data, FTP the results to OSPI FTP site daily. There are two SQL databases – ADDS and AFRS Title that are being synchronized every morning by downloading this data. Another SQL database Indirect Draw gets data from ADDS and AFRS Title DBs. Financial office people are using SSMS or ACCESS database (mostly) to access these data.

QUESTION: Has OSPI seen demonstrations of grants system prior to the issuance of this RFP? If yes, which vendor systems were seen?

ANSWER: OSPI performed some market research to see what potential COTS/MOTS/SaaS systems existed in the marketplace. The only demonstration that OSPI took place in was to see the state of Wisconsin's WISE Grants system. This system, however, was a custom built and maintained solution and not a viable candidate for this project.

QUESTION: A similar RFP was issued previously with vendor proposals received. Can OSPI provide reason for cancellation and reissuance to encourage better proposal responses from vendors?

ANSWER: Reason for cancellation of the previous RFP was due to funding versus the quality of the proposal responses from vendors.

QUESTION: Please provide guidance on how the price volume will be scored? Will it be based on a formula or relative weighting?

ANSWER: The bidder with the lowest proposed cost will receive the maximum (80) cost evaluation points. Bidders with higher proposed cost will receive proportionately fewer cost evaluation points based upon the lowest proposed cost as follows: low bid / higher bid = % of avail. points awarded * avail. points = total cost points

QUESTION: How many top scoring bidders does OSPI envision inviting to Phase 2? Is there a minimum number? Is there a maximum number?

ANSWER: This could differ based on the number/quality of proposals. No specific maximum. Phase 2 will occur as long as a minimum 2 bids are received.

QUESTION: Is OSPI open to extending the deadline for proposal submissions by 1-week?

ANSWER: No, OSPI believes the four-week period for proposals is a reasonable amount of time

QUESTION: The RFP includes a list of form packages currently in use. Does OSPI anticipate that its staff will create these forms in the new grants system or that the vendor will build them as part of the implementation?

ANSWER: Expectation is that Vendor will build some form packages in order to validate requirements and provide training to OSPI trainers and/or staff

QUESTION: Please provide additional detail as the nature / type of data / transactions that will be interfaced between SAFS vs. AFRS. Will the new grants system need to interface with both systems?

ANSWER: Proposed system should simply at minimum facilitate a means to export data to be absorbed by external financial systems.

QUESTION: Please clarify the meaning and intent of FRM-242 in Attachment B.

ANSWER: Looking for some form of automated approval workflow. i.e. Program Manager can generate a notification which asks for Director approval

QUESTION: Please provide a list of all Federal and State grant programs that will be managed in the new grants system.

ANSWER: These grants/programs change year to year. They're best outlined in the list of past year form packages, Attachment C.

QUESTION: Please clarify the meaning and intent of FRM-255 in Attachment B.

ANSWER: This requirement is looking to expand on the ability to make payment calculations by program staff directly in the system. Currently there is a gap between the iGrants system and Grants Claims system where much of this work may require communication and/or manual processes outside of the two systems.

QUESTION: Please clarify the meaning and intent of NFR 900 in Attachment B.

ANSWER: Looking for the system to display the current Form Package name/info as reference for what form package is currently being viewed.

QUESTION: Please clarify the meaning and intent of FRS-650 in Attachment B.

ANSWER: The intent of this requirement is to create an internal audit log and messaging log for better tracking and communication

QUESTION: Exhibit C "General Provisions" in the sample contract has the following statement: 1.3 Location of Services. The Services shall be provided solely from within the continental United States and on computing and data storage devices residing therein. Does this apply to all services rendered for this contract including configuration or support? Or if the hosting and other security requirements are met within the US, can the delivery of project or support services be completed from within Canada?

ANSWER: Development/support services can be completed outside of the continental US.

QUESTION: We would like to request a one or two week extension to the submission deadline to allow us to put together a full and considered response.

ANSWER: Unfortunately No, OSPI believes the four week period for proposals is a reasonable amount of time

QUESTION: Please provide the dollar value of the volume of grants for Federal versus State grants.

ANSWER: This data isn't readily available. Number of grants and dollar values can change drastically year to year.

QUESTION: Are we allowed to embed graphics in the Attachment B Excel file? Or should we include them separate attachments and refer to them within the file?

ANSWER: Whichever works best for you

QUESTION: Is there a limitation on email size for proposal submittal?

ANSWER: Size limit differs by device the email is being sent from but email should support file/message sizes up to 150MB.

QUESTION: We are hoping to get more clarity about the evaluation weighting and scoring, particularly as it pertains to cost for RFP No. 2020-14: Grant Management System. Will the 80 points for the Cost Proposal be awarded in entirety to the lowest cost bidder or will the points be pro-rated and apportioned to a number of low cost bidders?

ANSWER: Each bidder can receive up to 80 points for cost proposal. The lowest bidder(s) will receive the full 80 points with the rest receiving a proportionate number of points based on this formula $\text{lowest bid} / \text{higher bid} = \% \text{ of avail. points awarded} * \text{avail. points} = \text{total cost points}$

QUESTION: FRA022 – Ability to create a link within a grant application to a location within the same Form Package. **Can you please provide a specific example of how this would be used?**

ANSWER: Would mostly be used for quick navigation and reference purposes. For instance, if a form package had a lengthy instruction/summary section followed by specific questions the specific question could have a link that is anchored to the section of the summary that pertains to the specific question.

QUESTION: FRA023 - Ability to allow OSPI staff to search for application details prior to making the Form Package available for review by users outside OSPI. **What application details does this refer to that would need to be searchable?**

ANSWER: This is referring to the ability to search within a form package while in development/edit mode. Details in this case are referring to general text. Some of our

application forms are very lengthy and the current system does not support a Ctrl-F within the page.

QUESTION: FRS616 - Ability to support consolidated grant applications. **Can you define consolidated grant applications, and provide some context on desired functionality for supporting these?**

ANSWER: OSPI's most frequent applicants are from Public School Districts within the State of Washington. These Districts are often applying for a number of different grants or for the same grants year to year. OSPI would like the system to be able to auto-fill information so that an applicant would not have to enter the same information multiple times. For instance, the District fills out a profile with District Name, Address, Phone number, Superintendent, etc. and all of that information would auto populate for each application they submit.

QUESTION: regarding RFP Section 13. "In no event is a Bidder to submit its own standard contract terms and conditions in response to this RFP. The Bidder may submit exceptions as allowed in the Certifications and Assurances section. OSPI will review requested exceptions and accept or reject the same at its sole discretion."

Please know that SurveyMonkey has its own standard form of agreement, called a Master Services Agreement ("MSA"), and we believe that using it as a starting point will help to make the contracting process more efficient and productive for both parties. Given the specialized nature of our service, the terms included in generic vendor procurement contracts/terms and conditions are inappropriate for documenting the provision of that service. Typically, customer terms and conditions contain clauses which are not applicable, or which do not reflect the nature of the service. We also cover service-specific issues in our MSA, such as privacy issues relating to transfers of personally identifiable information, acceptable use policies, and our pricing model. We believe that the purpose of the contract is ultimately to ensure the details of the business deal are accurately documented. Our MSA is specifically tailored to our service and reflects what we believe to be a reasonable starting position for negotiation. If we were to work from your form of agreement, we would need to engage in a heavy markup, and then your legal team would need to spend time reviewing the redline. This would ordinarily be followed by several rounds of negotiation. This approach also erodes our ability to offer our service at a relatively low price point and may force us to no bid. We are always open to answering any questions you may have about our Order Form and MSA, and discussing any specific changes your legal team may need to make to it. In our experience, the process will proceed much more efficiently if we start from our MSA. We are also happy to consider different ways to implement the changes you need, including inserting an addendum of special terms.

ANSWER: This could be sorted out the details of the Contract/Agreement during negotiations. It sounds like you are referring to a Service Level Agreement in which case OSPI will allow Vendors to define their own SLA.

Refer to Addendum 01 for additional Q&A.