

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

RFP 2018-05 Education Grants Management System  
Addendum 03 – Questions & Answers

Note to potential respondents:

This addendum is intended to revise, clarify and become part of RFP No. 2018-05, issued August 28, 2017. All amendments, addendums, and notifications will be posted on the [OSPI website](#) and released via the Washington Electronic Business Solution ([WEBS](#)) website.

\*\*\*\*\*

**QUESTION:** Page 7 references current “off-label” use of iGrants and that replacing it may require replacing the use of iGrants for year-end and other data collection forms. Is the proposed solution expected to be used for this purpose?

**ANSWER:** No, data collection not related to the grant is out of scope.

**QUESTION:** Page 9, item 4.2.2 refers to LEA ability to create “consolidated plans” that may be funded using consolidated grant applications. Is the ability to create consolidated plans or other plan items a desired feature of this system? If so, will specific requirements be provided?

**ANSWER:** Yes it is a desired feature of the system and OSPI will hire a BA to work further define the requirements.

**QUESTION:** Is the requirements spreadsheet the appropriate place to respond to Technical Proposal section 30.1? Can the vendor respond to those items in a Word document, which will allow for better formatting and inclusion of screenshots where appropriate?

**ANSWER:** No, please provide in another document. Yes, a Word document is acceptable.

**QUESTION:** Will the proposed system perform its own authentication? Section 30.2.b on page 21 references password requirements; 30.2.d indicates use of OSPI’s EDS system for authentication.

**ANSWER:** It would be preferred to integrate with EDS and utilize existing portal security.

**QUESTION:** Please provide templates/file specifications for the Excel file exports for Apportionment and AFRS (page 21, section 30.3.b).

**ANSWER:** See document titled “Apportionment Extract Example”

**QUESTION:** On page 26, the end of section 30 indicates that repetition of work statements is not considered responsive. Some of the work statements, such as 30.7.3 through 30.7.7, seem to only require an agreement to adhere to the specifics of the work statement. What constitutes a responsive response on items like these?

**ANSWER:** Certifying or agreeing to statements may be repeated.

**QUESTION:** Page 28, section 31.3.4, references providing on-line training (via WebEx) approximately 20 days before release of the new system. However, section 31.3 seems to otherwise be dealing with the post-launch, ongoing support phase. Pre-launch training is addressed in sections 30.8.1 through 30.8.3. Can you please clarify the training requirement in 31.3.4? Is that meant to be ongoing annual training for new system users?

**ANSWER:** The training requirement in 31.3.4 has been dropped. Please refer to Amendment 02.

**QUESTION:** Please provide a list of grants that you expect to implement in the system during the three years for which you are seeking a cost proposal.

**ANSWER:** See revised version of Attachment A.

**QUESTION:** Requirement FR058 from Attachment A indicates a mandatory requirement to send claims data via interface to the SAFS system. Section 30.3.b on page 21 of the main RFP document refers to providing Excel file exports. Do you require an automated interface to send this data or do you want a spreadsheet that a user can then upload to SAFS?

**ANSWER:** Data export will be CSV from the grant system. OSPI will manage all processes beyond the creation of the CSV file. Requirement FR058 has been changed to Desirable. See Amendment 02.

**QUESTION:** Requirement FR062 from Attachment A includes a comment that “After the approved budget is received by the Grants Claims system, that system the grant award number returns it to the Grant Application system”. Please clarify this statement. Additionally, the requirement is to interface between the Grant Claims System and Grant Application system. We presume the “Grant Application system” is the same thing as iGrants. Is that correct? If so, this requirement is somewhat confusing, as these systems are intended to be replaced by the proposed solution.

**ANSWER:** See other responses to the Grant Claims system interface.

**QUESTION:** Requirement FR171 from Attachment A: please provide examples of the 10 required federal and 5 required state annual reports.

**ANSWER:** See revised version of Attachment A.

**QUESTION:** Please expand on the goals of the pilot. Would this include all grant programs, or a subset?

**ANSWER:** Subset

**QUESTION:** Does the term Payment Calculation refer to the sums of all submitted/approved claims in a given month? If more complex than that, please explain.

**ANSWER:** By grant number, by district, by group, or by all.

**QUESTION:** By what means does CEDARS data integrate with Applications? Is it by Web Service, or an extract or by some other means?

**ANSWER:** The system will not integrate with the CEDARS. OSPI has amended requirement FR111 to Desirable. See Amendment 02.

**QUESTION:** Per the Requirement, the existing iGrants system can interface to EDS for Building lists. Is this interface a web service, annual extract, or some other type? Does OSPI desire a more sophisticated type of interface that is currently employed?

**ANSWER:** This interface would be developed as part of implementation and can be architected to meet the solution needs. Utilizing EDS as the security portal would provide organization information.

**QUESTION:** Please explain how the services provided to private schools currently involve connected systems

**ANSWER:** This requirement has been dropped. See Amendment 02.

**QUESTION:** Does OSPI require Title I-A projects to be closed out on 6/30, or 9/30? Please list any Federal Programs which do not follow that same closeout timeline as Title I-A.

**ANSWER:** Sub-grantees are required to obligate current grant funds by 8/31 and final liquidation (Closeout) are due mid-November. OSPI closes all grants by 12/31. We are unable to provide all the closeout dates. We would like the system to be flexible in specifying the closeout date.

**QUESTION:** How does OSPI handle Cooperatives/Consortiums? Are member funds transferred to Fiscal Agents within iGrants today, or are allocations made to Fiscal Agents based on agreements that occur outside iGrants?

**ANSWER:** Application functionality is similar but allocations are combined for all member districts. Then the fiscal agent submits one budget. Fiscal agent claims funds as expended.

**QUESTION:** Is the determining factor in whether a claim is to be reviewed before being paid, based on the Program, the subgrantee, or both?

**ANSWER:** The Program. However, OSPI has a claims supervisor that reviews claims prior to payment.

**QUESTION:** As OSPI has indicated they desire a vendor hosted system, are there existing OSPI systems hosted outside OSPI that are accessed via the EDS/Single Signon.

**ANSWER:** Yes.

**QUESTION:** Can OSPI please provide a list of the program currently supported through iGrants? Are there programs not in iGrants that OSPI plans to put online in the EGMS?

**ANSWER:** See "List of 2016-17 Form Packages in iGrants"

**QUESTION:** Can OSPI provide details around the technology stack(s) of the existing iGrants and Grants Claim systems in use at OSPI? .NET / SQL. Will these systems be sunset at time of EGMS go-live or will there be a transition phase?

**ANSWER:** The plan is to sunset the previous system for form packages that are moved to the new system.

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

**ANSWER:** OSPI has worked with other states to view their systems. There was a demo with HMB in 2013.

**QUESTION:** Did OSPI utilize any vendor / SME consultants in defining the sought-after functionality and/or scope of work enumerated in the RFP? If yes, please provide their name(s).

**ANSWER:** No. OSPI hired a business analyst to work with our programs.

**QUESTION:** Please confirm, as mentioned in the pre-bidders' conference, that a cloud based Software-as-a- Service (SaaS) grants management solution is acceptable and will be evaluated equally with hosted solutions?

**ANSWER:** Confirmed.

**QUESTION:** Please provide the annual dollar amount of grant funding OSPI receives and distributes for the current fiscal year?

**ANSWER:** \$560M

**QUESTION:** What volume of these grants are Federally funded pass-through grants to sub-grantees?

**ANSWER:** 80%

**QUESTION:** It's stated that 2,200 users log into iGrants on a monthly basis. Please break down this user count into OSPI / State users (Internal) and sub-grantees (External educational entities) users.

**ANSWER:** There are no exact numbers. Approximately Internal: 75 External: 1,125

**QUESTION:** How many of each type – Internal and External – does the State anticipate having?

**ANSWER:** Same as above.

**QUESTION:** Please confirm that data migration from the existing systems to the new grants solution is out of scope. If not, can you provide an estimate of the volume of data to be converted and migrated into the new Grants Management System?

**ANSWER:** Confirmed.

**QUESTION:** What is the current format of this grant data?

**ANSWER:** N/A

**QUESTION:** Does OSPI or Washington State currently use/own an enterprise integration tool/ Data bus (such as Mulesoft)? If yes, please describe the tool and the ability or desire to use for integration purposes to EGMS.

**ANSWER:** No.

**QUESTION:** How many grant programs does OSPI manage? Please describe them in greater detail.

**ANSWER:** Section 4.2.1, restated below:

The system must be able to support federal grants governed by the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (Title I, Title II, Title V, etc.), the Office of English Language Acquisition (Title III), the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (specifically IDEA-B grants), the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (Perkins, Tech Prep, etc.). Additionally, the system must be able to support state and privately funded grants, including Capitol Facilities Grants to sub-grantees.

**QUESTION:** Do the business processes (application, pre-award, award, etc.) and associated forms/form packages vary with each type of program or are processes and forms largely standardized?

**ANSWER:** The form packages are customized for each grant application. They are modified annually to meet requirements. The new system does not have to replicate the old system and OSPI expects the vendor to present a solution that is already in use.

**QUESTION:** Given its high security and operational standards, does OSPI require cloud-based, SaaS solutions to be provisioned on a FEDRamp-certified infrastructure?

**ANSWER:** No.

**QUESTION:** Does OSPI require cloud-based, SaaS solutions to be provisioned on a FISMA moderate infrastructure?

**ANSWER:** Not required because none of the data we plan to process is sensitive. However, OSPI needs the product coded in a secure manner so we can assure our stakeholders the software will not compromise any information or other systems.

**QUESTION:** Given the State's stated challenges with maintaining a working grants solution without substantial effort and costs, does OSPI require EGMS to be updated annually free of charge to keep pace with changing federal legislation (e.g., ESSA)?

**ANSWER:** Yes, we are expecting the vendor to provide product support, continuous maintenance, and develop enhancements as needed. We are expecting smooth operations and the ability to keep current with changes to federal legislation and circular changes. The fee structure is up to the bidder to decide.

**QUESTION:** Can you provide a sample of your typical application and application review form?

**ANSWER:** Application samples were provided for Migrant Education, Improving Basic programs, and teacher & Principal Training & recruiting as part of Addendum 02.

**QUESTION:** How many total forms – across the grants life-cycle – are currently used?

**ANSWER:** Approximately 180 grant applications.

**QUESTION:** Please elaborate on the State's application review process. How many review steps are standard, what types of reviews are included (e.g., eligibility, financial, etc.), and who typically is involved in this review?

**ANSWER:** This is not standard across the agency and all programs establish their own review process to meet their unique needs.

**QUESTION:** Given OSPI's linkage to Federal grants and grants systems, can the 5 years of demonstrated experience demonstrated by vendors include Federal grants management experience as well?

**ANSWER:** Yes, as long as the system is in use in 3 or more states.

**QUESTION:** Please confirm that the State understands that it technologically cannot be the owner of any components of a software-as-a-service COTS solution nor can any component of such a solution be put into escrow. Custom code developed specific to OSPI may be put into escrow but not the base product.

**ANSWER:** OSPI understands that the bidder's current system is proprietary and owned by them. We expect a good installation and implementation; however, if the installation should go horribly wrong, we will seek to acquire the software and install on our own systems. We are asking for a licensing option for perpetual use should that option be selected by OSPI.

**QUESTION:** Please describe the purpose, architecture, and integration capabilities for the system (EDS).

**ANSWER:** The Educational Data System (EDS) is a security front end for OSPI applications. It is built on Microsoft .NET 4.5 and can accept OAuth security authentication to provide users with single sign-on capability.

**QUESTION:** During the pre-bidders' conference, it was stated no integration will be made to your financial management system, please confirm this statement that no interface/integration is required.

**ANSWER:** Confirmed; however, we will need a file export for the apportionment system. The claims management system will depend on the bidder's system and whether there is a claim management module contained within the software. If there is no claim management, then we will need to export claim information from the bidder's system and import into the OSPI claims system. If it contains a claims module, there is no need for integration or file transfers.

**QUESTION:** If integration is required, please provide the technology, version number, and vendor details associated with Washington state financial systems AFRS and Apportionment.

**ANSWER:** We are expecting a comma separated values (CSV) file.

**QUESTION:** What Washington State group would provide the AFRS support, modifications, and testing functions?

**ANSWER:** OSPI would provide testing of the file as an agency user of the AFRS.

**QUESTION:** OSPI requests the ability to send claims pay data via interface to the School Apportionment and Financial Services (SAFS) system. What is the technology and interface capabilities of SAFS?

**ANSWER:** We are expecting a comma separated values (CSV) file.

**QUESTION:** Please provide the purposes, architecture, and integration capabilities of Comprehensive Education Data and Research System (CEDARS)? What technology is CEDARS built on? What Washington State group would provide CEDARS support and testing?

**ANSWER:** The system will not integrate with the CEDARS. OSPI has amended requirement FR111 to Desirable; see Amendment 02. The vendor would have to accept a CSV file as part of the grant application. OSPI will work with the bidder to determine feasibility of desirable requirements.

**QUESTION:** Please provide the purposes, architecture, and integration capabilities of Private Participation System. What technology is Private Participation System built on? What Washington State group would provide support and testing?

**ANSWER:** OSPI will change requirement FR112 to Desirable. The vendor would have to accept a CSV file as part of the grant application. OSPI will work with the bidder to determine feasibility of desirable requirements.

**QUESTION:** The State is looking for a COTS grants management solution that can be easily modified to meet OSPI's requirements. Many, if not most, of these solutions are built using technologies other than .NET.

**ANSWER:** Great.

**QUESTION:** Please confirm the State is open to selecting the best possible solution independent of technology.

**ANSWER:** OSPI prefers applications built with the same technologies used internally in case the state must take ownership of the application.