

# Request for Proposals No. 2024-25

## Addendum 02 – Q&A

This document is posted to capture the questions received, and agency answers provided, during the question and answer period of RFP No. 2024-25, issued July 15, 2024.

All amendments, addenda, and notifications related to this procurement will be posted on the [OSPI website](#) (if this was an open procurement) and on the Washington Electronic Business Solution ([WEBS](#)) website. Additional questions concerning this procurement must be submitted to [contracts@K12.wa.us](mailto:contracts@K12.wa.us). Communication directed to other parties will be considered unofficial and non-binding on OSPI, and may result in disqualification of the Consultant.

---

- Question:** Does OSPI intend to replace all of the SAFS suite of applications/modules, or simply just the Apportionment module?

**Answer:** This effort is to address the entire system. The sizeable business rule set will be brought over in full (less any changes mandated by the legislature, any necessary corrections, and automations of what are presently manual processes), but the underlying purpose of this project is to move all apportionment functionality to a modern, cloud-based architecture with an easily updateable Business Rules Engine and robust security that facilitates the finance business of fund distribution, monitoring, and reporting.
- Question:** If the intent is to replace the whole suite, is the desire to build on the recently updated modules (e.g., F-195, F-196, etc.) or a wholesale technology replacement?

**Answer:** We expect to replace the whole suite of SAFS and Apportionment processes through a wholesale technology replacement. Only business rules and business logic will be retained.
- Question:** Does OSPI have a preferred architectural approach/technology stack in mind?

**Answer:** There is no preference for bidder-maintained solutions. We would prefer an Azure-based platform for custom solutions. However, we are open to other platforms. We simply want a secure modern cloud offering with this solution.
- Question:** Is OSPI's expectation that after two years all of the SAFS system upgrades will be complete, or is the goal after four years?

### A.7. PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE

The period of performance of any contract resulting from this RFP is tentatively scheduled to begin on or about July 1, 2025, and end on or about June 30, 2027. The option to extend any contract resulting from this procurement shall be at the sole discretion of OSPI.



OSPI reserves the right to amend to extend the contract for two (2) additional contract years through June 30, 2029.

**Answer:** Our expectation is that the entire suite of systems is replaced after two years. The option we are reserving to extend the contract would potentially address new annual funding guidance from the legislature, enhancements, maintenance, or further integrations.

5. **Question:** Is there a Demo account so that it is possible to see the current implementation? Or any demo videos of the whole main workflow (or a diagram)?

**Answer:** Our test environment is not available for this purpose, as it's needed for production at this time. To determine scope, please refer to the diagrams and description already provided within the RFP and the feasibility study.

6. **Question:** Do we correctly understand that these are the current roles in the SAFS platform described [here](#)?

**Answer:** You'll need to address only those roles within this document that begin with "SAFS". We are open to altering these roles to work with your system to ensure customers' continuous access.

7. **Question:** Could you elaborate on roles and permissions levels:

- Is it possible to create a custom role or each school has only default ones?

**Answer:** We are using only standardized roles. Roles are developed at an Agency level and are not subject to customization for individual LEAs or users.

- Can Assignment Levels be custom?

**Answer:** We are using only standardized roles. Roles are developed at an Agency level and are not subject to customization for individual LEAs or users.

- What issues do you encounter with roles and permissions in the legacy SAFS system?

**Answer:** Our greatest day-to-day challenge with roles and permissions in the apportionment suite is dealing with turnover within LEAs. We'd like this process to be easier in the new system.

8. **Question:** How do new users get the account in the system? Is there any verification of a user?

**Answer:** Local Education Agencies (LEAs) each have Security Managers, who are empowered to add new users to established roles within EDS.

9. **Question:** Is EDS a separate system from enrollment and staffing systems or EDS includes them?

**Answer:** EDS is a separate system for identity management, and is not part of the SAFS suite of systems included in this RFP. The SAFS suite, along with other, unrelated OSPI systems, use EDS for role and permission management and security.

10. **Question:** What external systems is SAFS integrated with (outside OSPI enterprise)? There is info about DocuSign integration, maybe anything else?

**Answer:** DocuSign and, it is anticipated for the near future, One Washington.

11. **Question:** Do we correctly understand that AFRS is not part of SAFS system? If so, is there an existing integration between AFRS and SAFS systems?

**Answer:** AFRS is transitioning to One Washington. One Washington is a statewide Workday application that will be used for all state government billing and payments. It is not, and will not be, part of the SAFS suite of systems, although SAFS will link to it. Currently, there is a manual process to transmit apportionment payment data to AFRS. Ideally, the new system will provide an automated integration of services to One Washington.

12. **Question:** To reduce manual input what systems should SAFS be integrated with (outside OSPI enterprise and within)? What processes should be automated?

**Answer:** DocuSign and, it is anticipated for the near future, One Washington. All current manual processes should be reviewed for transition to automated processes to the extent possible. The manual processes are mentioned in the RFP and feasibility study.

13. **Question:** How does SAFS get Non-SAFS data?

**Answer:** Non-SAFS data is currently gathered by LEAs and submitted as Excel spreadsheets via email.

o Are they inputted manually or integrated?

**Answer:** Each Excel file is then manually inputted.

o Seems that there is iGrants, EGMS systems in the frame of EDS or they are outside?

**Answer:** iGrants and EGMS are not part of the SAFS suite of systems and not included in this RFP. Any data needed from these systems are currently manually inputted to SAFS.

14. **Question:** Do we understand correctly that apportionment logic now is configured either manually by a Business Line manager or in the code by a developer?

o Could you provide us with an example of the apportionment logic rules and how it is configured on the UI?

**Answer:** Yes, both processes are used in various parts of the SAFS suite of systems.

Currently, payments logic is driven in one of three ways:

1) Calculated manually in excel and uploaded to apportionment as a payment total to LEAs; Or

2) Calculated in other non-SAFS system then provided as Excel files for upload into apportionment as payment total to LEAs;

Or

3) Calculated within apportionment using formulae that is applied to the data received from other SAFS systems, based on the legislatively mandated prototypical school funding formula.

Changes to that formulae or the corresponding configurations are made via code updates completed by developers.

More information can be found on the OSPI website's Apportionment pages here: [School Apportionment \(ospi.k12.wa.us\)](https://ospi.k12.wa.us/School%20Apportionment)

Additionally, refer to the sample formula file provided: Apportionment Formulas SAMPLE 2023-2024.xlsx.

These are calculation examples for staffing and student formulas within the apportionment system. This example is not inclusive of all calculations such as enrollment, personnel, or financial statement formulas which would be similar in nature, but still unique to the data collected and reported.

15. **Question:** How data in the reports are validated? Are there built-in rules, validators to make sure that the data in the report is in correct format?

**Answer:** Currently, validation varies based on the system. Validation is specific to the type of data entered.

OSPI's preference is for the new system to expand the use of appropriate validation to all data within the suite.

For example, if an LEA submits data in a category that is unapproved, the system should generate a user warning.

Validations are confirmed and, if necessary, changed to reflect new requirements, at the start of every school year.

16. **Question:** How long does it take now to generate the apportionment reports? What issues do you face?

**Answer:** Apportionment averages four hours to complete calculations, which are run numerous times during the processing week. Once calculated, approximately six further hours are needed to produce reports. Efficiency is limited by current server space and manual processes. The goal is to speed up processing time by automating manual processes, and right-sizing processing and storage capacity.

17. **Question:** How many users are there in the system now?

**Answer:** The number of external users may vary based on the needs of each LEA. In the last year there were 2287 individual external users from 321 LEAs with access to SAFS. Internal users are expected to number between 10-20.

18. **Question:** How many reports do the calculation engine process for the apportionment calculation?

**Answer:** Multiple reports are incorporated together in the calculation processes. There are currently 321 LEAs. We estimate 35 reports are estimated monthly for each LEA, with an additional 60-or-so annual reports per LEA.

19. **Question:** What is the data backup and recovery plan in the current system?

**Answer:** Currently, the SAFS suite of systems runs on three separate servers with nightly backups. An updated Crisis Recovery Plan is currently being developed and will be issued in the coming year.

20. **Question:** Is monthly Apportionment Payment File, monthly SAFS reports, raw data for the State Auditor's Office after calculation generated automatically or manual input is required?

**Answer:** All systems presently have some form of manual input. The expectation for the proposed system is to minimize the manual inputs and integrate data transfer as much as possible.

21. **Question:** How does the F-780 Levy Report come to a system?

**Answer:** The F780 Levy Report data is currently provided to OSPI via Excel spreadsheets. The expectation for the proposed system is to minimize the manual inputs and integrate data transfer as much as possible.

22. **Question:** What is certification for documents (e.g. The F-196 DocuSign Certification Process)? Why is it needed?

**Answer:** The state mandates that some submissions are certified by LEAs as approved data. Many of our documents are audited by the State Auditor's Office and these certifications are reviewed. DocuSign is acceptable certification for digital signatures.

23. **Question:** How do you handle customer support now?

**Answer:** OSPI currently has a customer support line supporting multiple systems. The SAFS Business Team works closely with customer support to resolve any issues. Ideally, the business team would like more visibility into the workings of the new proposed system to better allow them to assist with any system support.