Request for Proposals No. 2025-19 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. 2025-19, issued December 4, 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. Communication directed to other parties will be considered unofficial and non-binding on OSPI, and may result in disqualification of the Consultant.

1. **Question:** *RE page 8, Development Team: "…..and an external, contracted IT Support and Development team.":* Will these other teams remain in place?
   Answer: No: the new system will need to include a roadmap for service and maintenance options moving forward.

2. **Question:** *RE page 8, eCertification: "Requires integration to eCertification":* Is this the Washington State Educators eCertification? We need additional information about this.
   Answer: Yes, eCertification refers to the Washington State Educators' eCertification system, which is managed by OSPI. More information can be found on OSPI's eCertification webpage.

3. **Question:** *RE page 8, Non-SAFS Data: "Apportionment recieves data from at least 12 Non-SAFS sources.":* How do they recieve this data currently?
   Would they like us to integrate communication with each of these external systems into the application?
   Answer: Non-SAFS Data is received manually. File formats include Excel, CSV, include HTML. All received files must then be converted to HTML for integration with the current systems.

4. **Question:** *RE page 8, Annual Updates: "Calculations themselves are updated annually by each business line manager. One of them is communicated by Excel, while others use email narrative.":* Is this a process that they are looking to replace with the admin dashboard?
   Answer: Ideally, the new system will minimize or eliminate manual processes, so yes, we want to capture necessary data in an automated way.

5. **Question:** *RE page 12, Dashboard w/ Sandbox: "Create a dashboard that permits authorized users to make annual adjustments to business rules, formulas, schedules, and*

metadata (such as school names), and a 'sandbox' to test such changes.": We need clarification as to what kind of functionality they want for this. Can we get an example of what types of inputs, outputs, and calculations they would be updating?

Answer: SAFS formulas comprise of long strings of data elements (including the results of other formulas) that are added, multiplied, etc. through mathematical commands. Here are two random examples: The first is for a process called School CLS Salary Inc TK Total:

[School Generated TK CLS FTE] * [CLS - Salary Inc] * [Regionalization] - [School CLS Salary Maint TK Total].

The second is for Materials, Supplies, and Operating Costs' Additional Calculations when applied to Grades 9-12:

[Total MSOC Technology-LabSci] + [Total MSOC Utilities-LabSci] + [Total MSOC Curriiulum-LabSci] + [Total MSOC Library-LabSci] + [Total MSOC Supplies-LabSci] + [Total MSOC Prof Dvlp-LabSci] + [Total MSOC Facilities-LabSci] + [Total MSOC Districtwide-LabSci].

For more examples all the apportionment reports display the calculations with descriptions and values next to the calculated values and can be accessed from Apportionment, Enrollment, and Fiscal Reports | OSPI by using the dropdowns, and in an example file of SAFS formulas attached to this Q&A:
EXAMPLE_Apportionment Formulas Baseline 2024-25.xlsx

6. **Question:** *RE page 11, OSPI Integration: Automatically connect SAFS to a variety of related data sources throughout the OSPI enterprise.:* What specific existing systems will the new solution need to integrate with, and are there any existing documentation or APIs available for these systems? Can you provide more details on the data formats and input methods currently used? Are they expected to be unidirectional or bidirectional integrations?

   Answer: SAFS receives data from roughly a dozen separate internal systems regarding educators, students, grants, transportation, levies, and so on. Each is a one-way communication, via a stepwise UI, excel documents, or a direct db connection; SAFS does not send data back to these systems. Additional sources of information about these systems will be made available during the business analysis portion of the project. For planning purposes, assume that each connection will require a REST API.

7. **Question:** *RE Technology: The current technologies used by the legacy system have not been specified; we require clarification.:* Are there any existing vendor partnerships or technology ecosystems that we should consider when proposing technology solutions, especially if there are restrictions on using certain vendors or products? Are there any legacy technologies currently in use that OSPI finds problematic or would like to replace or avoid in the new system? If yes, could you elaborate on the challenges faced?

   Answer: SAFS was built in-house as a custom solution. We are looking for a full modernization. Vendors needn't be guided by our past technology decisions, nor avoid

any current technologies, outside of considerations expressed in the Feasibility Study, and by the fact that we are generally a Microsoft shop unless circumstances dictate another approach.

8. **Question:** *RE Data Migration:* Does SAFS require data migration as part of this RFP? If so, What specific data sets from the existing SAFS system need to be migrated to the new system?
   Answer: Per Requirement 028, "Users can view prior seven years of data: Users may only view estimates associated with the current school year, however the Query by Item Code function may be used to view data items from the previous six school years."

9. **Question:** *RE Success Metrics:* What key performance indicators (KPIs) will be used to measure the success of this project?
   Answer: We have not yet established KPIs for this project, but they will be based on the SAFS Key Feature subsection of Section A.5: Objective and Scope of Work.

10. **Question:** *RE page 12, Business Rules and Formulas:* Can you elaborate on the "extensive and dynamic catalog of business rules and formulas" mentioned? What are some examples of these rules that the new system must accommodate?
    Answer: Here are two random examples: The first is for a process called School CLS Salary Inc TK Total:
    [School Generated TK CLS FTE] * [CLS - Salary Inc] * [Regionalization] - [School CLS Salary Maint TK Total].

    The second is for Materials, Supplies, and Operating Costs' Additional Calculations when applied to Grades 9-12:
    [Total MSOC Technology-LabSci] + [Total MSOC Utilities-LabSci] + [Total MSOC Curriculum-LabSci] + [Total MSOC Library-LabSci] + [Total MSOC Supplies-LabSci] + [Total MSOC Prof Dvlp-LabSci] + [Total MSOC Facilities-LabSci] + [Total MSOC Districtwide-LabSci].
    For more examples all the apportionment reports display the calculations with descriptions and values next to the calculated values and can be accessed from Apportionment, Enrollment, and Fiscal Reports | OSPI by using the dropdowns, and in an example file of SAFS formulas attached to this Q&A:
    EXAMPLE_Apportionment Formulas Baseline 2024-25.xlsx

11. **Question:** *RE Data Extraction Capabilities:* What specific capabilities are expected regarding data extraction and generation for custom reports? Are there pre-existing criteria or formats that reports must seamlessly conform to?
    Answer: The legacy system contains a set of 'canned' reports that will need to be replicated in the new system. We prefer to maintain the content and style of existing reports where appropriate to minimize the impact on external customers.

Regarding data extraction capabilities, please refer to the following requirements in Exhibit K: SAFS System Requirements: 002, 037, 041, 042, 047, 048, 049, 050, 051, 052, 066, 071, 073, 074, 077, 083, 084, 085, 086, 098, 109, 116, 119.

12. **Question:** *RE page 13, Accessibility & Branding Requirements: "All documents, videos, audio records, presentations, or other deliverables required under the resulting Contract shall be produced in format, compliant with the Americans With Disabilities Act and follow the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.2":* Could you please clarify which level of compliance is expected: A, AA, or AAA? We want to ensure we meet your specific accessibility needs while understanding that AAA compliance may introduce more extensive design constraints
    Answer: Ideally, we would like the new system to conform to WCAG 2.2 requirements, level AA. The minimum acceptable level of compliance for accessibility is Level AA compliance with Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.1, See WaTech Policy USER-01-01-S for more information.

13. **Question:** Given OSPI's focus on empowering business users while maintaining IT governance, how important is it to have a platform that provides visual logic editing and robust governance controls to ensure compliance without relying heavily on IT support?
    Answer: Apportionment rules and calculations require review and updates, including changes, additions, and deletions, annually. Changes must often be completed, tested, and moved into production in short turnaround times and first-time right. It is very important that the new SAFS system makes the execution of these changes manageable for business staff without requiring extensive coding or IT expertise.

14. **Question:** With the need to integrate with WorkDay and WaTech services, have there been specific integration challenges OSPI has encountered in the past, and how critical is a model-driven integration approach to ensuring adaptability and long-term sustainability?
    Answer: The transition of Washington's financial system to Workday is still under development. We anticipate using APIs for integration, and will receive guidance from the Workday project on the integration expectations and planning.

15. **Question:** How does OSPI prioritize a flexible deployment model that can adapt to evolving security and operational requirements, such as hybrid or multi-cloud environments?
    Answer: Having a flexible deployment model that can adapt to evolving security is relatively high. It's more important than operating in a multi-cloud environment. We prefer to reduce the number of cloud environments that require support. However, a flexible deployment environment is not more important than the operational requirements and providing a complete product that functions correctly. It is our preference that the bidder supports changes in the SAFS application and maintains the infrastructure to support it.

16. **Question RE: Pre-Bid Q&A Question 15 -** Notes that Kiehl NW is the current vendor maintaining the system. It seems that Kiehl NW would have a depth of knowledge and experience with the intricate SAFS systems to make "sole sourcing" justified. Why is OSPI not proceeding with a "sole source" arrangement with Kiehl NW for the full implementation? Are Kiehl NW eligible to bid on the procurement?
    Answer: We prefer to use the state's competitive process for large systems to ensure we understand the market solutions and cost. We are seeking the best solution for the SAFS systems and encourage all bidders who meet the minimum qualifications of the RFP to submit a proposal.

17. **Question RE: Rule Authoring -** Are there predefined standards or formats for how rules should be authored, validated, and executed within the system? In the current system, if a new rule were to be required, how is that implemented?
    Answer: Yes, generally through new or modified rule Metadata and new or modified formulas. New rules can sometimes not fit the standard formats/processes for data gathering and processing and requires a more customized approach.

18. **Question RE: Compliance and Auditing -** What level of auditability is required in the new SAFS system? Should the system provide logs for every calculation or rule modification? If so, how long are logs required to be kept?
    Answer: Yes, the system should provide logs for every calculation or rule modification. We use the [OSPI's Records Retention Schedule](#), and the apportionment system documentation is retained for 25 years.

19. **Question RE: Performance -** What is the estimated peak transaction volume the system must support during critical reporting periods? And are there any benchmarks that OSPI is expecting the platform to meet (maximum time for calculation of district allocations)?
    Answer: Transaction volume is about 7 billon calculations per hour with peak user access could be 3,000 concurrent users. There are 12 SAFS systems with total record count totaling 1 billion. Specifically for the apportionment system our goal is 2 hours or less to complete each submission for calculations.

20. **RFP Pg 12 Section A.5.ii #5 - Role-Based Access:** How does OSPI envision the role-based access being structured? For instance, will district users only have the ability to view and modify their specific data? Or, are they able to view statewide data, but only modify their own?
    Answer: LEAs should have a dashboard to submit and view their data. They should only see their own data on their dashboard. Some submissions, such as the P223 system, will need to allow LEAs to view, create, revise, and submit their files. ESDs can view and submit their LEA files. SAFS can view, revise, and submit all files. Any required modifications would require a new upload.

21. **Question RE: RFP Section A.5.ii #6 & 7 - Training:** To what level is the selected vendor expected to be involved with the training & support of users to the replacement system? The RFP mentions "develop a transition and training plan" & "Provide training and materials for internal system administrators and IT support". To what level are we expected to be involved in training & transitioning? Is a "train-the-trainer" approach acceptable?
    Answer: The vendor will provide comprehensive training for internal users in the use and management of the system. The vendor will also provide additional materials such as user guides, quick start guides, and PowerPoints to support a "train the trainer" model for external users accessing the dashboard for data review and data submissions.

22. **Question:** If certified Veteran-Owned Businesses or Small Businesses are utilized as subcontractors in our proposal, will scoring preference points be awarded? What is the methodology for awarding the scoring preference points?
    If a small or veteran-owned business is in the process of becoming registered in the State of WA, but not yet approved, will points be received for those requirements?
    Answer: At this time, OSPI assigns preference points based only on the prime contractor's status.

23. **Question:** There are conflicts in the required sections listed in the RFP. Please confirm the required sections and preferred order of the proposal submission.
    Section C.2. PROPOSAL OVERVIEW on page 25 of 79 indicates four major sections are required. However, the following 6 sections are listed in C.2:

    1. Letter of Submittal including signed certifications, as applicable
    a. Certifications and Assurances
    b. Contract Issues List (if applicable)
    c. Qualification Affirmations
    d. Contract Intake Form
    2. Technical Proposal
    3. Requirements Review
    4. Management Proposal
    5. Cost Proposal
    6. Strategic Alignment
    The following sections are listed in Section C but are not identified as a major section above in A.
    Answer: The intended required sections are outlined in sections C.3 to C.10. The reference to Section C.2. having four sections is an error. The sentence on Page 25 reading, "The four major sections of the proposal are to be submitted in the order noted below" should read, "The eight major sections...
    1. Letter of Submittal including signed certifications, as applicable

        a. Certifications and Assurances

        b. Contract Issues List (if applicable)

        c. Qualification Affirmations

        d. Contract Intake Form

2. Technical Proposal

3. Requirements Review

4. Management Proposal

5. Experience of the Consultant/Staff/Subcontractors

6. Past Performance

7. Cost Proposal

8. Strategic Alignment

24. **Question:** C.7. EXPERIENCE OF THE CONSULTANT/STAFF/SUBCONTRACTORS
C.8. PAST PERFORMANCE
The Proposal checklist in Exhibit I does not align with all of the components listed in Section C, such as References.
Answer: See response to previous question.
Exhibit I is intended to guide the bidder's submission confirmation of all required sections. Sections C.7. and C.8. are missing from this Exhibit in error, and must be included in your response.

25. **Question:** Which of the following security regulations are required for SAFS?

154	Compliance with security guidance	The system must comply with all relevant security regulations, such as PCI, DSS, HIPAA, FERPA, etc.

    Answer: SAFS may contain DOB and Social Security information. SAFS must comply with all requirements if the new system contains any functionality subject to these regulations.

26. **Question:** Please confirm which of the following data privacy laws SAFS must comply with.

155	Data privacy laws	The system must comply with all data privacy laws, such as GDPR or CCPA, as applicable.

    Answer: SAFS may contain DOB and Social Security information. SAFS must comply with all requirements if the new system contains any functionality subject to these regulations. [WA State also has privacy principles](#).

27. **Question:** Is there a state time requirement to update a business rule from legislative change to business rule update. If so, how long?
Answer: Legislative changes must be incorporated prior to the start of the next school year. This turnaround time may be as long as a few months or as short as a few weeks and depends mainly on legislative decision-making timelines.

28. **Question:** There are conflicts regarding the required proposal validity period between section B.10 and Exhibit A. Please confirm which is correct.
B.10. ACCEPTANCE PERIOD

Proposals must provide six (6) months for acceptance by OSPI from the due date for receipt of proposals. OSPI may accept such bid, with or without further negotiation, at any time within such period.

EXHIBIT A - CERTIFICATIONS AND ASSURANCES

3. The attached proposal is a firm offer for a period of ninety (90) business days following receipt, and it may be accepted by OSPI without further negotiation (except where obviously required by lack of certainty in key terms) at any time within the ninety (90) business-day period.

Answer: The intended acceptance period is six (6) months.

29. **Question:** Please confirm which accessibility compliance is required. Both Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.0 and 2.2 are mentioned in the following sections of the RFP document:
    - A.5.iii. Accessibility & Branding Requirements - WCAG 2.2
    - I.D. Accessibility & Brand Compliance – WCAG 2.0

    Additionally, Exhibit K, requirement ID 179 identifies both 2.2 and 2.1.

178	WCAG 2.2 AA compatibility	The system must comply with the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.1 level AA standard for accessibility.

    Answer: Ideally, we would like the new system to conform to WCAG 2.2 requirements, level AA.

    The minimum acceptable level of compliance for accessibility is Level AA compliance with Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.1, See WaTech Policy **USER-01-01-S for more information**.

30. **Question:** Please estimate the following metrics for the current SAFS system:
    1) # of screens **Answer:** 143 screens, many shared among apps
    2) # of reports **Answer:** 186 SSRS Reports
    3) # of database tables **Answer:** 16 different db tables
    4) # of API connections / external interfaces **Answer:** About 13 api/service connections

31. **Question:** Please identify which database platform and which reporting tools are being used in the current SAFS application.
    Answer: The current SAFS application is on SQL Server 2016.

32. **Question:** Please confirm the total number of users previously provided included the third-party vendors who will require access to the SAFS system.
    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 OSPI users are expected to number between 10-20.
    Answer: The number of external users may vary based on the needs of each LEA. In the last year there were 2747 individual external users from 321 LEAs with access to SAFS. Internal OSPI users are expected to number between 10-20.

There are up to three application development contractors with access to the SAFS systems.

33. **Question:** Please specify the platform you are currently using for user training and support.
    Answer: Training and support materials may include, but not be limited to, recorded videos, PowerPoints, PDFs, user manuals, and quick start guides. Training materials should be available and transferable as standalone documents whether we decide to load them into a Learning Management System such as Canvas, or store them in SharePoint folders.

34. **Question:** Does the cost proposal section need to be submitted separate from the rest of the proposal response?
    Answer: No, the cost proposal should be included in the total proposal submission.

35. **Question:** Please clarify the section referenced in C.4.i below. Section A.4.i. does not exist in the RFP.
    C.4.i Project Approach/Methodology
    Include a complete description of the Consultant's proposed approach and methodology for the project. This section should convey Consultant's understanding of the proposed project. Additionally, describe how your solution will address the high-level future state improvements for the School Apportionment Systems Replacement as reference in section A.4.i.
    Answer: This is a typo. The sentence "Additionally, describe how your solution will address the high-level future state improvements for the School Apportionment Systems Replacement as reference in section A.4.1" should read as follows: "Additionally, describe how your solution will address the high-level future state improvements for the School Apportionment Systems Replacement as reference in the SAFS Key Features section of A.5.i"

36. **Question:** How many payments do we see per organization per month, on average? What is the highest, what is the lowest?
    Answer: Each LEA receives a single monthly payment that is initiated by SAFS. Each of these currently comprises 76 revenue code types (although many code will contain no payment for a given district in a given month). Every month, each county treasurer accesses SAFS reports to determine how much to provide each school district. Charter schools, State Tribal Education Compacts (STEC) and some state entity funds are processed by the OSPI fiscal office with electronic funds through the AFRS system, which will be replaced by One Washington.

37. **Question:** To how many parties is a given payment being apportioned, on average? What is the highest, what is the lowest?
    Answer: There are approximately 380 LEAs that are paid via SAFS. Month-to-month differences in the number of payments are negligible.

38. **Question:** Is it important to store students as rows in a table so they can be queried, or would student information simply be a piece of information on something else? In other words, what is student enrollment data being used for?
Answer: Personally Identifiable student info is out of scope of this project. LEAs report on aggregate student enrollment (total FTE counts) at the school level. This information is used by funding formulas to determine payments and ensure adequate school staffing.

39. **Question:** Is each student strictly N:1 to a school district, or can a student be enrolled in multiple educational entities?
When a student moves to another school district, how is this information sent to the system?
Does each student have a unique identifier that follows them between districts?
Answer: Yes, students can be enrolled in more than one school within a district and can be counted in more than one LEA for any month.

Student enrollment is reported by resident district – which could include a different district than the reporting district. For more information on this, refer to this publication: https://ospi.k12.wa.us/sites/default/files/2023-08/choicetransferreportingpublication_0.pdf.

The question of unique identifier is not something that would apply to the P223 system. A student who moves between LEAs does not need to be tracked by SAFS: the count would change, but SAFS neither has nor needs an identifier to trace an individual student.

SAFS uses student counts only and not personally identifiable info. (See #10 for more).

40. **Question:** How much of the calculation strategy would be available to bidding parties prior to project start?
Answer: Current calculation information (including any known upcoming changes) can be provided to the apparently successful bidder prior to the start of work. Bidders can reference RCW Title 28A for more information on the funding formulas and expectations.
An example file of SAFS formulas and data dictionary are provided with this Q&A:
EXAMPLE_Apportionment Formulas Baseline 2024-25.xlsx
EXAMPLE_Apportionment Data Dictionary Baseline 2024-25.xlsx
A final updated calculations file will be confirmed and provided to the Apparent Successful Bidder prior to the start of the project.

41. **Question:** Are reports for public transparency being manually uploaded, or is there an automated system in place to pull data, convert to .pdf, and upload?
Is this a separate system with which we would need to integrate, or is the expectation that the new SaaS solution would provide this automated functionality?

Answer: This set of reports can be viewed on OSPI's [School Apportionment website](#). They are generated via the automated process you describe, although the 'as is' process may sometimes require manual intervention.

42. **Question:** Is there interest in BI or visual/chart-based reporting?
    Answer: Yes; we are interested in BI. For SAFS, this functionality is likely categorized as a "nice to have", and it may not be prioritized to be included in this phase of the project.

43. **Question:** Is OCR a requirement for certain data uploading, namely SAFS ALE data?
    Answer: Optical Character Recognition (OCR) is not required for ALE data in regard to the SAFS Financial Application.

44. **Question:** Please confirm the Contract Issues List does not count towards the one-page limit for the Letter of Submittal.
    Answer: Confirmed. The one-page limit is intended for introductory remarks.

45. **Question:** Please confirm Exhibit B Qualification Affirmations should be provided in Section 1 Letter of Submittal portion of the RFP response.
    Answer: No: Exhibit B: Statement of Confidentiality and Non-Disclosure specifically needs to be submitted with neither the letter of submittal nor the proposal itself. At the time that you submit your proposal, Exhibit B is informational. The winning vendor will be expected to sign the form during the contract stage.

46. **Question:** Please confirm Exhibit K should be returned in Excel format.
    Answer: Yes, Exhibit K should be maintained in the same Excel format. However, if necessary, it can be converted to PDF. Readability should be the paramount driver in your decision. It is the bidder's responsibility to ensure the submission is readable.

47. **Question:** In Exhibit K, are comments a requirement if "Configuration" is selected as a response?
    Answer: No; the expectation is that configurations are relatively easy (e.g., an 'Extra Small' or 'Small' tee-shirt size) to implement and test, and pose a low risk, so no additional explanation is necessary at this stage. See the "Instructions" sheet within Exhibit K for more detailed directions.

48. **Question:** Should the Monthly Budget Status report be included in Appendix J?
    Answer: [Exhibit J,](#) provided as a separate file on OSPI's procurement website, is a collection of high-level system summaries intended to provide an overview of the project's scope and components. Please note that this exhibit is not considered 100% accurate and should be used for guidance purposes only. A full review and update of the information contained in Exhibit J will be necessary prior to the start of the project to ensure accuracy and completeness.

49. **Question:** During the preproposal conference, it was mentioned that there is an $8 million projected cost/budget for the project. Is the $8 million a total cost for the entire project? Over how many years would the $8 million projection apply?
    Answer: Our expectation is that the entire suite of systems will be replaced within two years. Approximately $8 million is being requested for this project for the entirety of the development and first year of Maintenance and Operations for a working system. Ongoing operational expenses after the closing of the project are not included in this budget projection but should be included in your proposal.

50. **Question:** Do you have the total student enrollment for the 380 educational entities the School Apportionment System is used to distribute funding to?
    Answer: Yes: 1,104,247 students are enrolled in Washington's Local Education Agencies for the 2024-25 school year. The number of students does not change the complexity of the calculations for apportionment funding.

51. **Question RE Technical Alignment:** What are the main pain points or limitations of the current SAFS?
    Answer: The pain points for the system are
    - too many manual processes that introduce the potential for errors.
    - Intercommunication between the modules is complex and makes updating take a long time.

    The system age makes it difficult to make change efficiently. We receive several legislative changes each year.

52. **Question RE Technical Alignment:** Are there specific issues with calculation complexities, reporting, or system integrations?
    Answer: Inputs, outputs, and reporting required within the SAFS systems must be regularly reviewed and revised based on legislative changes, often with short turnaround times. The current state requires considerable manual configuration updates and even hard coding to address changes to the formulas. It is critical that the new system be adaptable and flexible to meet any changing requirements each year.

53. **Question RE Technical Alignment:** How many data inputs and funding scenarios need to be processed monthly?
    Answer: Data is collected from each of the state's Local Area Education Agencies (LEAs), including school districts (295), Educational Service Districts (9), Tribal Compacts (7), and public Charter Schools (17). We also collect data from additional (51) entities such as State Colleges, Technical Colleges and other State Agencies.
    There are several required annual public-facing reports to be published on our website. In addition, each system within the SAFS suite will have different reporting needs. However, as funding is apportioned monthly, you can expect reports to be required at least as often.

54. **Question RE Technical Alignment:** What is the expected system workload in terms of users and transactions?
   Answer: The number of external users varies 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 OSPI users are expected to number between 10-20. Access to the Apportionment System, which calculates and summarizes data from all other SAFS systems, is currently limited to only 2 approved internal users.

55. **Question RE Technical Alignment:** Which external systems or databases (e.g., Workday, state ERP) must the solution integrate with?
   Answer: The new system will need to integrate with a user identification platform (whether EDS, our current system, or Entra ID, which we hope to adopt within this project's timeframe), DocuSign, the Apportionment system, which is the final system in the SAFS suite, and with state financial data (currently called AFRS, and to be replaced by the upcoming One Washington system, under development through Workday) via Workday's Enterprise Interface Builder (EIB) and, eventually, APIs.

56. **Question RE Technical Alignment:** Are there existing APIs, or would integration require custom development?
   Answer: Integration would require custom development.
   OSPI prefers to minimize new work for LEAs, and so data input via SFTP and direct entry, using a GUI, may need to be retained as well as creating API options.
   Development of EIBs, with the capability of transitioning to APIs, will also be required.

57. **Question RE Technical Alignment:** What specific WaTech security policies must the solution comply with?
   Answer: All state IT projects must comply with security and compliance protocols established by WaTech, including policy: SEC-01 was 141 - Securing Information Technology Assets. Additional Information can be found here: https://watech.wa.gov/policies

58. **Question RE Technical Alignment:** Are there advanced encryption, role-based access, or auditing needs?
   Answer: System encryption must meet or exceed WaTech's Encryption Standard SEC-08-02-2.
   Role-based access must be addressed using EDS, our current access system, or Entra ID, which we hope to adopt within this project's timeframe.
   All transactions must be auditable by the State Auditor's Office for up to four years.

59. **Question RE Functional Requirements:** How often do business rules and funding formulas change?
   Answer: OSPI typically has annual updates based on legislative decisions that need to be incorporated into the SAFs systems prior to the start of each school year. At the

close of each legislative session, the systems' calculations are updated to comply with current funding requirements. Local education agencies need to start with state forecasting and budgeting within 2-4 weeks of the end of the legislative session. However, rolling over enrollment reporting, apportionment funding calculations, and personnel reporting have until the start of the new school year before systems are needed. The financial statements have a one-year lag as local agencies do not report information to us until the year is closed.

60. **Question RE Functional Requirements:** What level of automation is desired in workflows, projections, and approvals?
    Answer: OSPI prefers to minimize manual tasks to the extent possible within the system, with the exception of approvals. Manual approval at certain levels is necessary to review and data to ensure accuracy.

61. **Question RE Functional Requirements:** Is the system expected to store individual teacher or student data within the system or are we just calculating high level numbers?
    Answer: Personal Identifiable Information (PII) for teachers and students is collected within SAFS. The system requires counts of teachers, other staff, and students within various categories. It's possible the new system may need to store PII and should be secured accordingly.
    There may need to be an effort to move the educator PII out of the SAFS if it is not stored there. That will increase the schedule and cost risk if a dependency is created.

62. **Question RE Functional Requirements:** Are there specific reporting capabilities required by stakeholders (e.g., dashboards, legislative reports)?
    Answer: Yes, there are specific reporting and audit requirements for the data, including public facing documents and visualizations. Please refer to the Statement of Work and Appendix K for high-level reporting requirements.

63. **Question RE Stakeholder Expectations:** How much training will OSPI staff and stakeholders require during and after the system transition?
    Answer: The amount of training required will be influenced by the complexity of the user interface and functionality of the proposed system. Please include in your proposal ample training to support external users and internal users in a successful transition to the new system. Also, the training must be repeatable so that OSPI can train new staff when required.

64. **Question RE Stakeholder Expectations:** What type of support (e.g., user guides, videos) is needed for onboarding?
    Answer: Training materials may include, at the discretion of OSPI, live trainings (in-person or online), training videos, user manuals, and slide decks.

65. **Question RE Stakeholder Expectations:** What are the expectations for stakeholder communication and involvement?
Answer: For the duration of the project, a Steering Committee and Product Owner will be committed to overseeing the vision and goals of the development. In addition, we expect to have at a minimum a Business Analyst, Quality Assurance Manager, Project Manager, and Program Management staff available in support of the work. This does not preclude the vendor also having individuals in some or all these positions. A meeting schedule will be established by OSPI at the start of the project for timely collaboration and communication. Each of these bodies or individuals will require frequent, tailored communication from the vendor, which will be explicated in an upcoming Communications Plan.

66. **Question RE Strategic Alignment:** Are there specific WCAG 2.2 or ADA compliance concerns for deliverables or reports?
Answer: All documents, videos, audio records, presentations, or other deliverables required under the resulting Contract shall be produced in a format compliant with the Americans With Disabilities Act, and must follow the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.2, OSPI's formatting standard specified in Exhibit G – OSPI Americans with Disabilities Act Compliance: Graphics and Colors, OSPI's Brand Use Policy, OSPI's Style Guide, and OSPI's Videography Style Guide.

67. **Question RE Strategic Alignment:** Are there any state-specific IT or procurement regulations that must be addressed?
Answer: All state IT projects must comply with security and compliance protocols established by WaTech, including policy: SEC-01 was 141 - Securing Information Technology Assets. Additional Information can be found here: https://watech.wa.gov/policies

68. **Question RE Strategic Alignment:** What is the agency's vision for the future state of apportionment (e.g., agility, forecasting)?
Answer: OSPI seeks to establish an efficient, user-friendly platform for education data collection, funding and enrollment calculation, payment distribution and reporting. Maintaining focus on customers, increasing operational efficiency and leveraging modern technology, the SAFS Modernization will address improvement opportunities including agility, integrated architecture, data integration, automation, self-service and accurate forecasting.
The apportionment system will be less dependent on manual calculations and more integrated.
The apportionment system will be flexible enough to change annually with legislative updates.

69. **Question RE Strategic Alignment:** Are there additional features that would be "nice-to-have" but not critical?
    Answer: Yes: Please see the 'Enhancement Request' (Requirements Line 131) in Exhibit M: SAFS Apportionment Requirements, requesting that the vendor Automate CTC, Open Doors, and Running Start Data reporting. Other such "nice-to-haves" will surely surface and can be prioritized during the course of the project.

70. **Question RE Strategic Alignment:** What is the critical go-live date?
    Answer: Based on the results of the feasibility study, the expectation is that the new system will go-live within two years of the start of the project. The current SAFS systems will remain in use until that time. This is also dependent on the planned date the vendor can achieve. We ask for realistic dates and would like to avoid persistent schedule changes.

71. **Question RE Strategic Alignment:** Is there room for a phased deployment, or must it be implemented all at once?
    Answer: OSPI is required to continue meeting state timelines for distribution of state funds to school districts. OSPI wishes to conduct this effort as an Agile project, with deliverables for every sprint. However, it's likely that we will have to continue to run the current-state system in parallel until all new system functionality has been delivered and successfully tested and accepted.

72. **Question:** How is the current environment built ? onprem or Cloud ? If Cloud Which cloud ?
    Answer: The current system is homegrown and on-prem. There is a preference to move any new solution to a Cloud environment, although an on-prem solution will be considered if it's the best fit for the solution.

73. **Question:** Which License tools are you currently using?
    Answer: The current system is homegrown and we own all licensing. The new system will need to integrate with a user identification platform, such as our current platform, EDS, with DocuSign, and with the state financial system being developed through Workday (One Washington). One Washington is in development and is expected to be implemented in the summer of 2026. OSPI is currently researching Entra External ID and hopes to replace EDS with this credentialing platform within the timeline of this project.

74. **Question:** How many active sources do you have for data ?
    Answer: Data is collected from each of the state's Local Area Education Agencies (LEAs), including school districts (295), Educational Service Districts (9), Tribal Compacts (7), and public Charter Schools (17). We also collect data from another (51) entities such as State Colleges, Technical Colleges and other State Agencies.

75. **Question:** How many active users use the system
    Answer: The number of external users varies based on the needs of each LEA. In the last year there were 2,287 individual external users from 321 LEAs with access to SAFS. Internal OSPI users are expected to number between 10-20. Access to the Apportionment System, which calculates and summarizes data from all other SAFS systems, is currently limited to only 2 approved internal users.

76. **Question:** What frequency of report generation is required ? daily ? weekly ? monthly ?
    Answer: There are several required annual public-facing reports to be published on our website. In addition, each system within the SAFS suite will have different reporting needs. However, as funding is apportioned monthly, you can expect reports to be required at least as often.

77. **Question:** Will the current platform and functionality be operational ? Who will be providing knowledge transition for modernizing apps ?
    Answer: The current platform remains operational, and will continue to calculate the necessary data to generate apportionment payments until the new solution is operational. We will have several internal users who are expert in some or all of the system available to answer any questions and to prioritize units of work. In addition, OSPI intends to begin the development effort by contracting a Business Analyst to further research and document system requirements, ensuring a comprehensive and complete understanding of the current state, as well as the intended future state of each sub-system.