

Request for Proposals No. 2026-20

Addendum 03 – Q&A

This document is posted to capture the questions received, and agency answers provided, during the question and answer period of RFP No. 2026-20, issued April 27, 2026.

Bidders should also refer to Amendment 01, posted June 2, 2026, for a schedule update related to this procurement.

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.

-
- Question:** Section C.1 states with respect to the email submission, "Attachments to the email shall be Microsoft Word, Portable Document Format (PDF), or a zipped file." Please confirm, should Exhibit M 1.2 Requirements and Exhibit N 1.3 Pricing Structure be returned in Excel, PDF, or both?

Answer: Excel is the expected format for attachments 1.2 Requirements and 1.3 Pricing Structure.
 - Question:** Is it compliant to submit any proposed dollar amounts (for pricing) outside of Exhibit N 1.3 Pricing Structure?

Answer: Proposed dollar amounts must be submitted in the attachment 1.3 Pricing Structure workbook as instructed in the RFP.
 - Question:** We are unable to access the Contractor Intake Form from the link provided in the RFP. To help us ensure we are using the correct version of the form, can you please provide a copy of the Contractor Intake Form?

Answer: The Contract Intake Form can be downloaded from the [Competitive Procurement website](#) – see "Procurement Forms."
 - Question:** Will OSPI accept demonstrated experience delivering a large-scale enterprise platform in a comparable regulated environment (e.g., public-sector operations, healthcare, or transportation) as meeting the minimum qualification for "an IEP platform or comparable system-of-record," even if the firm has not directly deployed an IEP system?

Answer: Yes, bidders should clearly explain how that experience is applicable to a statewide IEP platform.



5. **Question:** The minimum qualifications require an active SIS integration. Does this mean the proposed solution must currently have a live production SIS integration in an existing deployment, or is demonstrated technical capability to build and operate an SIS integration sufficient?

Answer: Demonstrated technical capability to build, operate, and support a SIS integration is sufficient. Bidders should describe prior integration experience, approach, standards, and operating model.
6. **Question:** The minimum qualifications require experience leading and being accountable for delivery of a large-scale multi-organization or high-complexity implementation. Does this include large-scale enterprise implementations outside of K-12?

Answer: Yes, OSPI will consider relevant large-scale enterprise implementations outside of PreK-22 where the bidder demonstrates applicability to the statewide education context.
7. **Question:** Will OSPI consider a teaming arrangement where a prime consultant partners with a subcontractor with direct IEP or special education compliance experience as collectively meeting the minimum qualifications?

Answer: Yes, OSPI will consider the qualifications of the proposed team. The selected prime contractor will remain responsible for overall delivery, accountability, and contract performance.
8. **Question:** Can OSPI provide additional detail regarding the current IEP platforms in use across LEAs, including whether there are incumbent vendors or preferred migration priorities?

Answer: OSPI conducted a feasibility study in 2025; related information can be found on the Statewide [IEP Project page](#). There is no incumbent vendor. OSPI will consider bidder proposed migration strategies and priorities.
9. **Question:** Is the expectation that all 312 LEAs will be migrated/onboarded to the new platform within the initial 3-year contract period (Dec. 2026 – Nov. 2029), or will some districts remain on legacy systems beyond this period?

Answer: The platform will not be mandatory. LEAs may opt in.
10. **Question:** Is Medicaid billing and reimbursement functionality within the scope of this contract, or is it a future-state integration only?

Answer: Medicaid billing is included in the RFP as an area for bidder response. Bidders should describe their proposed platform implementation capabilities and identify assumptions and dependencies.

11. **Question:** The RFP references a Functional Behavior Assessment / Behavior Intervention Plan capability and separately calls out pricing for FBA/BIP/MD for students not eligible for an IEP. Are these behavioral documentation tools required to be built into the core IEP platform, or can they be offered as an optional add-on module?
Answer: Bidders should clearly describe whether FBA, BIP, and MD functionality are included in the proposed platform or provided as an optional module. Pricing must be provided as instructed in the 1.3 Pricing Structure Excel workbook.
12. **Question:** The RFP references a High School and Beyond Plan (HSBP) System Alignment as a required integration. Is this a one-way data feed, bidirectional sync, or UI-level deep link?
Answer: The vision for this effort is that the High School and Beyond Platform (HSBP) data elements that comprise a student's IEP transition plan will be integrated as view only between the two systems. We have documented the data elements and are working with the HSBP vendor to build the integration which would be done through an application programming interface. Integration is a legislative requirement (SB 5969) to support educators and transition personnel to see the two plans and ensure they support the student with aligned goals.
13. **Question:** What is the current HSBP system in use by OSPI?
Answer: SchoolLinks.
14. **Question:** Regarding IFSP-to-IEP transition for children ages 0–3: Is OSPI expecting the platform to manage IFSP documents, or only to receive a student record at the point of IEP eligibility determination?
Answer: OSPI is focused on supporting effective transition into the IEP process. Bidders should describe how the proposed platform supports IFSP-to-IEP transition workflows.
15. **Question:** For post-secondary transition (students ages 16–22): Is the HSBP integration expected to be a real-time bidirectional sync, or a one-time data transfer?
Answer: The vision for this effort is that the High School and Beyond Platform (HSBP) data elements that comprise a student's IEP transition plan will be integrated as view only between the two systems. We have documented the data elements and are working with the HSBP vendor to build the integration which would be done through an application programming interface. Integration is a legislative requirement (SB 5969) to support educators and transition personnel to see the two plans and ensure they support the student with aligned goals.
16. **Question:** Are AI-enabled capabilities such as workflow assistance, summarization, translation, or support chatbots considered within scope for the platform?
Answer: AI-enabled capabilities may be proposed where they support the RFP objectives and comply with applicable privacy, security, accessibility, and governance requirements. At a minimum, the AI-enabled capabilities should address assisting users

with common questions, portal access, compliance requirements, and workflows or processes. It should also help with guiding users to applicable documentations within the platform, help with understanding student data, help clarify steps throughout the workflows to enable seamless IEPs. All AI use remains subject to the platform's FERPA, data-protection, and human-oversight expectations; AI should assist but do not replace the IEP team's professional judgment.

17. **Question:** For multilingual support, which specific languages are required at launch versus phased later?

Answer: OSPI has not established a final phased language list for this RFP. Bidders should describe the current proposed platform multilingual capabilities, supported capabilities, and its ability to expand over time. The system must support at minimum: Arabic, Khmer, Korean, Punjabi, Russian, Simplified Chinese, Somali, Spanish, Tagalog, Ukrainian, and Vietnamese.

18. **Question:** Are machine translation integrations/tools acceptable, or must translations be human-reviewed and certified for IEP documents?

Answer: We would expect there to be, at a minimum, machine translation integrated into the platform. However, OSPI does not treat automated translation as a substitute for human-quality assurance on legally significant content. Bidders should consider automated or machine translation as acceptable for accessibility, draft review, and family comprehension, but for the official/legally operative version of an IEP document, OSPI expects a human-review pathway (e.g., certified translator/interpreter validation) before a translated document is relied upon as the authoritative record. Bidders should describe how their solution distinguishes machine-translated convenience copies from human-verified official translations.

19. **Question:** For document translation in the family portal, does OSPI expect the platform to translate IEP documents themselves, or only platform UI elements and communications?

Answer: Both. There should be multilingual support for all documents and systems – translation of IEP documents into relevant languages, and family access to IEP documents in their native language to guide them through the platform. Translation is expected to cover the IEP documents AND platform UI and communications.

20. **Question:** What level of translation accuracy is required for legally significant documents?

Answer: Bidders should describe how they ensure translation accuracy, review, auditability, and where appropriate human oversight for legally significant documents. Generally, translations should be accurate enough that non-English-speaking families can fully understand and participate in the IEP process; and the system must support accurate communication, plain language, and certified interpreter involvement where system translations cannot fulfill the above.

21. **Question:** Are there specific accessibility or multilingual requirements beyond WCAG 2.0 and FERPA compliance that vendors should consider?
Answer: WCAG 2.X+, because standards evolve and change over time, the selected vendor will be expected to keep the platform updated to the latest WCAG standards and Washington OCIO policies for accessibility. The current level is WCAG 2.2 and can evolve over time. Most importantly, the platform should serve the users, so that all special needs of the users are addressed to enable their full participation in the IEP process. Where platform capabilities do not fully support user accessibility or participation needs, the vendor should provide a pathway to address them.
22. **Question:** Does OSPI have a preferred cloud hosting environment or approved cloud providers for the statewide platform?
Answer: No.
23. **Question:** Are there data residency requirements restricting hosting to Washington State or the continental United States?
Answer: Data centers hosting any system data must be located within the United States and managed by US persons; all backups must reside within the US; all disaster recovery replicas must reside within the US; and no data may be stored, processed, or replicated outside US borders unless explicitly approved by OSPI in writing. The general requirement is US-only with US-person management.
24. **Question:** Does OSPI require a FedRAMP-authorized cloud environment, or is a FERPA/HIPAA-compliant vendor-managed cloud acceptable?
Answer: The platform is not required to be FedRAMP-authorized, but preferably it should be FedRAMP capable, especially for data center and failover facilities. The data within the platform will be considered highly sensitive data and should be treated with the highest level of security expectations. The infrastructure is preferably hosted in a FedRAMP capable environment (e.g., AWS, Azure, GCP, etc.). Or in other words, the platform can meet all control requirements as mandated by FERPA, WaTech, HIPAA, NIST, and applicable compliance policies.
25. **Question:** What target uptime SLA does OSPI require for this platform?
Answer: 99.9% availability.
26. **Question:** Are there specific peak-usage windows that the system must support at elevated capacity?
Answer: Yes. Annual review windows at the beginning and end of the school year are examples of peak-usage windows. The system must implement automatic scaling to support intermittent peak-usage windows.

27. **Question:** What is the anticipated total number of concurrent users at peak, including estimates by user role?
Answer: An estimated 3,000+ concurrent users. There is no specified role-by-role breakdown of users during peak periods.
28. **Question:** Are there preferred interoperability standards or API frameworks that OSPI expects vendors to follow for SIS and statewide system integrations?
Answer: OSPI prefers that the platform data standards align with the Ed-Fi Data Standard and CEDS (Common Education Data Standards) where applicable. However, the vendor should anticipate work to be done to determine the canonical data models for a more standardized state-defined IEP data dictionary that will take precedence in the Statewide IEP Platform. For transport/API methods, vendors should accommodate multiple methods to account for Washington’s SIS diversity (e.g., REST APIs, SFTP/batch file processing, direct file uploads, on-screen form fills, etc.). API authentication must use industry-standard token-based auth such as OAuth 2.0 with bidirectional exchange support.
29. **Question:** Will OSPI facilitate introductions to Skyward, PowerSchool, Synergy, and other SIS vendors for integration planning, or is the vendor expected to negotiate API access independently?
Answer: OSPI will manage partner coordination.
30. **Question:** Will OSPI provide the CEDARS data dictionary and technical specifications for the special education data feed to shortlisted vendors?
Answer: Vendors should be aware that data from IEPs are not currently being fed directly into CEDARS. The flow of data goes from IEP to SIS to CEDARS via SFTP. The [CEDARS manuals](#) are already available to the public, but it is important to understand this will not be the integration technical specifications – that is more suited to come from each SIS vendor that the Statewide IEP will need to integrate with.
31. **Question:** What is the current submission format and schedule for special education data to CEDARS?
Answer: Current special education submissions do not go directly into CEDARS. IEP data goes into SIS and SIS data is sent to CEDARS via SFTP.
32. **Question:** When will the CEDARS technical specifications be available?
Answer: The [CEDARS manuals](#) are available to the public.
33. **Question:** Does OSPI require or recommend use of the Ed-Fi Data Standard for SIS integration? If yes, which version is currently in use or planned?
Answer: The selected vendor will need to work directly with each SIS vendor to understand the data standard that each SIS is using for integration.

34. **Question:** Will OSPI provide centralized support and standardized mapping guidance for migration from existing district IEP systems?
Answer: Yes, OSPI is providing a dedicated role to guide standardized mapping and technical efforts, but not a full migration-execution team; vendors should plan accordingly.
35. **Question:** Will OSPI provide access to sample datasets from existing IEP systems for migration planning and proof-of-concept development prior to contract award?
Answer: No.
36. **Question:** Are historical/archived IEP records expected to be migrated into the new platform, and if so, how many years of history must be preserved?
Answer: Yes. For planning purposes, bidders should address up to four (4) years of historical records, with final scope and approach to be confirmed during discovery.
37. **Question:** Does OSPI anticipate a phased rollout by district cohort, region, or readiness level?
Answer: Phased rollout is permitted.
38. **Question:** What is the anticipated go-live date for the first cohort of LEAs?
Answer: The estimated go-live date is September 2028 for the first cohort.
39. **Question:** Is there a mandatory statewide go-live deadline, or will phased district-by-district rollout be permitted?
Answer: Phased rollout is permitted.
40. **Question:** What level of support will OSPI and the 9 ESDs provide during LEA onboarding?
Answer: OSPI anticipates a coordinated implementation model involving OSPI, the selected vendor, and regional partners as appropriate. Bidders should identify recommended roles, assumptions, and dependencies.
41. **Question:** Will ESDs serve as regional coordinators managing district communications and training logistics on behalf of the contractor?
Answer: We anticipate ESDs to participate in the communication strategy.
42. **Question:** Will OSPI provide dedicated project staff throughout implementation, including a technical liaison, special education policy lead, and project manager?
Answer: OSPI will have a mixture of full-time and part-time employees working on this project alongside several full-time contracted resources applied throughout the effort.

43. **Question:** What is the estimated level of effort expected from OSPI's side?
Answer: OSPI will have a mixture of full-time and part-time employees working on this project alongside several full-time contracted resources applied throughout the effort.
44. **Question:** Can OSPI clarify whether greater evaluation emphasis will be placed on platform capabilities, implementation methodology, statewide governance approach, or prior education-sector experience?
Answer: We suggest reviewing the Evaluation Scoring Framework Summary section of the RFP.
45. **Question:** Can OSPI provide an estimated budget range or anticipated funding framework for this initiative?
Answer: OSPI is not providing a projected budget for this project. Vendors should provide reasonable budget proposals that provide sufficient detail for OSPI to understand the total cost of implementation, operation, and support over the life of the contract. Please see section C.7. Financial Proposal for additional details and expectations.
46. **Question:** Regarding the mandatory 15% payment holdback (SB 5197 / Section 701), will OSPI define the delivery gate structure, or is the contractor expected to propose their own gates?
Answer: This will be collaborative process to develop the delivery gate structure with the Contract Manager, project team and the Apparent Successful Bidder.
47. **Question:** For FBA/BIP/MD pricing for non-IEP students, is OSPI expecting a per-student fee, per-district activation fee, or another pricing unit?
Answer: Per attachment 1.3 Pricing Structure; A per-student fee is expected.
48. **Question:** What is the estimated volume of non-IEP students who may use this functionality?
Answer: OSPI does not collect data on the number of students for whom districts may utilize FBA/BIP/MD functionality outside of the special education population.
49. **Question:** Exhibit M 1.2 (Requirements Workbook), Exhibit N 1.3 (Pricing Workbook), and Exhibit O (Demonstration Scenarios) are referenced as mandatory. When will these exhibits be posted and where can vendors access them?
Answer: Required attachments and exhibits are available on [WEBS](#) and [OSPI's Procurement website](#).

50. **Question:** Can OSPI clarify how demonstrations will be evaluated relative to written proposal scoring?
Answer: Demonstrations will be evaluated according to the RFP's stated evaluation process and scoring criteria. The RFP identifies Interview and Demonstration as a separate evaluated category.
51. **Question:** Will shortlisted vendors be required to perform live demonstrations using configured workflows?
Answer: OSPI anticipates that demonstrations will require vendors to show relevant workflows and proposed platform capabilities. Specific demonstration instructions are available on [WEBS](#) and [OSPI's Procurement website](#) – see Exhibit O (Demonstration Scenarios).
52. **Question:** Will demonstration scenarios prioritize out-of-box functionality or custom-configured workflows?
Answer: OSPI anticipates that demonstrations will require vendors to show relevant workflows and proposed platform capabilities. Specific demonstration instructions are available on [WEBS](#) and [OSPI's Procurement website](#) – see Exhibit O (Demonstration Scenarios).
53. **Question:** Will OSPI permit references from large enterprise/public-sector implementations outside K-12 for scoring purposes?
Answer: Yes, OSPI will consider relevant large-scale enterprise implementations outside of PreK-22 where the bidder demonstrates applicability to the statewide education context.
54. **Question:** Are vendors expected to provide fixed pricing for the entire statewide rollout upfront, or phased pricing aligned to district onboarding cohorts?
Answer: Pricing should be fixed.
55. **Question:** Will OSPI allow optional/value-added capabilities outside mandatory scope to be proposed separately?
Answer: Yes.
56. **Question:** Does OSPI expect vendors to provide ongoing managed services/support after implementation, or only implementation and transition services?
Answer: Bidders should provide pricing as instructed in the RFP and attachment 1.3 Pricing Structure workbook. Bidders may identify phased and/or cohort-aligned pricing components in alignment with the RFP documentation.
57. **Question:** Will OSPI provide existing workflow diagrams, process maps, or current-state architecture documentation to shortlisted vendors?
Answer: Supporting diagrams are included as part of the RFP package.

58. **Question:** Will Attachment 1.1 Supporting Diagrams.pdf be made available in editable/high-resolution format?
Answer: The supporting diagrams are provided as is.
59. **Question:** Will OSPI permit use of subcontractors for specialized functions such as migration, accessibility, translation, or integrations?
Answer: Yes.
60. **Question:** Are there MWBE participation targets or preferences beyond standard Washington procurement scoring preferences?
Answer: OSPI supports the Office of Minority and Women's Business Enterprises (OMWBE) and statewide efforts to increase state procurement with small, diverse, woman- and veteran-owned businesses. In Fiscal Year 2026, OMWBE assigned OSPI a goal of doing 10.18% of its business with these business types. However, no scoring preferences can be given to minority- or woman-owned businesses.
61. **Question:** Does OSPI anticipate awarding to a single prime contractor, or could multiple vendors/consortiums share responsibility across implementation and platform delivery?
Answer: OSPI anticipates awarding a single contract.
62. **Question:** Are vendors expected to support future statewide expansion into adjacent student support domains (504 plans, MTSS, etc.) beyond the current IEP scope?
Answer: Expansion is not expected at this time.
63. **Question:** Will OSPI require a sandbox/demo tenant environment during evaluation?
Answer: No.
64. **Question:** Is there an expectation that districts will retain local configuration flexibility, or is statewide standardization prioritized over district-level variation?
Answer: OSPI anticipates a high degree of uniformity across the statewide IEP system with very limited localized configuration. There will be a state level configuration determined as a base. OSPI is actively in discovery of what unique district configurations will be included in the core system.
65. **Question:** Will OSPI provide guidance regarding acceptable AI governance, explainability, and student-data protections for AI-enabled functionality?
Answer: OSPI expects bidders to identify AI-enabled functionality and describe governance, privacy, and data protection controls. Additional governance may be defined during implementation. Review OSPI's published [AI resources for K-12 public schools](#). AI should assist but does not replace the IEP team's professional judgment.

66. **Question:** Are there expectations for analytics dashboards, statewide reporting, or longitudinal outcome tracking beyond standard compliance reporting?
Answer: Bidders should describe reporting and analytics capabilities for the proposed platform and where available.
67. **Question:** Will OSPI require integration with identity providers supporting SSO/MFA such as Azure AD, Google Workspace, Clever, or ClassLink?
Answer: SSO/MFA is mandatory regardless of which specific identity provider is used. WaTech mandates MFA and standards-based SSO (SAML 2.0 or OpenID Connect).
68. **Question:** Does OSPI anticipate future interoperability requirements with non-Washington state systems or interstate transfer frameworks?
Answer: No.
69. **Question:** Will the contractor be expected to provide change management and communications support statewide in addition to technical implementation?
Answer: OSPI will lead the change management and communications activities.
70. **Question:** Will OSPI define statewide governance/configuration approval processes prior to implementation, or will the contractor help establish them?
Answer: OSPI has an established governance and approval structure.
71. **Question:** Are there expectations for offline/mobile functionality for districts with limited connectivity?
Answer: OSPI expects to provide all districts with an IEP system primarily accessible through an internet connection. Districts who require additional remote connective services will be coordinated between OSPI, the selected vendor, and that district.
72. **Question:** Will OSPI require disaster recovery testing and security audit reporting as part of ongoing operations?
Answer: OSPI must satisfy WaTech standards for systems handling state data and will require the vendor to provide disaster recovery testing and security audit reporting regularly as required by WaTech.
73. **Question:** Does OSPI expect configurable reporting and dashboard-building capabilities directly accessible by LEAs?
Answer: Yes.
74. **Question:** Will OSPI provide current data retention policies and archival requirements for special education records?
Answer: The Washington State Public Schools Records Retention Schedule and Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction Records Retention Schedule are available here: [State Government Records Retention Schedules | WA Secretary of State](#)

75. **Question:** Are there expectations for parent/student mobile app support in addition to browser-based portals?
Answer: Bidders should describe available family and student access models, including browser-based portals, responsive design, and any mobile application capabilities.
76. **Question:** Will OSPI provide sample compliance workflows and audit processes currently used across districts?
Answer: OSPI anticipates a high degree of uniformity across the statewide IEP system with very limited localized configuration. There will be a state level configuration determined as a base. OSPI is actively in discovery of what unique district configurations will be included in the core system.
77. **Question:** Are there required third-party accessibility certifications or audits vendors must provide?
Answer: There is no official 'WCAG certification,' and OSPI does not require a specific named third-party credential. The preferred evidence of accessibility conformance is a VPAT / Accessibility Conformance Report documenting conformance to WCAG 2.2+, together with a remediation plan for any identified gaps.
78. **Question:** Will OSPI provide phased implementation prioritization criteria (district size, readiness, SIS type, etc.)?
Answer: OSPI will provide phased implementation prioritization criteria based on many of the factors listed above and other factors. The implementation criteria framework is currently under development.
79. **Question:** Will OSPI permit iterative/agile delivery methodologies, or is a traditional phased waterfall implementation expected?
Answer: OSPI expects an Agile delivery methodology with live demonstrations of functioning software, developed using incremental user research, held at the end of every two-week sprint; The project solution must be capable of being continually updated, as necessary.
80. **Question:** Are vendors expected to provide statewide training materials in multiple languages?
Answer: Yes. Bidders should describe training materials, delivery modes, multilingual support, accessibility and sustainability of training content.
81. **Question:** Will OSPI define statewide standard IEP templates before implementation begins?
Answer: Model forms are available here: [Model Forms for Services to Students in Special Education](#).

82. **Question:** Will the platform be expected to support custom district forms during transition periods?

Answer: In the context of a district transitioning onto the proposed platform, the bidder should describe support capabilities for custom district forms, transition approaches, and how local variations would be governed.

83. **Question:** Does OSPI anticipate future procurement phases for analytics modernization, AI augmentation, or statewide education data initiatives related to the platform?

Answer: OSPI may consider future opportunities as needs, funding, and priorities evolve.

84. **Question:** Will the statewide IEP be mandatory for districts, or will they have the opportunity to opt out?

Answer: The platform will not be mandatory. LEAs may opt in.

85. **Question:** Who are the key stakeholders that will be involved in this project?

Answer: Stakeholders will be actively involved throughout the statewide IEP project through a structured advisory and implementation model designed to ensure continuous collaboration, feedback, and shared learning. The project includes an IEP Advisory composed of LEA representatives, educators, families, and special education subject matter experts who will provide ongoing input on implementation strategies, system usability, workflows, training needs, accessibility, and operational considerations.

Stakeholder engagement will occur across all phases of the project, including planning, implementation, adoption, and continuous improvement. LEAs and partners will participate through advisory workgroups, pilot and early adopter cohorts, user acceptance testing, onboarding and training feedback sessions, post-implementation surveys, and ongoing feedback loops. Educational Service Districts (ESDs) will support regional coordination and communication between OSPI and LEAs to ensure statewide representation and responsiveness to local needs.

The OSPI Product Team will collect, synthesize, and incorporate stakeholder feedback into implementation planning, product roadmap priorities, system enhancements, and continuous improvement efforts. This structure is designed to maintain transparent communication, support meaningful practitioner and family voice, and ensure the statewide IEP platform evolves based on real-world implementation experience and the needs of Washington students, families, and educators.

86. **Question:** How active will Washington stakeholders be during the initial design and development phase? Specifically, what level of involvement should we plan for from OSPI staff, LEA representatives, and field practitioners — regular working sessions, periodic reviews, or something else?

Answer: During the initial design and development phase, Washington stakeholders will play an active and structured advisory role, with engagement designed to be both

consistent and purposeful. We anticipate an active role through design, implementation, and sustainability phases.

We additionally anticipate a cadence that includes regular working sessions with a core advisory group, complemented by targeted review and feedback opportunities at key design milestones. The advisory group will include OSPI staff, LEA representatives (including district IT partners and educators), field practitioners, family members, and individuals with lived experience in IEP systems.

OSPI staff and core partners will likely engage most consistently through recurring working sessions to support ongoing decision-making, alignment, and iterative design. LEA representatives and field practitioners will participate in both these sessions and scheduled review cycles to provide grounded feedback from implementation perspectives. Broader stakeholders will be engaged at defined points to review prototypes, validate design decisions, and ensure the system reflects real-world needs and usability.

87. **Question RE REQ-019:** Please clarify the direction of transfer this requirement addresses. "Out of state student transfer" could refer to either students leaving Washington for another state or students arriving in Washington from another state, which scenario (or both) is in scope?

Answer: Both in scope. The system should support the transfer of a student either from WA to another state or from another state to WA as efficiently as possible. Where the system cannot automate, there should be a manual pathway that can support as seamless of a transfer process as possible.

88. **Question RE REQ-019:** How does the SIS signal "out of state"? Is there a specific enrollment flag, an inferred signal from the absence of prior Washington enrollment, or something else?

Answer: The selected vendor will be required to work with each SIS to determine the specific enrollment signal that indicates a student is either leaving Washington and going to another state or coming from another state into Washington. The IEP platform itself should support the ability to set up a transferred IEP either automatically or manually as efficiently as possible. The platform should also make the transfer of records from itself to external entities as efficiently as possible.

89. **Question RE REQ-121-C:** By "enforce redisclosure restrictions," does OSPI mean (a) maintaining the § 99.32 disclosure log, (b) attaching § 99.33(b) redisclosure notices to outgoing disclosures, (c) gating disclosures behind documented authority (consent, exception), (d) preventing unauthorized internal redisclosure via access controls, or some combination? These are distinct capabilities.

Answer: A combination of all 4. Principally (a), (b), and (c), with (d) treated as a baseline expectation already covered by the platform's access control and metadata requirements rather than as the core of this requirement.

90. **Question RE REQ-121-C:** Should the system log only FERPA-required disclosures under § 99.32, or all disclosure events regardless of FERPA logability?

Answer: The system should log all disclosure events that release education records or PII outside the originating district/authorized user, not only the narrow set of disclosures FERPA itself requires to be logged under § 99.32.

91. **Question RE REQ-121-C:** At what granularity should disclosures be tracked — individual record (this IEP, this evaluation), bundle (records released together in a package), or student/category level? And should the recipient be captured as organization, individual, or both?

Answer: Capture the recipient as both organization and individual – the receiving entity and the individual record. OSPI's transfer and signatory-agency use cases involve organization-to-organization sharing while FERPA accountability and the § 99.32(b) redisclosure notice are most meaningful when the specific recipient and related organization is identifiable.

92. **Question RE REQ-119-B:** What counts as "security logs" here? For example, authentication events, data access logs, modification logs, all of these, or something else?

Answer: All of these. For example: authentication and access events (logins, failed logins, MFA, privilege changes), data-access logs (who viewed which records), data-modification logs (create/update/delete with who/what/when edit tracking), and security-relevant system/administrative events (configuration changes, security incident logs).

93. **Question RE REQ-119-B:** What's the actual regulatory or policy basis for the 7-year period?

Answer: Regulatory or policy for the retention of special education data varies by type of record. Medicaid billing has a retention of 6 years with the caveat that data must be retained for as long as any pending matters are still open, which can extend past 6 years. Other education retention policies can be viewed here: [State Government Records Retention Schedules | WA Secretary of State](#). The 7-year retention is an OSPI preference so that data retention is standard across the entire platform to accommodate regulatory

policies that require data to be retained for 6 years or more (e.g., Medicaid billing). Vendors are expected to have the ability to retain records for a 7-year period.

94. **Question RE REQ-119-B:** Does the 7-year retention apply to all security logs, or only to logs tied to Medicaid-billable services or other specific record categories?

Answer: The Statewide IEP system will be retaining system records for 7 years. OSPI will keep this requirement for consistency.

95. **Question RE REQ-157:** How should the 5-second target be measured? Server-side query time, API time-to-first-byte, or end-to-end client-perceived latency? Is it a median (p50), p95, or p99 target? And what concurrent user load should we maintain this under?

Answer: Vendors should target the typical-to-high range of real usage (e.g., p. 95) assuming 3,000+ concurrent users at peak times; the goal is consistent responsiveness, not a single median figure. Queries against large data volumes must remain fast and responsive for users (seconds, not minutes), and vendors should design indexing, query optimization, and pagination to sustain that as data grows.

96. **Question RE REQ-157:** What does "1M+ records" refer to — records returned to the client in one response, records in scope for the query (before filtering or aggregation), or total records in the underlying table?

Answer: This refers to the scale of the underlying data the query runs against (tables/datasets containing 1M+ records), not the number of rows returned to the client in one response. Queries are expected to return normal filtered, paginated, or aggregated result sets within 5 seconds when operating against large datasets.

97. **Question RE REQ-158:** Does the CDN requirement apply only to public-facing static content and unauthenticated pages, or do you also expect authenticated/personalized content to use edge caching? We're assuming FERPA-protected and Category 3/4 data won't be cached at edge PoPs.

Answer: This is confirmed, CDN/edge caching applies only to public, unauthenticated static assets (public access websites or pages). Authenticated and personalized content – and any content containing FERPA-protected education records or WaTech Category 3 or 4 data – must be preserved from origin over secure channels and must not be cached at edge PoPs. This follows the WaTech Data Classification Standard. Where categories are commingled, the record is protected at the highest applicable level. The general request here is to implement caching for optimal performance and user experience while still ensuring data and platform access is only within the US and secured properly and in compliance with FERPA and WaTech.

98. **Question RE REQ-158:** Does "across Washington" refer to low latency for distributed in-state users or to physical PoP placement within WA?

Answer: It refers to consistent low latency and reliable performance for geographically distributed in-state users (urban and rural districts, across the state), not a contractual

requirement to place physical PoPs inside Washington's borders. The underlying intent is the documented performance expectation such as minimizing timeouts, lags, and navigation delays and sustaining performance during peak usage statewide.

99. **Question RE REQ-172:** Can you clarify the scope of "complete data lineage tracking"? Does this mean record-level audit history (every CRUD operation), pipeline-level transformation lineage, a business glossary/data dictionary, or all of these?

Answer: Yes, all of these. The system must provide record-level audit history (CRUD operations), pipeline-level transformation lineage for ingested and derived data, and must conform to the statewide standardized data dictionary that OSPI has as an objective for this project. The data dictionary is a state-defined standard the platform is expected to support.

100. **Question RE REQ-172:** Should lineage cross system boundaries — for example, tracing data from district submission through CEDARS/EDS into this system and out to federal reporting — or is it scoped to data within this system?

Answer: Lineage is scoped to data within this system, including capture of where data enters from (e.g., district/SIS or EDS submissions) and where it exits to (e.g., federal reporting, exports, downstream systems). The system must record the source and destination at each boundary but is not responsible for tracing lineage within outside systems.

101. **Question RE REQ-172:** Do you have a preferred or required lineage tool (e.g., Microsoft Purview) that integrates with OSPI's existing data governance?

Answer: A preferred tool is not scoped for this platform.

102. **Question RE REQ-172:** What retention period applies to lineage metadata?

Answer: The standard 7 years of data retention applies to the entire platform.

103. **Question RE REQ-180:** Does the IPv6 requirement apply only to external/client-facing interfaces, or also to integrations with OSPI/WaTech-managed services?

Answer: WaTech has a formal Internet Protocol Version 6 Implementation Policy that establishes the expectation for state agencies that own or support infrastructure and/or applications to migrate to IPv6 in support of the state's infrastructure modernization strategy. It's a requirement, not a suggestion. IPv6 support applies to both external/client-facing interfaces and integrations with OSPI/WaTech-managed services.

104. **Question RE NR-029c:** Who has authority to grant section access at the IEP team level — the case manager alone, the case manager with sped director approval, or should this be LEA-configurable by policy?

Answer: This will be LEA-configurable by policy and guided by legitimate educational interest. Because districts retain local control over how they manage special education processes and staffing, the system should not hard-code a single grantor role. Instead,

it should allow each LEA to configure who holds section-grant authority and to apply that configuration consistently across its IEP teams, if desired.

105. **Question RE NR-029c:** Should grants default to time-bounded (expire at end of school year or when a student transfers out of a class), or persist until someone manually revokes them?

Answer: The system should support a flexible access control mechanism that allows for time-bounded and manual revoke for each applicable situation. Access control should follow least-privilege.

106. **Question RE NR-029c:** Should each grant generate a separate FERPA § 99.32 record-of-disclosures entry, or can the grant audit log itself serve that purpose?

Answer: The system should log all access grants, and a single audit log itself can serve that purpose. Within that log, the ability to filter for ease of use would be helpful.

107. **Question:** The RFP itself lacks detailed implementation timeline; please confirm the project schedule posted on OSPI's statewide IEP project website is the authoritative timeline OSPI expects.

Answer: OSPI anticipates an implementation period of approximately two (2) years; however, this estimate is intended for planning purposes only and should not be interpreted as a fixed or mandatory implementation timeline. Vendors should propose an implementation approach and timeline based on their experience, capacity, proposed solution, and recommended sequencing of project activities and milestones.

108. **Question:** Historical data requirements: What is the minimum historical data OSPI expects migrated/imported for all districts (e.g., current IEP only vs X years of IEPs, e.g., high level event data and/or pdf documents vs full details of IEPs in reportable fields), and does this differ for districts coming from different legacy systems?

Answer: OSPI expects vendors to support migration and long-term access to meaningful historical special education records for participating districts. REQ-106 identifies a critical requirement that families be able to independently access historical IEP documents through the parent portal. NR-024A further supports the storage and access of historical records and attachments.

OSPI has not established a single minimum number of years or a uniform migration approach applicable to all districts at this stage, as historical data availability, structure, and quality may vary across legacy systems. Vendors should describe their recommended approach for migration of historical documents, structured/reportable data elements, attachments, and event history, including any assumptions, limitations, or phased approaches.

OSPI anticipates collaborating with the selected vendor to define detailed migration requirements and implementation approaches based on the source systems and district needs involved.

109. **Question:** Transition plan integration: OSPI stated the need for transition plan data fields flowing to the “High School and Beyond Plan.” Please specify what data fields.
Answer: The vision for this effort is that the High School and Beyond Platform (HSBP) data elements that comprise a student’s IEP Transition Plan will be integrated as view only between the two systems. We have documented the data elements and are working with the HSBP vendor to build the integration which would be done through an application programming interface. Integration is a legislative requirement (SB 5969) to support educators and transition personnel to see the two plans and ensure they support the student with aligned goals.
110. **Question:** Is WSIPC an expected delivery partner? If so, please clarify OSPI’s intended role for WSIPC.
Answer: WSIPC represents a cooperative of our Educational Service Districts and provides direct support to many of our LEAs, for student information systems and IEPs. Their specific role in data migration and other potential supports will be determined once a vendor is selected.
111. **Question:** AI chatbot for families: Please clarify the expected chatbot scope (topics, guardrails, languages/accessibility), where it lives, and how OSPI expects privacy/records considerations to be handled.
Answer: The business requirements related to AI-enabled functionality are generally identified as medium-priority requirements intended to support enhanced user experience and future-state capabilities.

REQ-107 contemplates an AI-enabled tool to assist families with common questions and portal navigation. REQ-116 contemplates AI-assisted support for parent access to IEP-related information and resources. OSPI anticipates that proposed functionality would primarily support informational assistance, navigation support, and access to publicly available or user-authorized resources rather than autonomous decision-making or the provision of legal or educational determinations.

Vendors may describe the proposed scope, capabilities, and limitations of any AI-supported functionality, including:

- anticipated use cases and supported topics;
- guardrails, human oversight, and escalation pathways;
- multilingual accessibility and accessibility compliance considerations;
- privacy, security, records retention, and data governance approaches;
- handling of student data and personally identifiable information (PII);
- transparency regarding AI-generated responses; and

- whether functionality is currently available, configurable, or part of the vendor’s product roadmap.

OSPI is open to vendor recommendations regarding where such functionality would reside within the platform ecosystem (e.g., family portal, public-facing support resources, authenticated environments, or other approaches), provided the proposed solution aligns with applicable privacy, security, accessibility, and records management requirements.

112. **Question:** Out-of-state student transfer notifications / record requests: Please clarify what OSPI expects technically/operationally for automated out-of-state transfer notifications and records requests (data sources, compliance boundaries, and who initiates/authorizes requests).

Answer: For out-of-state transfers, the platform cannot push data directly into another state's system, so OSPI expects it to facilitate and streamline the records-request and exchange workflow rather than perform a fully automated system-to-system transfer (which is reserved for in-state, same-platform transfers). Automated notifications within the system (e.g., banners or badges) and email notifications should be supported when a transfer or records request happens. The platform’s responsibility ends at the system boundary, FERPA does not require the platform to interact with or control any external systems. Records requests are initiated or authorized at the LEA level.

113. **Question:** What is the budget for this project?

Answer: OSPI is not providing a projected budget for this project. Vendors should provide reasonable budget proposals that provide sufficient detail for OSPI to understand the total cost of implementation, operation, and support over the life of the contract. Please see section C.7. Financial Proposal for additional details and expectations.

Question: Who will be on the evaluation panel (roles/functions), and will any external parties participate in evaluation or advisory capacity?

Answer: The evaluation team comprises OSPI special education and IT staff as well as representatives from an Educational Service District and disability focused advocacy organizations.

Question: Offline capability + automatic sync: Please clarify OSPI’s intent for offline data entry and auto sync—required use cases, device expectations, and how OSPI weighs security/PII risk of storing data on offline devices vs usability (and whether an alternative approach is acceptable).

Answer: OSPI is not prescribing a required offline data-entry and auto-sync approach. Bidders should describe the proposed platform capabilities that align to the state statewide IEP goals.

114. **Question:** Does OSPI envision training and resource materials for educators and parents to be contained within the IEP platform, or should vendors plan to direct users to materials housed on an OSPI site?

Answer: OSPI anticipates both embedded and external supports. The platform should include built-in technical and programmatic guidance to support IEP development, instructional decision-making, progress monitoring, and parent participation. The platform should also support links to external OSPI and partner resources that provide ongoing professional learning, technical assistance, and family supports.

115. **Question:** Out of state student transfer notifications / record requests: Please clarify what OSPI expects technically/operationally for automated out of state transfer notifications and records requests (data sources, compliance boundaries, and who initiates/authorizes requests).

Answer: The system should support the transfer of a student either from Washington to another state or from another state to Washington as efficiently as possible. Where the system cannot automate, there should be a manual pathway that can support as seamless of a transfer process as possible.

116. **Question:** Day-one vs phased delivery: For requirements that represent significant new development, does OSPI expect all functionality at Day 1, or is OSPI open to phased implementation (and if phased, what is the preferred sequencing and what is the scoring impact)?

Answer: The prioritization of business requirements is designed to help communicate which requirements must be part of RFP implementation. Business requirements are prioritized as following:

- Critical: These requirements MUST be delivered as part of this RFP implementation
- High: These requirements SHOULD be delivered as part of this RFP implementation
- Medium: These requirements WOULD ideally be delivered as part of this RFP implementation
- Low: These requirements are NICE TO HAVE / aspirational, but vendor will need to provide an explanation for why the requirement cannot be delivered as part of this RFP implementation and how the vendor plans to deliver the requirement as part of a future development.

As a general statement critical requirements are anticipated as desired day 1 functionality where high priority requirements indicated requirements that are more suitable for a phased implementation approach if needed.

117. **Question:** OSPI highlighted “educational benefit” and “high quality instructional tool” as part of the core purpose of the platform. Can OSPI clarify how evaluators will interpret/score “educational benefit” (examples, evidence expectations, priorities)?
Answer: This will be evaluated through consideration of related business requirements met and scoring of the demonstration scenarios primarily. Business requirements are prioritized as following:
- Critical: These requirements MUST be delivered as part of this RFP implementation
 - High: These requirements SHOULD be delivered as part of this RFP implementation
 - Medium: These requirements WOULD ideally be delivered as part of this RFP implementation
 - Low: These requirements are NICE TO HAVE / aspirational, but vendor will need to provide an explanation for why the requirement cannot be delivered as part of this RFP implementation and how the vendor plans to deliver the requirement as part of a future development.
118. **Question:** Does OSPI desire a payment model for services under the contract in which payment is made by OSPI upon completion of each milestone?
Answer: Yes. The State’s preferred method of payment is performance-based. Performance-based contracts are based on attainment of specific outcomes (usually a deliverable) and tied to a specific payment for that deliverable. The rate of compensation is generally negotiated based on cost information provided by the contractor. This allows the agency to define the quality of services in terms of performance standards and pay accordingly.
119. **Question:** Do you require dollar amounts to be listed in C.6.vi, Deliverables and Performance Accountability, for each proposed milestone? If there are recurring subscription costs, do those need to be listed in C.6.vi Deliverables and Performance Accountability as well?
Answer: Dollar amounts do not need to be listed in C.6.vi Deliverables and Performance, but because the contract is performance based, during contract negotiations costs will be assigned to each contract deliverable. The cost of each deliverable will be informed by the C.7 Financial Proposal.
120. **Question:** Does OSPI desire a phased implementation approach where different LEAs would be moved during different phases, or does OSPI envision moving all LEAs within 12-18 months? If a phased approach is preferred, how many LEAs would you intend to move during each phase?
Answer: OSPI anticipates a phased implementation approach with an initial pilot cohort phase and cohort models annually. There is not a predetermined number of LEAs for each cohort or phase. It is anticipated that LEAs will be identified for reach cohort based on district interest and readiness in alignment with state capacity.

121. **Question:** The RFP states that all non-recurring costs should be included in the pricing in year one. In Exhibit N, on the Pricing Proposal tab, training is listed as both a recurring and a non-recurring cost. Can you provide more information on how you would like the training costs to be broken down? Can proposers include recurring training costs in year three but not in years four or five, for example?

Answer: Information provided in the Pricing Structure Workbook should make clear what costs will be one-time expenses and what costs will be ongoing. The Pricing Structure Workbook has columns for years 1-7 to allow vendors to document when they expect project costs to be incurred. OSPI is leaving it to the vendors to identify what costs are one-time versus reoccurring. It is assumed many activities associated with the platform development will be one-time, but other activities such as trainings will continue to happen routinely over time.

122. **Question:** Requirement NR-008c states that "training materials shall be available in English and Spanish." Does this requirement pertain to training for authorized parents/guardians/family members on using the new platform?

Answer: Yes.

123. **Question:** REQ-195 states that the "System shall integrate professional development tracking per RCW 28A.415.420." Does OSPI have a system or platform in place today that it uses to track professional development completion?

Answer: OSPI does not maintain or require a statewide system specifically aligned to this RCW for tracking professional development completion in alignment with RCW 28A.415.420. REQ-195 was rated as medium priority as a good to have or future enhancement component of a system.

As additional context, RCW 28A.415.420 previously addressed cultural competence–related professional development content and framework development; however, this statutory provision is no longer an active requirement. Professional development requirements and related expectations are now governed through other applicable provisions within RCW 28A.415 and associated state professional learning standards. In practice, professional development completion tracking is managed at the local education agency (district) level through district-adopted human resources systems, learning management systems, and OSPI-approved clock hour processes, rather than through a centralized OSPI statewide platform.

124. **Question:** To deliver a highly precise deployment timeline and resource model for the statewide rollout, the team requests clarification on the governance model for platform configuration. Will OSPI mandate standardized, state-level configuration baselines across all districts, or will individual Educational Service Districts (ESDs) and local educational agencies (LEAs) retain autonomy for localized configuration choices? Specifically, does the state anticipate uniformity or local variance across:

- Core Module Activation: IEP and Medicaid billing.

- Technical Integrations: SIS data imports/exports, authentication protocols (SAML/SSO).
- Program-Level Workflows: District-specific form selections, localized meeting types, and individual form features.

Clarification on this scope of governance will allow us to accurately identify the specific state-level resources, approvals, and stakeholder alignments required prior to initiating direct implementation kick-off activities at the ESD and district level.

Answer: OSPI anticipates a high degree of uniformity across the statewide IEP system with very limited localized configuration. There will be a state level configuration determined as a base. OSPI is actively in discovery of what unique district configurations will be included in the core system.

- The Core Module Activation (IEP and Medicaid billing) is anticipated to be uniform.
- Technical Integrations will largely be uniform, based on WaTech policies and standards, but will have variance based on district adopted SIS system. As part of the first phase of the project the project team will define and understand the SIS data and integration model, but it is anticipated to be very limited.
- Program- Level Work. The statewide IEP platform will be built off [OSPI Special Education Model Forms](#) as a base with expanded functionality as outlined in the business requirements. The business requirements outline district customizable reporting and configuration capabilities. District specific workflows are also anticipated to be very limited. More clarity will be obtained for local variance needed in Discovery.

125. **Question:** Is OSPI interested in expanding platform functionality to include other program tracking outside of the special education domains listed in the RFP? For example, extended functionality for 504, Multilingual Learners, Highly Capable, Service Records, etc.

Answer: No, the above listed expansion is not contemplated within the statewide IEP project.

126. **Question:** The RFP references requirements related to Ed-Fi and Common Education Data Standards (CEDS). Could OSPI provide additional clarification on how it envisions these standards aligning with or supporting the future evolution of CEDARS, particularly with respect to data exchange, reporting, and long-term interoperability between the statewide IEP platform and OSPI data systems?

Answer: Washington State aligns with standards. For example, in this project, this requirement is to maintain and strengthen CEDS alignment between IEP systems and testing platforms (such as TIES), to allow for greater consistency and fewer manual adjustments across platforms.

127. **Question:** Ownership and governance. Which entity owns and operates the statewide integration layer (State, designated systems integrator, regional ESA, or LEAs)? Who is the technical point of contact responsible for publishing the specification and approving connector certification?

Answer: The Vendor shall be responsible for leading the implementation of data integrations effort for each LEA (Local Education Authority) connecting to the system. OSPI will partner with the Vendor by providing leadership and guidance on integration approaches, data contacts, data sharing agreements, and other required coordination and facilitation activities. The vendor is the technical point of contact responsible for publishing the specification and approving connector certification. OSPI anticipates providing a technical lead and/or third-party partner to assist with the integration effort.

128. **Question:** Inbound data exchange to [Bidder]. In what format and via what transport will the layer deliver student demographic, enrollment, and program eligibility data? Specifically: Ed-Fi API (which ODS/API version and data model), OneRoster 1.1/1.2 REST, CEDS-aligned payload, SFTP push against a published schema, or a state-specific API? What is the expected refresh cadence (real-time, hourly, nightly)?

Answer: The data endpoint is per-district. Each LEA SIS vendor will have their own format. There is no required format for data integration. Currently, SIS vendors send and receive data through standard SFTP push with an agreed upon schema for each LEA IEP system. For API integration, connectors vary but can use standard API protocols. There are no other required reporting elements from CEDARS. SIS are required to report to for all required CEDARS elements. The refresh cadence is typically daily.

129. **Question:** Outbound data exchange from [Bidder]. What format is required for IEP, 504, service, and eligibility data flowing back to district SIS platforms and any state-level reporting system? Is this a single statewide endpoint or per-district endpoints behind the state layer? Are there required state reporting elements besides CEDARS that must be mapped on export?

Answer: The data endpoint is per-district. Each SIS vendor will have their own format. There is no required format for data integration. Currently, SIS vendors send data through standard SFTP push. There are also many districts with API integration. The vendor is responsible for each SIS data integration, and the API connectors vary but can use standard API protocols.

There is no data interaction between the IEP system and CEDARS. All IEP data required for CEDARS flows through the SIS. The LEA SIS is required to report for all required CEDARS elements and those data elements are currently well defined in the CEDARS data manual. The refresh cadence is for each LEA typically daily. 504 data is out of scope for the statewide IEP project.

130. **Question:** Authentication and certification. What authentication standard will the layer require (OAuth 2.0, API keys, mutual TLS, SAML)? Is a state-provided sandbox / certification environment required, and what is the expected vendor certification timeline?

Answer: Authentication architecture will be determined in accordance with WaTech policies, and bidders should expect to support modern federated identity standards (SAML 2.0, OpenID Connect / OAuth 2.0) for application-level SSO and OAuth 2.0 with TLS 1.2+ for system-to-system API integrations. The design must support internal authentication for OSPI staff and external authentication from parents or educators. Refer to WaTech SEC Access Control and Identification and Authentication Security policies. There is no pre-existing OSPI sandbox or vendor self-certification program for SIS-to-IEP integration today; necessary non-production environments will be determined by the vendor.

131. **Question:** Field-level specification. Will the State publish a canonical data dictionary for the integration layer, or is each vendor expected to map to district-specific SIS field structures? [Bidder] maintains a standard 50+ field import/export template; aligning to a single state spec versus maintaining per-district mappings has material implications for implementation timeline and total cost of ownership at statewide scale.

Answer: The desired outcome is a single canonical statewide data dictionary for the IEP integration layer rather than 300 LEAs' individual mappings; OSPI understands per-district field mappings are not sustainable at statewide scale and contradict the project's standardization objectives. A single canonical statewide data dictionary does not exist today; bidders can consider CEDARS (the state's longitudinal data system) field definitions and the IEP Model Forms as an authoritative starting point. The canonical dictionary will be net-new work developed jointly with OSPI, the selected vendor, district SIS subject-matter experts, and subject-matter experts from ESDs and LEAs. Bidders should scope on the assumption that their standard import/export template will be mapped to a state specification rather than maintained per district, and configurable field mappings should be treated as a positive capability.

132. **Question:** Could you please send us all of the graphics in the RFP as separate high resolution files? The diagrams in the RFP are not fully readable.

Answer: Some of the hard-to-see graphics – namely *Figure 1: Statewide IEP Platform Context Diagram* (page 16) and *Figure 2: Statewide IEP Future State Architecture* (page 17) – were updated via Addendum 01, and are available as separately downloadable PDFs on the [Competitive Procurement website](#).

133. **Question:** I wanted to follow up regarding RFP 2026-20 and ask whether the questions submitted during or following the pre-bid conference will be made available to vendors. If so, could you please confirm where those questions and responses will be posted?

Answer: Yes, all pre-bid and email submitted questions are published on the [OSPI website](#) and [WEBS](#).