

**RFQQ 23-06
Amendment 3
All Questions and Answers**

Grants Management System for the Washington State Library

Questions and answers for 37 through 60 are new since the preproposal conference Amd 2.

1. Whether companies from Outside USA can apply for this? (like, from India or Canada)
Yes, companies from outside the US can apply.
2. Whether we need to come over there for meetings?
No, all work can be completed remotely.
3. Can we perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside USA? (like, from India or Canada)
Yes, all work can be completed remotely.
4. Can we submit the proposals via email?
Yes, proposals can and should be submitted via email.
5. Given the current disparate data sources, will the state perform data cleansing function to insure [sic] all data migrated/populated in the platformed [sic] is current, accurate, and void of duplicates? If not will that function be a responsibility of the integrator?
WSL will be responsible for populating data. Data migration is expected to be minimal.
6. Does the state plan to redesign any grants management business process flows before or after vendor selection?
WSL expects to modify grants processes to match the capabilities and constraints of the selected GMS.
7. Please clarify [the requirement that the GMS should have customizable reporting features that allow for automated generation of reports in a format that aligns with IMLS' State Program Report requirements] as our understanding is the IMLS SPR accepts batch uploads in an excel template. Is the State's requirement for platform that exports data using the SPTR template?
The selected GMS should allow for the customization of reports that can easily integrate with the requirements of the SPR.
8. Are there other management reports the State wants, and if so, how many canned reports will the integrator be expected to provide? There is no estimated number of reports in the RFP.
WSL requires the ability to customize reports that fit the needs of its users, recipients, and IMLS. Canned reports are not a requirement of this RFQQ.

9. We believe the State may be excluding potentially qualified vendors with this requirement [five years of experience in developing and managing and GMS platform, at least three of which included working with State Library Administrative Agencies (SLAAs)]. If a vendor feels that they are qualified and can meet the state's needs, they should be permitted to submit a proposal that supports their case.

A vendor without those qualifications can make the case for their system with the understanding that experience working with SLAAs is a preferred qualification and points for that qualification will be awarded accordingly.

10. Please define "robust reporting functionality" with technical specifications.

The users of the selected GMS are not technical experts and are not familiar with the technical specification information being requested. WSL requires the ability to customize reports that fit the needs of its users, recipients, and IMLS.

11. Please define "strong" with more specific security requirements (e.g. Washington State Administrative Code (WAC) 200-391-166, etc.)

Bidders should provide details about the level of security that their system provides. State technology guidelines can be found at the Washington State Office of the Chief Information Officer's website at <https://ocio.wa.gov/policies>.

12. Did the state work with any vendors to develop this RFP? If so, which ones?

WSL has seen demonstration of several GMSs but none of them were involved in the development of this RFQQ.

13. Has the state seen any systems that meet their requirements in use in another WA State agency or another State's Library? If so, which agency?

WSL is not aware of the systems used by other WA state agencies. Other SLAAs use a variety of systems but WSL does not have details available to share.

14. Are there specific technical requirements that would prevent a grants management platform developed specifically for State and Local governments from serving the needs of the WA State Libraries?

Potential vendors may have the capacity to create a workable system, but WSL will prefer vendors already familiar with the specific needs of SLAAs due to the ability to streamline the setup and implementation.

15. One of the minimum requirements is 3 years experience working with State Library Administrative Agencies (SLAAs). Would experience with other state government grantmakers such as the State of Washington be sufficient?

See question 9.

16. Regarding the requirement to be registered with the state to do business and have obtained current UBI, is this requirement required at RFQQ submission time or at the time the contract is signed with the successful contractor?

The UBI is required at the time the contract is signed.

17. How many internal users (e.g., administrators and staff do you expect to access the system per month? Of these internal users, how many will access the system 40+ hours per month?
WSL seeks 10 seats for internal users. Of those, an estimated 1-3 will need access 40+ hours per month.
18. How many external users (e.g., applicants and external reviewers do you expect to access the system concurrently per month?
WSL seeks the ability to accept 200 applications per year. A portion of these applications will be from the same applicants, so we do not have an estimate of how many external users will need concurrent access. Please provide a cost breakdown for different numbers of users.
19. What is your preferred hosting option (public cloud vs private cloud)?
Public cloud.
20. In addition to interfacing with Outlook and DocuSign, are there any other external services/products that you need to integrate with? If so, what are they and what level of integration do you need (i.e., real-time vs batch)?
Additional features that are part of a vendor's GMS can be included in the response with pricing information.
21. Do you expect the contractors to elaborate on the required and nice-to-have features/capabilities in the submission? In the Proposal Contents and the Evaluation criteria sections, there is no mention of these features/capabilities that need to be submitted or scored against.
Vendors should provide responses that demonstrate the required and nice-to-have features/capabilities so that reviewers can assess their proposed GMS.
22. Please could you describe the types of 'Special Projects' that you provide the circa \$400K grants for?
Special projects cover a range of library needs and can include products like equipment, books, and supplies, services like data plans, online tracking subscriptions, or web design, training, professional development, digitization, or programming.
23. Do you have a preference or a need for single sign-on or multifactor authentication?
It is not a requirement, but we would be interested in having the option if it is available.
24. Do you have public facing needs for the GMS?
The staff of applicant libraries need to be able to access the GMS, but general public does not.
25. Do you have a targeted start date or a go live date?
No. The target start date for the contract is July 1, 2023 and we expect implementation and set up to happen in the weeks following.
26. It seems from the RFQQ that 2/3 of the need is the management of the incoming grants and less of the outgoing grants. Is that the case?

No, WSL seeks a GMS to manage the funds going out to libraries as subgrants. WSL is the administrator of federal and state funds to support libraries, so our focus is on the outgoing grants.

27. Has budget been identified for this and is this something you can share?

Yes, a budget range has been identified and no, it is not something we can share.

28. Are you open to one prime bidder or would you consider a prime bidder with a subcontractor/systems integrator?

We are open to either, but if there is a bifurcated arrangement, it should be clear who is responsible for what, especially on service requests and customer service.

29. Are your applications across programs the same or individualized?

Some information is the same across programs, like the library system information, statewide vendor numbers, UEI, etc. Other questions are tailored to the specific grant program.

30. Is WSL open to extending the submission date by 2 weeks?

No.

31. How does WSL intend to allocate points on SLAA minimum requirements given this scenario: the Software we will be recommending has been used by other libraries.

Although the implementation partner has previous GMS experience with other public sector agencies but not with other SLAAs, will we meet this minimum qualification outlined in 1.3?

Experience with other libraries or public sector agencies does not fulfill the preference for SLAA experience, but a vendor is welcome to make a case for their system.

32. Are there any grant reviewers that aren't employed by WSL?

WSL seeks the option to invite non-WSL staff to review applications.

33. Are all of the grant reviewers included in the 10 or fewer seats mentioned on Page 1 of the RFQQ document? Or, are there additional staff besides those 10 individuals that would be required to review and score grant applications? The grant reviewers are included in the 10 seats.

34. How many unique grant programs are expected to be implemented by the contracting firm and administered in the platform?

WSL seeks to administer as many grant programs as staff want to offer, but the vendor is not expected to set them up.

35. Could you describe the most common workflow that the grant programs follow? For example, an applicant submits 5 application questions, a single reviewer approves the grant for disbursement. Or, is it a much more complex process than that?

The rigorousness of the application process depends on the grant program. Some programs are first come, first served with a single reviewer. Others start with letters of interest and a panel of reviewers. The most common is in between, with short applications consisting of library

information and identifiers and a few short-answer questions, which are reviewed and rated by 3-5 people.

36. Is there an approximate budget for the annual licensing, initial implementation and ongoing support costs?

Yes, WSL has an estimated budget but will not share it before the contract negotiations. Vendors should include the costs for these services.

37. Is there a dedicated internal Project Manager on staff, or will you outsource that role to a third party? How many people do you anticipate participating in the “core team” to ensure the joint success of the project?

The RFQQ Coordinator identified in 2.1 will be the project manager. We anticipate the PM will handle most of the implementation with the support of 2-3 staff.

38. How many unique programs are open annually? What are the estimated averages around the number of applications you receive per year?

See question 34. WSL seeks the ability to accept 200 applications per year.

39. For each of the program applications, are these application forms minimally or materially different? Are there different approval workflows for each program and/or application type? How do they materially differ?

See questions 29 and 35. WSL seeks the ability to customize applications and workflows based on staff needs for each program.

40. Do you administer your grant payments in advance or via claim reimbursement?

Claim reimbursement.

41. For each of the program applications, do the line-item Grantee Budget templates vary minimally or are they materially different? Would you be open to sharing that format and document?

WSL seeks the ability to customize forms based on staff needs for each program. A sample budget template currently in use can be seen at <https://washstatelib.libguides.com/2023WDH/applications>.

42. Is there desired visibility and interaction for external reviewers/panels to offer expert opinions and/or validation on the application pool?

See question 32.

43. Do you desire to track sub-awards and/or re-grants?

No.

44. Roughly how many types of automated email communications are sent to applicants/grantees? Roughly how many documents/templates will need to be generated in the system (e.g., grant agreement, payment letter, etc.)?
WSL seeks the ability to customize templates and communications and prefers that the types/templates/documents not be limited.
45. Do you have any standard reports that need to be created on a regular basis (e.g., Grant Approval List, List of Approved Grants, List of Payments, etc.)?
See question 8.
46. How many budgetary or accounting levels are needed to capture expenses for grantee financial reporting?
We do not understand this question.
47. What is the annual expenditure of this program(s)?
As stated in section 1.1 of the RFQQ, WSL subgrants an estimated \$400,000 annually.
48. Do you currently use any advanced reporting/analytics software (such as Tableau, PowerBI, Qlik, etc.)? If yes, do you plan to continue to use this type of software going forward? If not, is there an interest in pursuing this option?
No.
49. Can you please estimate roughly how many grant records would need to be migrated from the previous systems? Organizations? People? Reports? Documents?
See question 5.
50. What, if any, is your Single Sign-On solution? If so, is it currently used for both internal users and external grantees? If not, do you have a targeted vendor partner in mind?
WSL does not currently have a GMS so no single sign-on solution exists. Vendors should include information about the options available with their systems.
51. Which systems must be integrated with our platform at launch? Do they have APIs available for integration? Ideally, in the consolidation of systems, which platforms do you envision continuing to use versus those where you want to consolidate/deprecate/End of Life?
As stated in section 1.3, WSL seeks the ability to integrate with Outlook for email communications and DocuSign for contract approval processes. Vendors should specify if their systems can integrate with those systems. If a vendor's system integrates with other systems, information can be included with prices.
52. To better understand compliance for this specific agreement, what levels do you require regarding State and Federal data security and accessibility for cloud-based SaaS offerings?
See question 11. Guidelines can be found at the Washington State Office of the Chief Information Officer's website at <https://ocio.wa.gov/policies>.

53. Is your organization or govt looking for the best SaaS practices under AWS, cloud-based, multi-tenant structures, etc.?

See question 11.

54. It seems you are amidst an IT Modernization effort, in addition to grants management. As such, are you interested in how we can provide advanced services and/or ongoing support as part of this effort?

Additional features not listed under minimum qualifications that are part of the vendor's GMS can be included in the response with pricing information. However, the primary focus of this RFQQ is a basic grant management system that can meet the needs of WSL and its subrecipients.

55. Is there a plan in place to manage organizational change in regard to a new Grants Management Software?

No.

56. Is there an ability to redline the terms and conditions and contract with the State?

Vendors should provide initial exceptions about the sample contract with their bid. Changes can be negotiated during contract negotiations.

57. Can the team share any diagrams or organizational structures as it relates to the grant program? No.

58. Will there be any public-facing needs with the GMS? If so, please elaborate on the need.

See question 24.

59. Has the team mapped all of the critical grant processes for each program?

No.

60. Will your team use this to manage grants for internal projects or is this system just for external grantmaking?

The primary function of the GMS will be to administer outgoing grant funds, but WSL may use the system for internal projects depending on the capabilities of the selected system.