DATE: February 13, 2020

TO: All Potential Vendors

FROM: Jessica Smith, RFP Coordinator

SUBJECT: Amendment #1 Q&A to RFP A20-RFP-038,– *Open Data Platform Service*

**Summary:**

This document is prepared by the Washington State Consolidated Technology Services (CTS) and shall serve as the sole official reply to Vendor Questions submitted in response to RFP A20-RFP-038 Open Data Platform Service.

Questions and responses are numbered for ease of reference only and are in no particular order or priority. Questions and comments have generally been stated as they were received except that some questions have been modified to maintain vendor confidentiality or to reduce redundancies. The answers may only explain or clarify some aspect that is already addressed in the RFP. Some of the answers may also supplement or change what was previously stated in the RFP or in an appendix. It is important that Vendors review all questions and answers. Vendors are advised to obtain and thoroughly review the complete, formal RFP located at: <http://watech.wa.gov/procurement-announcements>.

In the amended RFP deleted text appears ~~struck through~~ in black font, whereas added text appears underlined in red font.

**V****endor Questions and Official Answers**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Question** | **CTS Response** |
| 1 | Do you anticipate extending the bid due date? | CTS does not intend to extend the bid due date. |
| 2 | What additional details are you willing to provide, if any, beyond what is stated in bid documents concerning how you will identify the winning bid? | The responses will all be evaluated according to the RFP. |
| 3 | Was this bid posted to the nationwide free bid notification website at www.mygovwatch.com? | No the bid was posted on WEBS & our procurement announcements website <http://watech.wa.gov/procurement-announcements>. |
| 4 | Other than your own website, where was this bid posted? | Yes, WEBS. <http://des.wa.gov/services/ContractingPurchasing/Business/Pages/WEBSRegistration.aspx>. |
| 5 | How much of the data portal experience from the current data.wa.gov page is needed? Is it an overhaul of the experience or are you hoping to recreate the same thing? | Same or similar. No redesign is required, but may be proposed as an element of published requirements in section 5. |
| 6 | Are you tied to datasets as the base structure? Departments have to upload datasets and users have to find datasets? | Yes. The Solution must allow users to access and download machine-readable datasets, uploaded by state agency publishers. |
| 7 | How much usage is the current portal getting? Traffic goals vs. actual would be helpful. | The site may get up to 25K page views a day and have nearly 40M rows loaded, by API or browsers. Usage is expected to stay the same or increase. This does not include API query traffic which we don’t have specific numbers for. |
| 8 | Why was the previous RFP pulled last year without resolution? What was missing? | CTS determined that cancelling the RFP and revising the requirements and cost model was in the best interest of the state |
| 9 | In Section 5, what do blank points cells mean? Does it mean no points allocated to these items? If so, why should we consider these options since final decision will be made based on points? | No points are allocated to those items. They are desirable questions. |
| 10 | How will success be measured for the open data program? | Participation by publishers and users. |
| 11 | What tools does CTS use internally for ETL (Extract, Transform, Load) workflows? | The Solution facilitates publishing workflows for many different agencies in addition to CTS. Each agency may use different platforms for ETL and this may change into the future. The Solution should work with standard, commonly used tools and provide a documented publishing API that does not require any platform specific libraries. |
| 12 | What is considered a “larger dataset” for CTS in terms of row & column size and space (i.e. measured in Gigabytes/Terabytes)? | We do not currently track the size of the data in the way that one might track the bytes, blocks etc. Detailed data on the number of datasets, records, views etc. change daily and are available here: <https://data.wa.gov/analytics> |
| 13 | Does CTS have a data governance strategy document, a data playbook or metadata guidelines? If any of these are published or not published, can CTS please make the latest and updated copies available for review? | Yes. These documents are published on the OCIO website under policies. Search for Open Data and Metadata. Agencies may also have governance documents or policies for open data.  <https://ocio.wa.gov/policies?combine=Open+Data>  <https://ocio.wa.gov/policy/metadata-standard>  <https://data.wa.gov/dataset/Open-Data-Planning-Maturity/5r58-ib3h> |
| 14 | What level of technical expertise is currently required from CTS’s staff to receive, validate, and consolidates day perform transformations on the data? | None. The current solution is accessible to agencies without extensive technical expertise. |
| 15 | Would it be possible to name the three greatest challenges CTS is having with the current solution? | This is not a Q&A question and irrelevant to providing a response to the RFP |
| 16 | Have you had any external assistance preparing this RFP? If so, whom? | There are a variety of state agencies who provided input and assistance to CTS. |
| 17 | What technical staff from CTS will be involved in the migration phase? | Approximately 0.5 FTE is currently engaged in supporting Data.wa.gov in all respects. Staffing levels are subject to state budgeting processes. No vendor should rely on a specific level of support from OCIO, but current plans suggest that about the current level of staff engagement will continue for the life of this contract. |
| 18 | What other metadata schemas do you expect the solution to be interoperable with? | Those posted on the OCIO website under policies, search for metadata standard, 187.10.  <https://ocio.wa.gov/policy/metadata-standard> |
| 19 | (Req 5.2 Mandatory) We would like to provide our FedRAMP Authorization Letter as proof that we undergo a rigorous annual security assessment | Include supporting evidence that your Solution is compliant with the listed requirements. |
| 20 | Appendix B Section 32.1 includes mention of medical data, law enforcement records, agency source code or object code, agency security data, etc.  Clarifying question: what types of CJIS and/or HIPAA data is CTS looking to host on our platform? | Appendix B refers to standard contract language. The open data Solution hosts only category 1 data per policy 141. |
| 21 | (Req 5.2.1 Desirable) Would like context on what they expect for “flagging of suspect data by platform users, intrusion detection, and scanning for Personally Identifiable Information”  a. Can you please provide clarity on what you want us to support (i.e. they can access their own Activity Log to review who accesses what) vs. what they want us to provide (active data-type scanning) | The Solution should only publish data qualifying as Category 1 public information under OCIO Policy 141.10. We need to prevent non-Category 1 PII from being accidentally shared on the platform and malicious attacks. Tools should detect intrusions and scan for accidentally shared PII in a timely manner to prevent damage. This would need to be controlled at the dataset level. |
| 22 | Technical Requirement 5.5.3 is for “Migration includes derivative content.” Can you please explain the name and type of derivative content that would need to be migrated? | Maps, charts, filtered views, etc. |
| 23 | In the cost proposal, Attachment E, next to “Years 1.3 (Initial Term of the Contract(”, is the vendor supposed to provide the total price for the 3-year term, or the annual price for a single year? | Annual price/ year. |