

February 8, 2023

To: All Potential Respondents

From: Karl Wendt, Procurement Manager

Subject: 005-RFP-0317-2023 - Education Savings Account Administration

### Addendum Two

**Please amend the subject RFP to include answers to the following timely received questions:**

1. Follow-up question from Addendum 1

3. Regarding 4.3.3 System Requirements; page 18 - Will any state agency be responsible for providing data for or verifying family income, or other eligibility?

Answer: We are committed to the security of Iowa's personal information. When possible, if secure, we are open to **expediting the process through the sharing of data**. Appropriate consent may need to be built into any application process to authorize access to existing state agency data for the purposes of income validation or other eligibility determinations.

**Follow-up Question:** If you are open to expediting the process by sharing data files, how will families who are not on the data file list be vetted and approved or declined?

**Answer:** Please provide examples of your successful management of a vetting process. We would like to see a proven track record, hear best practices & learn how your organization would manage manual vetting of applicants in those limited circumstances where it may be needed.

2. The next Follow-up Question is based upon the State's answers to Questions 12 and 29: 12. **Regarding 4.2.2** and the Responsible Respondent will need to work through and establish rules, procedures and schedules up to and including the approval of and funding of family accounts, is this requirement understood to mean having a **fully operational application, less ongoing configuration that will be a part of the implementation planning between 30-60 days prior to the 6/30/23 deadline?**

Answer: Yes.

29. With software applications, *some respondents will make "promises to build,"* while others already have the software built and others *may need to modify existing code* to meet Iowa's requirements. Will these three scenarios be judged as equivalent, or will promises to build or modify be deemed to have lower value?

**Answer:** Respondents with proposals that can **fully implement the ESA program within the required timeline** will be scored the highest.

**Follow up Question:** Given the response to Question #12, the state's expectation is the respondent must have **fully operational applications** for family applications, digital funding, approval processes and reporting **by no later than May 30** (30 days prior to 6/30/2023 deadline) and **preferably by April 30** (60 days prior to 6/30/2023 deadline). Furthermore, under Question #29, the state has indicated allocating highest scores based upon the **ability to fully implement**

**by April 30 to May 30** (30-60 days ahead of the June 30 Deadline). By following any industry standard for technology development such as Agile, Spiral, RAD, Waterfall, etc., any “promise to build” or need for development will require a minimum of ten specific steps, including:

- (1) General Analysis and Requirements Gathering
- (2) Validation of Scope of Work
- (3) Product Design
- (4) Software Coding
- (5) Wireframing
- (6) Testing and Stress Testing
- (7) User Acceptance Testing
- (8) Deployment
- (9) Training or Hiring of Support Staff
- (10) Go-Live

**Measuring Risk Tolerance:** How will the state determine an acceptable level of risk that a respondent will be successful at building or adapting a system under such a tight deadline, given the system must be fully operational by April 30 or May 30 at the latest, and given schools will start in August regardless of any development challenges?

**Answer:** Please provide references and proof of success in implementing projects under similar timeframes.

**Mitigation:** As the ESA program is the first bill passed into law in 2023, and is being closely observed by both supporters and critics alike, the state can greatly reduce risk by having each respondent come to your office (or remotely) shortly after the RFP due date of February 14, 2023 to demonstrate all aspects of a fully operational system, including family applications, using digital wallets with approved vendors (schools), approving transactions and real-time reporting. States often make this a practice when procuring non-commodity products or services. Would the state consider implementing such a pre-award presentation by respondents?

**Answer:** Respondents that meet the mandatory requirements and have technical score exceeding the minimum may be asked to perform a presentation regarding their systems and services.

**Please acknowledge receipt of this addendum by signing in the space provided below, and return this letter with your offer (do not send back separately).**

I hereby acknowledge receipt of this addendum.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Typed or Printed Name