

## Vendor Questions regarding the IC2 HPCDS RfP

1. Related to the one-year warranty that is specified in section 3.13 of the RfP, could NEWMOA provide an example of and/or more details related to the warranty NEWMOA would like to have in place? Namely, what reference (document) and processes will be used to determine that a HPCDS function, feature, or content needs alteration under the warranty vs a modification to the original contract.

**NEWMOA response:** *The warranty shall cover attributes of the System captured during requirements gathering and described in the System requirements and design documents.*

2. Related to that, how will product acceptance be determined?

**NEWMOA response:** *The System shall be deemed acceptable by NEWMOA and the project team, based on its expression of the requirements captured during requirements analysis and documented in a Functional Requirements Document (or equivalent).*

3. Could NEWMOA share the list of attendees at the April 2 vendor conference?

**NEWMOA response:** *Yes; see <http://theic2.org/hpcds>.*

4. Could NEWMOA clarify the extent to which users of HPCDS would be expected to comply with each unique requirement of each state's program?

**NEWMOA response:** *Entities subject to reporting must comply with the unique requirements of each and every state to which they are required to report.*

For example:

- 4.1. Will users be expected to identify in which states they sell or manufacture qualifying children's products?

**NEWMOA response:** *Yes. This would be necessary to—for example—assess the proper reporting fees and determine the appropriate set of high priority chemicals required by that state's statute.*

- 4.2. Does NEWMOA expect that the most restrictive reporting requirements across the three states would apply to all HPCDS reporters OR each user would first be challenged to identify a) chemicals of concern and b) states where their products are sold/manufactured?

**NEWMOA response:** *Scenario (b) is the most likely approach. The System shall determine the appropriate set of reportable chemicals, reporting fee, etc.—including, in the case of Vermont, whether brand name and product model (BNPM)-level data is required.*

- 4.3. Will all users have to provide the detailed product information required by the Vermont program?

**NEWMOA response:** *No, only entities reporting to Vermont and only for products subject to Vermont's reporting requirements. That is, if Acme Corp. sells products A, B, and C in Washington and sells products B and C in Vermont, then Acme must only submit BNPM data for products B and C. However, the System should allow Acme to submit detailed (BNPM) product information for products A, B, and C if Acme chooses to do so.*

## Vendor Questions regarding the IC2 HPCDS RfP

4.4. Will states be adjusting the periodicity of reporting and reporting deadlines so that all state reporting periods and deadlines are synchronous?

*NEWMOA response: Probably not, because this requires a statutory change for some states—and certainly not before the HPCDS is in production. The System design should allow for changes in reporting frequency and deadlines among participating states.*

5. In order to optimize development time and deliver functional system components sooner than prescribed in the RfP (i.e., critical date specified in RfP Section 3.1 and the key deliverables specified in RfP Section 4), would NEWMOA consider proposals with a different approach and timelines for requirements gathering and software development (more Agile than Waterfall), which we believe would speed up development of requirements and expand the time available for the build of the beta system?

*NEWMOA response: Yes, with the caveat that gathering and harmonizing Ecology's, OHA's, VDH's, and NEWMOA's requirements is likely to take time. Proposals that compress the requirements gathering and analysis timeline should take care to assure the selection committee that doing so will not compromise the project.*

6. What type of functions/activities are anticipated in the “Administration System” that is referred to throughout the RfP?

*NEWMOA response: This must be explored during requirements analysis, but anticipated functions/activities include:*

- *IC2 and state agency review of submitted reports (e.g., review of submitted data, whether record-by-record or in bulk, including records for which companies have made a CBI claim)*
- *Approval of submitted data to make it visible to the public (presumably but not necessarily implying transfer of published records from staging to production database tables)*
- *For data submitted to multiple states, an indication of which data have already been approved/published by other states.*
- *IC2 and state agency staff views of submitted and approved data, including filtering/searching submitted data and exporting/downloading data*
- *IC2 staff administration of HPCDS, including but not limited to:*
  1. *Create, delete, merge state agency user accounts*
  2. *Delete or merge company user accounts*
  3. *Reset user passwords*
  4. *Update or modify database reference values (state CHCC lists, product categories, etc.)*
  5. *Add, edit, delete bricks (product categories) and reportable chemicals for each state*
  6. *Possibly adding new states (though we understand that this may not be feasible through the admin UI)*

## Vendor Questions regarding the IC2 HPCDS RfP

7. OHA requires a fee when reporting high priority chemicals of concern for children’s health. Can we assume that the new reporting system will not require acceptance of payment during the reporting process?

**NEWMOA response:** *You should assume that companies will have to pay reporting fees during the reporting process, if submitting reports to Oregon or Vermont. It is unlikely that the System will accept or process payments on behalf of states. Rather, we expect that the System shall calculate the fees and facilitate some kind of “handshake” between the HPCDS and states’ payment systems. The goal is to make payment of reporting fees as seamless as possible, from the user’s perspective.*

8. The RfP indicates that custom or COTS solutions are viable options. For off the shelf systems, will the contract accommodate ongoing license fee?

**NEWMOA response:** *Yes. Although this applies mostly to a separate, future hosted service agreement, not the current development contract, cost proposals for this project should include information related to ongoing O&M costs, as stated on p. 26 of the RfP: “In describing their approach, vendors must specify the hosting configuration proposed and any associated costs. Costs associated with hosting options, including technical support, should also be enumerated.”*

9. The RfP indicates that the vendor shall host the new reporting solution. Will the contract accommodate ongoing annual hosting fees?

**NEWMOA response:** *Yes, but (again) this applies mostly to a separate, future hosted service agreement, not the current development contract. However, as noted in our response to the previous question, cost proposals for this project should include information related to ongoing O&M costs.*

10. Can you provide more detail pertaining to user security and the various roles envisioned in the new reporting and administration systems? For example, is self-registration expected? Will there be a need to ensure that users are reporting data for only the companies they have permissions/rights to?

**NEWMOA response:** *Likely roles include a NEWMOA/IC2 system admin role, state reviewer role, a reporting company role (possibly two: one for entities creating and submitting reports for themselves and one for entities creating reports for another entity—see below), and public user (consumer of published data) role. Self-registration is desired and expected. And yes, the System should ensure that users can submit reports only for the companies they have permissions/rights to. The System must allow companies to delegate reporting to other companies in some cases (for example, a toy manufacturer may submit reports on behalf of a retailer for its toys sold by that retailer in one or more states).*

11. For the IC2 project implementation, please elaborate

- 11.1. Total participating authorities
- 11.2. Estimated total user accounts,
- 11.3. Estimated total companies,
- 11.4. Estimated total reports per year,

## Vendor Questions regarding the IC2 HPCDS RfP

*NEWMOA response: Total participating authorities = 3 (Oregon, Washington, and (ideally) Vermont). See § 2 (Background) of the RfP for the other requested information.*

12. Will the IC2 HPCDS be designed to be used by all states and local authorities? If yes, in addition to the 18 states on RFP page 7, please project the potential expansion of user community for next 10 years:

- 12.1. Estimated total user accounts,
- 12.2. Estimated total companies,
- 12.3. Estimated total reports per year,
- 12.4. Estimated total participating authorities...

*NEWMOA response: No. It is possible that, within the next ten years, a few more states will enact laws establishing disclosure programs for chemicals in children's products. It is also possible that states (including Oregon, Washington, and Vermont) could create similar programs for other product categories and that the HPCDS could support implementation of those programs.*

13. Will the new IC2 solution use a standard reporting form to capture HPCD reports for all participating states? If yes, can you please provide a report template? If IC2 needs to provide different reporting forms based on requirements unique to each participating state, please elaborate the reporting form differences among the states.

*NEWMOA response: The goal is to standardize reporting as much as possible, given the minor differences in the three state programs. We do not have a standard template; the selected contractor will develop that template during the system design phase of the project. We encourage you to review the existing documentation provided by [Oregon](#), [Washington](#), and [Vermont](#), as well as the draft data dictionary and comparison document provided on <http://theic2.org/hpcds>.*

14. What will be the relationship between the new IC2 solution to existing states' systems? Will existing reporting systems from Washington State Department of Ecology and Vermont Department of Health be sunset after the IC2 HPCDS goes live?

*NEWMOA response: Yes, we expect Oregon, Washington, and Vermont to retire their existing reporting systems once the HPCDS is online.*

15. Does the HPCDS need to meet CROMERR requirements?

*NEWMOA response: No.*

16. Does the HPCDS need to provide functions to support compliance & enforcement of reporting rules? If yes, please provide details.

*NEWMOA response: This must be explored and confirmed during requirements analysis, but the answer is yes. Relevant System functions include:*

- 1. Payment of reporting fees before reports can be submitted to Oregon or Vermont
- 2. Basic form validation to help ensure that submitted data are complete and well-formed

## Vendor Questions regarding the IC2 HPCDS RfP

3. *Recordkeeping and reporting that supports states' enforcement actions against non-reporters by providing information on reporting history, etc.*
4. *Possibly, the ability for IC2 or state agency staff to flag records and send questions about them to the responsible party*

*We do not expect the System to include, for example, a wizard to help companies evaluate whether they are required to report. Information or guidance of that nature will be maintained on each state agency's website.*

17. For the “optional” deliverable regarding the “Import of Vermont Department of Health’s existing data, is the itemized cost estimate required?

**NEWMOA response:** *As stated on p. 26 of the RfP, “The pricing proposal must be itemized. At a minimum, the vendor must provide those items identified in Business Requirements and Technical Requirements sections.” This RfP will result in a firm, fixed-price contract. All other things being equal, a proposal that includes this task will receive a higher score.*

18. Is the itemized cost estimate for the “optional deliverable” Public-Facing advanced query builder (AQB) required?

**NEWMOA response:** *As above.*

19. For the “optional” defined reports, do you have a list of desired reports or examples of existing reports available?

**NEWMOA response:** *No. This must be explored during requirements analysis.*

20. Is the itemized cost estimate for the “optional deliverable” for a mobile-ready when app required?

**NEWMOA response:** *As above. Also, anticipated use of the HPCDS via mobile devices was discussed during the vendor conference; we encourage you to listen to the conference audio recording.*

21. Is the draft function requirement document developed by IC2 available for review?

**NEWMOA response:** *Yes. See <http://theic2.org/hpcds>.*

22. Is the draft data dictionary and business processes developed by IC2 database Workgroup available for review? (RFP page 15)

**NEWMOA response:** *Yes. See <http://theic2.org/hpcds>.*

23. Is there a User Guide for Ecology’s CSPA Reporting Application? May we have an electronic copy?

**NEWMOA response:** *See <https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/documents/1704040.pdf>.*

24. Is there a Data Dictionary available for CSPA Reporting Application?

**NEWMOA response:** *Yes. The CSPA Reporting Application documentation and code is available upon request.*

25. Is the Excel template for the TFKA Biennial Notice available for review?

## Vendor Questions regarding the IC2 HPCDS RfP

**NEWMOA response:** See

<http://www.oregon.gov/oha/PH/HEALTHYENVIRONMENTS/HEALTHYNEIGHBORHOOD/TOXICSUBSTANCES/Pages/Toxic-Free-Kids-Reporting.aspx>.

26. For the task to import OHA’s entire TFKA dataset into the “new” database, can you provide a “rough” estimate on the number Biennial Notice that need to be migrated?

**NEWMOA response:** *Our current best estimate is 1500 – 2000 records (i.e., chemical-brick combinations).*

27. For the task to import data from CSPA’s database into the “new” database, can you provide a “rough” estimate on the number of reports currently in CSPA’s database?

**NEWMOA response:** *See § 2 (Background), p. 5 of the RfP.*

28. For the RESTfull web services, how many data retrieval services are required by the project (e.g. search data by chemical name, search data by manufacturer name, etc.)?

**NEWMOA response:** *Unknown; this must be explored during requirements analysis.*

29. For the Training Session, will this require a face to face meeting at NEWMOA office or will online training sessions be acceptable (e.g. GoToMeeting)?

**NEWMOA response:** *Online training is acceptable. Oregon, Washington, and Vermont staff would not likely travel to Boston for training.*

30. Is Contractor’s project manager required to be onsite at NEWMOA?

**NEWMOA response:** *Not on a regular basis, no. However, we may request occasional face-to-face meetings.*

31. I do have a general question about the project. Since we are not a custom software vendor our primary interest is to support the consolidated reporting frameworks with the toxnot toolset. We are interested in proposing that we create the reporting application within our standard version of toxnot (since there is already a high degree of functional overlap) and we then provide a data connection to IC2 and the states that gives all parties to the individual access they need. We think this partnership approach would be much lower cost to IC2 but we also would not be handing over our IP around the reporting module. I think structurally the grants would pay for the admin customization and we would make edits to the reporting module at our expense (that way there’s not an issue of IP development with public funds). This approach would be by far the most extensible since we could hook new states and product categories up to the system over time and charge for the data feed to support our hosting/development and IC2’s coordination. This is obviously not a straight ahead response to the requirements. Can you give us guidance as to whether we should submit an “innovative” partnership proposal? Obviously we don’t want to invest the time in something that’s a nonstarter (or we need to know what can’t be considered around partnership prior to writing)

**NEWMOA response:** *The selection committee will seriously consider “innovative” proposals, but they must address all known HPCDS requirements, as described in § 4 (Technical Requirements) of the RfP, including but not limited to:*

- *Companies’ ability to create and submit reports to one or more states*

## Vendor Questions regarding the IC2 HPCDS RfP

- *Payment of reporting fees, where applicable*
- *User and company account management*
- *IC2 staff's ability to administer the System, as described above*
- *State agency staff's ability to filter, search, and review submitted data and approve it for publication*
- *Publication of reported data not designated CBI in a public interface that gives users the ability to search/filter and export the data*
- *Creation of a virtual Exchange Network Node and implementation of a RESTful web service and data flow*

*As stated in the RfP (p. 25), NEWMOA prefers vendors with the following qualifications:*

- *Demonstrable experience with the Exchange Network and EPA standards and services such as the Substance Registry Services (SRS).*
- *A minimum of five (5) years' experience consulting, analyzing, designing, and developing web-based information systems.*
- *A minimum of five (5) years' experience with Object Oriented Analysis and Design.*
- *To facilitate the gap analysis of the CSPA System, demonstrable experience with C#, ASP.NET, .NET 3.5/4.x, Webforms, Transact-SQL, HTML, JavaScript, SQL Server 2008/2012, Unit Testing, Web Services/WCF, and XML/XSLT.*