

## **IDV RFP Questions and Answers – as of Nov 18 2019**

**This is a compilation of numerous questions, most of the questions covered similar topics.**

**Any updates will be posted to: <http://www.itsc.org/Pages/IDV.aspx>**

1. Is NASWA agreeable to putting a Non-Disclosure Agreement in order to allow both sides to discuss such matters in complete confidence arrangement in place?

Response: Yes. A Non-Disclosure Agreement can be put in place upon written (email) request.

2. There appear to be consistency errors in the evaluated factors enumerated and the table listing the page limitations?

Response: Consistency between the table on page 13 and the evaluated factors has been addressed in the updated RFP provided on the RFP site.

3. Will a list with contact information of vendors participating in the RFP Webinar be published on the RFP website?

Response: Yes. The attendee list will be published on the RFP website.

4. Would it be possible to get a redacted copy of the Data Sharing/Data Use agreement between NASWA and a state?

Response: Yes. The template for the Participation Agreement will be available upon written (email) request.

5. Section 1 on page 7 lists data elements transmitted to the Integrity Data Hub (IDH) and available to the IDV solutions. For additional fraud risk analysis, are states able to provide directly from their sites additional elements related to the members' devices?

Response: As stated in the RFP the elements provided are as listed, and all Identity Verification analysis will be performed without interaction directly with the individual state site.

6. Will states be permitted to participate while only sending a partial dataset?

Response: Yes. But data elements required by the Vendor to perform a full or partial analysis

will be required.

7. If participating states are permitted to send a partial dataset, how will absent data elements be identified and defined by the IDH?

Response: This will be established as a part of the Statement of Work to be delivered as a joint effort between the IDH and the selected vendor post award.

8. Are dates of application/contact going to be available?

Response: Only the data elements specified will be provided.

9. Would NASWA consider allowing vendors a brief (1 to 3 page) executive summary – or perhaps allowing for the attachment of a high-level process flow diagram that highlights their offerings, start to finish?

Response: The page limitations will remain as stated.

10. Will proposals be allowed to include attachments, customer case studies, or supporting material outside of the published page limits, as reference for points made within the proposal overall?

Response: The page limitations will remain as stated.

11. NASWA seems to be accessing more than one vendor as part of the IDV. Does NASWA plan to award this contract to multiple vendors? If so, please elaborate on the anticipated interaction between/among vendors.

Response: There is the possibility the award may be made to multiple vendors. There will be no interaction between the vendors, all interaction will be between the IDH and the selected vendor(s).

12. What do the asterisks next to MBI and SSBI on page 12 refer to?

Response: The typographical error has been corrected to remove the unintentional asterisks.

13. What are the background check levels required by NASWA?

Response: NASWA is a FISMA Moderate Level organization. Vendor personnel who are determined to be “high risk” as defined on page 12 of the RFP should undergo a background check at the BI level. The vendor response should include the current background check process and frequency for all personnel who meet that designation.

14. Would the presence of strong controls – such as data being encrypted both at-rest and in-transit at all stages within the proposed solution, and the presence of monitored, unalterable audit logs tracking employee access to the data and solution – have bearing on employee risk sensitivity level? For example, would an employee with access only under such strong controls be rated at

a lower risk sensitivity level than an employee with access without such controls?

Response: Strong controls are anticipated to be in place due to the nature of the Personally Identifiable Information (PII) being exchanged. These controls do not alter the sensitivity level of the personnel who have access to the systems handling the PII.

15. Do you have an existing process for performing background checks that should be modeled/followed by the vendor? If so, please elaborate.

Response: NASWA does not have a process to be modeled and anticipates the vendor will provide the process in use as part of the response.

16. Will NASWA honor existing screening already performed for a specific employee?

Response: Yes. If the process is documented and consistently followed.

17. How often will background screens be required to be performed on staff? Is there an ongoing monitoring component of these screens required by NASWA?

Response: Frequency of background screens should be indicated in the vendor response. Monitoring will be done as a component of the annual NASWA security evaluation.

18. Is NASWA expecting any specific reporting format or frequency regarding background screening? Particularly as it relates to new/changing staff members for the vendor?

Response: NASWA anticipates a report upon request providing current status of personnel background checks only as part of an annual security evaluation, or as part of a breach investigation.

19. Are the results of the background check to be submitted with the vendors response or is that something the awarded vendor will do once notified by NASWA?

Response: The results will be requested at the start of the period of performance for the selected vendor(s), and then continue as above.

20. The RFP requirement is for purging data from the system following processing. Some capabilities, such as pattern matching, require data be retained for some period of time for ongoing processing. Does an exception apply to the data used in these situations?

Response: As stated in the RFP all data provided by the IDH will be purged immediately after the verification response is returned to the IDH. If a vendor has a solution which requires an extended period of time to provide identity verification services it could be proposed with justification as an optional part of the solution.

21. We interpret 'bulk requests' as batch processed requests from the IDH. We understand from the 11/6 Webinar call that 'individual requests via API' are individual real-time inquiries by SWA staff manually entering applicant details. With SWA staff manually

entering applicant details, does NASWA anticipate building a custom interface for the SWA or the use a vendor provided UI?

Response: "Bulk requests" are batch processed requests from the IDH. "Individual requests via API" are individual real time requests that may come from the IDH user interfaces, via an API interaction between the State system and the IDH, or other real time request. All custom interfaces for real time requests are the responsibility of the IDH.

22. Please define: Conduct initial testing of IDV solution.

Response: This is anticipated to be a connectivity test, that exercises the connection, API, and bulk file interactions utilizing test data.

23. Please provide success criteria which apply to: Conduct initial testing of IDV solution.

Response: Ability to send test data via API and bulk interaction channels and receive properly formatted identity verification responses in return.

24. Please define, Pilot solution available. Specifically, what are the expectations of the scope of the pilot since it is scheduled to occur only 90 days after awarding of the contract?

Response: The pilot solution should have the ability to send live production data via API and bulk interaction channels and receive properly formatted identity verification responses in return.

25. Will NASWA entertain vendor proposals for developing the solution from scratch integrating various components used previously by the vendor or is the schedule based on NASWA expecting the entire solution has been developed and implemented by the vendor previously?

Response: NASWA anticipates the solution will be developed by the vendor using their internal methods, including build from scratch or previously developed solutions that enable the successful completion within the specified time frame.

26. Appendix A shows matching codes in the data element fields. Does NASWA expect this format, including the match codes, to be adapted based on the selected solution?

Response: Appendix A is for illustrative purposes only. The matching codes, formatting, and other details are anticipated to be finalized in the Statement of Work to be agreed upon between the selected vendor(s) and the IDH.

27. Can NASWA explain more detail on the current matching logic and thresholds? Please define what is acceptable, and what is considered a match.

Response: NASWA anticipates that each vendor will have their own matching logic, thresholds, cause codes, etc. that will be presented in the vendor response. The IDH will be responsible for mapping all responses and codes to the result sets prior to the results being reported to the IDH participant.

28. Will integration or development work be performed by NASWA and/or a 3rd party integrator? Will the responsive proposal need to incorporate the performance of any such development or integration services other than the support and guidance associated with the vendor's API or file transfer methods?

Response: All integration work will be handled via the IDH's existing development methodology and resources, only support and guidance on utilizing the selected vendor(s) API and result sets will be part of the SOW established with the selected vendor(s) post award. IDH integration costs will not be part of the funding described in the RFP and during the vendor conference.

29. What is the anticipated frequency of the files transmitted by the IDH to the IDV service.

Response: The frequency is dependent on the SWAa frequency of request, there will be daily and weekly transmissions. API requests will have no frequency associated with the ad hoc nature of the interaction.

30. Will initial and ongoing claims be submitted for verification?

Response: Both types will be submitted and will not be differentiated as part of the identity verification process.

31. Will the transmission be a single aggregate file across all states, or will each state's files be sent separately?

Response: There will not be a single aggregate file for all states submitted. An individual state may have multiple files, a single file, API requests, or a combination of all.

32. Will there be a unique transaction identifier be provided for each identity verification request?

Response: The unique identifier is anticipated to be part of the SOW established between the awarded vendor(s) and the IDH.

33. Is there an existing standardized format in use by the states in the submission of the claims?

Response: Yes. There is a standardized format for the interaction between the IDH and the States.

34. What is the current SLA between the IDH and states for response on submissions?

Response: There is no current SLA between the IDH and the States.

35. Please clarify what needs to be included in the RFP response for the following: "Rubric for evaluation data returned to the IDH. (with examples).

Response: It is anticipated that the vendor will provide the status code returned as a result of the identity verification transaction and any cause codes for this status. The rubric refers to how the status is determined based upon the cause codes returned.

36. Is this a real time service which will integrate into states online UI claim filing systems through the IDH to allow the individual to authenticate during the claim filing process?

Response: No. As specified in the RFP this is a completely passive system, there is no direct interaction with the application process.

37. Will the vendor be tasked with providing a web service for the states to use and integrate that web service to the states online claim filing system?

Response: No. The vendor will interact only with the IDH.

38. The RFP states the solution is passive only and rules out questioning the claimant for additional shared secrets, out of pocket, or additional questions the individual on publicly available personal information only the individual will know, is this correct?

Response: Yes. The solution requested will be passive only.

39. The RFP states this IDV process is not a real time process occurring when the individual in filing the claim but happens instead after the claim has been filed? So the IDV service is not authenticating the individual during the actual claim filing process just providing the state with an IDV score in a report format?

Response: Correct. There is no interaction in the claims filing process, this identity verification will occur post claim filing with the IDV score provided to the state in a report format for further adjudication.

40. Has the Integrity Center considered including state Drivers' License/State ID number as optional data elements for interested states to submit?

Response: The individual states vary widely in the use of Drivers' License/State ID number utilization and is not currently part of the data collected by the IDH.

41. Analyzing the 11 data elements and determining that these elements are all valid and all belong to the same individual and running them through the data sources listed on page 7 of the RFP and other data sources identified by vendors is one step in the process however it does not prove that the individual presenting those data elements is the person represented in the

data. Since those data elements might legitimately belong to the same individual the identity might have been compromised/stolen and not yet logged as such in any system including banks and credit bureaus etc. Will this be addressed?

Response: The identity verification score returned to the state via the IDH is one of many risk factors the individual state is responsible for evaluating and adjudicating according to their individual state guidelines upon receiving the report from the IDH.

42. The RFP Evaluation Criteria lists factor to be considered in evaluating the proposals in order of importance. How is the overall vendors solution being evaluated?

Response: The solutions will be evaluated holistically by the panel, and a selection made based upon best value to the Center.

43.