



**Amendment #2  
Request for Proposals  
Enterprise Budgeting System Replacement  
DOIT-FY-16-24  
April 11, 2016**

Ladies/Gentlemen:

This Amendment #2 is being issued to amend and clarify certain information contained in the above referenced RFP. All information contained herein is binding on all Offerors who respond to this RFP. Specific parts of the RFP have been amended. The following changes/additions are listed below; new language has been double underlined and marked in bold (i.e., **word**) and language deleted has been marked with a strikethrough (i.e., ~~word~~).

1. Revise Section 3.11.4 “Credit for failure to meet the SLA” to address vendor questions

Contractor’s failure to meet an SLA will result in a credit, as liquidated damages and not as a penalty, to the Monthly Charges payable by the State during the month of the breach. The ~~reductions~~ **credits** will be cumulative for each missed service requirement. The State, at its option for amount due the State as liquidated damages, may deduct such from any money payable to the Contractor or may bill the Contractor as a separate item. In the ~~result~~ **event** of a catastrophic failure affecting the entire System, all affected SLAs shall be credited to the State. In no event shall the aggregate of all SLA credits paid to the State in any calendar month exceed 25% of the Monthly Charges. The State shall have the right to unilaterally change the distribution of the SLA Credit percentages, cumulatively eighteen percent spread among eight service requirements, once per Contract Year.

2. Added a row to the table in Section 4.2.2.6 “Offeror Technical Response to RFP (Submit under TAB E)” to allow for responses to RFP Section 3.4.2.3

<b><u>E.3.3</u></b>	<b><u>Scope and Sizing of Technical Components</u></b>	<b><u>The Offeror shall describe the Solution features it will deliver to the State as requested in Section 3.4.2.3</u></b>
---------------------	--------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

3. Revised Section 5.2.1 of the “Technical Proposal Evaluation Criteria” to correct a reference to a document that was not asked for.

The Offeror’s Technical Response to the RFP as outlined in Section 3 and as required in Tab E. Note: The State will place a greater weight on the following sections of the Technical Response: Offeror’s understanding of the business requirements (§3.4.1), the Offeror’s Technical Capabilities (§3.4.2) including inherent risk, the Solution’s match with the features in Attachment W, the Offeror’s Training ~~Plan~~ **strategy** and any appendices incorporated by reference.

4. Corrected the “RFP Attachments” listing on pages 103-105 to accurately reflect the actual attachments:

**ATTACHMENT P – Non-Disclosure Agreement (Offeror)**

If required (see Section 1.37), this Attachment is to be completed and submitted prior to viewing any documentation set aside in a reading room in advance of the RFP due date.

**ATTACHMENT PQ – Labor Classification Personnel Resume Summary**

If required, this Attachment is to be completed and submitted with the Technical Proposal.

**ATTACHMENT Q – Agency Receipt of Deliverable Form**

~~If required, this Attachment is to be completed upon deliverable delivery to the State.~~

5. Revised Attachment F “Price Sheet” to remove an optional feature regarding Purchase Orders. This feature is not in scope.
6. Revised Proposal Due Date and Time on the Key Information Sheet as follows:

<b>Proposals Due Date and Time:</b>	<del>April 19, 2016</del> <b><u>April 26, 2016 2:00 P.M. EST</u></b>
-------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------

Issued by  
Dale Eutsler  
Procurement Officer