



Questions and Answers No. 1
RFP DOIT-FY-16-24
Enterprise Budgeting System Replacement

Ladies/Gentlemen:

This list of questions and responses is being issued to clarify certain information contained in the above referenced RFP. Nothing in the State's response to these questions is to be construed as agreement to or acceptance by the State of any statement or interpretation on the part of the vendor.

1. Is this the same procurement that was released in the summer or fall of 2015?

Response: It is the same project. The prior RFP was cancelled prior to award.

2. Would the State be able to provide the attachments in an editable format e.g. MS-Word or rich-text?

Response: No.

3. Is there a process by which the State could consider and make a determination, before the closing date for the RFP, on exercising its discretion to substitute experience for education as per Section 3.8.2.2 for a particular individual?

Response: The State will not evaluate a particular individual prior to the proposal submission. However, work experience may be proposed as an alternative to education.

4. The Key Information Summary Sheet shows 10% MBE goal; however Attachment D-1A is showing 15%. Can the State please confirm that the Key Information Sheet is correct?

Response: Please see Amendment #1. In addition, please see DoIT-FY-16-24 - RFP v1.1 - Amended for the amended RFP document.

5. Attachment M-1 is showing a total VSBE participation goal of .5%; however the Key Information Summary Sheet shows 1%. Can the State please confirm that Attachment M-1 is correct?

Response: Please see Amendment #1. In addition, please see DoIT-FY-16-24 - RFP v1.1 - Amended for the amended RFP document.

6. Section 3.4.2.1 of the RFP states "As part of the proposal the Offeror shall describe the operating environment and proposed infrastructure." Later in Section 3.4.2.1.1 the State has specified that "The State has chosen to use Amazon Web Services (AWS) as its hosting provider for the EBS

project.” May vendors only propose a solution that uses AWS to host the proposed system or whether alternative vendor hosted solutions will be considered?

Response: Vendors can discuss alternate hosting options in addition to AWS; however, only the AWS alternative will be evaluated. If you are offering a solution which may only be vendor-hosted, discuss why the proposed solution will not operate on AWS.

7. If vendors propose a solution that is hosted by AWS, please verify the extent to which the State will provide labor or staffing to manage the AWS infrastructure. Can the State confirm that the use of AWS services will be via the State’s existing contractual relationship with the AWS?

Response: The State will maintain the contractual relationship with AWS for this project.

8. If the hosting solution is being managed through the State’s existing relationship, would configuration specifications, changes, or issues be communicated through the State to AWS, or would vendors be granted authorization to communicate and coordinate directly with AWS?

Response: Vendors will be granted the required permissions to support the Solution's infrastructure and can use their own processes to do so - with the caveat that all production infrastructure changes be part of a change control process involving the State's product owner.

9. If vendors propose a solution that is hosted by AWS is the vendor expected to identify the specific infrastructure service options that will be used by AWS to support specific requirements listed in the RFP that are dependent on infrastructure capabilities? For example the State has specified specific technical requirements including the following:

- Encryption and data security (Section 3.4.2.2.8)
- Disaster recovery (Section 3.3.2.2.9),
- Backup frequency and retention (Section 3.4.2.2.10).

The specifics of how these requirements would be fulfilled are partially, or in some cases wholly dependent on the service options and capabilities made available by AWS. Will the State accept the vendor’s recommended approach for how the infrastructure services should be configured to meet the requirement? In cases where different AWS options can be used to fulfill the requirement, how will the State evaluate alternative options specified by different vendors, particularly since the cost of the AWS service configuration will not be included in the vendor’s proposal?

Response: The State will accept the vendor's recommended approach for infrastructure services configuration for purposes of the evaluation. Also, the State expects that the cost of the AWS configuration will be included in the vendor's proposal. It is part of the total cost of the Solution, and there is a section on the price sheet to address this.

10. In Section 3.6.1 of the RFP the State has specified that “The Contractor shall be required to comply with all applicable laws, regulations, policies, standards and guidelines affecting information technology projects, which may be created or changed periodically. It is the responsibility of the Contractor to ensure adherence and to remain abreast of new or revised laws, regulations, policies, standards and guidelines affecting project execution.” Can the State confirm that solution changes required by the vendor to support future changes to the laws or policies referenced in this section will be via the defined change request process?

Response: This is confirmed to the extent that it is a substantive change in law or policy that requires a substantive change to the solution.

11. In Section 3.6.1 of the RFP the State has specified that “The Contractor shall be required to comply with all applicable laws, regulations, policies, standards and guidelines affecting information technology projects, which may be created or changed periodically. It is the responsibility of the Contractor to ensure adherence and to remain abreast of new or revised laws, regulations, policies, standards and guidelines affecting project execution.” The ability of the overall solution to support such changes may be dependent on the infrastructure services provided by AWS. Can the State confirm that the infrastructure’s compliance with existing or future changes to applicable laws, standards, or policies will be managed and verified by the State through its existing contractual relationship with AWS?

Response: This is confirmed.

12. In Section 3.11.3 the State has specified that “The Contractor shall provide detailed monthly reports evidencing the attained level for each SLA set forth herein.” If the hosting services are being managed through the State’s existing contractual relationship with AWS, can the State please confirm that the State will have a separate SLA reporting model in place with AWS for the hosting infrastructure services provided by AWS?

Response: The infrastructure service levels will be separate from the application service levels. However, the vendor is expected to configure the Disaster Recovery options of the AWS service to minimize the effect of a local AWS disruption.

13. In Section 3.11.5 vendors are expected to list their proposed service level targets. Some of the service level categories listed as desired by the State; specifically uptime and planned downtime; are dependent on the infrastructure hosting services that are expected to be provided by AWS. Credible vendors typically only extend SLAs for functionality which is part of their exclusive purview. Can the State confirm that the infrastructure availability SLA and associated penalties will be separately managed through the State’s contractual relationship with AWS and that the vendors are only responsible for missed application related service levels only to the extent not caused by AWS?

Response: Please see the response to Question 12.

14. Section 3.14 outlines the State’s requirements for a SOC II Type 2 audit report. The State has also specified that the hosting infrastructure services will be provided by AWS. We would

expect AWS to provide its own SOC II Type 2 audit report to the State as part of their hosting services and costs. Given that the vendor would not have access to have such an audit performed on AWS, can the State clarify this requirement to reflect the audit report from the vendor pertains only to the application management functions being provided by the vendor and that vendors will not be expected to integrate or consolidate their SOC II Type 2 audit report with the report provided by AWS?

Response: The SOC II Type 2 audit requirement would be limited to the items under the vendor's control.

15. The 60 page limit prescribed for vendors' "TAB E – Offeror Technical Response" response section significantly limits each vendor's ability to provide a complete response to the proposal requirements, particularly since the RFP specifies that the Solution and Services Overview, Project Management Plan, Project Schedule, Staffing Plan, Test Strategy, and Training Strategy required in Section 3.5.5 are supposed to be included in this page count. This limitation leaves very little space to address how vendors will fulfill the State's technical requirements. In order for the resulting contract document package to accurately reflect the vendor's proposed solution, In regards to RFP Proposal Format, Section 4.2.2 – Technical Proposal Format Table (Page 89) will the State consider eliminating the Solution and Services Overview, Project Management Plan, Project Schedule, Staffing Plan, Test Strategy, and Training Strategy from TAB E, or at least expanding the page count limitation to at least 80 pages for this section?

Response: RFP Section 3.5.5 and RFP Section 4.2.2 state that the Project Management Plan, Project Schedule, Staffing Plan are to be included in Tab Q, not Tab E. As such, they are not part of the page limit. For testing and training topics the State specifically asked for strategies. The page limit for Tab E stands.

16. Can the State discuss the extent to which the State desires an application that can be extended to support the Legislative Budgeting process?

Response: Extensions of functionality to the legislative budgeting process are not in scope, and are not part of the evaluation criteria.

17. Can the State discuss the State's rationale and basis for the minimum qualifications?

Response: The State determined that the number of employees in the State of Maryland has a direct relation to budget capability. Please note that the State employees over 84,000 people.

18. Can the State advise if the Evaluation Panel for this solicitation will be the same as for the previously cancelled budget system solicitation?

Response: The composition of the Evaluation Panel for this solicitation will not be disclosed at this time.

19. Will the State seek referee reports again if they were completed for the previous solicitation?

Response: The State reserves the right to contact all references included in the vendor's proposal.

20. Can the State provide technical architecture of the current HOBO system along with it's interfaces?

Response: HOBO is based on IBM ADRS (A Departmental Reporting System) Version 2. The file layout is APLDI. HOBO is capable of addressing 5MB RAM. The last major system update was in 1982.

21. How is data flow handled from the interface systems? Is it on demand or scheduled? If file load is done automatically, how many such interfacing jobs are there?

Response: All current interfaces are manual, using the TSO command line.

22. It is mentioned that HOBO is mainframe based but can you elaborate on the technical landscape of the system? Is the data stored in relational or flat file structure?

Response: Please see the response to Question 20.

23. What is the approx. size (in GB) of data in the live system?

Response: The current data structure includes redundant data and derived fields. Therefore a size figure is not meaningful. Each year creates about 150,000 line items in the current budget files, but the State expects the new system to be able to capture a greater level of detail - up to 750,000 line items per year.

24. How is data integration between the budgeting system and system of record. What data would flow between these systems?

Response: The State expects to send and receive files to the systems of record that would include authorized positions and vacancies as well as account balances and appropriations.

25. How are reports & bills currently generated?

Response: Current reporting involves multiple manual steps, including visual confirmation of columns of numbers, manual pagination and collating individual pages from multiple sources such as Access, Bookmaster and Excel.

26. What is the workflow followed for Corebudgeting/Over Target/Deficient/Amendments?

Response: The details regarding these processes will be worked out with the selected vendor to best leverage the offered Solution. The workflows regarding amendments are mandated, with a couple of examples included in the RFP, Attachment U.

27. How are amendments managed, are they overwritten by latest one or archived?

Response: Amendments are not overwritten - they are changes to the previous baseline and set a new baseline. In addition, please see the response to Question 26.

28. What is the treatment for FY0 budget changes, should it overwrite existing data?

Response: Please see the response to Question 27.

29. Currently how are MFRs linked to budget requests manually?

Response: It is an entirely separate function performed by the agencies and OBA analysts in Excel.

30. How are the fund and source assigned and how does the budgeting differ ?

Response: Every line item has a Fund Type - General, Federal, Special, etc. The Fund Source details the specific source(s) of those funds, including, for example, the CFDA number for federal funds.

31. How are decision guides set up at present?

Response: This is a manual process set up by each analyst for their agencies that includes outstanding items, calculations for alternatives and options, impact assessments, etc.

32. Can the State provide structures of agencies?

**Response: Agency information is publicly available at:
<http://msa.maryland.gov/msa/mdmanual/html/mmtoc.html>**

33. Which location does the customer want to application to be hosted in? AWS Government Cloud or typical AWS Cloud Data Center?

Response: The State has no preference.

34. Can the State provide a list of key locations from where users will access the application?

Response: State agencies are primarily located in Baltimore and Annapolis, but there may be users from other areas of Maryland.

35. What are the availability SLA requirements (environment wise)?

Response: The vendor's proposal should include the SLAs to which they are able to commit.

36. Are there any NFRs that has to be considered for the solution (Eg: Performance)?

Response: Many non-functional requirements are listed in the RFP, including encryption, access controls and two-factor authentication. If the question is specific to performance the RFP requires the vendor to include performance measures in their response.

37. Can the State provide the capacity of the database to be hosted on cloud (Expected YoY data growth)?

Response: Please review RFP Section 3.3.2. Archiving should be viewed as a performance measure rather than a financial one.

38. Are there any special industry specific compliance, or security restrictions that the solution has to adhere?

Response: Data must be encrypted at rest and in transit. Security restrictions regarding the handling of Confidential data are addressed in the RFP.

39. Can you please provide the SLA that is required for Managed Services across different environments?

Response: The vendor is required to propose production SLAs as per RFP Section 3.11 (specifically 3.11.5). Service levels for non-production environments are not discussed or required.

40. We will propose tools for managed services and ITSM for the workloads to be hosted on cloud? Can the State share any integration requirements with respect to the existing ITSM solution at customer's location?

Response: At this time there are no requirements for ITSM integration.

41. Is it possible to showcase more than 1 software as part of the proposal and also demonstrate their capabilities through a POC on a need by basis?

Response: No. Please refer to RFP Section 1.12.

42. Is the Offeror expected to provide production server hardware requirements and the State will translate those requirements into an equivalent AWS configuration? Or is the Offeror expected to provide a recommended AWS model?

Response: The offeror is expected to provide a recommended AWS model.

43. Is the Offeror expected to provide production server hardware requirements and the State will translate those requirements into an equivalent AWS configuration? Or is the Offeror expected to provide a recommended AWS model?

Response: Please see the response to Question 42.

44. Is test/training environments to be hosted on AWS? or does the offeror provide this environment?

Response: The proposal should include AWS for all hardware environments.

45. Given the RFP requirement that the Solution is to be hosted on AWS, is it the State's expectation that the contractor will provide an independent cloud environment, possibly servers and hardware, for a DR environment?

Response: AWS offers DR functionality.

46. In regards to Attachment W, Is 14.18 relevant if this is an AWS solution? If yes, what types of support does the State require?

Response: AWS does not specify the database environment and offers several options for the operating system. Also, the State is looking to the vendor to support and maintain the Solution on top of the AWS hardware.

47. Given the RFP requirement, Attachment W, 15.4.6, that the Solution is to be hosted on AWS, is it the State's expectation that the contractor will provide an independent cloud environment, possibly servers and hardware, for a DR environment?

Response: The State is not looking for an independent DR solution. DR can still be hosted on AWS, albeit in a different region. Testing of failover processes and procedures is still required.

48. Is the state looking to implement a complete financial transformation?

Response: No.

49. Is the state only looking at budget application process?

Response: Please review RFP Section 3 for the scope of this RFP.

50. Is there an existing ERP system? If so what ERP system is being used?

Response: There is no statewide ERP system.

51. Will there be direct data input? What system would be feeding the planning information/data?

Response: There will be direct data input. Interfaces are discussed in RFP Section 3.4.2.3, Subsection 2.

52. What financial transactional processing system do they have outside of the mainframe that is being replaced?

Response: The State does not understand this question. Please clarify.

53. The Training Plan was eliminated in Section 4.2.2.18 as a draft document. Does this mean that the State will place a greater weight on evaluating Offeror's responses to requirement E.5.2.3/Section 4.2.2.6.F (the Offeror's Training Strategy in Tab E) or should a Training Plan be added to the list of Draft Documents in Section 4.2.2.18?

Response: The State will amend the RFP to refer to the "training strategy" in RFP Section 5.2.1.

54. Can the State confirm that the State is willing to contract directly with software vendors for software licensing?

Response: Please refer to RFP Section 3.6.5.1

55. Is the go live schedule objective no later than May 1st or May 31st?

Response: The users begin the process of creating the next fiscal year budget during May. The specific date can vary.

56. Can the State confirm that the State has a contract with AWS?

Response: Please see the response to Question 7.

57. If the State has a contract with AWS, does the State wish to remove the hosting costs from Attachment F?

Response: No. Hosting costs are part of the overall cost of the project, and will be affected by the vendor's infrastructure requirements.

58. What are the number and roles of State resources assumed to be assigned to the EBS PMO for planning staffing levels?

Response: Please review RFP Section 3.3.5

59. Section 3.4.2.3 (Scope and sizing of technical components) is not mentioned in section 4.2.2.6.F (the Tab E response section). Should the information in 3.4.2.3 be added to 4.2.2.6.F, and if so, where?

Response: The State intends to amend the RFP to require a response to RFP Section 3.4.2.3 as part of the Tab E response.

60. The MBE Form (Attachment D) states an MBE goal of 15%. The Key Information Summary Sheet states a goal of 10%. Which goal is correct?

Response: Please see Amendment #1. In addition, please see DoIT-FY-16-24 - RFP v1.1 - Amended for the amended RFP document.

61. In regards to Attachment V, Executive Dashboards - for scope planning purposes, can the State confirm if there will only be one version of an Executive Dashboard, configured to meet users' needs based on filters, security and drill down capability?

Response: The requirement will be detailed as part of the Agile development methodology.

62. In regards to Attachment V, Executive Dashboards does the State of Maryland intend that the Executive Dashboard reports will drill down to reports in Attachment V or are the drill downs outside of the list of reports in Attachment V?

Response: Some of the reports may be appropriate for the Dashboard, but not all of them. The Executive Dashboard is not intended to be the only user interface.

63. In regards to Attachment V, Executive Dashboards – for scope planning purposes, can the State provide an estimate of the number of individual reporting objects (performance tiles, charts, graphs, tables, etc.) the State envisions to be part of the Executive Dashboard?

Response: It is not possible for the State to provide an estimate at this time. Vendors should use their experience with other enterprises to present their proposal.

64. Does the State have any prescribed tools that can be leveraged on this project to help manage the project level backlog in accordance with the SAFe methodology?

Response: The State is currently looking at procuring such a tool, but has not made a decision. The project is currently using Rational CLM, and is assessing whether it is appropriate to managing in an Agile environment.

65. Can you please explain the rationale for not using real time or near real time integration?

Response: The State does not have any requirements for real-time integration.

66. The requirement to convert the data for Two Years of detailed vendor purchase orders and/or invoices from the FMIS/ADPICS system was deleted from Section 3.4.2.3.3 but remains as a requirement in Attachment F. Can the State confirm that the conversion of PO and Invoice data is not required and should not be priced?

Response: Confirmed.

67. With the exception of the State and MDOT's FMIS, can the State identify the agency source systems that the vendor will need to convert from to meet requirement 3.4.2.3.3.C (pg.58)?

Response: Please see RFP Section 3.4.2.3.2.A on page 58 and RFP Attachment W, Section 10.

68. We appreciate the State's revised proposal structure to streamline responses and simplify the review process for Tab E requirements as outlined in the table contained in Section 4.2.2.6.F of the RFP. In our review of the new format, it appears that the State wants us to respond to several requirements in Sections 3.5 and 3.11 multiple times. For example, Tab E Section E.5 asks for a response to each requirement in Sections 3.5 and 3.11. Tab E Sections E.5.1.2 through E.5.3.1 also require a response to various subsections within Sections 3.5. Tab E response Sections E.5 and E.5.1.6 both ask for a response to Section 3.11. Can you clarify, is Tab E Section E.5 simply a Summary Header that does not require a response to all Section 3.5 and 3.11 requirements? If not, is it permissible for offerors to respond to the requirements in Sections 3.5 and 3.11 one time, in Tab E Response Section E.5, and refer the reviewer to our initial response when asked to respond to a subsection within Section 3.5 (Tab E Sections E.5.1.2 through E.5.1.5 E.5.2.1 through E.5.2.3, and E.5.3.1)? Also, as a result of the State's reorganization of Tab E from multiple sections to one section, will the State consider eliminating or significantly expanding the page limit for the Tab E Response so Offerors can thoroughly respond to all Tab E requirements?

Response: RFP Section 4.2.2.6 Paragraphs A - E provide the Offeror with the State's expectation of the scope of information to be included in the TAB E response. Section 4.2.2.6 Paragraph F provides the Offeror with the State's required organization of the Tab E Response. Header sections are to include content at the discretion of the Offeror. The State does not desire the inclusion of redundant information. The State will not consider any changes to the page number limitations as stated in Section 4.2.2 of the RFP.

69. Does the State have a preference as to the timing of the implementation of the optional items before or after May, 2017?

Response: No.

70. Can the State please elaborate on how to prioritize your requirements in Section 3.4.2.1 for leveraging the Offeror's recommended hardware & software configuration while leveraging Amazon Web Services?

Response: The State has nothing to add to RFP Section 3.4.2.1

71. In regards to Section 3.4.2.1, will you make your contract vehicle and posted pricing available to the bidders?

Response: No. The Offeror should use the publically posted pricing from Amazon.

72. Can the State provide the specific services available from your AWS Contract? Does this include S3, S3 Glacier, Elastic Compute (EC2), Elastic Block Storage (EBS) and S3/Glacier Archive?

Response: No. Please use any services you feel are useful or required for your proposed Solution.

73. If you require Offerors to propose a solution that will leverage Amazon Web Services, for the production environment, will you also require Offerors to propose an AWS solution for Disaster Recovery solution and Backup/Recovery Solutions?

Response: Yes.

74. In Section 3.4.2.1 (b), you request Offerors to "define when Hardware and Software Procurement take place for Non-Production and Production Systems, yet in section 3.4.2.1 (d) it is requested that Offerors provide 'on-demand or reserved instances' via Amazon Web Services. Do you wish to see this separate from the recommended Hardware and associated software procurement? Will these On Demand Services be recommended for Production, Non-Production, DR, Backup or some other function?

Response: This is not separate. Due to the seasonal nature it was the State's assumption that the production environment would be a mixture of reserved and on-demand instances. The vendor is free to propose the combination they think is most advantageous to the State.

75. We are presenting our Bid as both a Prime and Manufacturer. We meet all minimum qualifications and are prepared to provide a best-in-class proposal. A possible limitation that exists is the requirement to have a default agreement to all of the State's Terms & Conditions at Bid Submission. As a current contracted vendor, the State of Maryland and this Offeror has negotiated terms and conditions that may conflict with the Terms & Conditions with this RFP. May the Offeror provide an exception in the Executive Summary that references the previously negotiated and agreed-upon Terms & Conditions in order to be considered for the response?

Response: All exceptions to the Terms & Conditions of the RFP should be listed in the Executive Summary. Identifying exceptions that the State has previously agreed to in other procurements may be referenced, but they are not guaranteed to be accepted again.

76. This Offeror meets all the minimum qualifications but would like to prime. Is it possible to have an existing partner agree to Terms & Conditions while the Offeror meets the all obligations of the response? The partner is a contract holder under the 2012 COTS Contract.

Response: No.

77. Can the State elaborate on how you wish the EBS to be supported over the next 3, 5 and/or 7 year term?

Response: Please see RFP Attachment W, RFP Section 15 and RFP Section 3.5.1.2.

78. Will the State require direct, onsite support from the Annapolis office or location or will virtual / remote support suffice?

Response: The State's position that on-site support during the Break/Fix period as defined in RFP Section 3.5.1.3 would be very useful, but it is not specifically required. Please

address your recommendation regarding on-site vs. virtual support as part of your response in Tab E section E.5.

79. Can the State of Maryland provide examples of an editable budget bill?

Response: A link to the budget bill is provided in the RFP, Section 3.4.1.2.2

80. Can the State clarify what is meant by Performance Management Results and provide an example?

Response: Please see: http://dbm.maryland.gov/Pages/MFR_StrategicPlansFY17.aspx

81. Can the State provide a 5 year forecast example?

Response: Please see: <http://dbm.maryland.gov/budget/Documents/operbudget/2017/2017Highlights.pdf>

82. Could vendors get an inventory of personnel systems created, with type of system and age?

Response: The primary system is identified in the RFP. Other systems with which the solution will interface (i.e., exchange data) should have identical data requirements.

83. Can the State clarify the desired discrepancy reporting and reduction process?

Response: "Discrepancy reporting and reduction" refers to the identification and elimination of data quality issues with some of the source systems.

84. What else is included in the "etc." of requirement 3.3.1.3, Item C?

Response: Any other costs or benefits required to calculate the total cost per position.

85. Can the State clarify the desired functionality of requirement Section 3.3.1.3, Item E with an example?

Response: Specific items should be locked from user input, such as FICA or retirement contributions. The default values must be calculated based on a configurable rate, with a possible override for selected users.

86. Is there a Project Management system in place that this is being interfaced with?

Response: No.

87. Labor Category III Scrum Master: The education criteria calls for a "First or Second level Scrum Master certification (CSP, PSM)". Would the State consider the Certified Scrum Master (CSM) or other similar certifications to be acceptable?

Response: Yes.

88. In the Project Methodology Section, the State indicates they are adopting the Scaled Agile Framework (SAFe©) across projects and programs managed by DoIT. How many projects and programs have been implemented using this framework?

Response: Please clarify how this question is relevant to the current solicitation.

89. How many projects have been implemented that focused on Lean-Agile or other Agile-like methodologies such as SCRUM, Feature Driven Development (FDD), Extreme Programming (XP), or Dynamic Systems Development Method (DSDM)?

Response: Please see response to Question 88.

90. In the Project Methodology Section, the State indicates they are adopting the Scaled Agile Framework (SAFe©) across projects and programs managed by DoIT. As the State has started to adopt SAFe, what has the State done to help organizations adopt SAFe or Agile practices?

Response: Please see response to Question 88. Also, please clarify whether the organization to which you are referring are State entities or other entities.

91. The State has specified that hosting services will be supplied by AWS, and the referenced requirement indicates that “Specialized hardware not available from AWS must be listed separately using publically posted retail pricing. Note that the set-up, configuration and support of the technical infrastructure are part of the Offeror’s responsibility even if the procurement is performed by the State.” Does the State consider network connectivity between AWS and the State to be part of the hosting services that will be provided by AWS, or are offerors expected to include the provisioning and management of the network connection between the State and AWS in their proposed solution pricing? If network connectivity is considered part of AWS’s hosting services, can the State confirm that offerors should still include a recommendation for the size and type of network connection required by the solution?

Response: Network connectivity from State facilities is not in scope of the RFP. Configuration of the Amazon end-point is in scope, as well as support for error identification and localization.

92. In Section 3.11.4, the State indicates that “In no event shall the aggregate of all SLA credits paid to the State in any calendar month exceed 25% of the Monthly Charges.” However, in Section 3.11.5, the State’s instructions indicate that offerors should fill out the Service Level Measures table by “distributing 18 percentage points in the ‘SLA Credit’ column.” Please confirm that the maximum aggregate at risk amount is 18%? If that is not the case, please describe how the State expects the penalties to be applied to get to a maximum at risk amount of 25%.

Response: Section 3.11 will be clarified in an upcoming amendment.

93. In Section 3.11.4, the State indicates that “In the result of a catastrophic failure affecting the entire System, all affected SLAs shall be credited to the State.” Credible vendors typically only extend SLAs where the highest credit related to a specific incident would apply. Please confirm that in the event of a failure to meet a specific service target (for example failure to meet a system availability target due to an outage), only the highest single potential credit would apply rather than applying all potential downstream penalties such as an additional credits for a missed Issue Resolution for an issue that may have been opened to document the outage?

Response: Section 3.11 will be clarified in an upcoming amendment.

94. In Section 3.11.4, the State indicates that “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.” However, Section 3.11.5 indicates that offerors are supposed to fill out the Service Level Measure table with their specific proposed targets. Can the State confirm that the State does not have an explicit list of eight required service targets, and if so, that the language in Section 3.11.4 will be modified accordingly?

Response: Section 3.11 will be clarified in an upcoming amendment.

95. Will the State grant a one-week extension?

Response: Yes.

96. Is it possible to receive a two-week extension on the RFP submission, with a modified deadline of Tuesday, May 3, 2016?

Response: No.

97. Is the State of Maryland willing to consider doing business with a small Canadian Software Company?

Response: Any offeror that meets the minimum qualifications outlined in the RFP is encouraged to submit a proposal.

98. In preparation for the onsite proof of concept demonstrations, will vendors have the opportunity to speak with the evaluation team in order to ask questions about the demo scripts?

Response: The oral presentations will be with the evaluation team, and will include a Q&A period.

99. Upon reviewing the vendors RFP responses, approximately how many vendors will be shortlisted and included to conduct an onsite demo?

Response: All vendors that submit a proposal, satisfy the minimum qualifications criteria and are reasonably susceptible of being selected for award will be evaluated equally. There will not be a shortlist.

100. When does the State anticipate the shortlisted vendors to conduct the onsite demonstrations?

Response: Please see the response to Question 99.

101. Has the State experienced a software demonstration from any enterprise budgeting solutions / vendors? If so, which vendors?

Response: The State had submitted an RFI for enterprise budgeting solutions in the summer of 2015. The types and origins of the responses are not relevant to this RFP.

102. What resources (and how many) will the State commit to supporting the selected vendor with the implementation of a new enterprise budgeting solution?

Response: In addition to the resources shown in Section 3.3.5 the State team will include subject matter experts as required.

103. Regarding the non-visual access clause, if the proposed solution uses MS Excel as the user interface, will the provisions for the visually impaired made by Microsoft (see link below) be considered sufficient to address the requirements of the Non-Visual Access Clause?

Response: No. MS Excel is too flexible, and while it is possible to create NVA-compliant applications with it, it is also possible to create non-compliant applications.

104. Will you please provide copies of the attachments as separate pdf files?

Response: No.

105. The Personnel Resume Summary is described in the RFP as "Attachment P" (pg. 104) and "Attachment Q" (pg. 168). Can you please confirm that "Attachment P" (labelled as "Non-Disclosure Agreement - Offerer", pg. 167) is not part of the required documents to be submitted with the proposal?

Response: Attachments P and Q are mislabeled. This will be corrected in an upcoming amendment.

106. Will the State accept a contractors standard substitution equivalent of experience for a degree requirement?

Response: Please see the response to Question 3.



Thank you,

Dale Eutsler
Procurement Officer

End of Question and Answer # 1