

**Q&A's #3 to  
Request for Proposals (RFP)  
Statewide Personnel System SaaS Human Capital Management Solution RFP  
#060B3490012  
June 17, 2013**

Ladies/Gentlemen:

This list of questions and responses is being issued to clarify certain information contained in the above referenced RFP. The statements and interpretations contained in the following responses to a question by potential Offerors are not binding on the State, unless an addendum expressly amends the RFP.

7. Section 2: With regard to previously issued RFP for Project No. Please clarify what requirements within Section 2 of the RFP require a detailed description and what requirements require acknowledge or disagree. This vendor interprets Sections 2.1 - 2.6 as informational and Sections 2.7 - 2.10 as requiring a detailed response. Please advise.

**Answer: The Offerors are encouraged to provide the information to help the State evaluate their proposal. Sections 2.1 to 2.5 are informational and help the Offeror to best understand the State's current systems and volumes. Section 2.6 contains the requirements and reference to the Requirement Traceability Matrix (RTM) which requires detailed responses per instructions in the RTM. Sections 2.7 – 2.10 require detailed responses.**

8. Attachment F, RTM: The State has included multiple response codes in the Functional matrix. Some of these codes are asking for the Software vendor to identify if the Configuration or Customization will require an additional cost. This type of information is typically the responsibility of the Implementer as part of an implementation RFP. Each implementer typically has a different approach on whether or not they include certain configurations as part of their implementation services or whether or not they charge for those configurations. Will the State consider a change to the response codes by removing the delineation of "with cost" or "without cost". We would request the following change in order for us to identify what the functional capabilities of the software are and allow the implementation firms to identify whether or not they will charge for those types of configuration or customizations during the Implementation Services RFP:

- Remove
  - Configuration with cost
  - Configuration without cost
- Change to
  - Configuration
- Remove
  - Customization with cost
  - Customization without cost
- Change to
  - Customization

**Answer: The State requires the Software vendor to identify all requirements that may require additional services. The Offeror shall use the most appropriate response code and, if necessary, include remarks in the "Comments" column.**

9. We have a question regarding the liability terms for the State of Maryland RFP. If we are not able to meet the \$50 million limitation would that be a knock out for us? It would be beneficial for us to know the answer to this question sooner rather than later so that we can move forward with this opportunity. Thank you!

**Answer: Please refer to Section 1.21.**

10. Part 7: Legacy Reporting, Question 2. Describe the Offeror's solution for data retention, archiving, purging and availability of historical data for reporting purposes. – Is it the intent that the data from legacy systems should be converted and imported into the new SPS? If this is not part of the requirements, is it the intention of the state that the new provider will migrate the data from legacy systems to a "data warehouse" for historical reporting – and for the provider to host and maintain this platform?

**Answer: The State expects the Offeror to describe their best approach for legacy reporting in their proposed solution.**

11. Will the DoIT consider providing an extension on the July 10, 2013 rfp due date, if a request were made from a submitting rfp entity, ie, extending the response timeframe to July 31, 2013, consistent with other Maryland procurement activities of 8-10 week response time?

**Answer: At this time, the State is not considering an extension.**

12. SaaS HCM solutions are highly configurable and configuration costs are normally included as part of the implementation. Vendor Responses in the Attachment F RTMs include OB - Out of Box; CW - Configuration with Cost; and CO - Configuration without Cost. Can the State provide further guidance as to how these responses should be used or should they be used interchangeably?

**Answer: Please see answer to the question #8.**

13. The RFP states in Section 2.3.6 that "COBRA Administration and Direct Billing Services outsourcing is not in scope of this RFP." COBRA and Direct Billing requirements are, however, still listed in the RTMs. Does the State have a preference as to how these requirements are addressed in the RTMs?

**Answer: The State is looking for the automation of COBRA Administration and Direct Billing functionality only.**

14. Can the State provide additional guidance as to how the implementation will proceed? Is it an expectation that the task orders will be used to perform phases of the implementation or will a separate RFP be issued for the entire implementation?

**Answer: Please refer to Section 1.1 in the RFP.**

15. Please explain how exceptions outlined in the Executive Summary per Section 3.3.5 will be handled as part of the evaluation?

**Answer: Please refer to Section 1.21 in the RFP.**

16. Per Section 2.5, the new SPS will support over 161,000 total and nearly 55,000 active employees. Prior experience references are required for customers with more than 10,000 employees, a relatively low size. Certain annual cycles such as benefits enrollment and employee reviews usually create very heavy simultaneous user access to the SaaS solution on the last few days of such cycles. Accordingly, a reference for 10,000 employees may not adequately demonstrate that the proposed solution can scale to meet the State's needs. Will references that more closely resemble the State's active employee size be given higher consideration than those with smaller employee populations?

**Answer: Please refer to Section 4 in the RFP.**