



**State of Rhode Island
Department of Administration / Division of Purchases
One Capitol Hill, Providence, Rhode Island 02908-5855
Tel: (401) 574-8100 Fax: (401) 574-8387**

ADDENDUM # 3

RFP# 7550815

TITLE: Grants Management System

SUBMISSION DEADLINE: September 7, 2016 at 11:00 AM ET

ADDENDUM DESCRIPTION: Extension and Responses to Questions received by August 4, 2016 at 11:00 AM ET

A. Submission Deadline Extension: The submission deadline has been changed:

From: August 23, 2016 at 11:00 AM ET

To: September 7, 2016 at 11:00 AM ET

B. Responses to Questions received by August 4, 2016 at 11:00 AM ET:

1. **Question:** Whether companies from Outside USA can apply for this? (like, from India or Canada)

Answer: Yes however companies outside of the USA may be subject to additional security requirements. Also the State shall not conduct business with any foreign countries prohibited by State and/or Federal law. Cloud data centers must be located in the contiguous United States.

2. **Question:** Whether we need to come over there for meetings?

Answer: Yes, the State expects any acceptable foreign companies to be able to meet at our office in Rhode Island if selected for an interview (all expenses will be the Vendor's). Also the State expects the awarded vendor to provide an onsite team for the implementation and training as well as customer service/technical support available during the State's business hours in the Eastern Time Zone. Some meetings can be done with as a conference call during the State's business hours and some meetings the State will expect onsite participation; these requirements will be mutually agreed upon as the meetings arise.

3. **Question:** Can we perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside USA? (like, from India or Canada)

Answer: The State anticipates that some tasks can be done at the Vendor's location, however the State also expects the awarded Vendor to have an onsite presence during the implementation and training. Any tasks related to the State's Oracle ERP system, RIFANS, integration will be completed on-site or remotely as agreed upon by the State. If any PII (Personal Identifiable information) and/or confidential information is collected, depending on which information, a Vendor would be subject to certain terms and conditions in the contract on the additional security levels that need to be established to address the PII. If determined applicable, in order to protect this confidential information and to secure the identities of Rhode Island citizens in a reasonable manner as mandated by R.I. Gen. Laws § 11-49.3-2, the State requires that any and all State information and/or software code for this project shall be located within the United States at all times and all personnel supporting this project be located in the United States. Further, if applicable, any and all data storage shall be on servers located within the United States.

4. **Question:** Can we submit the proposals via email????

Answer: No. Please see the RFP's Section 7, page 12. Response package must be mailed or hand-delivered in a sealed envelope marked "RFP# 7550815" to:

RI Department of Administration
Division of Purchases, 2nd floor
One Capitol Hill
Providence, RI 02908-5855

Please see the RFP for additional information on the contents of responses in Section 8, pages 13-14.

5. **Question:** In Exhibit A – Detailed Business and Technical Requirements, columns E and F beginning at row 97 do not include any options within the drop down. Could you please send an updated spreadsheet?

Answer: The valid options for these columns as defined in the glossary are as follows:
RESPONSE (Column E): MET, CONFIGURABLE, PARTIAL, TOOL, EXTERNAL, CORE, UNKNOWN, NOT MET
EFFORT (Column F): SMALL, MEDIUM, LARGE

An updated spreadsheet is provided with this addendum.

6. **Question:** Because technical proposals will be scored at a total of 55 points (Staff qualifications 5 points, Capability, Capacity, and Qualifications of the Offeror 10 points, Work Plan 10 points, Suitability of the Solution (includes Exhibits A and B) 30 points) before demonstrations, are vendors required to score 50/55 to advance to the demonstration phase? Amendment 2 states that technical proposals will be scored at 70 points before the demonstrations.

Answer: Please see the clarification provided in Addendum 2 on page 2:
"Technical Proposals must receive a minimum of 50 (71.4%) out of a maximum of 70 technical points to advance to the Demonstration/Interview stage. Technical Proposals

scoring less than 50 points shall not advance to the Demonstration/Interview stage and not have the cost component opened the proposal shall be dropped from further consideration.

The Technical Proposal and Demonstration/Interview must receive a combined minimum score of 58 (82.8%) out of a maximum of 70 technical points to advance to the Cost Proposal evaluation stage.

Technical Proposals and Demonstrations/Interviews scoring a combined total of 58 technical points or higher shall be evaluated for cost and assigned up to a maximum of 30 points in the cost category, bringing the potential maximum score to 100 points.”

7. **Question:** Will the business scenarios described in Exhibit B be the basis for the vendor demonstrations?
Answer: No, qualifying vendors will be provided additional instructions for the vendor demonstration which will include the functionality to be demonstrated.

8. **Question:** What are the names of the financial and time reporting systems that will require integration? What other systems will require integration? Is integration desired via an API or flat file transfer?
Answer: Oracle EBS is the financial system. Workforce Software is the time reporting system that will begin implementation in 2017. An RFP for a new budget system will be released in 2016 with implementation beginning in 2017. Most interfaces at the State are flat file transfer; however other methods are open for assessment.

9. **Question:** What automated grant management system(s) are currently being used by the Department of Transportation, the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, the Council on the Arts, and the University of Rhode Island (URI).
Answer: The Department of Transportation is using Oracle EBS on a separate instance from the State of Rhode Island. The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education is using AcceleGrants. The Council of the Arts is using Foundant Technologies. The University of Rhode is using PeopleSoft.

10. **Question:** Should a price be provided for the functionality currently provided by the COTS system, or would the State like customization costs included in the price quote? If the State would like a customization cost quote, could a row be added to Exhibit C- Uniform Cost Schedule?
Answer: Customization costs should be included in the Implementation line on Exhibit C. Further explanation or breakdown can be detailed in the Bidder’s cost proposal described in Section 5 on page 10.

11. **Question:** Is there a specific scoring method for Exhibit B, given the different pre-determined selection options? For example, would a certain number of Critical and High items that are met with the base product would receive a higher score than another vendor who would require customization to provide the functionality? How will points be allocated?

Answer: Yes, functionality delivered in the base product would be scored higher than the same functionality requiring customization. Points will be allocated based on a combination of the PRIORITY, RESPONSE, and EFFORT columns in Exhibit B.

12. **Question:** 1.0010, Please provide a definition or examples of “industry-standard” reporting templates. [Vendor Name Omitted] does contain reporting templates used for generating formatted reports in formats such as PDF.

Answer: Industry-standard reporting templates would include standard federal report formats such as the SF-425 or SF-270 and other industry-standard reports templates such as a performance progress report.

13. **Question:** 5.0060, By attachments, does this mean all uploaded documents such as images, MS Word, etc.?

Answer: Yes, attachments are uploaded documents of all file types.

14. **Question:** 12.0085, Can you elaborate on what type of integration you’re looking for with these applications suites?

Answer: See response to Question 8.

15. **Question:** 27.0223, What method would be used to compare against these watch lists? e.g. Generating a report from each system, and comparing them?

Answer: In reference to Exhibit B, requirement ID 27.0223, comparing against watch lists could be done in several ways such as real-time with an immediate alert, a process that compares and then sets a flag, or various reporting methods.

16. **Question:** 27.0224, Need Examples of contact status. e.g. active, inactive, pending registration approval?

Answer: In reference to Exhibit B, requirement ID 27.0224, contact status should be a configurable field with valid values to be determined during implementation.

17. **Question:** 27.0231, What is meant by “automatically”? On a schedule?

Answer: The word “automatically” is used in describing several requirements in Exhibit B. In some cases it means that reports or processes should run on a scheduled basis. In other cases, it means that data should be populated or reports generated without having to invoke or create a separate process.

18. **Question:** 27.0234, What method would be used to compare against these sources? e.g. Generating a report from each system and comparing them?

Answer: See answer to Question 15.

19. **Question:** Implementation – What is the expectation for each agency’s implementation? Is the expectation that each agency will have **all** grant programs available in the system at the same time, or are agencies open to a phased approach, wherein initial implementation is for up to X amount of programs, with additional programs to be phased in later?

Answer: The intent with each agency is for full implementation. However, a phased approach may be considered.

20. **Question:** Implementation – Which agencies will be part of the first phase of implementing an online GMS?
Answer: The Department of Administration and the Department of Health are confirmed for the first phase. Other agencies for the first phase have not been confirmed yet.
21. **Question:** Demo – Page 10 of the RFP notes that vendors will be expected to provide an in person, hands on demonstration. Is Rhode Island’s expectation that its staff will be watching Vendor representatives navigate through a demo system, or is the expectation that Rhode Island staff will be using the system at the demonstration? The latter scenario would potentially be much more time consuming.
Answer: The State is expecting the vendor to navigate through the system for the demonstration.
22. **Question:** Exhibit D - Would it be possible to inform vendors how many Grant Programs each agency runs? For example, Department of Transportation awards 1,129 grants to local agencies; how many different programs did those 1,129 awards come from?
Answer: Exhibit D - Chart of Agency Awards reflects awards from Federal agencies to the State agencies.
23. **Question:** Item b. under Section 3 Work Plan (page 9) references components described under Scope of Work. The RFP does not have a section explicitly titled Scope of Work. What is this statement referencing?
Answer: Section 3, pages 6-7, of the RFP is labeled “Scope of Work”.
24. **Question:** What are the anticipated numbers of internal users that will require access to the solution?
Answer: Approximated 500 internal users.
25. **Question:** What are the anticipated numbers of external users that will require access to the solution? Will these users require authenticated access to the solution?
Answer: Approximately 1000 external users (sub-recipients) will require authenticated access.
26. **Question:** Budget - Does the State currently have an approved budget for this new Grants Management System? If yes, can you provide that budget information?
Answer: Funds are allocated for this project. Details on funding are not available to vendors.
27. **Question:** Grant Systems - Can the State provide the vendor/system names of any existing grants management systems in use at the four State agencies - Transportation, Education, Arts and URI?
Answer: See answer to Question 9.
28. **Question:** Grant Systems - Is the expectation that these systems would be retired as part of project scope?
Answer: Not in all cases.

29. **Question:** Grant Systems - Has the State previously entertained any system demonstrations and/or presentations from vendors? If so, which systems were seen and when?
Answer: This question is not pertinent for responding to this RFP.
30. **Question:** Grant Systems - Did the State utilize any vendor / SME consultants in defining the sought after functionality and/or scope of work enumerated in the RFP?
Answer: This question is not pertinent for responding to this RFP.
31. **Question:** Grant Systems - Given the changing grants regulatory environment, does the State prefer vendors who have experience deploying Grants Management Systems at the Federal level?
Answer: The RFP defines the experience the state is looking for. Vendor's experience will be scored in accordance with the specified criteria.
32. **Question:** Audience / market - In a given year, what is your estimate of the number individuals/companies/non-profits that will need access to the new grants management system for application submission and any other post-award functions that require external user access?
Answer: Unknown at this time.
33. **Question:** Internal Users - How many "internal" State / Agency users will require system access on day one, and on day 365 and every year thereafter to complete Exhibit C requirements?
Answer: Users will vary depending on the agencies implemented.
34. **Question:** Scope of Work - Given the enterprise nature of this project, change management will be critical to success. Will the State staff organizational change management resources in support of this project?
Answer: The State recognizes the criticality of change management and will lead efforts in this area with vendor support (e.g., training materials).
35. **Question:** Scope of Work - Does the State expect the selected vendor to support organizational change management – not just system training - as part of the project scope?
Answer: The State will lead organizational change management with vendor support.
36. **Question:** Proposal Submission - To allow for adequate time to integrate the State's responses to vendor questions into our response, can you provide a 1-week extension to the submission deadline?
Answer: Yes. Please see the new submission deadline in A. on page 1 of the Addendum.
37. **Question:** Convert Data - Can you provide an estimate of the volume and type of data to be converted and migrated into the new Grants Management System? What is the current format of this grant data?

Answer: The volume of the data to be converted is unknown at this time. Data is currently being captured in disparate spreadsheets, databases, and paper files in some cases.

38. **Question:** **Convert Data** - Will the import/export of data into the Grants Management System be achieved via a data loading type capability for xls/csv files or through API/web services? Does the State use/have preferred system interface tools/capabilities?

Answer: Most import/export is expected to be handled via flat file (xls/csv) and an ETL process. A few systems are accessible via API.

39. **Question:** Exhibit A, 12.0084, 18.0121, Financial Management – ERP - What does the State currently use as its financial management/accounting system? Is this system used by all agencies? If no, what alternatives exist? Can you provide the names of the systems/modules/releases that are implemented within the current financial management system? Can you provide the expectation for the type of integration required with the financial management system, e.g., web services, file based, one way or bi-directional data flow?

Answer: Oracle EBS 11g, running on Linux.

40. **Question:** Exhibit A, 12.0088, Federal System Integrations - Can you provide the names of the federal agencies that Rhode Island desires to integrate with? Has the State already received approval for each integration (from prior question) from the federal government?

Answer: This information is not available. The State has not contacted any federal agencies for integration.

41. **Question:** Contract Management System - What does the State currently use as a contract management system? Can you provide the vendor/system software name and version?

Answer: N/A

42. **Question:** Programs - How many separate grant programs does the State manage? Do the business processes (application, pre-award, award, post-award management, etc.) and associated forms vary with each type of program or are all processes and forms standardized. Is the expectation that all State agencies will standardize on grants business processes as part of Grants Management System deployment?

Answer: Available information is provided in Exhibit D - Chart of Agency Awards. It is expected that State agencies will standardize grants business processes as part of the deployment. However, forms, reports, approval structure, workflow, and other requirements could vary by agency and by grant.

43. **Question:** Security - Due to security concerns and compliance, does the State require the cloud-based, SaaS solution to be provisioned on a FISMA moderate infrastructure?

Answer: Yes, and it must be located in the contiguous USA.

44. **Question:** Software Upgrades - Does the State require its Grants Management System to be updated annually free of charge to keep pace with changing federal legislation?
Answer: Compliance with annual changes in federal legislation should be included in the proposal.
45. **Question:** Forms - Can you provide an example of a typical State form? How many forms are currently used across the grants lifecycle by all State agencies? Is the expectation that all State agencies will standardize on forms as part of Grants Management System deployment?
Answer: Specific forms will be determined when gathering detailed agency requirements. Also, see answer to Question 43.
46. **Question:** Reviews - Do you have a single step application review process? If not, can you elaborate on your review process? How many steps, who is involved, how are grant awards made, etc.?
Answer: In most cases, the application review is multiple steps and the number of steps can vary by agency and by grant.
47. **Question:** Exhibit A, 4.0053, Languages - Which language(s) do you require for public facing forms?
Answer: English.
48. **Question:** Exhibit A, 18.0123, Tracking Indirect Costs - To ensure the appropriate reimbursed amount, can this be accommodated by ensuring it is less than the total amount allotted or can you explain your requirement further?
Answer: Ideally the system should be able to compute the indirect cost amount by applying the rate to the allowable expenses. The system should also capture the indirect cost budget and actual amount from the State financial system. Indirect cost rates differ by agency.
49. **Question:** Exhibit A, 18.0133, 18.0134, Draw Downs - Can you list the federal systems that allow an interface to initiate draw down or funds reimbursement and the type of interface that is available for each federal system? Does the State currently have this interface built to send and receive data from the State's financial management system?
Answer: The State expects the vendor to provide this information. There are currently no interfaces between the State and Federal systems.
50. **Question:** Exhibit A, 22.0161, Split Grants - "Split grants across different categories/codes" - Can you please clarify/expand upon the details of this requirement?
Answer: Federal grants can be used to fund many different State programs. See Exhibit B, Scenario 2 for a specific example.
51. **Question:** Exhibit A, 30.0281, 30.0282, Budgeting - Ability to create a process for requesting budget re-direction, with configurable review and approval hierarchy." Is this through a formal amended budget process or some other means, please clarify/expand upon the details of this requirement?

Answer: Original approved budgets should not be directly changed. Budget amendments should be initiated with a separate review and approval process. Both original and amendment budgets should be retained as history in the system. The review and approval hierarchy can vary by agency and by grant.

52. **Question:** Exhibit C, Uniform Cost Schedule - Please clarify if the State wants the annual price to be the costs for that particular year and not the cumulative cost? Can the State provide the names of the agencies that are expected to be on-boarded in Years 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the project? How many internal users will each of these agencies have? How many external users will each of these agencies interact with?

Answer: Each year should be priced separately with the total cost equal to the sum of the five years. The initial implementation of up to 5 agencies in Year 1 will position the State to be able to better forecast agencies to onboard in future years.

53. **Question:** Exhibit C, Uniform Cost Schedule - Shall all pricing assumptions be placed in Exhibit C, or where shall they be placed?

Answer: Pricing assumptions can be placed in a separate document clearly labeled as support for Exhibit C. Follow instructions in the RFP under Section 5, page 10.

54. **Question:** 1.0006 Supports user creation of ad hoc reports within the system including any field displayed to users custom data columns, sorting, grouping, logos, and headers. (Q) Please provide examples of "custom data columns", "logos", and "headers" as used in the context above.

Answer: A custom data column is a field defined by the State to capture a specific data element unique to the State. Agency logos can be found by accessing agency websites from http://www.info.ri.gov/browse.php?choice=show_az&letter=a. Agencies may want their report headers formatted in a particular way.

55. **Question:** 1.0010 System contains industry-standard reporting templates. (Q) Please provide examples.

Answer: See answer to Question 12.

56. **Question:** 1.0015 Ability for the agency, sub-recipients and/or vendors to print a final report. (Q) Please provide example of report to be printed.

Answer: Final reports can vary by agency and by grant.

57. **Question:** 2.0031 Supports electronic signatures. (Q) What methods of electronic signature are acceptable?

Answer: The State expects the vendor to advise on an acceptable method.

58. **Question:** 4.0049 Allows customization of the information requested in online forms. (Q) Is the term online form meant to be the same as a screen in the software?

Answer: Yes, but must be also able to print and save the form as a file in a user friendly format.

59. **Question:** 4.0045 System includes in-system editable help text. (Q) Editable by whom?

Answer: Editable by the State.

60. **Question:** 4.0046 Allows customized dropdown values for fields. (Q) Is the correct term here customized or configurable? (Q) Section 4 uses the word "Customization." Please distinguish between customization (software change) and configuration for each item.
Answer: The dropdown values should be configurable by the State without a software change.
61. **Question:** 5.0060 Applicants can spell-check applications and all attachments. (Q) Is it sufficient that the attachment can be opened and spell checked by the creating software, e.g., MS Word. (Q) Are you expecting spell check capability in PDF documents? (Q) Throughout the requirements, you make mention of "forms" and the ability to modify them for each grant program. Are you expecting the data in those forms to be treated as an attachment or are you expecting the data to be extracted and stored as data elements?
Answer: Spell check should be available within the system when applicants are completing online applications or other forms. The data in forms should be stored as data elements in the system with the ability to print and save the form as a file in a user friendly format.
62. **Question:** Interfaces - (Q) There are several references to interfaces in the requirements. Are you expecting the software to provide point-to-point connections or do you have a middleware product to manage the interface connections?
Answer: Some interfaces can be achieved through APIs, while others require an ETL process from provided flat files.
63. **Question:** Ad-hoc Reporting - (Q) Please provide some examples of both standard and ad-hoc reports that you expect the system to be able provide.
Answer: The State is expecting the vendor to be familiar with Federal reports and common performance reporting for grants. Any additional ad-hoc reporting will be determined by the State and coordinated with the vendor. The State expects the system to have functionality to create custom reports.
64. **Question:** Correspondence/Reports - (Q) Do you expect logos to be included in the letters generated or will the letters be printed to letterhead stationary? (or do you anticipate both being used)
Answer: Logos should be included on the letter generated.
65. **Question:** I understand we are to use Rhode Island's W9 for, however I found 2 different forms on the website. Which one should we use?
<http://www.purchasing.ri.gov/rivip/publicdocuments/fw9.pdf> or this one
<http://www.gwb.ri.gov/pdfs/innovation/w9form.pdg>.
Answer: Use the W-9 posted on the Division of Purchases website at:
<http://www.purchasing.ri.gov/rivip/publicdocuments/fw9.pdf>
66. **Question:** On page 13, Section 8: Response contents, Item 3, a, iii state "One (1) electronic copy of Exhibit B – Detailed Business Scenario Narrative Worksheet in Excel format (XLS)." This is actually a Word Document, and it asks for narrative and possibly

screenshots, flow charts or diagrams. So, should we actually submit the final copy as a Word document, and not an Excel Sheet?

Answer: Please submit as a Word document.

67. **Question:** Approximately how many users (internal and external) do you anticipate using the new system? How many will be high usage (40+ hours/week)? Low usage (less than 40 hrs/week)? Will any be classified as administrators? If so, how many?

Answer: See answers to Questions 24 and 25. High/low usage users have not been determined yet. There could be 2-3 administrators per agency plus additional administrators at the State level from IT and OMB.

68. **Question:** Does the State employ any external reviewers? If so, approx how many?

Answer: The state will not be using external reviewers.

69. How many external users will access the system concurrently at peak times?

Answer: Unknown at this time.

70. **Question:** The RFP states 32 state agencies. Is the agency amenable to phased approach for all 32 agencies? Is a multi-year roll-out acceptable?

Answer: A phased multi-year roll-out is expected.

71. **Question:** Does the State have any preferences on the hosting environment?

Answer: FISMA compliant data center located in the 48 contiguous US states.

72. **Question:** How many concurrent users will be accessing the system in future?

Answer: See answers to Questions 24 and 25.

73. **Question:** the RFP states, "The Technical Proposal is limited to six (6) pages (this excludes any appendices, exhibits, and/or key staff resumes)" Will the cover letter, Executive Summary, and forms (RIIP and W-9) form part of the page limit? Can we include additional pages for providing information about our product capabilities and functionalities? Please clarify.

Answer: The page limit for the Technical Proposal is adjusted to a twenty (20) page limit.

NO FURTHER RFP QUESTIONS SHALL BE ACCEPTED AS OF THIS ADDENDUM.

Meredith Skelly
Interdepartmental Project Manager