Solicitation Information
December 21, 2018

Addendum #4

RFP # 7597648

TITLE: Grants Management System

Submission Deadline: January 16, 2019 at 2:30 PM (ET)

PLEASE NOTE:
Submission deadline has been extended from January 9, 2019 to Wednesday, January 16, 2019 at 2:30 PM (ET).

Revised Appendix E – Security Questionnaire is attached as a downloadable .zip file.

Attached are vendor questions with State responses. No further questions will be answered.

Gail Walsh
Chief Buyer

RFP #7597648 – Grants Management System Bidders Conference Questions

Vendor A - IBM

1. Aside from Performance Bond, nothing else has changed related to the instructions for submission?
A. The elimination of the Performance Bond requirement is the main change. Refer to the posted addendums for additional information.

2. Architecture: are you expecting this system to be an independent system, or are you expecting it to integrate with some existing architecture or strategy that is public?
A. The solution must integrate with the State's Oracle e-Business System (RIFANS) as well as at least several federal systems as outlined in the RFP.

3. You invite proposals for Paas & aPaaS are you looking for this system to be part of something larger that is part of a larger system or strategy?
A. This is not a specific goal of the RFP.

4. Are there any public documents that specify the State of RI Dept of Administration architecture or State of RI overall system architecture that can be shared that this could fit into?
A. State does not have a preference between approach one vs. the other and recognizes there are different vendors with different strategies available and we didn't want to discount any of one of them. The solution and the cost are paramount.   We are certainly open to the possible expanded future use of a platform if the solution allowed us to do so that could be an extended benefit.

5. Federal integrations, is there a deadline you need to achieve this by? In terms of audits or anything?
A. No.

6. In terms of design work that has been done by OMB. On a scale of 1 to 5 (highest) how much design work has been done, in terms of level of review vs. expansion that is required.
A. An extensive amount of work has been done. The State expects there to be some additional discovery necessary but that will not be the main focus of this project. Bidders should factor their proposals accordingly. The State estimates design work is in the "3 - to 4" range on the scale referenced in the vendors question.

7. Hosting, looking for cloud-based solution?
A. Yes.

8. Solution infrastructure coordination with DoIT/ETSS please elaborate.
A. Vendor will be expected to work with State DoIT/ETSS regarding integration or infrastructure changes need to support the Vendor's solution.

9. Pilot/Proof of Concept related to RIFANS. Can design considerations developed as part of that integration be posted on the addendum site?
A. The design considerations will be shared once the vendor is selected.

Vendor B – Dulles Technology

1. Are we submitting proposals for the entirety of the implementation for all 28 agencies or are we submitting proposals for a pilot program as a subset of those programs, to put that into production as a proof of concept?
A. The RFP is soliciting proposals for all 28 agencies, design, development and implementation. The State is open to options on how a vendor may structure and propose the roll out process.

2. Do you have in mind the possibility of a pilot program before tackling all 28 agencies?
A. Vendors are free to submit what they feel is the best option for success of project.

3. What is the duration of the implementation of these 28 programs?
A. We do not have a specific timeframe defined in the RFP, we are looking for vendors to provide that information as part of their proposed project plan. Please refer to RFP Section 3.3.2 Project Phases and *Appendix D RI OMB Proposed Project Phases*

4. "Integrate with grants.gov"- are you saying you want have the system support you acting as a Grantee pursuing Federal opportunities from the Federal Government?
A. Yes. Objective is to be able to pull funding opportunities from grants.gov have them available and searchable in our system and ultimately be able to turn it back around push back to grants.gov to apply so our staff are using one system for their work.

5. If you submit your application to the federal government and are awarded a grant, I am assuming that you would want to be able to track that grant in the system as well acting as a Grantee.
A. Yes.

Vendor C – Agate Software

1. Is there a Timeline for when proposals will be reviewed and awarded?
A. Proposals were originally due on January 9th. The State is granting a one-week extension to **January 16, 2019 at 2:30 PM (ET).** The timeline for awarding will vary. Tentative project kick-off is April 2019.

2. When coming up with project plan timeline what should vendors use?
A. Use a timeline based on number of months for proposal not linked specifically to date(s).

Vendor D - GCR

1. State mentioned there are 28 state agencies involved, are there any agencies outside of those 28 that also manage grants?
A. Yes, 4 state agencies. The public colleges (3) and the Department of Transportation are not included in the 28 agencies slated for implementation.

Vendor E - CGI

1. Was the work done related to RIFANs integration was that tested with the two existing grant management systems in place currently in the state (AccelaGrants & Fondant)?
A. No, it was not tested. Testing was internal, conceptual design testing.

Vendor F - Infostrat

1. How mature are the 28 agencies with Agile?
A. The degree of familiarity varies.

Vendor G – Innovation Network

1. With Agile, there are often tools to support. Does state have access to a tool(s) or is this something handled by vendor?
A. The State is open to the tools to support project from vendor, what their preferred toolkit is and what the benefits to the state exist.

2. Is the State is amendable to a phased rollout for the 28 state agencies?
A. Yes

Vendor H - Unidentified

1. Delivery methods - can you talk about the difference between custom development vs. procuring a solution that is already developed by a third party?
A. The State is open to proposals that include taking a COTS product and customizing it to meet the needs specified in the RFP. The State is also open to a system being developed from scratch.

2. Sounds like a lot of work has been done with processes. How will you balance out working with a proposal that uses a product that is already designed vs. a custom development?
A. As long as the core requirements outlined in the RFP and related attachments are met we will evaluate.   When evaluating, the requirements are the requirements and that is what we will fall back on when evaluating proposals. If a vendor has a core product and plans to adapt or customize it, the State is open to this approach.

3. Is the State open to modifying the business process its developed?

A. The business process developed is the product of extensive work and is lean, that being said we would be open to modifications that make sense from the State's perspective.

4. How far did you go with your discovery in terms of assessing your ecosystem in terms of APIs and the readiness of that ecosystem to support integration vs the amount of development that has to be done to make to that leap?

A. Extensive research. APIs deep analysis in terms of what it looks like to integrate with external federal grant systems. Internally, we had working proofs of concept for integration to multiple different transactions and transaction types we did not build a proof of concept out to those external systems. There are published API standards for all systems mentioned.

5. For the discovery done over the past year has the state worked with a third party?
A. Yes

6. Can the State share who the third party they worked with is?
A. No

RFP #7597648 – Grants Management System Questions Submitted by Vendors

Vendor A - CGI

1. Should non-federal funding opportunities (ex: foundations) be tracked similar to grants.gov opportunities?

A. Yes, non-federal funding opportunities should be tracked similar to grants.gov opportunities.

2. What is the role of OMB users in the grant management system?

A. The role of OMB users is oversight and transparency.

3. How are funding opportunity announcements rated? Who rates the opportunities?

A. Federal and private funding opportunities are rated by state agency staff.

4. What criteria is used to evaluate funding opportunities? Is this criteria different for each state agency?

A. Each state agency is responsible for evaluating alignment between funding opportunities and strategic priorities. The State has developed cross cutting evaluation criteria that will be implemented as part of the Grant Management System (GMS).

5. What criteria is evaluated during the fiscal review? Is this criteria different for each state agency?

A. See response to Submitted Question A.4.

6. What criteria is evaluated during the programmatic review? Is this criteria different for each state agency?

A. See response to Submitted Question A.4.

7. What criteria does the executive review board use to evaluate grants? Is this criteria different for each state agency?

A. See response to Submitted Question A.4.

8. How is a notice of grant award received? In what format? From what system? Containing what information?

A. Notice of grant award come electronically from the awarding Federal agencies. The Federal agencies currently use a variety of grant systems to generate notice of grant awards. The minimum requirements for the information regarding what is contained in a Federal award is outlined in 2 CFR 200.210.

9. What steps does the strategic planning process consist of?

A. The State is in the process of updating its state agency strategic planning process

10. What information is captured during strategic planning? When is it updated? By whom? With what frequency?

A. See response to Submitted Question A.9.

11. For what time period is a strategic plan valid?

A. See response to Submitted Question A.9.

12. How does a strategic plan relate to a funding opportunity?

A. See response to Submitted Question A.4.

13. How does strategic plan relate to a program?

A. See response to Submitted Question A.9.

14. What information is captured during a programmatic risk assessment?

A. Programmatic risk assessment captures information on, experience, performance, compliance, and personnel.

15. How is programmatic risk measured?

A. By State program staff prior to the issuance of a subaward and the context of a periodic

renewal.

16.   What are the bounds for each level of programmatic risk?

A.   Programmatic risk is rated as low, medium or high with corresponding numeric values

17.   What information is captured during an organizational risk assessment?

A.   The following categories are captured: management System, financial reporting, budgetary controls, cost principles, audit, organizational governance, property standards, procurement standards, subrecipient monitoring and management and fraud waste and abuse

18.   How is organization risk measured?

A.   Will be measured at the time of registration when a subrecipient entity applies subaward in the grant management system and annually thereafter.

19.   Can any steps of the fiscal approval process be automated? If so what criteria determines an automatic approval?

A.   The State expects approvals and workflows will be automated in the grant management system.

20.   Can any steps of the programmatic approval process be automated? If so what criteria determines an automatic approval?

A.   The State expects approvals and workflows will be automated in the grant management system.

21.   Can any steps of the executive approval process be automated? If so what criteria determines an automatic approval?

A.   The State expects approvals and workflows will be automated in the grant management system.

22.   What does collaboration mean in the context of grant application? A single document that multiple individuals can work on at the same time in real time or a shared repository of documents that multiple individuals can access and see version history of?

A.   The State anticipates that multiple people will work on a grant application. The State expects that individuals can access and see prior effective dated historical versions of said application.

23.   What state government roles are involved in the creation and submission of a grant application?

A.   A multitude of state agency staff including, program, fiscal and executive staff may be involved the creation and submission of a grant application.

24. How are those roles determined?

A. State agency determines who is responsible for the creation and submission of grant applications.

25. Does a grant pursuit team always consist of the same individuals?

A. No.

26. What determines an individual's participation in pursuit of a grant?

A. Participation is driven by subject matter expertise; i.e., financial or program staff.

27. What type of data will flow to the grant management system from RIFANS, and vice versa?

A. Financial data will flow from RIFANS to the GMS system.   Grant award task will be passed from the GMS to RIFANS. Subrecipient reimbursement requests will be accepted in the GMS and passed to RIFANS.

28. What does it mean to "electronically submit applications through external services such as Grants.gov?" Does the entire application need to be pulled into the grant management system as text fields or just the attachments?

A. To the extent the State prepares and application in the grant management system that application should be able to be submitted to grants.gov. The State expects that all application fields will be pulled into the system as text fields including attachments such as the budget form.

29. How will communication occur with federal agencies in the system? Are federal agencies registering as users in the system or is this just email communication?

A. All communication between the Federal agency and the State is expected to be captured in the system. For example, we expect to be able to generate emails from the system and capture responses. Federal agencies are not registering as users in the system.

30. What information is required of a sub-applicant to complete registration?

A. A subrecipient entity will be required to complete an initial registration the first time they are applying for a subaward in the system. The starting point for subrecipient registration is: entity name, DUNS, EIN, SAM.gov

31. What information is captured during each audit process?

A. Monitoring protocols will be determined by the risk level. The information captured is further driven by award requirements and federal agency requirements.

32. Are all programs audited? If not, how are programs selected for audit?

A.   Subrecipient monitoring is determined by risk level.

33. Please provide any form references where they may exist e.g. drawdown request form.

A.   The Federal government uses many systems and forms. Multiple systems exist for federal drawdowns. Please refer to grants.gov and federal agency websites for additional information.

34. When state is Grantor, are any required reporting metrics standardized? What are they?

A.   The State is not using standardized reporting metrics at this time.

35. When state is Grantee, are any required reporting metrics standardized? If so, what are they?

A.   Federal agencies dictate required reporting metrics.

Vendor B – Innovation Network

1. With regards to the MBE participation, will it count if we are a certified MBE with the State of MD? Or are you only looking for State of Rhode Island certified firms? If we cannot count our MBE certification, do we still need to fill out the 'MBE, WBE, and/or Disability Business Enterprise Participation Plan' form?

A. Vendor must be certified in RI. Vendor should fill out form and indicate no participation.

2. For the estimated number of users/licenses, the following categories are listed on the cost sheet: State, Applicant, Sub recipient. Of these categories, which do you anticipate as being high volume users (users logging on to the system 40 or more hours/month)? Which do you anticipate being low volume users (logging on to the system less than 40 hours/month)? We assume the following...is this correct?
    ○ State - high volume
    ○ Applicant - low volume
    ○ Sub recipient - community (casual user)

A. The State is not able confirm the assumptions made by the vendor regarding potential hours of use at this time. In a general sense, the highest volume users will be State users, followed by subrecipient users and applicants. Vendors should propose the most the cost-effective licensing options available.

3. On pg. 13, Section 3.5 Data Conversion Requirements, it states that the State requires data conversion from all agencies' current systems. Can you provide information on how many different current systems there are, what those systems are, and how much total data there will be to convert?

A. As stated in RFP, the vendor will provide the data conversion template and is responsible for moving data into the GMS. The amount of data to be converted is unknown. Most agencies use spreadsheets (Excel/Access). Two agencies have grant management systems: Dept of Education: AccelaGrants, Council for the Arts: Fondant Technologies. See RFP Section 3.5 for detailed data conversion requirements.

4. On pg., 14, Section 3.7.3 Performance Testing, it states the GMS will contain a large amount of information to be displayed to a large potential pool of users. Can you specify the amount of information (i.e. define "large") and the number of potential users?

A. As outlined in Appendix B, the State has 1340 awards. Refer to Appendix G Licensing tab for number of potential users.

5. On pg. 16, Section 3.8.3 Train-the-Trainer, we understand that the initial train-the-trainer training needs to be conducted in person. Do you also require that the "shadowing" of all initial end user training that each State Trainer conducts also be in person? Or will these trainings be online? If they are in person, will they be conducted at the State of Rhode Island facility, or other/multiple locations?

A. Yes. The State requires the shadowing of all initial end user training provided by state training contacts to be conducted in person. All training will be conducted at a State of Rhode Island facility.

6. On pg. 19, Section 4.2 (a) (iii), it asks for the number of people who will be onsite at State location(s) at any given time. Does the State require vendor staff to be onsite for any portion of this project? Although, we do plan on being onsite various times throughout the project, most of our work is typically completed remotely. Is this approach sufficient for the State?

A. As outlined in Section 4.2, the vendor is expected to provide a staffing plan by phase that includes all key project personnel and whether they are onsite/offsite. The Technical Proposal and the Cost Proposal should reflect the bidders plan for onsite staffing.

7. Appendix E, Security Questionnaire - it seems to be related to case management, parole information, etc. Is this the correct questionnaire that we are supposed to complete for this RFP?

A. A revised Appendix E with instructions has been posted as addendum.

Vendor C – Publicis Sapient

1. Can the state describe in more detail the types of financial assistance they can provide? This is a broad range of financial assistance and it would be helpful to have a more detailed delineation of how assistance is provided through each of these mechanisms: (i.e., what types of loans? Fixed Rate, Variable rate, Revolving lines of credit (RLOC)?

"Financial Assistance that State agencies receive or administer in the form of: grants; cooperative agreements; non-cash contributions or donations of property including surplus property; direct appropriations; food commodities; loans; loan guarantees, interest subsidies and insurance."

A. The priority of the state is to manage subawards in the system. Only one State entity provides loans at this time and we would envision that would be handled as a potential enhancement.

2. Does a middleware exist to integrate this system with other systems (i.e., Oracle e-business suite)?

A. The State developed a proof of concept utilizing a Talend. A final decision has not been made as to the ESB. The State is open to other alternatives to integrate our Oracle E-Business Suite.

3. Can you provide more detail about what data is transferred to federal databases? "Grants.gov, SAM.gov, Federal Audit Clearinghouse (harvester.census.gov), and USAspending.gov"

A. The State expects to be able to push and pull data from grants.gov in the GMS.   Please review the grants.gov API instructions.   For SAM.gov, Federal Audit Clearinghouse (harvester.census.gov), and USAspending.gov the State would be pulling data.

4. What customer service channels (i.e., messaging, SMS, email, mobile, Desktop sharing) does the State expect to implement as part of this engagement?

A. The State is open to vendor proposals to provide support through a Help Desk including email and ticket submission/ tracking capabilities and messaging.

5. 3.2.4. Automated Testing: Does the state already have a test automation solution that should be utilized?

A. The state does not currently have an automated solution that should be utilized. The vendor is

to provide such tools as part of their proposal.

6. 3.5 Data Conversion Requirements: How many data sources (e.g. will each agency have their own source) will need to be migrated into the system? Approximately how many tables and rows will need to be migrated for each of these source systems? How much history will be required?

A. See Submitted Question B.3 for response.

7. 3.7.4 Accessibility Testing: Does the state have an accessibility testing solution, or does the vendor need to provide an accessibility testing solution and provide compliance reports?

A. The state adheres to Federal accessibility standards. The vendor is to ensure their solution adheres standards and utilize industry tools. Such tools will not be provided by the State.

8. Testing Environments: Will a corresponding number of other systems test environments be available? (i.e., development, systems testing, user acceptance testing, production support)?

A. The State does have test environments. However, some legacy systems will have limited testing capabilities.

9. How much agile development training has project resources received? Should we assume they are already experienced and comfortable with agile?

A. Yes, there is fair level of comfort with agile among state project team staff and core team members.

10. Do you have a preferred timeline for each phase of the project?

A. See response: Bidders Conference Question B. 3.

11. Are there any fiscal constraints across years? Are funds for all 3 phases appropriated at award?

A. There are no fiscal constants across the years.

12. Does the State expect an automatic upload of candidate opportunities from grants.gov and/or other sites?

A. The state expects to be able to pull funding opportunities from grants.gov into the GMS system in a searchable format.

13. Can the state provide the cross-agency standardized Grants process flows (State as Grantee & State as Grantor) mentioned in the RFP?

A. Please refer to the PowerPoint provided in Bidders Conference for Grantee and Grantor business process flow posted as an addendum. These reflect statewide business process flows for Grantee and Grantor.

14. How many internal users and external users are expected to use the system? Please break this down by phase.

A. See Appendix G. Cost Template Licensing Tab for breakdown of users by phase.

15. Please describe the different user roles, both internal and external with user counts? Indicated which user roles require mobile?

A. The State expects to be able to create and maintain role-based user profiles for a wide range of internal and external users. The proposed solution should be mobile accessible for all users per the requirements.

16. Work Plan response section 4.3.d references section 3.3. Should this be 3.4? If not, please provide an expectation for this section.

A. Section 4.3d refers to the phases of the project outlined in Section 3.3 which includes 3.3.1, 3.3.2 and 3.3.3. It does not refer to 3.4.

17. The numbering in other parts of Work Plan response section 4.3 appears to out of alignment with 3.x references. Please provide an update.

A. Please note the following correction to the language:

    e. Solution Requirements Gathering (Section 3.6)
    f. Solution Quality Assurance Testing (Section 3.7)
    g. Solution Deployment (Section 3.7)
    h. Testing plans (Section 3.7)
    i. Documentation (Section 3.8.7)
    j. Security plan, (use template provided in Appendix E or alternative tool addressing all security requirements)
    k. Roles and responsibilities RACI Chart (Appendix F)

18. Appendix E appears to be for a different solicitation. Please provide the correct document or provide additional expectations on how to complete.

A. See Submitted Question B.7 for response.

19. The state mentions it has already completed a comprehensive requirements phase. Have all requirements been provided with this RFP?

A. Yes, all the requirements are provided with this RFP.

20. Does the State require each phase to be completed on a predefined timeline or is there flexibility in the schedule?

A. There is flexibility in the scheduling of phases. See response to Bidders Conference Question B. 3.

21. Section 3.7.3 speaks to performance testing and indicates the system is be tuned to support the expected load. Please provide any volume metrics that would be representative of the expected load such expected daily transaction volume and integration API volume? How many records will be in the system and how many data objects are expected?

A. The state expects the performance response time to be in line with industry standards for the number of users outlined in the licensing section of the RFP. The system should be scalable to meet increased usage and vendors should outline how their platform is capable of scaling dynamically in response to demand**.** The State reserves the right to review response time performance metrics in contract negotiations.

The state is unable to answer the number of objects and records as this is dependent on the architecture described in vendor proposal.

22. Requirements 2.0001, 2.0003, 21.0007 imply integration. Please provide a comprehensive list of all integrations, their purpose and a business description of the data exchanged.

A. The main integration will be with the RIFANS systems. Vendor should refer to the PowerPoint from the Bidder's Conference for a list of other potential integrations.

23. How many new APIs need to be built?

A. The vendor is to determine.

24. Is there an existing tech stack to support Microservices architecture? If yes, please provide details.

A. There is no tech stack to support Microservices architecture.

25. Is there an existing DevOps tool chain? If yes, please provide details.

A. There is no existing DevOps tool chain.

26. What is the maximum number of records expected (estimate is fine) in any single table?

A. The State is unable to estimate the number of records expected in any single table.

27. For formatting output documents/letters/reports?
- How many should we assume are required?
- What is the length in number of pages for the largest reports?
- Are any reports expected to include graphical data like visualizations etc.?
- Are there requirements for large complex aggregations to generate the reports?

A. See Appendix C Detailed Requirements which outlines the State's expectations for reports and reporting.

28. Is SCORM compliance required only for end-user documentation or for developer / admin documentation as well?

    A.   SCORM compliance is required only for end-user documentation.

29. For SharePoint integration for files, please explain the functions that are required to be supported (view, search, upload, direct edit of files, etc...)?

    A.   See Appendix C. 12.0004. System integrates document storage with client file server, SharePoint, or other document storage application. The State expects to have the ability to view, search, upload and delete. We do not need ability to direct edit files.

30. What is the total volume in GB of file storage required?

A.   This is dependent on the solution offered by the vendor. The State does not have a current grants management system, nor does it have an easily-accessible cloud-based storage provider, we cannot respond to this question. The vendor should plan accordingly and present pricing options in the Cost Proposal for different levels of storage as the State's needs increase.

31. Is it mandatory that all cloud-based components of the solution have a FedRAMP ATO? For example, do solution components used for outreach such as mass emailing and tracking need to have a FedRAMP ATO?

A. The State will give due deference to architectures that run end-to-end on FedRAMP-certified infrastructure. At a minimum, the core services (application engine, user interface, static file delivery, database, etc.) must be hosted on FedRAMP-certified infrastructure, and the State will evaluate external integrated components for security and compliance on a case-by-case basis.

32. What is the average number of messages sent to an applicant during the application process? What would an annual number of applicants be in an average year?

    A.   We do not have data to provide an accurate estimate of the number of applicants or messages.

33. Do you currently use any algorithms or machine learning to classify and evaluate grant submissions, which can result in improved productivity? Or is this currently a manual process? Will the State be evaluating this capability as part of the RFP response evaluation?

    A.   The State does not currently use any algorithms or machine learning for grant submissions. Process is manual. Some grant data and financial data is available in some rudimentary business intelligence systems. State is open options.

34. What are the anticipated total number of internal users that will require access to the solution? What is the volume of external users that will be accessing the solution on a monthly basis? For each of these user counts, please provide total number of users, and not just number of users accessing the system at any one time.

A.   See Submitted Question B.3 for response and refer to Appendix G licensing tab.

Vendor D – Streamlink

1.   Given resource restrictions around the holidays, can we request an extension to the submittal deadline?

A.   Yes. The new deadline will be January 16th.

2.   For Appendix E - Security Plan, is the expectation that we only fill "Tab 11 Infra Security & Integrity"?

A.   Yes, see response to Submitted Question B.7 for response.

3.   Section 3.3.2 Project Phases of the RFP slates Federal system integration for Phase Three. However, Appendix D - RI OMB Proposed Project Phases slates SAM.gov integration for Phase 1, Group 2. Could you please clarify?

A.   The phasing outlined in Appendix D is proposed however bidders have the option to propose alternative approaches. It should be noted that pulling data from SAM.gov is an essential component of subrecipient registration.

4.   Section 4.1.b.i states that Vendor must warrant that their proposed solution will meet all of the State's requirements outlined in this RFP and related appendices. However, requirements are prioritized (i.e. Critical, High, Medium, Low). Could you please clarify the expectation for meeting "all" requirements?

A.   Bidders are expected to meet all requirements in Appendix C, the RFP, and related appendices.

5.   Do we need to submit Appendix C -Technical Requirements? It is not listed in the RFP requirements as an attachment, just that we need to address it in the Work Plan.

A.   Bidders workplan must describe how they will meet the technical requirements in Appendix C, the RFP, and related appendices.

6.   What agencies will be represented in the scoring committee? How many people are on the scoring committee and what are their roles within their respected agency?

A.   The Technical Review Committee will be made up of State Agency personnel and includes program and financial, IT and OMB staff.

7. Please provide a list of systems currently housing on-going/historical grant information and for each please provide the data schemas and approximate number of records to be extracted, transformed, and loaded into the system.

A. See Submitted Question B.3 for response.