



LARRY HOGAN
Governor

BOYD K. RUTHERFORD
Lieutenant Governor

DAVID R. BRINKLEY
Secretary

MARC L. NICOLE
Deputy Secretary

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES # 3
PROJECT NO. DGSR8400113
Department of Budget & Management
eMaryland Marketplace eProcurement Solution RFP
April 17, 2018

Ladies/Gentlemen:

This List of Questions and Responses #3, Questions #22 through #26, is being issued to clarify certain information contained in the above named RFP.

In most instances the Department's response to the submitted questions merely serves to clarify the existing requirements of the RFP. Sometimes, however, in submitting questions potential Offerors may make statements or express interpretations of contract requirements that may be inconsistent with the Department's intent. To the extent that the Department recognizes such an incorrect interpretation, the provided answer will note that the interpretation is erroneous and either state that the question is moot once the correct interpretation is explained or provide the answer based upon the correct interpretation.

No provided answer to a question may in and of itself change any requirement of the RFP. If it is determined that any portion of the RFP should be changed based upon a submitted question, the actual change may only be implemented via a formal amendment to the RFP. In this situation the answer provided will reference the amendment containing the RFP change.

Questions and Responses # 3

22. Executive Support: *Have the Comptroller, Treasurer and Board of Public Works all pre-approved and pre-authorized the eProcurement solution as represented in the RFP Document*

RESPONSE: The State does not pre-approve or pre-authorize contracts submitted for approval to the Board of Public Works.

23. Off-shore delivery: *Does the State have any restrictions or punitive scoring associated with performance of work outside of the United States, such as contract loading, supplier enablement or data transformation/loading?*

RESPONSE: Yes. The State restricts performance of Contracts outside of the United States. See RFP Section 2.7.5 B (15) “Data Protection and Controls” for prohibitions on data processing, transfer, and storage outside the United States and Attachment L “Location of the Performance of Services Disclosure.”

*24. **Accessibility:** Does the State require Section 508, or any other ADA accessibility compliance for the buyer, supplier and/or public access components of the proposed solution?*

RESPONSE: Yes, the State does require nonvisual accessibility. See Appendix 5, Section 1.33 for details.

*25. **Interfaces:** Two follow-up questions in response to “Questions and Responses #1”, where the State clarifies that “... new system may not be expected to interface with FMIS initially, it will be expected that it will have the capability of interfacing...”:*

- a. Can the State better define how to demonstrate the “capability of interfacing” to the Financial Systems, including FMIS and/or its replacement?*
- b. Does the State expect the agencies to perform double data-entry until the interface/integration is completed? Or, has the State identified another solution or approach to address the gap between the procurement and financial systems without the interface?*

RESPONSE:

25a. Given that each Offerors solution is unique unto itself and that the RFP directs Offerors to propose how their proposed solution would achieve the desired outcomes and an Offeror’s proposed method is part of the evaluation of its proposal (see Appendix 5 Section 3.2.1), the State is unable to offer additional guidance on how an Offeror demonstrate it is capable of providing real-time integration, or batch interface with the State’s enterprise financial and other information management systems other than to suggest that it describe in its proposal how it has demonstrated this capability in similar state or other governmental business settings.

25b. Yes, double data entry is expected until integration/interfacing is completed.

*26. **Funding:** In RFP section 1.2.4.4, as well as in responses to questions in the first two Question and Responses, the State indicates that the funding will be recovered through eProcurement transaction fees. We would appreciate additional clarifications:*

- a. Can the State provide the transaction volume and fee assumptions that are being used that confirms the ability to fund both the initial project implementation and the ongoing operational costs?*
- b. Does the selected solution vendor bear any financial risks in the event the project transaction fee models do not provide sufficient revenue to cover the ultimate costs?*

RESPONSE:

26 a. The State is not assuming certain transaction volume or fee amounts, but the amount collected as a result of the current 1% fee on statewide commodities only, was \$1,512,951.52 in fiscal year 2017 and is \$1,098,792.22 year to date in fiscal year 2018.

26 b. No, the selected vendor would be paid a fixed price as proposed in its Financial Proposal regardless of transaction volume or related fees charged or collected.