

State of Arkansas Department of Finance & Administration (DFA)
RFP #: SP-19-0001 - e-Procurement Solution
State's Response to O-1 Final Written Questions

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	State Response
1	Procurement Library - AR eProcurement Business Narrative, Page 19, Section 2.5.6	The current process for goods receipt occurs in the AASIS system. This is a manual entry into the system and is to be done at time of receipt of goods and/or services	What system does the State desire to receive goods/services as this contradicts the Functional RTM document? In what system (AASIS or eProcurement) will the State perform 3-way matching (PO to Invoice to Goods Receipt)?	Section 2.5.6 of the Business Narrative document (located in the Procurement Library) has been updated. Three-way matching (PO to Invoice to Goods Receipt) will occur in the e-Procurement system. The e-Procurement system must integrate with ERP (AASIS) which will process payment, encumber funds and prevent deficit spending; ensuring continued integrity of the system of record. Refer to RFP Section 3.1B(3), in case of any inconsistency, the RFP and Response Templates shall govern.
2	Procurement Library - AR eProcurement Business Narrative, Page 20, Section 2.6.1	System Functionality will provide the capability to designate a contract as mandatory or not	Please further clarify with use case.	Refer to Arkansas Procurement Law 19-11-222 and 19-11-223. When goods and services are available on a Mandatory Statewide Contract, the purchase must be made from one of the Suppliers on that contract unless given written authorization by the State Procurement Director. Refer to DFA-OSP State contracts website for a listing of Mandatory Statewide Contracts: https://www.dfa.arkansas.gov/procurement/state-contracts/
3	RFP Draft 2, Page 10, Section 1.14	e-Procurement Details DFA	We are a provider of Invoice Imaging, OCR Data Capture, AP Workflow and Payment Processing Solutions. Is the DFA and Office of State Procurement willing to accept bid for portions for the RFP?	No, the State of Arkansas is seeking an end-to-end eProcurement Solution. Prospective Contractors should thoroughly review the Solicitation requirements and SOW and submit a proposal, which will be evaluated based on the Solicitation requirements. A single Prospective Contractor must be identified as the prime Contractor.
4	RFP Draft 2, Page 15, Section 1.30 Procurement Library	The best suited process integration tool for ECC is SAP PI/PO.	Would State of Arkansas utilize the same tool for communicating with other systems	The State does not currently have a license to PI/PO. The State is open to best business practices. Prospective Contractors should thoroughly review the Solicitation requirements and SOW. The State relies on Prospective Contractors to leverage their expertise and propose a solution that is most advantageous to the State.

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	State Response
5	RFP Draft 2, Page 16, Section 2.1.2 (See also T-2, Page 2, Section 1.3)	2.1 PROSPECTIVE CONTRACTOR MINIMUM MANDATORY QUALIFICATIONS 2. The Prospective Contractor must have a current Dun & Bradstreet (D&B) Financial Stress Risk Class not greater than 2.	We are a large privately held business entity with the financial capability to perform this work. We are routinely found to be a responsible contractor for large federal and state public contracts, including other contracts in the State of Arkansas. However, as a privately held entity (i.e., not a publicly traded company), we have elected not to share information with D&B for rating and other purposes. However, we can demonstrate our financial capability to perform. As such, we request subsection 2 be modified so that we can compete for this project and we provide a suggested edit to subsection 2 as follows: 2. The Prospective Contractor must have a current Dun & Bradstreet (D&B) Financial Stress Risk Class not greater than 2 or, alternatively, be able to demonstrate its financial capability to perform the services as determined by the State in its sole discretion.	This requirement has been deleted.
6	RFP Draft 2, Page 16, Section 2.2 B	N/A	Assuming there can potentially be up to 2,000 users of the new e-Procurement system and the possibility of tens of thousands of vendors, is it possible to provide an estimate for the number of Level 1 support contacts after the roll-out of the new system for: a. The first month b. For months 2 and 3 c. For steady state – months 4 through 36	No, the State is unable to answer this question.
7	RFP Draft 2, Page 16, Section 2.2 B 2.	The State has approximately 580 procurement specialist (buyers) in AASIS ...	Sourcing and Contract Users in our system are individuals who will manage the development of bid/proposal responses, quotes, addendums, amendments, etc. How many of the 580 procurement specialists will need this capability and is this the total number of users for this functionality?	Refer to Final RFP, Section 2.2B(2). The State has approximately 580 procurement specialist (buyers) in AASIS who are responsible for day-to-day procurement activities (e.g. issuance of purchase orders) and are also responsible for management of bid/proposal responses and quotes and development of solicitations, addendums, amendments, etc.

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	State Response
8	RFP Draft 2, Page 16, Section 2.2 B	Potential State Users	<p>Supplier Risk Users in our system are individuals who will manage and monitor the risk of the supply base. This is related primarily to FR4.28 to FR4.37 and the ongoing monitoring of external events. This is usually a small group of individuals focused on risk mitigation. How many users will need this capability?</p> <p>Supplier Management Users in our system are individuals who will manage the registration, qualification, and certificates for suppliers. Approvals from stakeholders are not considered users. How many of the 580 procurement specialists will need this capability and is this the total number of users for this functionality?</p>	<p>Refer to Final RFP, Section 2.2B(3)</p> <p>The State anticipates having twelve (12) users at DFA-OSP to review and approve Supplier accounts to make them active and available for use in the system. These users will also be responsible for creating and maintaining supplier accounts as needed. (See T-4, Tab 4, Line FR4.4)</p>
9	RFP Draft 2, Page 16, Section 2.2 B	Potential State Users	<p>Supplier Management Users in our system are individuals who will manage the registration, qualification, and certificates for suppliers. Approvals from stakeholders are not considered users. How many of the 580 procurement specialists will need this capability and is this the total number of users for this functionality?</p>	<p>Refer to Final RFP, Section 2.2B(3)</p> <p>The State anticipates having twelve (12) users at DFA-OSP to review and approve Supplier accounts to make them active and available for use in the system. These users will also be responsible for creating and maintaining supplier accounts as needed. (See T-4, Tab 4, Line FR4.4)</p>
10	RFP Draft 2, Page 17 Section 2.2 E (See also FR4.39, FR5.89, and FR7.8 Electronic Signatures)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The State has approximately 410 active Statewide contracts issued by OSP 2. 29,000 one-time bids issued within AASIS in FY18 3. 82,000 POs issued within AASIS in FY18 4. 500,000 invoices processed within AASIS in FY18 5. 50,000 active Vendors in AASIS 	<p>The State has requested Electronic Signature capabilities for FR4.39, FR5.89, and FR7.8. Is DocuSign an acceptable approach?</p>	<p>Refer to Final T-4 Functional RTM: FR4.39, FR5.89, FR7.8. A copy of signature submitted electronically will satisfy the requirements. The State is not requiring 'electronic signature' capability.</p>
11	RFP Draft 2, Page 25, Section 4.1 B.1	<p>Members of the Evaluation Committee will individually review and evaluate proposals, including browsing of functionality accessed remotely.</p>	<p>The phrase including browsing of functionality accessed remotely implies the State will have access to a sandbox or test system. We did not find any requests for access to such a system. Please confirm access to a sandbox or test system is not required as part of the evaluation.</p>	<p>Access to a sandbox or test system is not required as part of the evaluation. This requirement has been removed from the RFP.</p>

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	State Response
12	RFP Draft 2, Page 27 Section 4.2 Orals B.	The buyer will create a second set of score sheets by copying the Excel workbook (including the scores entered) and titling each of the score sheets in that workbook as the "Post-Orals/Demonstration" score sheets.	Will the Orals be based only on T4 Functional or will components of T6 Non-Functional also be included? Given the volume of these requirements, will the State be narrowing the list to critical functionality? Will it be allowed to re-sequence the demonstration as long as the requirements are called out for scoring?	An invitation to demo and detailed agenda, which will be based on the RFP and Prospective Contractor's proposal will be issued to the three Prospective Contractors with the highest Technical proposal scores (Refer to RFP 4.2 A). Prospective Contractors will be given at minimum fourteen (14) calendar days notice of the scheduled demo. Prospective Contractor may re-sequence the demonstration covering all agenda items as they see fit.
13	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR1, Line FR1.4	System must provide secure login capabilities. System must provide secure way for all users to obtain their User ID and reset passwords via a web-based tool requiring no interaction with Help Desk personnel. Web-based tool must use security verifications to prevent unauthorized access to the account. Logins must comply with the State's password and security standards.	Best practice to ensure the state standards are met over time is to leverage Single Sign On. Please confirm Single Sign On is an acceptable option.	SSO is not required. Prospective Contractors should thoroughly review the Solicitation requirements and SOW. The State relies on Prospective Contractors to leverage their expertise and propose a solution that is most advantageous to the State.
14	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR1, Line FR1.6	System must provide Security controls using role and/or privilege definitions that define user access to at a minimum: individual system modules, functions within modules, fields on a transaction and values for specific fields on a transaction.	Configuration of security on any field and value becomes a performance issue. There are common "Sensitive" items our customers have asked for special controls on that are standard. Would the State consider an approach of this nature?	This question does not provide the details necessary to sufficiently answer the question. Refer to Final RFP 2.3D(2)(e) System Security.
15	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR1, Line FR1.10	System must have, in all modules, the ability to import and export data in a variety of standard formats, including at a minimum: fixed length, delimited, csv, cXML, text, PDF, Microsoft Word, and Microsoft Excel.	Fixed Length, delimited, csv, cXML, and text can all be derived from Excel. Would export to Excel, Word, and PDF in all modules suffice?	Refer to T-4 Instructions, 'Requirement Met' field.

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	State Response
16	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR1, Line FR1.11	System must provide attachment functionality in all modules with the ability to import and export documents in any file format. System must not restrict the size of any single or set of documents. System must provide the capability to distinguish an attachment as internal only.	We have found support of attachments greater than 100 MB to have an adverse impact on performance and recommend the use of links to document sharing as an alternative. Please confirm this would be an acceptable approach.	Refer to requirement in Final T-4, Tab FR1, Line FR1.11. System must provide attachment functionality in all modules with the ability to import and export documents. System must at minimum, support attachments up to 100 MB. System must provide the capability to distinguish an attachment as internal only.
17	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR3, Line FR3.6	1. Unlimited number of catalogs;	We have found support of greater than 1,000 catalogs to have an adverse impact on performance, but we can support 5,000. To reduce the number of catalogs any customer needs to manage and host we have enabled access to marketplaces like eBay for business where there are thousands of suppliers and millions of items. Would the State be willing to accept a limit of 1,000 internally hosted catalogs?	Refer to Final T-6, Tab I2. On-Going Support Services, Lines I2.27-I2.29 regarding Vendor Catalog Support Services. Refer also to requirement in Final T-4, Tab FR3, Line FR3.6 1. At minimum, 1,000 catalogs;
18	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR3, Line FR3.7	2. Unlimited number of items per catalog;	We have found greater than 100,000 items per catalog to have an adverse impact on performance and we limit this to 500,000. For catalogs greater than 100,000 items we suggest splitting those up. Would the State consider this an acceptable approach?	Refer to requirement in Final T-4, Tab FR3, Line FR3.7 2. At minimum, 100,000 items per catalog
19	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR3, Line FR3.15	10. Items with pricing per thousandth unit	Please clarify the requirement. Are you seeking a Unit of Measure capability with pricing to order per Thousand?	System must allow for pricing to the thousandth of a cent. (i.e. 0.001)
20	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR3, Line FR3.21	16. Unit of measure as defined by UNSPSC item/category code	The most widely accepted international UOM standard is UNUOM (United Nations Units of Measure). This is also known as UN/CEFACT, UNTDED, and UN/ECE in other countries. While not the same as UNSPSC, it does come from the United Nations. ANSI is another very popular UOM code. It makes it easier for the suppliers to provide their catalogs if you adhere to one of these standards. If the suppliers provide one of the codes above, you can always map to the UNSPSC code, but this requires extra effort. Would the State be open to leveraging UNUOM or ANSI?	Refer to requirement in Final T-4, Tab FR3, Line FR3.21 16. Unit of measure as defined by UNUOM and/or ANSI standards (Currently, the State uses the default units of measure provided by the SAP ERP system)
21	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR3, Line FR3.31	System must allow users to specify search parameters and limit results on records returned.	Limiting results led to end user frustration and was largely based on an effort to maintain performance. With the advent of more sophisticated search engines this feature has been removed from most systems so the users can refine from large results easier (see FR3.32 below. Would the State consider removing this requirement to improve end user satisfaction?	Refer to requirement in Final T-4, Tab FR3, Line FR3.31 System must provide sophisticated predictive search engine that allows users to specify search parameters and refine from large results with ease.

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	State Response
22	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR3, Line FR3.34	System must provide the capability for catalogs to be accessible and searchable without requiring the user to login (e.g. public access for read/search only access). Authorized users must have the ability to specify any fields that must not be publicly visible (e.g. Tax ID).	Public access can be achieved with a generic user id and password that is confined to read only permissions. An unlimited number of users can be browsing at the same time under this common user ID. Is this an acceptable approach to meeting this requirement? Administrators can manage visibility of fields in catalogs is easiest by performing a copy then removing the data from the public catalog copy. This view is then the only view available to the public. This approach has been useful for limiting other content as well. Is this an acceptable approach to the requirement?	No.
23	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR4, Line FR4.1	System must provide the capability for a system generated or State assigned official/standard Supplier unique identifier to be used throughout all functional components of the system. The Supplier must have access to the unique identifier for reference.	Please confirm a system generated unique identifier is acceptable as long as the State Assigned vendor number is made available within the system for cross reference as well.	Confirmed. Currently, in the ERP system vendor accounts are grouped using number ranges some of which are system generated and some are manually assigned for specialized grouping.
24	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR4, Line FR4.2	System must integrate with AASIS to ensure consistency of Supplier data between the e-Procurement and Financial systems.	It seems as though the state is predisposed to a certain solution when referring to connections to it's financial system. How will the state ensure a true competitive nature among it's responses?	DFA-OSP is not predisposed to a certain solution, but it will require any e-Procurement Solution it procures to integrate with its ERP system. DFA is committed to an enterprise approach that unifies key information systems throughout the enterprise that would otherwise be fragmented. This improves data sharing throughout DFA because the data is compiled, stored, shared and accessed through a single system to provide enterprise-wide consistency, measurement, and support of transformation efforts. PricewaterhouseCoopers Public Sector (PwC PS), a consultant firm with considerable experience with leading best practices related to e-Procurement and software application delivery, has validated this requirement and noted that "[t]his criterion and the associated functionality requirement should be included in the RFP." DFA-OSP will ensure a fair competition by seeing that all responsive proposals will be evaluated fairly and transparently in accordance with Arkansas Procurement Law and DFA-OSP policy. Please refer to RFP Section 4 <i>Criteria For Selection</i> , which identifies the evaluation criteria and outlines the evaluation process.

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	State Response
25	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR4, Line FR4.2	System must integrate with AASIS to ensure consistency of Supplier data between the e-Procurement and Financial systems.	The standard integration to SAP ECC leverages the Business Partner model so we can support relationships and other features seen in this RFP. It is important to leverage the Business Partner model for the future because the S4HANA system uses the Business Partner Model. Please confirm this is acceptable.	Prospective Contractors should thoroughly review the Solicitation requirements and SOW. The State relies on Prospective Contractors to leverage their expertise and propose a solution that is most advantageous to the State.
26	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR4, Line FR4.3	System must provide the capability to integrate or export Supplier registration data, including uploaded documents, to external State systems.	Please confirm the requirement is to perform an export of Supplier registration data, including uploaded documents so the State can then integrate this data to external systems. The effort to perform the integration to the unnamed systems remains with the State with this clarification.	Yes, the State must have the ability to export Supplier registration data including attachments. Integration to external State systems not identified in this solicitations SOW would be out of scope of the Project.
27	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR4, Line FR4.4	System must provide capabilities for authorized State users to create/maintain Supplier accounts as needed.	Best practice for maintaining supplier data is for the supplier to provide the data in a self service format and the State to approve it. Core data required to perform basic tasks can be maintained in SAP ECC and synchronized to the system to eliminate duplicate entry. Please confirm the creation and maintenance of the core data in SAP for these purposes meets this requirement.	While most data entry can be shifted to the self-service model, the State must maintain the capability for select State users to create accounts on an as-needed basis. Refer to RFP 2.2B3.
28	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR4, Line FR4.7	System must provide the State the ability to designate specific Supplier fields as non-editable by the Supplier once the Supplier is registered. (e.g., Company Name, Tax ID, etc.).	Best practice is for the supplier to maintain their own data with an audit and approval within the State prior to update within the system and then the ECC system. Company Name is a classic example of this with the number of mergers and acquisitions that occur. This approach allows the State to follow the best practice while controlling when the update occurs in your systems. Please confirm a supplier self service to change data with a required approval by the State prior to update meets this requirement.	This requirement has been deleted. Refer to FR4.8. Refer also to requirement FR4.66 As needed, System must provide safeguards in the Supplier Enablement component to protect from data entry errors. (e.g. double entry capability)

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	State Response
29	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR4, Line FR4.12	3. Main telephone number, fax number, and email address. Includes double entry capability of email address to protect from data entry errors.	Designing a self service survey like this to eliminate data entry errors makes sense if the only way data is entered is manual. In more advanced systems the data the supplier provides in a Common profile on the system can be automatically populated into all their customer survey forms without manual entry. This radically reduces the effort for a supplier to respond. In cases where the double entry of these fields is required, it breaks this automation and causes extra effort on the part of the supplier on an ongoing basis. Email validation through a confirmation email is performed as part of account setup regardless of the approach to the surveys. Would the State accept an alternate approach to achieve benefit of reduced data entry errors by automatically populating the basic data from the common profile of the supplier who is already established on the system?	Refer to requirement in Final T-4 Functional RTM, Tab FR4, Line FR4.12 3. Main telephone number, fax number, and email address. Refer also to requirement FR4.66 As needed, System must provide safeguards in the Supplier Enablement component to protect from data entry errors. (e.g. double entry capability)
30	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR4, Line FR4.14	5. Multiple contact persons associated with each location and the phone number, fax number and email address for each contact. Includes double entry capability of email address to protect from data entry errors.	Each location establishes an account on the system with a verification email confirmation for setup. This email address can be automatically mapped to the survey question to eliminate data entry errors. Please confirm this alternative approach to eliminating data entry errors meets this requirement.	Refer to requirement in Final T-4 Functional RTM, Tab FR4, Line FR4.14 5. Multiple contact persons associated with each location and the phone number, fax number and email address for each contact. Refer also to requirement FR4.66 As needed, System must provide safeguards in the Supplier Enablement component to protect from data entry errors. (e.g. double entry capability)
31	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR4, Line FR4.15	6. Federal tax identifier and associated 1099 data for each location with the capability of supporting different tax identifiers for individual locations to support situations such as subsidiaries. Includes double entry capability of tax identifier to protect from data entry errors.	Double Entry of the Tax ID can cause issues with other entry methods that reduce entry errors such as the automatic population from the common profile. Please confirm this alternate approach will meet this requirement.	Refer to requirement in Final T-4 Functional RTM, Tab FR4, Line FR4.15 6. Federal tax identifier and associated 1099 data for each location with the capability of supporting different tax identifiers for individual locations to support situations such as subsidiaries. Refer also to requirement FR4.66 As needed, System must provide safeguards in the Supplier Enablement component to protect from data entry errors. (i.e. double entry capability)

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	State Response
32	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR4, Line FR4.18	9. Item/category codes designating goods and/or services provided. The functionality provided to find/select a code must provide features to help ensure that Suppliers pick an appropriate code by searching all levels of the item/category code hierarchy (Segment, Family, Class and Commodity/Service) and presenting search results in a manner that clearly displays the full item/category hierarchy including the descriptions of the higher code levels.	Will browsing through all levels of UNSPSC with each level displayed meet this requirement?	<p>The State has identified a subset of the UNSPSC codeset which will be relevant for use. Browsing this subset using the standard heirarchy is acceptable.</p> <p>Refer to requirement in Final T-4, Tab FR4, Line FR4.18</p> <p>9. Item/category codes designating goods and/or services provided. The functionality provided to find/select a code must provide features to help ensure that Suppliers pick an appropriate code by browsing all levels of the item/category code hierarchy (Segment, Family, Class and Commodity/Service).</p>
33	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR4, Line FR4.25	2. Address validations (existence & USPS formatting);	Is this data currently automatically validated and reside in the SAP ECC system? Does the State currently have a paid subscription data service to meet this requirement? If so, please provide the name of the supplier and the specific service.	No, the data in SAP ERP is not currently automatically validated. The State does not have a paid subscription data service.
34	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR4, Line FR4.26	3. Email address validations;	Is this data currently automatically validated and reside in the SAP ECC system? Does the State currently have a paid subscription data service to meet this requirement? If so, please provide the name of the supplier and the specific service.	This requirement has been deleted.
35	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR4, Line FR4.27	4. Phone & Fax number validations;	Is this data currently automatically validated and reside in the SAP ECC system? Does the State currently have a paid subscription data service to meet this requirement? If so, please provide the name of the supplier and the specific service.	This requirement has been deleted.

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	State Response
36	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR4, Line FR4.28	5. Debarment status (State and federal);	Is this data currently automatically validated and reside in the SAP ECC system? Please provide details of the online web site to perform validations from the State if available. Please provide details on the web services API from the State if available. Does the State currently have a paid subscription data service for federal Debarment validation? If so, please provide the name of the supplier and the specific service.	This requirement has been deleted.
37	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR4, Line FR4.29	6. Licensure with State;	Is this data currently automatically validated and reside in the SAP ECC system? Please provide details of the online web site to perform validations if available. Please provide details on the web services API if available.	This requirement has been deleted.
38	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR4, Line FR4.30	7. EOD Affirmative Action and disadvantaged business registry and performance;	Is this data currently automatically validated and reside in the SAP ECC system? Does the State currently have a paid subscription data service to meet this requirement? If so, please provide the name of the supplier and the specific service.	This requirement has been deleted.
39	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR4, Line FR4.31	8. State Tax registry;	Is this data currently automatically validated and reside in the SAP ECC system? Please confirm https://www.sos.arkansas.gov/corps/search_all.php is the online version of validation to meet this requirement. Please provide details of a web services API if available.	This requirement has been deleted.
40	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR4, Line FR4.32	9. State Criminal History;	Is this data currently automatically validated and reside in the SAP ECC system? Please confirm https://www.sos.arkansas.gov/corps/search_all.php is the online version of validation to meet this requirement. Please provide details of a web services API if available.	This requirement has been deleted.

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	State Response
41	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR4, Line FR4.33	10. Federal Office of Foreign Assets Control's (OFAC) Specially Designated Nationals List; and	Is this data currently automatically validated and reside in the SAP ECC system? Does the State currently have a paid subscription data service to meet this requirement? If so, please provide the name of the supplier and the specific service.	This requirement has been deleted.
42	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR4, Line FR4.34	11. Secretary of State certification.	Is this data currently automatically validated and reside in the SAP ECC system? Please confirm https://www.sos.arkansas.gov/corps/search_all.php is the online version of validation. Please provide details of a web services API if available.	This requirement has been deleted.
43	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR4, Line FR4.35	System must integrate with the State system used to certify Suppliers for the disadvantaged business program to link certification values to all modules to support disadvantaged business reporting needs.	Is this data currently automatically validated and reside in the SAP ECC system? Please provide details of the online web site to perform validations if available. Please provide details on the web services API if available.	Refer to requirement in Final RFP, Section 2.2 B 5 Arkansas Economic Development Commission (AEDC) has the responsibility of designating suppliers as minorities (disadvantaged businesses) as defined by Arkansas Code Annotated § 15-4-303. Currently, two (2) AEDC staff make this designation in Supplier accounts in the SAP ERP system through a custom developed Web-Dynpro application.
44	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR4, Line FR4.37	System should capture and automatically validate Equal Pay and Human Rights Certification status prior to contract or PO execution, where required.	Best practice is to provide workflow based on a "Qualification" status. This allows for a wide variety of factors to "Disqualify" a supplier. Then a single Qualification workflow rule supports many factors over time with less maintenance. Please confirm a workflow check on Qualification will meet this requirement.	This requirement has been deleted.

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	State Response
	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR4, Lines 45 FR4.39 and FR6.83	Suppliers must have electronic signature capabilities to sign bid/proposal responses, quotes, addendums, amendments, etc. Suppliers must be able to electronically sign their response and any addendums/amendments utilizing an acceptable method, as identified by the State.	Will the State accept the submission of the bid proposals through the system as the signature where the supplier was validated through access to the system and an audit trail is provided? Or are you seeking more formal capabilities like those provided by DocuSign where there is a signature page and you can see the signature of the ranking person signing? Does the State currently have an electronic signature software in place? Electronic Signature systems are in many cases based on the number of transactions (Envelopes) processed. Please provide the total estimated transactions requiring signature for this requirement. For example: what are the total number of bids (including quotes, addendums, amendments, ...) times the number of supplier responses. There may also be a User component to pricing these Electronic Signature systems. Please confirm the 580 procurement specialists (buyers) described in 2.2.B.2 would be the users to initiate these requests for bids.	Refer to Question #10. Refer also to requirements in Final T-4 Functional RTM, Tab FR4, Lines FR4.39 and FR6.83. A copy of signature will satisfy the requirements. The State is not requiring 'electronic signature' capability.
46	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR4, Line FR4.41	1. System must be capable of syncing the vendor self-categorization tree with a the latest version of the item/category code list at the time of registration.	It seems as though the state has decided on a specific vendor categorization approach. How will the state ensure a true competitive nature among it's responses?	Syncing of the vendor self-categorization tree with item/category codes list is existing functionality. DFA-OSP does not want an e-Procurement Solution with less functionality than it currently enjoys in this respect. PricewaterhouseCoopers Public Sector (PWC PS), a consultant firm with considerable experience with leading best practices related to e-Procurement and software application delivery, has validated this requirement and noted that "[t]his criterion and the associated functionality requirement should be included in the RFP." DFA-OSP will ensure each response is fairly evaluated according to the same standard in compliance with Arkansas Procurement Law and OSP Policy, but cannot assure that all competitors are equally capable of meeting its requirements. Please refer to RFP Section 4 <i>Criteria For Selection</i> , which identifies evaluation criteria and outlines the evaluation process.

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	State Response
47	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR4, Line FR4.41	1. System must be capable of syncing the vendor self-categorization tree with a the latest version of the item/category code list at the time of registration.	Please confirm the State will be using UNSPSC codes for this requirement.	The State has identified a subset of the UNSPSC codeset which will be relevant for use.
48	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR4, Line FR4.56	16. Submit order fulfillment status updates including order receipt acknowledgement, processing status and shipping status.	Please confirm the State is seeking suppliers to provide fulfillment updates through specific transactions including order receipt acknowledgement, advance shipping notices, invoices, and order inquiries, and responses to buyer questions in chat.	Confirmed.
49	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR4, Line FR4.63	System must provide a means for a Supplier to sign up for notification/alert when a specific Contract is to be re-solicited.	Best practice is for suppliers to register for all leads based on the commodity codes they support. This would include notifications on all contracts to be re-solicited when the State issues public notice. Please confirm this approach to notification meets this requirement.	Confirmed. Refer to requirement in Final T-4, Tab FR4, Line FR4.63 System must allow Suppliers to register for all leads based on the commodity codes they support. Suppliers must have the ability to manage this list in their supplier account.

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	State Response
50	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR5, Line FR5.4	Need Identification functionality routing business rule must have the ability to support the precedence sequence: 1. Inventory stock, if available for the Agency expressing a 'Need' 2. Internal Services (as applicable) 3. Contract catalogs/punchouts 4. Contracts without catalogs (e.g. SOW situations, Configuration required situations, Services, etc.) 5. Open Market item search, if 'Need' is within procurement dollar thresholds 6. Solicit as either Quick Quote (Informal) or Formal solicitation Definition of the business rule must be State administered, provide flexibility to change the order of precedence and allow the definition of data triggers (e.g. dollars, type such as for emergencies, etc) to override the established precedence.	Please confirm the routing of a Purchase Requisition workflow will meet the intended phrase Need Identification functionality routing business rule ...	Yes, however, a PR is not required for purchases under certain thresholds.
51	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR5, Line FR5.6	System must assign State established, unique, non-duplicating PR number format (e.g. 1000000000, 1000000001, 1000000002).	The system will generate a unique PR. The SAP ECC system is the system of record for all reservations / encumbrances. There is a PR number automatically assigned in ECC for the corresponding system PR with a cross reference. Please confirm the ECC PR number will meet the State Established PR number format in this requirement.	Refer to requirement in Final T-4 Functional RTM, Tab FR5, Line FR5.6 A system generated, State approved, unique, non-duplicating PR number format must be assigned in the eProcurement and the ERP systems. (e.g. 1000000000, 1000000001, 1000000002).
52	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR5, Line FR5.9	System must provide the capability to attach documents of any size or type to individual line items of a PR.	We have found support of attachments greater than 100 MB to have an adverse impact on performance and recommend the use of links to document sharing as an alternative. Please confirm this would be an acceptable approach.	Refer to requirement in Final T-4, Tab FR5, Line FR5.9. System must provide the capability to attach documents to individual line items of a PR.
53	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR5, Line FR5.13	System must allow authorized users to copy all information from an existing PR to a new PR transaction. System must present the attachments available for copying and allow the user to select which to copy/include in new PR.	Our approach is to copy the PR including all attachments then allow the user to make any changes including deletion of attachments. Please confirm this approach to the business requirements meets the need.	Yes, refer to requirement in Final T-4, Tab FR5, Line FR5.13. System must allow authorized users to copy a PR (including all attachments) then allow the user to make changes to the copied PR (including deletion/insertion of attachments, change in quantity, delivery date, account assignment, etc.).

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	State Response
54	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR5, Line FR5.19	System should provide the capability to define input forms that can be searched and used for entry of line items on a PR. Forms should be configurable and definable by individual agency and/or Central Procurement with the ability to limit user access to the form either by agency or role.	User defined forms for entry are presented to the user based on your defined Need Identification tiles so they are easy for the user to find. The configuration of your Need Identification approach includes different views and forms by role. Please confirm this tile approach to finding forms is an acceptable alternative to the "search" definition of this requirement.	This is an optional requirement. Prospective Contractor should provide best practice approach in their proposal.
55	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR5, Line FR5.21	System must provide the capability to select registered Suppliers or internal organizations (government entities providing goods or services) and select a specific fulfillment location and/or payment address, if the selected Supplier/organization has multiple locations/addresses available.	Please confirm the selection of supplier by location if they have multiple meets this need.	Yes, the selection of supplier or internal organization by location (if they have multiple) meets this requirement.
56	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR5, Line FR5.30	System must provide the ability to create line items utilizing catalogs, punch-outs, contracts, direct entry of non-catalog/contract items, and by obtaining/selecting quotes from contract Suppliers. Items selected from a catalog, punch-out or referencing a contract must automatically populate line item fields. Users with appropriate privileges must be able to edit the pre-populated field values including item description, unit price and/or by unit of measure.	Allowing users to change descriptions and prices on contract line items defeats the benefits of compliance against a contract or a supplier provided quote. This is not best practice for compliance. If a user wants to leverage content they can copy / paste into a non-contract line then run through proper approvals based on a non-catalog request. Please confirm this approach will meet the intended need.	Yes, refer to requirement in Final T-4, Tab FR5, Line FR5.30. Users must not be able to edit the pre-populated field values except for unit price. This is needed to allow for greater pricing discounts than is in the catalog, punch-out, or contract/OA.
57	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR5, Line FR5.32	System must provide a configurable rules engine which will allow users to automatically prioritize or limit search results to specific sources (contract catalogs/punchouts, contracts, etc.).	Best practice is to return all results to a user's available catalogs. If you want to limit a user to specific catalogs this can be done through catalog views instead of the search. Please confirm this alternate catalog view approach meets the intent of this requirement.	Refer to requirement in Final T-4, Tab FR5, Line FR5.32. When searching, system must be able to direct users to identified State contracts by commodity or supplier.
58	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR5, Line FR5.33	System must provide a configurable rules engine for direct entry items (e.g. non-catalog). System must direct users to specific sources of supply (contract catalogs/punchouts, contracts, etc.).	Please confirm these are two separate requirements. Please confirm the configurable rules engine for direct entry is to direct the user through the Need Identification system to the appropriate forms, then route the PR through the configured approvals. Please confirm the second requirement is to inform the user of preferred sources of supply for catalogs, contracts, etc. that are in catalogs. These PRs may also go through appropriate approval rules.	Refer to requirement in Final T-4, Tab FR5, Line FR5.33. System must provide a configurable rules engine for direct entry items (e.g. non-catalog).

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	State Response
59	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR5, Line FR5.58	System must allow Approvers to add comments and attachments (any size or type) when they are reviewing/approving/denying the transaction.	We have found support of attachments greater than 100 MB to have an adverse impact on performance and recommend the use of links to document sharing as an alternative. Please confirm this would be an acceptable approach.	Refer to requirement in Final T-4, Tab FR5, Line FR5.58. System must allow Approvers to add comments and attachments when they are reviewing/approving/denying the transaction.
60	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR5, Line FR5.61	System must provide the ability for authorized users to bypass approval requirements or override denials/rejections to approve a PR or PO. System must provide audit functionality to capture this action and require the user to record a reason.	Is it acceptable for the system to Allow a user to record a reason for this action instead of Require a reason?	Refer to requirement in Final T-4, Tab FR5, Line FR5.61. System must provide the ability for authorized users to bypass approval requirements or override denials/rejections to approve a PR or PO. System must provide audit functionality to capture this action.
61	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR5, Line FR5.81	System must assign State established, unique, non-duplicating PO number format (e.g. 4501000000, 4501000001, 4501000002).	The system will generate a unique PO number. The SAP ECC system is the system of record for all reservations / encumbrances. There is a PO number automatically assigned in ECC for the corresponding system PO with a cross reference. Please confirm the ECC PO number will meet the State Established PO number format in this requirement.	Refer to requirement in Final T-4 Functional RTM, Tab FR5, Line FR5.81. A system generated, State approved, unique, non-duplicating PO number format must be assigned in the eProcurement and the ERP systems. (e.g. 4501000000, 4501000001, 4501000002).
62	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR5, Line FR5.86	System must provide the capability to attach documents of any size or type to individual line items.	We have found support of attachments greater than 100 MB to have an adverse impact on performance and recommend the use of links to document sharing as an alternative. Please confirm this would be an acceptable approach.	Refer to requirement in Final T-4, Tab FR5, Line FR5.86. System must provide the capability to attach documents to individual line items.

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	State Response
	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR5, Line 63 FR5.89	System must provide the capability for electronic signature on approved orders based on State specified standards.	Will the State accept the electronic approval through the workflow system as the signature where the user who provides the final approval is validated and an audit trail it captured? Or are you seeking more formal capabilities like those provided by DocuSign where there is a signature page and you can see the signature of the ranking person who signed? Does the State currently have an electronic signature software in place? Electronic Signature systems are in many cases based on the number of transactions (Envelopes) processed. Please confirm the 82,000 PO's described in 2.2.E.3 is the correct transaction count requiring signature for this requirement. There may also be a User component to pricing these Electronic Signature systems. Please confirm the 580 procurement specialists (buyers) described in 2.2.B.2 would be the users to initiate these requests for bids.	Refer to Question #11. Refer also to requirements in Final T-4 Functional RTM, Tab FR5, Line FR5.89. System must provide the capability for a copy of signature to be on approved orders based on State specified standards.
	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR5, Line 64 FR5.99	System must provide the ability for authorized users to create a Purchase Order directly without a Purchase Request, in accordance with dollar threshold and authority restrictions.	We usually see this request to meet specific business needs like FR5.56 to meet emergency issuance of purchase orders. We have found managing workflows within the requisition and having requisitions for all purchase orders a best practice to provide consistency and transparency. Would the State accept an approach where workflow on the requisition allows for exceptions, then a PO is created from the requisition automatically? Is it possible for the State to clarify the underlying business requirement so we might address it in the Requisition process instead of the Purchase Order?	Yes, however, a PR is not required for purchases under certain thresholds.
	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR5, Line 65 FR5.100	System must provide the capability to create a Purchase Order or a release from an existing Contract without a Purchase Request.	We usually see this request to meet specific business needs like FR5.56 to meet emergency issuance of purchase orders. We have found managing workflows within the requisition and having requisitions for all purchase orders a best practice to provide consistency and transparency. Would the State accept an approach where workflow on the requisition allows for exceptions, then a PO is created from the requisition automatically?	No. Not all purchases will require requisitions.

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	State Response
66	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR5, Line FR5.107	P-card functionality must provide p-card administration capabilities that are separate from other system administration functions and include the capability to assign one or more p-cards to a user profile, set dollar limits with minimum and maximum thresholds, temporarily increase dollar limits, deactivate p-cards and review/monitor p-card holder purchase activities. Access to the administration functionality must be restricted to only authorized users.	Would a different approach to managing P-cards be acceptable to the State? For example managing who the P-cards are assigned to within the P-card system instead of the user profile, and managing the maximums through an upload of limits based on category and Agency. Access to administration would still be restricted.	<p>These P-Card functions are currently managed through a web application provided by the issuing bank.</p> <p>Refer to Final T-4 Functional RTM, Tab FR5, Line FR5.107</p> <p>P-card functionality should provide p-card administration capabilities that are separate from other system administration functions and include the capability to assign one or more p-cards to a user profile, set dollar limits with minimum and maximum thresholds, temporarily increase dollar limits, deactivate p-cards and review/monitor p-card holder purchase activities. Access to the administration functionality should be restricted to only authorized users.</p>
67	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR5, Line FR5.108	Authorized users with p-card(s) must have the ability to maintain p-card (number and expiration date) as part of user's profile.	Would a different approach to managing P-cards be acceptable to the State? For example managing who the P-cards are assigned to and the expiration dates within the P-card system instead of the user profile. Access to administration of this data would still be restricted to Pcard administration only instead of individual card holders.	<p>These P-Card functions are currently managed through a web application provided by the issuing bank. The intent behind this particular requirement is to allow an employee who has been issued a credit card for procurement functions to maintain information about that card account (i.e. card number, expiration date) on their procurement user profile so as to manage their specific payment options.</p>
68	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR5, Line FR5.114	3. Provide an automated reconciliation function that matches p-card bank transactions using intelligent rules (e.g. 1st pass based on purchase order number match; 2nd pass based on Supplier and amount match);	Would an automated first pass based on purchase order number and a manual reconciliation thereafter be acceptable?	<p>System must provide automated P-card reconciliation with no manual reconciliation. This reconciliation must include the purchase order number, supplier and amount match.</p>

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	State Response
	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR5, Line 69 FR5.118	7. For unmatched transactions, default chart of account code values from the p-card holders' profile and allow the values to be edited;	Because there may be multiple users assigned to a p-card we default these values based on the user performing the reconciliation. Would this be an acceptable approach?	Each P-Card is assigned to a specific employee. For credit card transactions that are not tied to a purchase order, the user must assign appropriate accounting codes according to the specific purchase so as to allow for proper cost accounting. Currently, this function is performed on a web application provided by the issuing bank. If a user does not assign the accounting values to the transaction before the bank sends the monthly billing file, a default set of codes are substituted in order for the file to be loaded into the State's system. The default values are the same for all cardholders regardless of the person or the agency. The user must then correct the codes in order for the transaction to post for payment. The intent behind this requirement is to provide that functionality within a State system rather than having to depend upon the bank's application.
	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR5, Line 70 FR5.119	8. Provide integration with AASIS budget/funds for verification and to encumber funds;	For all purchases on the cards that originated through the procurement system with a Purchase Order the encumbrance accounting is integrated to ECC. For those charges outside of a Purchase Order (if allowed) we recommend the State process those in the ECC system. Is this an acceptable approach for the State?	Budget encumbrance (without a double encumbrance) is accomplished with the use of purchase orders. The new system must facilitate the creation of all POs including budget encumbrance. The State does not anticipate that budget encumbrance would occur with P-Card transactions that are not part of the PO process, however, the system should provide a way to manage all P-Card activities.
	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR5, Line 71 FR5.125 (See also RFP Draft 2, Page 16, Section 2.2 D)	14. Allow use tax (via the direct pay permit) to be applied on p-card transactions, which must flow to the corresponding p-card vouchers. Currently, a monthly electronic feed is received from the State's p-card Contractor that creates budget-encumbering invoices for remittance of payment to the p-card Contractor.	Does the current process support the Use Tax flow described? If so, would the state be willing to manage these items through the current process?	Yes, the current process does support the Use Tax flow described. P-Card holders provide account allocation specifications, including tax coding, for each card transaction. Currently, this activity occurs on a web application provided by the issuing bank. The resulting data file from the bank is then be uploaded to the SAP ERP system for parking of invoices. The State will transfer the function of classifying card transactions into a State-owned system such as ERP or the proposed e-Procurement system. Refer to Final T-4 Functional RTM, Tab FR5, Line FR5.125 (optional).

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	State Response
	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR5, Lines 72 FR5.126 through FR5.143	Receiving Functionality	We have some options available and would like some input from the State. Is the State open to performing receiving in the current SAP ECC with integration to the procurement system? The advantage to this approach is a reduction in the change management of moving to a replacement of this function.	No.
	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR5, Line 73 FR5.141	System's good receipts data must integrate with AASIS goods receipt solution to provide updated accounting data.	There seems to be a strong correlation between the e-procurement needs and the current ERP solution. How will the state allow for competition for this?	DFA-OSP seeks an e-Procurement Solution that can integrate with its ERP financial system in order to preserve the value of its investment in an enterprise system. However, it is open to proposals from any solution provider that offers to provide this level of integration, even if it has to be custom built. PricewaterhouseCoopers Public Sector (PwC PS), a consultant firm with considerable experience with leading best practices related to e-procurement and software application delivery, has validated this requirement and noted that "[t]his criterion and the associated functionality requirement should be included in the RFP." DFA-OSP will ensure each response is fairly evaluated according to the same standard in compliance with Arkansas Procurement Law and OSP Policy, but cannot assure that all competitors are equally capable of meeting its requirements. Please refer to RFP Section 4 <i>Criteria For Selection</i> , which identifies evaluation criteria and outlines the evaluation process.
74	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR6, Line FR6.27	System must assign State established, unique, non-duplicating solicitation number format (e.g. SP-19-0001).	Please confirm it is acceptable to provide a system generated solicitation number in addition to the State number?	Refer to requirement in Final T-4, Tab FR6, Line FR6.27. System must assign a State approved, unique, non-duplicating solicitation number format. (e.g. SP-19-0001).

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	State Response
	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR6, Line 75 FR6.40	System must provide the capability to include attached documents (any size or type) to a solicitation with the ability to identify, by attachment, whether it is to be viewable by the public. The e-Procurement Sourcing/Bid Management functionality must be capable of publishing attachments with the solicitation in a manner that is easily accessible and downloadable.	We have found support of attachments greater than 100 MB to have an adverse impact on performance and recommend the use of links to document sharing as an alternative. Please confirm this would be an acceptable approach.	Refer to requirement in Final T-4, Tab FR6, Line FR6.40. System must provide the capability to include attached documents to a solicitation with the ability to identify, by attachment, whether it is to be viewable by the public. The e-Procurement Sourcing/Bid Management functionality must be capable of publishing attachments with the solicitation in a manner that is easily accessible and downloadable.
	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR6, Line 76 FR6.51	5. Ability to have an unlimited number of Suppliers/Supplier contacts on the list; and	Public postings and notifications can be unlimited, but we have found 100 shortlisted participants for the full evaluation to be viable limit for performance. Would this be acceptable for the State?	All suppliers registered to receive notification through their supplier account must receive notification. The Buyer/Analyst must also have the ability to submit a suggested supplier list. The suggested supplier list must not be limited, but is not anticipated to exceed 100 email addresses. (See FR6.53)
	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR6, Line 77 FR6.52	6. Ability to include Suppliers that signed up to be notified through their system account.	We provide notification of solicitation separate from active participant lists for a specific event. Please confirm ability to notify suppliers of a solicitation based on their preferences in their account with the option to add them to the participant list meets the requirement.	Yes, this appears to be an acceptable approach. All suppliers registered to receive notification through their supplier account must receive notification. The Buyer/Analyst must also have the ability to submit a suggested supplier list. The suggested supplier list must not be limited, but is not anticipated to exceed 100 email addresses. (See FR6.53)
	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 1, Tab FR6, Line 78 FR6.65	The e-Procurement Sourcing/Bid Management functionality must provide the capability to process changes to a solicitation that are for internal purposes only (e.g. administrative changes) which (1) will not create an Addenda to the solicitation; (2) will not publish to the State public website and (3) will not send electronic notifications to Suppliers.	Could the State provide a use case scenario for this? Why would the State make a change to a formal solicitation that would not be transparent to the vendors and public.	This requirement was removed prior to publishing RFP Draft 2.

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	State Response
	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR6, Line 79 FR6.81	6. Suppliers must be able to submit multiple attachments (any size or type) with their online bid/proposal;	We have found support of attachments greater than 100 MB to have an adverse impact on performance and recommend the use of links to document sharing as an alternative. Please confirm this would be an acceptable approach.	Refer to requirement in Final T-4, Tab FR6, Line FR6.81. 6. Suppliers must be able to submit multiple attachments with their online bid/proposal;
	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR6, Line 80 FR6.84	9. Suppliers must receive an electronic confirmation (email) that their bid/proposal response, modification of their bid/proposal response, and cancellation of a bid/proposal response was received by the system;	Is an electronic confirmation within the system acceptable instead of an email? We have found many suppliers appreciate the flexibility to reduce their notifications as long as there is an audit log.	Refer to requirement in Final T-4, Tab FR6, Line FR6.84. 9. Suppliers must receive an electronic confirmation that their bid/proposal response, modification of their bid/proposal response, and cancellation of a bid/proposal response was received by the system;
	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR6, Line 81 FR6.92	System should provide the capability for online Audit certification of bid/proposal responses prior to initial evaluation of responses by Buyer/Analyst and prevent the Buyer/Analyst from accessing/viewing responses until Audit certification has been obtained. This functionality should be configurable so it can only be applied when required.	A workflow task for Audit approval can easily be established. However, the files would be open at that time to the owner of the project. Please confirm this is an acceptable approach.	This requirement has been deleted.
	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR6, Line 82 FR6.97	3. Ability to have the system hide the name of the Suppliers.	Our approach to meeting this is to provide offline evaluation. Please confirm anonymous evaluation through offline Excel is acceptable.	This requirement has been deleted.
	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR6, Line 83 FR6.111	System must provide the ability for evaluation committee members to enter scores, notes, comments, and/or attachments (any size or type).	We have found support of attachments greater than 100 MB to have an adverse impact on performance and recommend the use of links to document sharing as an alternative. Please confirm this would be an acceptable approach.	Refer to requirement in Final T-4, Tab FR6, Line FR6.111. System must provide the ability for evaluation committee members to enter scores, notes, comments, and/or attachments.

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	State Response
84	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR6, Line FR6.123	7. Sourcing/Bid Management functionality must provide the capability to support business rules to determine that external agency approval is required and integrate with the external agency's system to automate creation of the review/approval request with data from the intended solicitation award in that system and receive automated approval/denial for the solicitation award.	Please confirm the integration requirement is to provide the application program interface for approvals to external systems with return information into our system while the actual integration to these unnamed external systems is performed by the State.	This requirement has been deleted.
85	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR6, Line FR6.131	System should provide a means to track work State procurement offices perform for Agencies with the ability to set service fee rates and calculate billable amounts. Billable amounts should be interfaced to the State financial system for invoicing to Agencies.	Please confirm you are seeking integration directly to Accounts Receivable and not to Sales and Distribution.	Refer to requirement in Final T-4, Tab FR6, Line FR6.131. System should provide a means to track work Central Procurement performs for Agencies with the ability to set service fee rates and calculate billable amounts using cost allocations through Accounts Receivable. Billable amounts should be interfaced to the State financial system for invoicing to Agencies.
86	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR6, Line FR6.135	System must provide the capability to support multiple units of measure for a item/category code with conversions between each that can be used on solicitations and bid/proposal responses submitted by a Supplier.	Units of measure can be a great source of confusion. Best practice is to keep it simple and use a single measure. Will the State consider making this an optional requirement?	While units of measure can be a source of confusion, there remains a need to be able to specify a price by one unit and order by another unit (e.g. price per can of tomatoes and order by the case).
87	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR7, Line FR7.7	System must be capable of creating a contract from a selected bid/proposal on a solicitation, bringing forward Supplier information, scope, terms and conditions, mutually agreed upon changes/revisions and pricing detail information that will populate the selected contract template.	We support this concept, but accomplish it with concurrent solicitation negotiation and contract development. There is limited Clarification space in the Excel document. Should we reference our detailed explanation in the T-5 Functional Approach document or try to summarize within the Excel document with a restatement of the requirement?	The 'Suggested Clarifying Comments' column is set to wrap-text and should provide ample room for Prospective Contractor to provide brief explanation. The Prospective Contractor should provide a more detailed explanation in T-5 where appropriate.

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	State Response
88	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR7, Line FR7.8	System must provide the capability for electronic signature on approved contracts/OAs for both the State and the Supplier, based on State specified standards.	Please confirm the State specified standards would be met with a system like DocuSign where there are signature pages, the documents are routed to the various parties, and you can see the signatures on the document will meet the State specified standards.	Refer to Question #11. Refer also to requirements in Final T-4 Functional RTM, Tab FR7, Line FR7.8. System must provide the capability for a copy of signature on approved contracts/OAs for both the State and the Supplier, based on State specified standards.
89	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR7, Line FR7.19	System must provide the capability to enter payment retainage, withholding and retention amounts with descriptions, and amounts set as percentages or dollar values that are withheld until final approval of contract/OA deliverables.	The execution of these items is best managed in the SAP ECC system where the accounting takes place. Is acceptable to the State to execute these in ECC and document them within the procurement system?	No.
90	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR7, Line FR7.21	System must allow attachment of any size or type of document and designate them as proprietary/confidential, for internal use only or as a public document.	We have found support of attachments greater than 100 MB to have an adverse impact on performance and recommend the use of links to document sharing as an alternative. Please confirm this would be an acceptable approach.	Refer to requirement in Final T-4, Tab FR7, Line FR7.21. System must allow attachments to be designated as proprietary/confidential, for internal use only or as a public document.
91	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR7, Line FR7.23	System must have validations to prevent backdated (prior to current date) contract/OA effective dates. An 'override' capability must be available, requiring special Role assignment, to address exception situations and the initial entry of existing contracts/OAs into the system as part of system implementation.	Please confirm validations in the workflow approval process will meet this requirement.	Yes, this appears to be an acceptable approach.
92	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR7, Line FR7.25	System must provide the capability to establish specified default coding values (i.e. project, grant, Supplier codes, line item codes, agency codes, item/category codes, etc.) to be used with orders from the contracts/OAs. System must also allow for reminders to be configured when certain contract maintenance activities must be performed (e.g. default account code updates).	The execution of these reminders is best managed in the SAP ECC system where the accounting takes place. Is acceptable to the State to execute the reminders in ECC OA and reference the OA in the procurement system?	This requirement has been deleted.

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	State Response
93	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR7, Line FR7.27	System must provide a means to capture subcontractor or reseller/dealer detailed information including scope and value of the products/services to be provided as either amount or percentage and allow the attachment of associated documents (any size or type).	We have found support of attachments greater than 100 MB to have an adverse impact on performance and recommend the use of links to document sharing as an alternative. Please confirm this would be an acceptable approach.	Refer to official requirement in T-4, Tab FR7, Line FR7.27. System must provide a means to capture subcontractor or reseller/dealer detailed information including scope and value of the products/services to be provided as either amount or percentage and allow the attachment of associated documents .
94	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR7, Line FR7.40	System must provide posting capability to a State public contracts website ...	Many of the other references to a public website clearly indicate the website is to be provided by the system. Please confirm the intent for this requirement is for the system to provide the public website and the capability to post the items following this requirement.	Yes, the website is to be provided by the Contractor.
95	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR7, Line FR7.56	System must have the capability to facilitate the invoicing and collection process for any contract fee assessed to a contractor.	Procurement systems don't typically do invoicing and collections. Is the State willing to execute these within the current SAP ECC Accounts Receivable or Sales and Distribution modules with input from the Contracts system?	This requirement has been deleted.
96	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR7, Line FR7.57	System must have the capability to allow authorized users to suspend a delinquent (i.e. unpaid fees, failure to submit required reports or documents) contractor's contract/catalog(s) based on alerts triggered by State-defined thresholds (i.e. dollar amount or number of days late).	Procurement systems don't typically do invoicing and collections. Is the State willing to manage the alerts on unpaid fees, dollar amount or days late within the current SAP ECC Accounts Receivable or Sales and Distribution modules?	Refer to requirement in Final T-4, Tab FR7, Line FR7.57. System must have the capability to allow authorized users to suspend a delinquent supplier's contract/catalog(s).
97	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR7, Line FR7.68	1. ability to create encumbrances;	Our approach to encumbrance accounting is to provide a real time integration through Requisitions and Purchase Orders. It is possible to associate these with a contract for reference. Please confirm it is acceptable to manage contract encumbrances through related Requisitions and Purchase Orders.	Yes, this appears to be an acceptable approach. The State's business process is to establish pre-encumbrance on the PR and encumbrance on the PO.

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	State Response
98	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR7, Line FR7.69	2. ability to track payments against the contract;	Our approach to payment tracking is through Requisitions and Purchase Orders. It is possible to associate these with a contract for reference and provide a drill down inquiry from the contract into the detailed orders and payments. Please confirm it is acceptable to manage contract payment tracking through related Requisitions and Purchase Orders.	Yes, this appears to be an acceptable approach.
99	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR7, Line FR7.70	3. ability to verify budget/funds;	Our approach to budget checking is to provide a real time integration through Requisitions and Purchase Orders to the ECC Funds Management system. It is possible to associate these with a contract for reference. Please confirm it is acceptable to manage contract budget / funds checking through related Requisitions and Purchase Orders.	Yes, this appears to be an acceptable approach. The State's business process is to establish pre-encumbrance on the PR and encumbrance on the PO.
100	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR7, Line FR7.71	4. ability to track offset for failed SLR.	The calculation and tracking of the offset can be managed in the procurement system. The execution of these items to apply a credit against specific invoices is best managed in the SAP ECC Accounts Payable system where the accounting takes place. Is acceptable to the State to execute these in ECC Accounts Payable and document them in the procurement system?	This requirement has been deleted.
101	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR7, Line FR7.73	System should provide a means to track work by Central Procurement performed for agencies with the ability to set service fee rates and calculate billable amounts. Billable amounts would be interfaced with AASIS to invoice agencies for payment.	Please confirm you are seeking integration to Accounts Receivable within ECC.	This requirement has been deleted. Refer to Question #85.
102	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR8, Line FR8.33	System must be able to integrate data to the State's existing Enterprise Data Warehouse or reporting functionality.	Please confirm the availability of an open application program interface to extract the data to then be integrated by the State to the Enterprise Data Warehouse meets this requirement.	This requirement has been deleted.

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	State Response
103	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR8, Line FR8.37	System must have the capability to incorporate federal reporting requirements in standard report formats with the ability to have electronic submission of final reports to appropriate federal entity.	Since the ECC system is the financial system of record, the best practice is to develop reporting out of this system for federal reports and submissions. Is the State open to this approach? Can you please identify the specific reports you need?	This requirement has been deleted.
104	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR8, Line FR8.38	The fully integrated system must have the capability to transfer external data to the e-Procurement system for more comprehensive reporting (e.g. State's enterprise data warehouse, inventory system on-hand balances, ERP approval process data, alternate data rollup data such as Legislative Districts, payments, etc.)	Our system supports the reverse of this process to export data through an open application program interface. We have found most enterprises prefer this because they have more information in their Enterprise system than in the procurement system. Would the State be open to this alternative approach to consolidating all reporting into an Enterprise reporting system?	Refer to official requirement in T-4, Tab FR8, Line FR8.38. The fully integrated system should have the capability to transfer external data to the e-Procurement system for more comprehensive reporting (e.g. State's enterprise data warehouse, inventory system on-hand balances, ERP approval process data, alternate data rollup data such as Legislative Districts, payments, etc.)
105	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR8, Line FR8.38	The fully integrated system must have the capability to transfer external data to the e-Procurement system for more comprehensive reporting (e.g. State's enterprise data warehouse, inventory system on-hand balances, ERP approval process data, alternate data rollup data such as Legislative Districts, payments, etc.)	There seems to be a strong correlation between the e-procurement needs and the current ERP solution's proprietary data. How will the state allow for competition for this?	DFA-OSP is required to perform substantial amounts of reporting regarding the State's procurement activity and the State's expenditures, some of which will be external to the e-Procurement Solution. Consequently, DFA-OSP seeks an e-Procurement Solution with robust and comprehensive reporting capacity that will be capable of transferring external data to the e-Procurement system as required in the RFP. DFA-OSP will ensure each response is fairly evaluated according to the same standard in compliance with Arkansas Procurement Law and OSP Policy, but cannot assure that all competitors are equally capable of meeting its requirements. Please refer to RFP Section 4 <i>Criteria For Selection</i> , which identifies evaluation criteria and outlines the evaluation process.

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	State Response
106	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR9, Line FR9.2	1. Recognition of Fund Accounting reporting and balancing. Fund Accounting is the management of accounts by purpose or use. Revenues are entered based upon the requirement of said collection. Comprehensive Annual Financial Reports are dependent upon the accurate reporting of funding accounting. (Example: Special License Plate Fees – numerous fees are collected but each has a special requirement and use.)	The ECC system is the system of record for all encumbrance accounting with real time integration. As such, all financial records will be available in ECC. Please confirm this approach meets this requirement.	Confirmed.
107	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR9, Line FR9.12	1. Recognition of State's Use Tax business process and the continued ability to remit timely without duplication. Configuration is completed to allow for the recognition of a liability at the time a good receipt is entered or a direct invoice is paid. At the end of the month a single payment is payment to net against the liability.	There are options available to support this requirement and we would like input from the State. If receiving is done within ECC and the resulting receipt moved into the procurement system, then by definition the accounting requirements here would be met if you have the current system configured as described. This approach has the benefit of reduced change management on receiving and accounting. Is the State open to this approach?	Receiving must occur in the e-Procurement system. The e-Procurement system must integrate with ERP (AASIS) which will process payment, encumber funds and prevent deficit spending; ensuring continued integrity of the system of record. Refer to Final T-4, Tab FR9.
108	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR9, Line FR9.28	Invoicing	We have some options available and would like some input from the State. Is the State open to performing invoice processing and matching in the current SAP ECC with electronic submission of invoices as input? The advantage to this approach is a reduction in the change management of moving to a replacement of this function while radically reducing the current effort of invoice input.	Refer to Question #1, invoice matching will occur in the eProcurement system, however, the eProcurement system must be integrated with the ERP system (AASIS) so matching will occur in both eProcurement and the ERP system (AASIS). Invoice processing must occur in the ERP system (AASIS).

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	State Response
109	T-4 Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab FR9, Multiple Lines	Many seem as if can only be done by financial system; at least in a cost effective manner.	We understand a need to successfully integrate with financial system data. However most verbiage seems to be leaning toward that of a one-system solution. How does the state plan on opening that interpretation up for competition beyond that of the existing company?	DFA-OSP is seeking an end-to-end eProcurement Solution that integrates with DFA's financial system data, and plans to open this opportunity to competition through competitive sealed proposals. PricewaterhouseCoopers Public Sector (PwC PS), a consultant firm with considerable experience with leading best practices related to e-Procurement and software application delivery, has validated this requirement and noted that "[t]his criterion and the associated functionality requirement should be included in the RFP." The RFP is structured so as to allow competing vendors to propose how they would meet this requirement, which may be through custom development if this functionality is not a native feature of the e-Procurement software a Prospective Contractor wishes to incorporate into its proposal. All proposals will be evaluated fairly against the same evaluation factors, in accordance with Arkansas Procurement Law and OSP policy. Please refer to RFP Section 4 <i>Criteria For Selection</i> , which identifies the evaluation criteria and outlines the evaluation process. Prospective Contractors should thoroughly review the Solicitation requirements and SOW and submit a proposal, which will be evaluated based on the Solicitation requirements.
110	T-5 Functional Requirements Approach Draft 2, Page 3, Paragraph 3	The Prospective Contractor should use these response sections to provide specific details of the proposed approach to meeting DFA requirements in each area. Responses should, when necessary, reference requirements using the appropriate Requirement Numbers from Template T-4 – Functional Requirements Traceability Matrix. Refer to the Business Narratives Document in the Procurement Library for additional details on the selected functional areas.	Please clarify the expectations for T-5 Functional Requirements document. Please confirm the sentence "Responses should, when necessary, reference requirements using the appropriate Requirement Numbers from Template T-4 – Functional Requirements Traceability Matrix." means the State is NOT seeking a discussion on each specific requirement in the matrix, but rather a discussion at a high level of the specific tab within the matrix with occasional references back to specific requirements where appropriate for clarity.	The State is not seeking a detailed discussion of each specific requirement. A high level discussion with appropriate references to some specific requirements will be sufficient. The intent of this template is for the evaluators to develop confidence in the respondent's understanding of the State intent, and to communicate their unique and expert approach to meeting the requirements in T4- Functional RTM. Refer to Response Template T-5 Functional Requirements Approach Instructions on page 2. Prospective Contractor should provide a detailed narrative overview of how the proposed solution will meet the e-Procurement functional requirements.
111	T-6 Non Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab G1, Line G1.13	The e-Procurement Solution should provide drop down and list boxes for all key entry, and text entry must display filtered values for selection (system based auto fill) (but specifically disallow client browser based auto fill).	If a particular field is set up for a drop-down single/multi-select response, the system will only allow the user to select from a valid list of options. Conversely, a field set up for free text entry will not validate or prevent the user from entering invalid content nor will it disallow browser based auto-fill features. What is it the State is trying to prevent by disallowing client browser-based auto-fill?	This requirement has been deleted.

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	State Response
112	T-6 Non Functional RTM Draft 1, Tab G1, Line G1.37	The e-Procurement Solution must provide the ability for on-line access by any site connected to the State Wide Area Network (WAN).	Is this requirement applicable to a SaaS solution that is browser based? Is this requirement tied to single sign on? Please explain.	SSO is not required. The referenced requirement was changed to "System's public facing portal must be linked through DFA-OSP's website." prior to publishing Draft 2.
113	T-6 Non Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab G2, Line G2.13	The system must be capable of receiving notification from the personnel administration system when a personnel action occurs that requires the system administrator to lock a user ID and restrict access to the system.	It seems the state is very predisposed to a specific system. This requirement seems to have a specific link to HR modules that only reside in the ERP. How will the state allow for competition from a best of breed procurement company for this?	If someone's employment is terminated or suspended, or their password is compromised, DFA-OSP must be able to restrict their access to the system. Exclusion of this requirement, and the resulting lack of a basic safeguard, would result in an exploitable vulnerability that would put the system at risk. Consequently, the system must be capable of receiving notification from the personnel administration system when a personnel action occurs that requires the system administrator to lock a user ID and restrict access to the system. Although the State is not predisposed to any particular e-Procurement software, it is committed to ensuring that whatever solution it selects from the competing proposals can provide this safeguard, whether it exists in the off the shelf software a Prospective Contractor wishes to propose as part of a comprehensive solution or needs to be developed. DFA-OSP believes that multiple providers of best of breed procurement solutions will indicate in their proposals that they can satisfy this requirement. All responsive proposals will be evaluated fairly against the same evaluation factors in accordance with Arkansas Procurement Law and OSP policy. Please refer to RFP Section 4 <i>Criteria For Selection</i> , which identifies evaluation criteria and outlines the evaluation process.
114	T-6 Non Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab G4, Line G4.12	Bill of Material	The Bill of Material integration is usually required for organization who are trying to source a set of requirement to manufacture products. This type of sourcing is available, but comes at as an additional option. Please confirm the State needs this integration to Sourcing to build products.	This requirement has been deleted.
115	T-6 Non Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab G4, Line G4.13	Material Master	The Material Master integration is usually required for organization who are trying to source a set of requirement to manufacture products or planning to perform purchasing within ECC. This type of sourcing is available, but comes at as an additional option. Please confirm the State needs this integration to Sourcing to build products.	The State does not use Material Master integration for Sourcing to build products. The State uses material master data to identify goods and services in a standardized way on purchasing documents and to provide for procurement controls and analytics.
116	T-6 Non Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab G4, Line G4.22	Cost Center Languages - Description is USD	Please clarify if you are seeking language translations or currency conversions.	Any currency in cost center function will be in USD.

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	State Response
117	T-6 Non Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab G4, Line G4.40	Purchasing Organization Supplier Combo The description is: Is SRM (Supplier Relationship Mgt) and SCM (Supply Chain Mgt) configuration required?	It would be unusual for the State to run SRM and SCM. Please confirm the State is not running SRM and SCM.	The State is not running SRM. The State is also not not running SCM. Refer to requirement in Final T-6 Non Functional RTM, Tab G4, Line G4.40 Purchasing Organization Supplier Combo -- Some Suppliers are purchasing org specific.
118	T-6 Non Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab G4, Line G4.46	Material PO	This integration is available as an additional cost item. This is used when the State plans to run MM to generate requisitions and Purchase Orders within ECC then collaborate with the supplier on these instead of leveraging the proposed procurement system to create the requisition and Purchase Order. Please confirm the State wants this integration because they plan to manage procurement of inventory items through MM.	Confirmed.
119	T-6 Non Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab G4, Line G4.54	Expense report	We did not see any Expense Report requirements in the functional matrix. Please clarify the need for this interface and if there is a functional requirement for expense report processing, please direct us to the requirement.	This requirement has been deleted.
120	T-6 Non Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab G4, Line G4.52 and G4.74	Service Entry Sheet	Service Entry Sheet' appears in 52 and 74. Please confirm.	Refer to requirement in Final T-6, Tab G4, Line G4.52 Service Master.
121	T-6 Non Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab T4, Line T4.1	The e-Procurement Solution must provide content management features that incorporate data archiving capabilities at a minimum.	Is archiving a required function? If the solution does not archive any data but keeps it all data available real-time would that be acceptable?	Yes, this would be acceptable. Refer to requirement in Final T-6 Non Functional RTM, Tab T4, Line T4.1 The e-Procurement Solution must provide content management features that should incorporate data archiving capabilities.
122	T-6 Non Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab T5	Entire worksheet T5.01 - T5.08.01	For SaaS based solution providers, please explain the relevance of Tab 5 - Architectural Components. Is this required for SaaS providers?	Tab 5: Architectural Components has been removed from the Final T-6 Response Template.

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	State Response
123	T-6 Non Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab I1	Describe Prospective Contractor's approach for training and education of its personnel, both initially and ongoing.	Will training need to include non-State participants (vendors, partners, etc.?)	Refer to requirement in Final T-6 Non Functional RTM, Tab I1, Line I1.30. At minimum, Contractor must provide suppliers up-to-date online tutorial/instructional training on system functionality.
124	T-6 Non Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab I1	Migration, Organizational Change Management (OCM), Training, and Knowledge Transfer (KT) Requirements	Does the State have a survey tool that it utilizes? If so, what is it?	No.
125	T-6 Non Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab I2	Help Desk Support Requirements	Will the State's ITSM system (problem management) be used to log incidents, issues and problems or is the successful vendor expected to provide their ITSM system?	Refer to requirement in Final T-6 Non Functional RTM, Tab I2, Line I2.13(a). The Contractor must provide an ITSM system to log incidents, issues, and problems.
126	T-6 Non Functional RTM Draft 2, Tab O3	Project Description The State has recognized a need to improve the coding of material and service acquisitions for better spend management. The State plans to transition from using a customized NIGP classification system to the UNSPSC classification system prior to the e-Procurement Contractor migrating any active procurement documents into the e-Procurement Solution. The State anticipates using a 9-digit material group code, of which 8-digits are standard UNSPSC, plus 1-digit as a business function code for workflow. For example, Nursing - Technical Service - New Material Group Number: 851016013 Nursing - Professional Service - New Material Group Number: 851016015	Adding an additional digit to the UNSPSC will create a CUSTOM classification system. This will break the automated synchronization the State wants in the Supplier Self Service registration and it will force ALL catalogs to have an extra mapping process. If the objective is to manage workflow, we strongly suggest leveraging another field to manage this. Please clarify the business requirement behind the workflow so we can explore options.	The objective is to manage workflows. Based on the State's legislative and executive requirements, some products and services must be classified into two different categories of approvals (TGS and PCS). The goal is for the business process to be driven automatically, without user intervention, to the appropriate approval process. The State can use the standard UNSPSC number. The State is open to other creative options that can address the required workflow management capability.

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	State Response
127	T-7 Non Functional Requirements Approach Draft 2, Response No. 3.3	<p>Describe the Prospective Contractor’s approach for the e-Procurement Solution to meet I1. Training Requirements. In addition to describing the approach, include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prospective Contractor should provide a Training Plan that, at a minimum, identifies the method of training recommended for the various users of the Solution. 2. The Training Plan should address the training methods that will be employed, such as, on-site instructor lead, computer-based classroom training, web-based instructor lead training (e.g. webinar session), 3. Proposals should include links to examples of training materials that would be used in conjunction with the Training Plan. 4. Other recommendations and/or lessons learned regarding post-implementation training 	What if any responsibility will the selected vendor have for training on the integration with the other SAP non-eProcurement modules?	<p>Refer to requirement in Final T-6 Non Functional RTM, Tab I1, Line I1.31.</p> <p>The Contractor must train appropriate State personnel on the changes to business processes impacted by the eProcurement implementation.</p>
128	T-7 Non Functional Requirements Approach Draft 2, Response No. 3.3	<p>Describe the Prospective Contractor’s approach for the e-Procurement Solution to meet I1. Training Requirements. In addition to describing the approach, include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prospective Contractor should provide a Training Plan that, at a minimum, identifies the method of training recommended for the various users of the Solution. 2. The Training Plan should address the training methods that will be employed, such as, on-site instructor lead, computer-based classroom training, web-based instructor lead training (e.g. webinar session), 3. Proposals should include links to examples of training materials that would be used in conjunction with the Training Plan. 4. Other recommendations and/or lessons learned regarding post-implementation training 	Will the State provide classrooms for training delivery (Train-the-Trainer)?	Yes, the State can provide classrooms for training. Refer to T-3, Section 3.0(B)(2).

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	State Response
129	T-7 Non Functional Requirements Approach Draft 2, Response No. 3.3	<p>Describe the Prospective Contractor’s approach for the e-Procurement Solution to meet I1. Training Requirements. In addition to describing the approach, include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prospective Contractor should provide a Training Plan that, at a minimum, identifies the method of training recommended for the various users of the Solution. 2. The Training Plan should address the training methods that will be employed, such as, on-site instructor lead, computer-based classroom training, web-based instructor lead training (e.g. webinar session), 3. Proposals should include links to examples of training materials that would be used in conjunction with the Training Plan. 4. Other recommendations and/or lessons learned regarding post-implementation training 	Does the State plan on printing training materials?	No. Online training materials are acceptable. Users must have the ability to print online training materials.
130	T-7 Non Functional Requirements Approach Draft 2, Response No. 3.3	<p>Describe the Prospective Contractor’s approach for the e-Procurement Solution to meet I1. Training Requirements. In addition to describing the approach, include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prospective Contractor should provide a Training Plan that, at a minimum, identifies the method of training recommended for the various users of the Solution. 2. The Training Plan should address the training methods that will be employed, such as, on-site instructor lead, computer-based classroom training, web-based instructor lead training (e.g. webinar session), 3. Proposals should include links to examples of training materials that would be used in conjunction with the Training Plan. 4. Other recommendations and/or lessons learned regarding post-implementation training 	Does the State have a current training team and if so how many instructors do they have on their team?	This is undetermined at this time. The State is open to recommendations from the Contractor related to required resources and capabilities.

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	State Response
131	T-7 Non Functional Requirements Approach Draft 2, Response No. 3.3	<p>Describe the Prospective Contractor's approach for the e-Procurement Solution to meet I1. Training Requirements. In addition to describing the approach, include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prospective Contractor should provide a Training Plan that, at a minimum, identifies the method of training recommended for the various users of the Solution. 2. The Training Plan should address the training methods that will be employed, such as, on-site instructor lead, computer-based classroom training, web-based instructor lead training (e.g. webinar session), 3. Proposals should include links to examples of training materials that would be used in conjunction with the Training Plan. 4. Other recommendations and/or lessons learned regarding post-implementation training 	Does the State have a Learning Management System (LMS) for scheduling training and publishing Computer Based Training (CBTs)? If so, what LMS does it use?	Yes, SAP Enterprise Learning.
132	T-7 Non Functional Requirements Approach Draft 2, Response No. 3.3	<p>Describe the Prospective Contractor's approach for the e-Procurement Solution to meet I1. Training Requirements. In addition to describing the approach, include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prospective Contractor should provide a Training Plan that, at a minimum, identifies the method of training recommended for the various users of the Solution. 2. The Training Plan should address the training methods that will be employed, such as, on-site instructor lead, computer-based classroom training, web-based instructor lead training (e.g. webinar session), 3. Proposals should include links to examples of training materials that would be used in conjunction with the Training Plan. 4. Other recommendations and/or lessons learned regarding post-implementation training 	Does the State have a centralized location that they can use to post training materials? If do, what system (SharePoint, etc?)	DFA-OSP uses SharePoint and currently posts training materials to the DFA-OSP website.

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	State Response
133	C-1 Official Price Sheet Draft 2, Tab 1, Line 19	1. Business Transaction Surcharge Costs (as applicable)	The 2nd draft RFP does not appear to be open to the concept of optional pricing and/or optional funding. Specifically in the cost workbook we did not see the opportunity to propose any alternate approaches. In fact, the cost workbook has vendor specific pricing terminology to allow for "additional" vendor charges based on surcharge for business transactions completed on top of the standard SaaS. If the state is open to flexible/optional models, how does the state plan to score these models?	Refer to Final Official Price Sheet of the official RFP. Table 4 is designed to be sufficiently flexible to meet a range of SaaS costing models and Table 7 expressly allows for other optional models to be proposed. To ensure a uniform comparison, however, all proposals are being required to supply a cost in the same format. Cost scoring will be based on the lowest seven (7) year total cost of ownership as shown in Table 1. Table 1 will be automatically populated with information in Tables 2-6 and Table 8. Refer to RFP Section 4.3 Cost Score. As a matter of law, the State retains the discretion to award a contract to the responsible offeror whose proposal is determined in writing to be the most advantageous to the State, taking into consideration price, the evaluation factors set forth in the request for proposals, and the results of any discussions conducted with responsible offerors.
134	C-1 Official Price Sheet Draft 2, Tab 4, Lines 21-32	Ongoing Usage Costs based on Volumes: Item 1 (usage volumetric assumption x annual fee)	As in the question above. It appears as though the state is predisposed to a particular vendor's pricing structure. Volumetric pricing discourages maximum utilization of a system. How will the State score SaaS plus volumetric vs. all inclusive SaaS?	Refer to Final Official Price Sheet of the official RFP. Table 4 is designed to be sufficiently flexible to meet a range of SaaS costing models and Table 7 expressly allows for other optional models to be proposed. Cost scoring will be based on the lowest seven (7) year total cost of ownership as shown in Table 1. Table 1 will be automatically populated with information in Tables 2-6 and Table 8. Refer to RFP Section 4.3 Cost Score.
135	C-1 Official Price Sheet Draft 2, Tab 8	The Material Master Replacement costs must include all activities required to complete the project, as described in Template T-6, tab O3 Material Master Replacement Project. Insert additional rows as necessary. It is the responsibility of the Prospective Contractor to ensure spreadsheet calculations are correct. The table below is intended to be flexible for Prospective Contractors. Use the Cost Assumptions tab to clarify any assumptions related to on-going support costs. All costs must be fully inclusive.	Has the State already initiated this process? Please explain why this is optional.	Refer to Final T-6, Tab O3. Material Master Replacement Project. The Material Master Replacement Project (MMR Project) is being included in the RFP as a mandatory project. The State has taken preliminary steps to move to the United Nations Standard Products and Services Code (UNSPSC) to better align itself with the majority trend in eCommerce.