

Vendor Questions and Answers
RFP 23RFP9328: ERP Independent Verification and Validation Services
as of 12/22/2023

This document provides updated information and clarification pertaining to the above captioned RFP and will be updated as necessary.

Link to RFP for reference purposes:

https://bfm.sd.gov/solicitations/23RFP9328_ivv.pdf

REMINDER: It is the Offeror's responsibility to thoroughly examine and read the entire RFP document and any appendices and addenda to the RFP.

#	Question	State's Response
1	We recognize the importance of relevant experience to provide effective support to such a large, complex information system experience. That noted, we believe that – particularly in an IV&V role – extensive private sector and public sector ERP system implementation experience in conjunction with broad information system implementation experience from multiple sectors and industries will be critical to serving as an advisor to BFM and an effective overseer of the ERP system project. As such, we respectfully request that BFM allow vendors with a different set of experiences than those currently required in the RFP to submit proposals.	<p>The minimum requirements remain unchanged. In order for proposals to qualify for acceptance and evaluation by the State, prospective offerors must meet the mandatory requirement as set forth in the RFP. For reference, please note the minimum qualification below (RFP Section 2.0):</p> <p>The following minimum qualification is established for a firm to qualify to provide IV&V services for the State's ERP modernization project. The offeror should describe how their firm meets the following minimum qualification:</p> <p>1. Have provided, or are in the process of providing, IV&V services on at least three (3) engagements for the implementation of entity-wide ERP projects for governments meeting one of the following conditions:</p> <p>a. U.S. state government; or a</p> <p>b. U.S. city or county government or a public institution of higher education of comparable size and complexity to the State. For the purposed of this RFP, "comparable size and complexity" is defined as an annual budget of at least \$1 billion and a minimum of 8,000 full-time employees.</p>
2	Can the experience of individual team members be counted towards meeting the experience requirement?	No.
3	Can South Dakota information system experience (i.e. experience working with other South Dakota state government agencies), even if it is not specific to ERP system projects, be counted towards meeting the experience requirement?	No.
4	In the RFP, it is mentioned, "The offeror should respond to each point in Section 5.0 SCOPE OF WORK and Section 7.6 DELIVERABLES in the order they were presented." Where should we include 5.0 SCOPE OF WORK and 5.1 OVERVIEW within the proposal response?	RFP Sections 7.3 (Corporate Qualifications), 7.4 (Relevant Project Experience), 7.5 (Project Plan), 7.6 (Deliverables, and 7.7 (Team Organization and Staffing) are the platform for respondents to provide responses to each point stated in Section 5.0 (Scope of Work).
5	Is the State willing to consider a Canadian province as one of the three (3) engagements for the implementation of entity-wide ERP projects for governments?	Please note the State's response to Inquiry #1. The minimum requirements must be met as set forth in the RFP.

Vendor Questions and Answers
RFP 23RFP9328: ERP Independent Verification and Validation Services
as of 12/22/2023

This document provides updated information and clarification pertaining to the above captioned RFP and will be updated as necessary.

Link to RFP for reference purposes:

https://bfm.sd.gov/solicitations/23RFP9328_ivv.pdf

REMINDER: It is the Offeror's responsibility to thoroughly examine and read the entire RFP document and any appendices and addenda to the RFP.

#	Question	State's Response
6	We understand the State is looking for no more than 1.5 FTE involvement for IV&V services. Is the State expecting a resource that will be dedicated full-time to the Project, or would the State prefer a team of several partially dedicated resources?	The State expects respondents to put forth a proposal that they feel is in the best interest of the State. As stated in the RFP, the State expects no more than 1.5 FTEs to be required to provide the services listed within the RFP. It is at the discretion of the respondent to determine how resources are allocated to the project.
7	Does the State have either a limit for how many resources can be involved in the selected IV&V vendor's team or a preferred maximum number of key resources? If so, could you share these expectations?	Please note the State's response to Inquiry #6.
8	Is the consulting firm, which assisted the State in drafting the RFP, allowed to bid for the IV&V work?	No.
9	Is the consulting firm, which has been awarded the PMO work for the project, allowed to bid for the IV&V work?	No.
10	Can the proposal due date be extended by one week to allow for better accessibility of key resources and references after they return from holiday vacations?	Yes. Please note RFP Addendum 2. The revised RFP proposal due date is January 15, 2024.
11	Is there an MBE/WBE requirement for this RFP?	No.
12	Do you have a consultant that will be helping you with your evaluation and selection? If so, who is your selection consultant?	As noted in Section 3.1 of the RFP, Information Services Group, Inc. (ISG), has been engaged by the State to provide project management office (PMO) services relating to the implementation of the forthcoming ERP system for the State. Evaluation of responses to RFP #23RFP9328 and the subsequent awarding of contract to a successful respondent will be solely determined by the State.
13	Is there an estimated budget for the IV&V engagement?	The budget for these services will be dependent on the cost proposals received through the RFP process and funded through appropriations already in place.

Vendor Questions and Answers
RFP 23RFP9328: ERP Independent Verification and Validation Services
as of 12/22/2023

This document provides updated information and clarification pertaining to the above captioned RFP and will be updated as necessary.

Link to RFP for reference purposes:

https://bfm.sd.gov/solicitations/23RFP9328_ivv.pdf

REMINDER: It is the Offeror's responsibility to thoroughly examine and read the entire RFP document and any appendices and addenda to the RFP.

#	Question	State's Response
14	What is the ERP system, that is currently in place for the Financials, Budget and Procurement, management functions?	<p>The major existing systems that support these processes include the following:</p> <p>South Dakota Budget System A client/server application that supports the statewide Budget Development processes. The system was developed by and is supported by the State.</p> <p>Central Accounting System The State's accounting system of record that provides functionality to support the State's financial business functions (i.e., General Ledger, Accounts Payable, Budget Control, Procurement, Inventory). The software is E:Series from Infor. This is a mainframe system the State has used for 35 years.</p> <p>Financial Reporting System The State uses Oracle Financial Consolidation and Close System (FCCS) to create accrual-based annual financial reports from our cash basis budgetary accounting system.</p> <p>E-Procurement System The State uses EasyPurchase, a commercially available, standalone application from ESM Solutions that provides e-Procurement functionality</p>
15	The State anticipates no more than 25% of services to be delivered onsite. Is there a minimum percentage of onsite time that the state expects?	The State is not mandating a minimum or maximum threshold for the delivery of services. Respondents should propose the mix of on-site and off-site time that it believes would lead to the best project outcomes.

Vendor Questions and Answers
RFP 23RFP9328: ERP Independent Verification and Validation Services
as of 12/22/2023

This document provides updated information and clarification pertaining to the above captioned RFP and will be updated as necessary.

Link to RFP for reference purposes:

https://bfm.sd.gov/solicitations/23RFP9328_ivv.pdf

REMINDER: It is the Offeror's responsibility to thoroughly examine and read the entire RFP document and any appendices and addenda to the RFP.

#	Question	State's Response
16	Does the State expect the professional references to be only client references who have worked with our firm, or can they also be from prior professional positions?	<p>The State's preference is for all professional references for proposed resources, as outlined in Section 6.0 of the RFP, to come from client references of the firm responding to the RFP. However, the State will accept other professional references from proposed staff provided they meet the following criteria: 1) the professional reference is from an organization that meets the minimum requirements in Section 2.0 of the RFP; 2) the work performed by the proposed resource was similar to the scope of work outlined in the State's RFP; and 3) the work was performed within the last 7 years.</p> <p>Please note this response only applies to the professional references of proposed resources. The responding firm must still comply with the minimum qualifications outlined in Section 2.0 of the RFP.</p>
17	Are the three professional references expected to be just callable or will there be an option to be contacted via email?	The State expects to have the ability to contact professional references listed in proposals by both telephone or email.
18	Is the use of state per diem strictly enforced for the use of travel expense calculation?	No. The State intends to negotiate a travel budget to determine the maximum dollar amount the successful firm will be eligible to seek reimbursement for travel expenses against over the course of the project. Within that negotiated maximum travel budget, the State anticipates reimbursing the successful firm for "actual" travel expenses. The travel rate used would be an internal policy matter for each vendor.
19	Is it acceptable to modify the travel and expenditure tables to include travel, lodging, per diem and taxi/parking expenses into the single table that shows a complete "cost per trip" estimation? If not, in the table that includes estimates for lodging and per diem, is this a "per trip" calculation or an all-in number of days for the length of the engagement?	The first travel table provided (i.e., method of travel) is intended to show the complete travel costs for each projected resource for the entirety of the project. The second travel table is intended to show the estimated itemized costs for each trip. Respondents may add additional columns to the second table for descriptive purposes of anticipated trip expenses (e.g., rental car, parking, etc...).
20	Does the State prefer the travel expenses to be included as part of the firm fixed price or would the State prefer the travel expense be estimated and invoiced as incurred?	Respondents should provide an estimated total of projected travel expenses. Payment for travel expenses during the engagement will be invoiced as they are incurred.