

Amendment 1 – Attachment A

CFOPD-19-R-001 – Enterprise Financial System

Set forth below are the District’s responses to the first set of Offeror questions:

1. **Reference: Page 54 - I.3.2**

The indemnification obligation under this section shall not be limited by the existence of any insurance policy or by any limitation on the amount or type of damages, compensation or benefits payable by or for Contractor.

Will the customer agree to remove this clause or adjust it to limit liability?

Response: The District may consider this request prior to award of a contract.

2. Regarding RFP E.3 and H 4.5 regarding performance warranties, would the District be amenable to clarifying in a contract a general performance warranty that Services and Deliverables of original vendor content would be in material compliance with the agreed upon specifications? Also, as the warranty period for the Services stated in RFP E.3 appears long for work of this type (life of contract plus active options, extensions), would the District consider alternative warranty periods?

Response: The District may consider this request prior to award of a contract.

3. Regarding the requirements of H.8.1. ‘Licenses’ and H.8.2 ‘Ownership’, it is not clear whether the District is indicating in 8.1 that the Vendor would own the ‘Works’ and remit back to the District a commercial license back, or, as 8.1 indicates, the Works would be owned by the District. Can the District please clarify if it intends to own the Works or have the Vendor own the Works and grant District the licenses in 8.1? If the District’s view is it owns all created ‘Works’ and IP embedded in it (less pre-existing IP), would the District be amenable to negotiating with a vendor a commercial use license back to the Works?

Response: Since the Offeror is providing implementation services for a SaaS solution, all artifacts including deliverables and software code created and/or developed by the Offeror for the sole use of the District supporting the implementation become the property of the District upon delivery.

4. Regarding H.9 pre-existing materials, would the District consider negotiating with a vendor clarification of a definition of pre-existing materials with clarification that the vendor retains ownership not only of the embedded pre-existing IP but also of any enhancements, modifications or derivative works of that pre-existing IP, regardless if such are created as part of the Services under this Contract?

Response: Pre-existing material embedded in deliverables from the Offeror should be identified as proprietary material. Material created for the

District – including enhancements, modifications or derivative works – become property of the District requiring no commercial license for use. The Offeror may negotiate with the District for the ability to re-use materials created during this engagement.

5. Regarding RFP H 9.2.2, I .18, I 19, and I 3.1(F) pertinent to indemnities, would the District be amenable to clarifying that such indemnity obligations apply to third party claims made against the District?

Response: The District may consider this request prior to award of a contract.

6. Regarding RFP I.30 Insurance, the vendor holds global insurance policies which apply to its clients in a ‘one to many’ model. While vendor’s insurance coverages and policies are similar to the District’s RFP requirements, there are some procedural and substantive differences. Would the District consider with a proposal copies of a vendor’s currently available policy certificates to evidence vendor’s similar policies?

Response: The District may consider this request prior to award of a contract.

7. Would the District consider negotiation of a reasonable limitation of liability in the form of an agreed upon aggregated direct damage cap with a mutual disclaimer of indirect damages, which would apply notwithstanding any other RFP requirement to the contrary-including the requirement in I.3.2 that the general indemnity shall not be limited by any limitation on the amount or types of damages?

Response: The District may consider this request prior to award of a contract.

8. Regarding the requirements in RFP Sections H 11.2 and 11.3 would the District be amenable to negotiating with a vendor an agreed upon form, content and terms and conditions of a Performance Bond and Fidelity Bond? Are the Bond requirements based on the total contract amount across years?

Response: The District may consider this request prior to award of a contract. The Performance Bond amount would be for the base year initially as defined in Section H.11.2. If option years are exercised, then the Performance Bond would be renewed for the amount of that Option Period. The Fidelity Bond is for the life of the contract and shall be in the amount specified in Section H.11.3.

9. How/when does the District intend to contract for the optional years? After the blueprint period is completed, is the District amendable to contracting the entire implementation?

Response: The District intends to exercise the Option Years as described in Section F.2 of the solicitation. Currently the District is not amenable to contracting for the entire implementation period.

10. Would the District entertain an industry standard and reasonable disclaimer of any implied warranties (including Merchantability, Fitness for particular purpose)?

Response: **The District may consider this request prior to award of a contract.**

11. Can we request an extension on this response? Per the bidders conference we need to have the proposal in 5 days before its due if we use Fed Ex and in addition we have thanksgiving week.

Response: **At this time the District believes that the time provided to submit a RFP response is sufficient.**

12. Would the Department be amenable to the following revision to question #7 (within C.4 Minimum Qualifications)?

ORIGINAL WORDING

The Offeror shall be required to show that it has completed, as primary provider of implementation services (more than 50% of implementation services to customer), at least three Oracle Cloud ERP or Oracle EBS implementations for a U.S. public sector (federal, state, county or local municipality) customer that has more than \$3 Billion of operating budget. In addition, each customer's implementation must have included at least 30 integration points and more than 500 users.

PROPOSED REVISED WORDING

The Offeror shall be required to show that it has completed or has in-process (more than 50% of the project completed), as a primary provider of implementation services (more than 50% of implementation services to customer), at least three Oracle Cloud ERP and/or Oracle EBS and/or PeopleSoft Financials implementations for a U.S. public sector (federal, state, county or local municipality) customer that has more than \$3 Billion of operating budget. In addition, each customer's implementation must have included at least 30 integration points and more than 500 users.

Response: **The District does not accept the proposed revision.**

13. Would the Department be amenable to the following revision to question #8 (within C.4 Minimum Qualifications)?

The Offeror shall be required to show that it has completed at least three Hyperion or Hyperion Cloud implementations for a U.S. public sector (federal, state, county or local municipality) customer that has more than \$3 Billion of operating budget.

Response: **Refer to revised language in Attachment B.**

14. Requirement C.3.4.2.c (within C.4 Scope of Services) reads as follows: Convert the current

Oracle EBS perpetual licenses to Oracle Cloud licenses; review Oracle licensing to ensure proper licenses exist for the District to move forward with implementation. Will the systems implementation partner be responsible for this?

Response: The District will work with Oracle to convert the licenses. As part of Blueprinting, the District expects the Contractor to perform the analysis that will identify the number of licenses that the District needs to buy from Oracle for each Oracle module and/or product to support its user community.

15. The RFP indicates that the blueprint stage will include confirming the as-is business processes and desired end state business processes for the central offices, the six-agency financial operations clusters, and three additional district organizations. Will the systems implementation partner be required to confirm the as-is business processes and desired end state business processes with the remaining decentralized agencies (approximately 80 additional agencies in total)?

Response: There will be involvement from decentralized agencies to confirm as-is and desired end state business processes. District Project team will invite (when required) individuals from decentralized agencies who need to participate in these sessions.

16. Will the three additional district organizations (Lottery and Charitable Games, Events DC, and United Medical Center) be migrating to Oracle Cloud with the District or will they remain on their existing financial systems and require interfaces to Oracle?

Response: No. These organizations will remain on their existing systems and will interface with new Oracle Financial and Budget Solution. The interface requirements will be finalized during Blueprinting.

17. Approximately how many account-level line items are budgeted in your current P&B tool? How consistently do you plan to maintain the COA between current P&B and financial systems?

Response: Approximately 100,000 accounting lines. The COA is kept in sync currently between existing budget solution and SOAR. The District is planning to keep COA in sync between these two systems in future until SOAR is completely replaced by the Oracle Solution.

18. How many years/periods of converted data does the District expect in the P&B solution at go-live? Where are converted years/periods of budget data stored currently and in the future?

Response: The District expects two (2) years of historical budget (both approved and revised) data to be loaded into Oracle Planning and Budgeting solution. The current budgeting solution is only used for formulation.

Budget execution and reprogramming are performed in SOAR. The future solution for formulation, execution and reprogramming will be evaluated during Blueprinting. Currently budget data is stored in a CFOSolve and SOAR.

19. Are any allocations required in the current P&B solution? If so, will they be required in the future state?

Response: Yes, there are allocations required in the current P&B solution, and they will be required in the future state.

20. Is the District expecting the Oracle EPM solution to replace the SaaS Economic Outlook model that is input into the ORA estimate process, or will the Oracle EPM solution receive the output from the SaaS Economic Outlook Model?

Response: No. The Economics Outlook model is used for revenue and other economic forecasting and will not be replaced by Oracle Planning and Budgeting.

Yes, Oracle EPM will receive data from Economic Outlook Model. There is no automatic interface to load the Economic Outlook data into current Budget solution. The District would like to have an interface built from to load Economic Outlook data to Oracle Cloud EPM as part of the future solution. The final requirements will be determined during the Blueprint phase.

21. Is the District's preference to implement the new P&B solution earlier or later on the implementation timeline?

Response: Please refer to Attachment J.23 (Project Planned Timeline).

22. Where do budget controls currently exist within your system architecture? What requirements do you have for budget controls in the future?

Response: Currently budgetary controls exist in SOAR. Requirements and proposed budgetary control solution will be evaluated during Blueprinting phase.

23. Did the District purchase or intend to purchase Enterprise Performance Reporting Cloud Service (EPRCS) as an option for reporting?"

Response: No, the District did not purchase EPRCS. Unless Blueprinting identifies a need to purchase EPRCS to meet District's requirements, the District does not plan to purchase.

24. What is the estimated number of management reports that currently contain P&B data? What is the estimated number in the future? Is an objective of the project to redesign and

reduce the number of reports currently used?

Response: Currently the District maintains a custom IBM COGNOS and Tableau based reporting solution that is used by the District's Budget team and agencies. Since the current solution allows any user to save an existing report as a new report, the current number won't reflect the future scope. During Blueprinting, the District, working with the implementation contractor, will evaluate the impact on the current reporting solution and re-design modification of existing reports and determine whether redesign/modification work will be performed by the contractor as part of the Oracle implementation or by the District's COGNOS/Tableau reporting team.

25. General - As part of this RFP creation process, has an exercise been performed to collect the requirements expected to be fulfilled from the new system. If yes, at what level of details are these and can it be shared with the respondents?

Response: Since the SaaS model provides a standard process for business activity, it is expected that Blueprinting will begin with the principle that the District intends to use the out-of-the-box functionality provided in the SaaS solution and will focus on identifying legislative or regulatory gaps in the provided functionality.

26. General - As per section C1.1.2 & 3.5.11 it is mentioned that OCM activities (Organization Change Management, Communication and End User Trainings) and Testing (Independent Verification & Validation) will be acquired thru separate procurement. Accordingly, Pls. confirm that these activities are out of scope for this RFP.

Response: Yes, these requirements are out of scope for this solicitation and will be procured separately.

27. Sec I.3.1, Page 53 - Section I.3.1 implies Unlimited Liability. Will you consider limiting the liability at the time of the award?

Response: The District may consider this request prior to award of a contract.

28. FIN: GL - How many old/ different COA structures exist today? Are the differences' in COA driven by legal requirement or there are other reasons for this differences'? Also highlight any potential difficulties faced either during reporting or integrations.

Response: One (1) COA structure exists today. The District's expectation is that a new COA will be created as part of this EFS implementation. The current COA does not have any major issues or challenges based on limited business functions that can be performed in SOAR.

29. FIN: Reporting - How many management reporting hierarchies defined in the existing financial application? Can you please also elaborate the issues with this existing structure, if any?

Response: The District owns a mainframe-based financial system with limited functional and subledger capabilities. Most of the reports are generated out of the COGNOS and Tableau reporting solutions and are provided to users based on their current roles in SOAR.

30. FIN: GL - Do we have a need for adjustment periods in our calendar and if yes, please describe how many.

Response: Yes. The District currently has one adjustment period in SOAR. The number of adjustment periods needed will be evaluated and decided during Blueprinting.

31. FIN: GL - Do we perform any form of GL consolidation. If yes, how often? Also, do we use separate set of books for the same?

Response: The Contractor will not perform any form of GL consolidation.

32. FIN: Data - 1.) What is the period of historic data which needs to be brought in the new application (across AR, AP, GL)? 2.) Is there a need to bring closed transactions in the new application. Or, can we define a Datawarehouse strategy to archive the same? 3.) Data cleansing is typically considered out-of-scope. Is that a fair assumption?

Response: For subledger modules, unless historic data is needed for a mid-year conversion (only for current year), the District is planning to only bring open transactions. The District will bring up to three (3) years of General Ledger data into Oracle Financial Cloud. The need for historical data conversion of sub-ledger (AP, AR, Projects, PO) data will be evaluated during the Blueprinting phase. Data cleansing is considered out of scope.

33. FIN: CM - How many banks from where we get statements for bank reconciliations. Are there any custom bank formats used for integrations?

Response: The District gets statements from twenty-five (25) banks. There are no custom bank formats used for integrations.

34. FIN: AP - Are invoices entered manually or some form of OCR used for automatic creation of supplier invoices?

Response: The District currently has an e-Invoicing Solution, which allows vendors to login to the portal and enter invoices.

35. FIN: AR - Do we have specific revenue recognition process where revenue is deferred for various reasons?

Response: Yes. District follows Government Accounting Standard Board (GASB) statements 63 and 65 for recording deferred revenue and Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) for revenue accounting and revenue recognition. District uses the modified accrual basis to recognize revenue when measurable and available.

36. EPM Reports - Summarize anticipated statutory reporting requirements outside of SEC reporting.

Response: See chart below:

	Reporting Requirement	Frequency	# Per Year
1	Operating Financial Status Report	Monthly	9
2	Capital Financial Status Report	Quarterly	3
3	Emergency and Contingency Cash Reserve Fund	Quarterly	4
4	Anti-Deficiency (operating and capital)	Quarterly	3
5	Variiances between Actual Agency Expenditures and Approved Spending Plans	Quarterly	3
6	Reprogrammings	Quarterly	4
7	Intra-Districts	Quarterly	4
8	Capital FTE Outlay	Quarterly	4
9	Capital Project Support Fund (ABC)	Quarterly	4
10	DDOT Project Review and Reconciliation (ABC-DEF)	Quarterly	4
11	Pay-As-You-Go	Annually	1
12	Grant Budget Modifications and Activity	Quarterly	4
13	Comprehensive Financial Management Policy Review	Annually by various dates	3

14	Budgetary Status: Financial Accountability Compliance	Quarterly	4
15	Pay-As-You-Go Capital Infrastructure Preservation and Improvement	Annually	1
Total reports prepared by OBP per year			55

37. EPM Reports - How many users will need to be able to create reports in Financial Reports?

Response: There are approximately two hundred fifty (250) users that will need to be able to create reports.

38. Terms - Can we submit our exceptions for the RFP terms and conditions? And will you be open to negotiate any of the terms and condition at the time of the award?

Response: The Offeror may submit its exceptions. The District may consider the request prior to award of a contract.

39. Confirming, this is a fixed fee schedule for all roles?

Response: Yes.

40. Confirming, the change management and QA will be distributed as separate RFPs? Have these RFPs been released yet?

Response: Yes. No, they have not been released.

41. Is it the consultant's responsibility to confirm licenses and make recommendations for additional licenses based on gather requirements?

Response: Yes.

42. Will the blueprint phase include gathering requirements for all clusters?

Response: Yes.

43. Was there a previous implementation attempt? If so, can you share the outcome?

Response: Yes, the District unsuccessfully tried to implement both Oracle eBS and Hyperion solution in the past. The project was terminated by the District prior to implementation.

44. What is the IV&V vendor's role?

Response: To provide independent verification and validation for all implementation and change management activities.

45. Confirming the scope includes a fit/gap of gathered requirements against Cloud offerings with recommendations?

Response: Yes, including recommendation on how to close gaps.

46. Confirming the user manuals are called out as a deliverable but the training is the responsibility of the OCM vendor?

Response: Yes, the user manuals will be a deliverable under this procurement and the OCM vendor will be responsible for training the users.

47. Has the middleware for interfaces decision been made?

Response: No. The decision will be finalized during Blueprinting. The District owns licenses for Oracle SOA.

48. Are there key dates to stand up the EPM or ERP?

Response: Please see the attachment J.23, Project Planned Timeline for details. These are the proposed timelines that will be re-evaluated during Blueprinting.

49. What is the anticipated client team structure? Have they been identified and empowered to make decisions?

Response: Section C.3.6 provides the District's Team structure. The District is in the process of identifying these resources and is planning to have them identified and available at the start of the project. Team members will be authorized to make decisions in their respective areas.

50. Post production support: Is there an established help desk system to support this or does the offeror need to define this?

Response: The District is planning to build a Center of Excellence (COE) to support all OCFO Financial Solutions. The District is working towards building the COE organization and is planning to have the organization ready prior to Wave 1 go-live. The District is not expecting the Offeror to establish or manage the helpdesk system.

51. Section J.1.2 attachments were not available in our version of the RFP. Can you please make them available?

Response: The Section J.1.2 attachments (Attachments J.11 through J.24) are located on the Office of Contracts Solicitation Gateway site at (<https://dc.cobblestonesystems.com/gateway/SolicitationPublicSearch>).

aspx). Once at the site view the solicitation. Under the ‘Public Files, Documents, Images’ box, open the solicitation then the RFP Attachments folder.

52. Is the District willing to negotiate limitations on liability?

Response: The District may consider this request prior to award of a contract.

53. Section E, H and I, K.3 and other contract clauses in the RFP or resultant contract - Given the complexity of the procurement, most offerors expect contract negotiations with the District. Our experience is that both the procuring entity and the contractor benefit from such negotiations occurring in a manner that allows each party to understand the other’s reasonable concerns. Where complex procurements with extensive terms do not allow for exceptions and negotiations or restrict them only to a written Q&A exchange, unwanted outcomes such as no-bid decisions/reduced competition, protests or failed procurements often result.

For these reasons, we request the District modify the RFP, including the referenced certification, to permit bidders to submit terms and conditions exceptions as part of their proposal. Given the investment involved in responding to an RFP of this magnitude, should the District decline to allow for an exception and negotiation process, we respectfully request the District advise the offerors as soon as possible.

Response: The Offeror may submit its exceptions. The District may consider the request prior to award of a contract.

54. Section C.3.5.1.5, Section E Warranty - While Warranty is within the scope of the request related to Section E in question #1 to allow exceptions, given the Help Desk is tied to the Warranty terms and further given all vendors will need to include the projected warranty cost in the fixed price, we request the District:

(1) reconsider the duration of the warranty period (e.g., have the warranty period commence on go-live of Wave 1 and continue until 90 days after go-live of Wave 2); (2) align the Help Desk to run concurrently with the support period and align the contractor duties with the support services and (3) consistent with the request above to allow negotiation of the warranty scope and terms, not answer this question in manner that prevents offerors from specifying the terms of the warranty it may offer for its services.

Response: See Section C.3.5.9, which defines the required support period for each wave.

55. Section C.3.4.2.C (Page 7) - Section states the following: “During Blueprint, the Contractor shall perform services in the following areas at a minimum (all costs for these services must be part of the quoted Blueprint fixed fee) . . . Convert the current Oracle EBS perpetual licenses to Oracle Cloud licenses and implement the solution.”

Specifically, what is your expectation of the awarded contractor in converting current licenses or purchasing new licenses?

Response: Please see the response to Question 14 of this Amendment.

56. Section C.3.7.1 (Page 17) - Section states the following: “The District will provide computer equipment for use by the Contractor’s personnel...”.

Can the contractor work from their contractor issued laptops during hours not on site (i.e. evenings and weekends)? Are contractor laptops allowed to connect to the District’s network?

Response: The Contractor will not be able to work from their contractor issued laptops during hours not on site. The Contractor laptops will not be allowed to connect to the District’s network.

57. Section J.1.1, Page 82 - Are original signatures required on Attachment J.6 and Attachment J.10A in the signature field or are PDF electronic signatures acceptable?

Response: PDF electronic signatures are acceptable.

58. Section M.3.1.1.2.G, (Page 101) - Section states the following: “Provide with the proposal a client completed Attachment J.10, Past Performance Evaluation Forms for each reference provided above.”

Can the District please confirm that Attachment J.6, Past Performance Evaluation Form should be provided for each reference instead of J.10?

Response: Attachment J.6 is the correct document to provide for each reference. Refer to revised language in Attachment B.

59. Section M.3.1.1.2.H, (Page 101) - Does the District want J.10A – Sub Contracting Form and J.10B – Vendor Verification Form Template (Revised 7.12.17) submitted to support M.3.1.1.2.H?

If yes, can it be provided in Tab 7 – Appendices rather than in to preserve space Tab 2 – Firm Qualifications and Experience?

Response: Attachment J.10A is specific to the subcontracting requirement as described in Section H.3 and shall be provided as part of the price proposal as described in Section L.3.3.

Attachment J.10B is required to be completed only by the Contractor who is awarded the contract to report their subcontracting spend in accordance with the subcontracting requirement in Section H.3.

Section M.3.1.1.2h is inclusive of all subcontractors that may work on the project. There is no specific form for this evaluation factor. Please provide the information if applicable to this factor. This information can be provided under Tab 7.

60. C.3 SCOPE OF SERVICES - Please provide us some insight on data quality of your current Financial system. Is the data cleansed periodically to remove duplicate transaction entries, orphan entries, invalid transactions?

Response: The data cleanup activities are in progress for Master and Transaction Data. This is an on-going activity to prepare us for the transition to the Oracle Cloud product. The District's project team will work with the Contractor team to resolve any data anomalies identified during implementation.

61. C.3.2 Software Scope - Please share with us the list of key reports that are currently being used.

Response: Since the District's current Financial System provides limited functionality compared to the Software Scope listed in Section C.3.2.1, we are expecting that the Contractor will collect the information of future needs during Blueprinting. Some of the key reports are the CAFR, PAFR and Budget Book. The COGNOS/Tableau solution is used for the majority of our reports. Please refer to Question 24 of this Amendment for Planning and Budgeting key reports.

62. J 23 Project Timeline - Will the revisions/ replanning for the Implementation Phase be done during Blueprint Phase based on input from Blueprint Phase? Attachment J23 shows immediate start of Implementation Wave I after completion of Blueprint Phase.

Response: Yes, revision/re-planning for the implementation phase will be part of the Blueprinting Phase. The Contractor shall document the details in the Implementation Strategy and Plan (Deliverable# 10) listed in Section C.3.4.3.

63. L1. SOLICITATION CONDITIONS - Request you to please provide us a two weeks extension to the Proposal submission due date of November 27, 2018.

Response: See response to Question 11 of this Amendment.

64. C.3.4.2 - 'Convert the current Oracle EBS perpetual licenses to Oracle Cloud licenses and implement the solution;' - Does the District expect the contractor to convert Oracle EBS perpetual licenses to Oracle Cloud licenses or will the District work directly with Oracle to get the Oracle Cloud Licenses?

Response: See response to Question 14 of this Amendment.

65. Pre-Proposal Conference General Question - As addressed at the pre-proposal conference, can the District please confirm per the question and answer process that vendors can include with their proposal's exceptions to the terms and conditions of the contract and that vendors with the District would have a reasonable opportunity to discuss them?

Response: The Offeror may submit its exceptions. The District may consider the request prior to award of a contract.

66. RFP C.3.5.1.4 - Does the District expect the Contractor to propose or include various Testing tools (e.g., for Regression and Performance Testing) and other Enterprise Tools such as Enterprise Batch Scheduler? Can the District provide a list of any Enterprise Tools that it expects the Contractor to leverage from its existing product licenses?

Response:

- The Contractor shall use SharePoint as a document repository and the MS Office Suite, including Visio, to create documents. The District will provide the software or access to the software.
- The District is planning to use either MS Project or Smartsheet as a Project Management software. A decision will be made working with the Contractor to decide which project management software to use for the EFS project.
- The District currently owns Oracle SOA licenses and is planning to evaluate with the Contractor if the software will be needed for any integration activities.
- The District also owns Quality Center. The testing tools will be revisited during Blueprinting to validate if we need additional licenses or modules to support performance and regression testing or District needs to buy a new product.
- The Contractor shall identify any gaps in the software being provided above and the tools normally used by the Contractor and make recommendation to the District as to what additional tools might be needed during the Blueprinting process.

67. Attachment J.11 Pricing Schedules - The '1. Blueprint Summary' and '2. Blueprint Con Srv' tabs in Attachment J.11 contain formula references to '#Ref!' values and there is a comment in Tab 2, Cell D2 that refers to removing monthly rates. Can the District clarify this comment, correct the cell reference errors, and reissue Attachment J.11?

Response: Attachment J.11, Pricing Schedules, has been revised per Attachment C.

68. Attachment J.22 Question 9 - Can the District please provide Ariba and PeopleSoft Application version details?

Response: The District uses PeopleSoft Version 9.2. Ariba version is 9.1 but the District's Office of Procurement and Contracting (OCP) is in the process of migrating to Ariba Cloud. During Blueprinting, the District,

working with the contractor, will finalize if the integration will be built with Ariba Cloud or Ariba's on-premise solution.

69. L.3.2 Technical Proposal, Tab 6 Implementation Resource Plan - The RFP instructions for Tab 6 do not appear to indicate what content should be included in that tab. Instead Tab 6 instructions indicate that 1) the pricing schedule should be completed in the Price Proposal and 2) the hours on the pricing schedule should be included in Tab 7 and entered in Attachment J.24 Implementation Resource Plan (Note: RFP section M.3.1.3.2.e states this attachment should be included in Tab 4). In summary, the Tab 6 instructions infer we are to update Tab 4, Tab 7, and the Pricing Proposal, but we are unclear about what we are being asked to include in Tab 6. Can the District please review these instructions to determine if there is an error in the Tab 6 instructions or provide clarification regarding what should be included in Tab 6?

Response: Refer to revised language in Attachment B.

70. L.3.3 Price Proposal, #11 - For the response to item #11, would the District allow us to provide a link to our most recent SEC filing, rather than providing a copy of the filing in the proposal, which may be hundreds of pages in length?

Response: Yes.

[End of Attachment A]