September 21, 2022

NOTICE TO OFFERORS

ADDENDUM NO. 1

RFQ 540782

The following changes and/or additions shall be made to the original for the Request for Proposal (RFP) for the Grant Management System. Please acknowledge receipt of this addendum by signing and returning with your proposal.

1. Section 4.2 is deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

   4.2 Offerors shall demonstrate experience in providing the system and services being requested to a minimum of five organizations with similar size and scope to that of the Loudoun County Government. Offerors shall include with their proposal a list of organizations currently running production versions of the system, specifying which ones are self-hosted and vendor-hosted solutions.

   Offerors shall also include a list of all comparable contracts, including software elements in use and number of years in use. The list shall include company name, person to contact, address and telephone number, description of work performed, and the total value of the contract. Offeror hereby releases listed references from all claims and liability for damages that result from the information provided by the reference.

2. Section 5.8 Software Escrow is deleted in its entirety.

3. Attached are the questions and answers received in response to the solicitation.

Prepared By: s/Diane C. Smith, NIGP-CPP/CPPP  Date: September 21, 2022

Acknowledged By: ____________________________ Date: ____________________
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q1. Can the County please clarify the definition of a commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) system regarding this RFP and better define the requirements needed for this COTS System.

A1. The County uses the standard definition of a COTS system: Readymade software products, designed to be easily installed and to interoperate with existing system components that are sold to the general public.

Q2. If an offeror's solution is not a pure COTS solution and requires some configuration to tailor it to the County’s specific business requirements, would the County consider a customizable platform or Modified off-the-Shelf (MOTS) solution rather than a pure COTS solution?

A2. Yes. The County would be willing to accept a MOTS rather than a pure COTS solution.

Q3. Does the County have or utilize Microsoft Online?


Q4. Is the County looking for a solution for all departments or for an initial implementation for one department with additional departments added in the future?

A4. The envisioned solution will support all County departments who participate in Grantseeking and Grantmaking activities.

Q5. If the County’s anticipated system requires integration with grants.gov, can offerors assume that the County has already secured permission for access to the grants.gov system?

A5. Yes, the County has already secured permission for access to the grants.gov system.

Q6. What is the County’s base budget for this RFP and the proposed funding for the future for this initiative?

A6. Budget information for this initiative is not available.

Q7. Has the County received any system demonstrations or presentations from vendors of the requested system? If so which firms provided those demonstrations or presentations?

A7. The County has had general discussions with various GMS vendors over the past few years. The County has not received any formal system demonstrations or presentations associated with the current initiative.
Q8. Would the County consider adjusting the Section 4.0 Offeror’s Minimum Qualifications, 4.1 that states “Offerors must demonstrate they have been in business providing same services for at least the last five (5) years” if an offeror is able to provide two to three years of services providing the same services?

A8. No, the County will not consider adjusting the Section 4.0 Offeror’s Minimum Qualifications, 4.1.

Q9. Would the County consider adjusting the Section 4.0 Offeror’s Minimum Qualifications, Section 4.2 that states “a minimum of five (5) government organizations” if an offeror is able to provide substantially more than five private/non-government organizations?

A9. Yes. The County prefers government organizations, but will accept private/non-government organizations.

Q10. Did the County utilize any vendor/subject matter expert consultants in defining the sought-after functionality and/or scope of work enumerated in the RFP? If so, please provide the name of the vendor/consultant?

A10. No, the County did not utilize any vendor/subject matter expert consultants.

Q11. Based on the requirement to manage Federal funds, does the County require vendors who have experience deploying Grants Management Systems at the Federal level?

A11. The County does not require Federal-level experience.

Q12. Please provide the following:

1. The total annual dollar amount of grant funding the County received for the current fiscal year?
2. The dollar volume of these grants that are pass-through grants to subgrantees?
3. What is the total dollar amount of grants distributed?
4. How many separate grant programs does the County manage? Please provide a list if possible.

A12. See responses below:

1. Approximately $200 million from various federal and state sources (including approximately $80 million in ARPA funding).
2. Not available at this time. Depends on agreements with funding sources.
3. Approximately $20 million of grants distributed.
4. No more than six separate grant programs.
Q13. Do the business processes (application, pre-award, award, etc.) and associated forms vary with each type of program, or are all processes and forms standardized? Are there different approval workflows for each program and/or application type? How do they materially differ?

A13. The Grantseeking and Grantmaking processes reflected in Attachment 1, Operational Overview, represent the County’s vision of the County’s Grants processing environment. It is the County’s objective that the system support standardized processes and forms as much as possible. We anticipate that any variation from the standard processes and forms will emerge from the vendor’s configuration process.

Q14. When does each of the programs’ application periods begin in a given fiscal year?

A14. Quarter 1: Two programs; Quarter 2: One program; Quarter 3: One program; Quarter 4: Varies. There will be one program ongoing throughout the year.

Q15. Does the County have a timeline/anticipated go-live date for the new system or is there a compelling event that is driving this date? Does the County have an anticipated timeline to be fully implemented with the grant management system?

A15. The County anticipates going live with the System in the Spring of 2023.

Q16. Does the County require any integrations? If so, provide the expectation for the type of integration required, e.g., web services, file-based, one-way, or bi-directional data flow?

A16. Please refer to Appendix A of the RFP.

Q17. Does the County require any integration to a financial system? If so, what version of your financial management system is currently being used? Also, provide the current modules that are implemented within the financial management system.

A17. Oracle EBS Financials 12.2.10. General Ledger (GL), Accounts Payable (AP), Accounts Receivable (AR), Cash Management (CM), and Fixed Assets (FA)

Q18. Does the County anticipate a migration of current data to the new system? If so, please provide an estimate of the volume of data to be converted and migrated into the new Grants Management System along with the Organizations? People? Reports? Documents?.

A18. The County intends analyze the feasibility of migrating portions of existing data into the envisioned system. The current grants environment utilizes the County’s Laserfiche application to store applications and other documentation associated with the grantmaking activity.
The HSNP process goes back to FY2018 with an approximate average of fifty-five (55) records in each year. RTOT (which goes back to FY2009), CARES, ARPA are also stored in Laserfiche.

Q19. What is the current format of this grant data? Please provide an example row of data and/or database schema.

A19. The data schemas and approximate number of records to be extracted, transformed, and loaded into the new system and not available at this time. The County anticipates that the vendor will research and develop an approach to migration the of current legacy data.

Q20. Given the priority of securing public data and assets, does the County require any cloud-based, SaaS solutions to be provisioned on a FedRAMP-certified infrastructure?

A20. This Solution will require SOC-II compliance as a minimum. FedRAMP would be preferred.

Q21. Is there a dedicated internal Project Manager on staff or will the County outsource that role to a third party? How many people do you anticipate participating in the "core team" to ensure the joint success of the project?

A21. The County will have a dedicated Project Manager on staff. The core team will have six members.

Q22. Will the County accept a joint (two-company) proposal, or should all proposals have one prime vendor or a prime vendor with a subcontractor?

A22. Offerors are able to partner as necessary in the providing of the services. However, there must be a designated lead organization with the other as a subcontractor.

Q23. Has the County allocated resources as a team to participate in the implementation? If so, what functional areas do they represent? (i.e., Project Manager, IT, Grant Manager SME’s, Finance, etc.)?

A23. The County will have a dedicated Project Manager on staff. The core team will have six members from various County departments and functional areas including Finance, Grants Management and IT.

Q24. Does the County need and/or want a test environment for implementation and training purposes?

A24. Yes, the County require a test environment for implementation and training purposes.

Q25. Is there a centralized grants management department/division within the County? Will decisions be made within that department or will each department involved make their own decisions regarding processes?
A25. There is a centralized Grants Management function within the County. The goal of this initiative is to develop a system supporting standardized Grants business processes; Grants Management will collaborate with County Departments to determine the best approach to standardization.

Q26. Is there a requirement for the software as a service (SaaS) to have Grantseeker, Prospecting tools and a database of opportunities?

A26. Yes, please refer to Appendix A of the RFP.

Q27. Is the County able to elaborate on the need for a help desk? Is this public facing or for internal users? Would an online issue ticketing system be sufficient for this requirement?

A27. The County anticipates using its online issue-ticketing system for technical support for internal users and indirectly for external users. It is anticipated that Grants Management personnel will train external users of the System and provide support for the resolution of technical and business-related issues.

Q28. How many unique programs are open annually? What are the estimated averages around the number of applications you receive per year?

A28. There are six unique programs. There are 35-100 applications per year.

Q29. Does the County administer the grant payments in advance or via claim reimbursement?

A29. Both, the County administers the grant payments in advance and via claim reimbursement.

Q30. How many budgetary or accounting levels are needed to capture expenses for grantee financial reporting?

A30. There are four levels of budgetary or accounting levels needed to capture expenses for grantee financial reporting.

Q31. What is the number of internal users (County employees and other reviewers) who will need access to the system? What is the number of external users (grant recipients) who will need access to the system?

A31. The anticipated number of internal GMS users is 25; the number of external users is 100-150. The number of users accessing the system at any one time (concurrent users) will be a subset of the total.

Q32. For each of the program applications, do the line-item Grantee Budget templates vary minimally or are they materially different? Please share that format and document?

A32. The Grantseeking and Grantmaking processes reflected in Attachment 1, Operational Overview, represent the County’s vision of
the County’s Grants processing environment. It is the County’s objective that the system support standardized processes and forms as much as possible. We anticipate that any variation from the standard processes and forms will emerge from the vendor’s configuration process.

Q33. Is there a desired visibility and interaction for external reviewers/panels to offer expert opinions and/or validation on the application pool?

A33. Yes, please refer to Appendix A of the RFP.

Q34. Does the County want to track sub-awards and/or re-grants?

A34. Yes, the County wants to track sub-awards and/or re-grants.

Q35. Is the County currently using another system and/or vendor to manage grants? If so, what is the system/vendor? Will there be an anticipated simultaneous use of the new grant management system and prior GMS processes? If not, how are grants currently being managed by the County currently?

A35. The County does not use another formal system to manage grants. The envisioned system does not replace another system.

Q36. How many grant programs are currently being managed by the County that will also be managed in the new system? Does the County anticipate adding other grant programs this year, and if so, how many?

A36. The system will support management of all six grants programs.

Q37. Does the have any standard reports that need to be created on a regular basis (e.g., Grant Approval List, List of Approved Grants, List of Payments, etc.)?

A37. The County has a very limited set of standard reports relating to Grants Management. The County anticipates that the vendor would offer in its solution a library of canned reports.

Q38. Do you currently use any advanced reporting/analytics software (such as Tableau, PowerBI, Qlik, etc.)? If yes, do you plan to continue to use this type of software going forward? If not, is there an interest to pursue this option?

A38. The County currently uses PowerBI for analytics. It is expected the vendor solution offers out of box reporting and data export capabilities.

Q39. Is the County able to provide an estimate of how many types of automated email communications are sent to applicants/grantees and how many documents/templates will need to be generated in the system (e.g., grant agreement, payment letter, etc.)?

A39. The County is not able to provide an estimate at this time.

Q40. Regarding the API integration with Oracle, does the County have internal IT resources or a preferred software partner to assist with the setup of the
integration? Please elaborate further on any expectations regarding the integration with Oracle. If the County does not have resources internally, or preferred partners, does the County allow the vendor or vendor’s partners to use offshore resource to complete project work?

**A40. The County does have internal resources to assist with the setup of the integration. The expectation is that the vendor will develop the interface which utilizes the standard Oracle APIs for uploading data to the Oracle environment.**

Q41. Which systems must be integrated with the vendor’s platform at launch? Do they have APIs available for integration? Ideally, in the consolidation of systems, which platforms does the County envision continuing to use versus those where the County would want to consolidate/deprecate/end of life (EOL)?

**A41. The required integration is with Oracle.**

Q42. Does the County possess a license for an electronic signature tool that the County would like to use as part of this solution? If so, please provide the name. If not, does the County have a preferred tool or would the County like this to be included in the proposal?

**A42. The county currently does license both DocuSign and Adobe Sign.**

Q43. What is your anticipated timeline for review, scoring and vendor selection?

**A43. The schedule for the review as well as the scoring and vendor selection is very fluid at this time and will be largely dependent on the number of proposals that are received by the County.**

Q44. Is the vendor required to be on site for any portion of the contract term?

**A44. The County anticipates that the vendor will be onsite for the Kickoff Meeting and for System Administrator and internal End-User Training.**

Q45. Is your agency exempt from sales tax and, if so, can you provide an exemption certificate if necessary?

**A45. The County is exempt from sales tax and can provide the required exemption certificate upon request.**

Q46. To better understand compliance for this specific agreement, what levels does the County require regarding State and Federal data security, accessibility for cloud-based SaaS offerings??

**A46. The County requires SOC-II level.**

Q47. Single Sign-On: What, if any, is the County’s Single Sign-On solution? If one exists, is it currently used for both internal users and external grantees? If not, did the County have a targeted vendor partner in mind??

**A47. The County requires Security Assertion Markup Language (SAML) compliant for single sign on**
Q48. It appears that the County is in the midst of an IT Modernization effort, in addition to grants management. Is the County interested in how a potential offeror can provide advanced services and/or ongoing support as a part of this effort?

A48. The intent of this RFP is for an offeror to provide the required support for the Scope of Services stated in this RFP.

Q49. Please clarify the Functional Requirements for the following statements:

1. The system will support interaction with the Grants.gov application web service. Does the County need a system that can push information to Grants.gov or pull data from grant.gov into the Grants Management System (GMS)?

2. The system will support population of Project and Award Request forms (3). Requires Oracle P&G, GL Module Integration. Is the intent to have this form “transfer” to Oracle upon final approval?

3. The system will support population of Administrative Items Report. Requires Oracle P&G, GL Module Integration. Is the intent to have this form “transfer” to Oracle upon final approval?

A49. The following response are provided.

1. Yes, please refer to Appendix A of the RFP.

2. GMS will automatically push content from the online forms to Oracle. See Appendix A of the RFP.

3. GMS will automatically push content from the online forms to Oracle. See Appendix A of the RFP.

Q50. Does the county intend to pull over (true-up) their grant information into the new GMS?

1. Information for the county acting as a grantee?

2. Information for the county acting as the grantor (including current subrecipients and open programs?)

3. Additionally, does the county want ALL documentation (files, etc.) associated with grantor/grantee migrated to the GMS?

A50. The County intends to analyze the feasibility of migrating portions of existing data into the envisioned system. The current grants environment utilizes the County’s Laserfiche application to store applications and other documentation associated with the grantmaking activity.

Q51. How many unique programs are open annually where the county is acting as the grantor?

A51. There are six unique programs open annually where the county is acting as the grantor.
Q52. Will the County look to pilot programs first, or pursue an implementation with a phased-in approach?

A52. The County prefers implementation with a phased-in approach.

Q53. Do the same resources perform the grant seeking activities as the grant making or are these different groups and/or departments?

A53. County Grants Management resources use the system to manage Grantmaking activities. Different groups/departments use the system to perform Grantseeking activities with the support of Grants Management.

Q54. Are there any resource constraints or "threats" to a grant management system implementation, i.e., additional projects, system enhancement/changes, etc. or are there any known factors or simultaneous projects that would mitigate the resource allocation for implementation?

A54. There are no known threats to GMS implementation.

Q55. For the electronic signature requirement, does the County wish to integrate with their current DocuSign or Adobe Signature environments or does the County want the grant management tool to have its own electronic signature system embedded into the solution? Or is there not a preference?

A55. The County’s preference is to leverage the existing licensed tool. The County can entertain a separate tool if it is licensed and managed through the vendor.

Q56. In Section 5.7 Training of the RFP, it indicates the requirements for eight (8) DFB staff and 25 end users. Confirm that the DFB Staff are included in the end user count or are they distinct?

A: The DFB Staff is included in the end user count.

Is this the total amount of users that offerors should provide a price for license pricing or what is the total licensed user count by type of user?

A: This is the total amount of users that offerors should provide a price for license pricing.

1. How many County staff will access/log into the grants management system for 40+ hours/week?

2. How many County staff will access/log into the grants system less than 40 hours/week?

3. How many Grantee/Recipient users will need access to the grants management system?

4. How many unique logins are expected through the Grants Portal per year or per month?

A56. See responses below:
1. It is unlikely that any County staff will access the system 40+ hours a week.

2. A subset of the total number of internal users will access the system 40 hours a week or less.

3. 100 total external users accessing the system as required by the application/award schedule.

4. N/A. Login rates will depend on the season.

Q57. In Section 5.8 Software Escrow of the RFP, it states that the County desires to use a SaaS-based grants management system, most SaaS applications reside on large highly secure commercial cloud platforms. These commercial clouds will not allow for their code to be placed into escrow; therefore, can this requirement be removed so the county can receive additional highly competitive proposals from vendors?

- **A57. Section 5.8 Software Escrow of the** has been deleted in its entirety.

Q58. For the Multi-Factor Authentication (MFA) in addition to email or text, does the County also support additional authentication using Authenticator apps on mobile devices? (e.g., Google Authenticator, Microsoft Authenticator, Salesforce Authenticator?)

- **A58. The county does currently use Microsoft Authenticator.**

Q59. In Section 3.2 Grantmaking of the RFP, it states that approximately $4 million has been disbursed per year to deserving County organizations. How many grantees and distinct grants will?

- **A59. The system will be tracking up to 120 grantees or more per year.**

Q60. What is the average (or typical minimum/maximum amounts, if there are large variations between different grants) awarded per grant per year?

- **A60. Smallest award is $5,000. Largest award is $113,000. Grant award vary by program within this range.**

Q61. Is the County open to redlines of the County’s contract? Would the County be open to contracting on the Contractor’s contract?

- **A61. The County is able to support edits to the County’s Terms and Conditions in Section 6.0 of the RFP and the County is able to incorporate the Contractor’s supplemental agreements or documents as attachments to the County’s contract.**

Q62. Due to the Covid-19 circumstances, some firms may not be able to provide wet-ink signatures, get documents notarized, or commute to the office for production as these activities require in-person interactions. Requests that the County modify the RFP to allow electronic signatures/notarizations and remove the hardcopy
submission requirement in its entirety and allow for electronic (email) submission of response OR allow for submission of flash drive(s) only.

**A62.** The County does accept electronic signatures on the Proposal Submission Form and the County is able to accept the original hard copy as the one physical copy; thus relaxing the requirement for the six copies.

The County is not able to completely eliminate the requirement for a physical copy and allow a total email submission or flash drive submission due to the vulnerabilities found in email submissions and inaccessible flash drives.

**Q63.** Is there a specific County Form that should be used to provide References

**A63.** Please utilize the attached and incorporated Attachment II for References when submitting your proposal response.

**Q64.** Would the County be willing to extend the due date of September 29th?

**A64.** Currently, a reason does not exists for the County to extend the Acceptance Date beyond September 29, 2022 since the County has allowed over a month for the compilation of proposal responses.

**Q65.** Are local businesses scored favorably for this RFP? Is there a benefit in the evaluation process to partner with a Small, Women-owned, and Minority-owned Business (SWaM) certified business for this opportunity?

**A65.** The County does not provide preferences to any groups regardless of their location or SWaM status.
ATTACHMENT II: REFERENCES FOR RFP RFQ 540781

Offerors shall provide references on this form. Use additional sheets as necessary.

Offeror’s Name: ____________________________________________________________

1. Firm Name __________________________________________________________________
   Contact _____________________________________________________________________
   Title _____________________ E-mail ___________________________________________
   Mailing Address_____________________________________________________________
   Phone _____________________ Fax _____________________________________________
   Dates of Service: _____________________________________________________________
   Nature of Work Performed: ____________________________________________________
   Value of the Contract: _________________________________________________________

2. Firm Name __________________________________________________________________
   Contact _____________________________________________________________________
   Title _____________________ E-mail ___________________________________________
   Mailing Address_____________________________________________________________
   Phone _____________________ Fax _____________________________________________
   Dates of Service: _____________________________________________________________
   Nature of Work Performed: ____________________________________________________
   Value of the Contract: _________________________________________________________

3. Firm Name __________________________________________________________________
   Contact _____________________________________________________________________
   Title _____________________ E-mail ___________________________________________
   Mailing Address_____________________________________________________________
   Phone _____________________ Fax _____________________________________________
   Dates of Service: _____________________________________________________________
   Nature of Work Performed: ____________________________________________________
   Value of the Contract: _________________________________________________________

4. Firm Name __________________________________________________________________
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5. Firm Name: ____________________________
   Contact: _______________________________
   Title: ___________________________ E-mail: ____________________________
   Mailing Address: ____________________________
   Phone: ___________________________ Fax: ____________________________
   Dates of Service: ____________________________
   Nature of Work Performed: ____________________________
   Value of the Contract: ____________________________