

January 3, 2022

ADDENDUM NO. 2

RFI 451782

The following changes and/or additions shall be made to the original Request for Information (RFI) for Integrated Grants Management System, RFI 451782. Please acknowledge receipt of this addendum by signing and returning with your submission.

1. The Acceptance Date has been changed to January 11, 2022 prior to 3:00 PM "Atomic" Time.
2. Attached are the answers to the questions received in response to the RFI.

Prepared By: s/Kathleen Armstrong Date: January 3, 2022

Acknowledged By: _____ Date: _____

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q1. Please provide the different levels of access needed for the Grants Management System (GMS), such as viewer, editor, signatory, and read-only licenses.

A1. The different levels of access needed are as follows:

- 1) System Administrator**
- 2) Grants Administrator**
- 3) Grantee User**
- 4) Internal Grantee Application Approval**
- 5) Internal Grantor Application Approval**
- 6) External Grantor User**

Q2. Has the County had any assistance in preparing this RFI? If yes, from whom? Have you had demonstrations and/or conversations with grants management vendors? If so, with whom?

A2. The County prepared the RFI in-house. The County has not used any consulting services for this initiative.

Q3. Section 4.2 D. The County is looking for a link to the existing online demonstration. Would a live demo be acceptable instead of providing a link to an existing online demonstration?

A3. Once it is determined which firms are available to support this type of initiative, the County will issue a formal solicitation that will require live demonstrations.

Q4. Please specify the County's planned hosting option (e.g., Public Hosting, Private Hosting?)

A4. The County is in the planning stages of its RFP requirements for a Hosting solution. Currently, the County uses Private Hosting. However, Public Hosting could be a possibility provided the vendor is able satisfactorily address the County's Department of Information Technology (DIT) security questions in the upcoming RFP.

Q5. What is the County currently using for its GMS?

A5. The County's current GMS is a combination of the County's Laserfiche application to store applications and other documentation, off-the-shelf grantor activity tracking software and numerous spreadsheets to manage the grant-seeking and grant-making activity.

Q6. In addition to Oracle Projects & Grants, Accounts Payable module and Laserfiche, are there any other external services from which the County needs to integrate?

A6. Please refer to Section 3.1 D. and E. of the RFI.

Q7. Does the County expect to use a Representative state transfer (REST) Application Programming Interface (API) integration with Oracle Projects & Grants and General Ledger modules, or would the County prefer to integrate using an Secure File Transit Protocol (SFTP) site or manual process? If the County would prefer an API integration, does the County have internal resources or a partner that would be willing to support the County with the integration?

A7. The County intends to use the SFTP type integration with the Oracle Projects & Grants and General Ledger modules. The County does not prefer an API integration. The County has an internal resource for post-production support but will want the vendor to build this interface.

Q8. Please clarify the definition of a commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) system with regard to this RFI.

A8. The County uses the standard definition of a COTS system: *Ready-made software products, designed to be easily installed and to interoperate with existing system components that are sold to the general public.*

Q9. If a vendor's solution is not a pure COTS solution and requires a fair bit of configuration to tailor it to the County's specific business requirements, would the County be willing to accept a modified off-the-shelf solution (MOTS) rather than a pure COTS solution?

A9. The County would be willing to accept a MOTS rather than a pure COTS solution.

Q10. Please confirm the final RFI be submitted via email.

A10. Responses to the RFI can be submitted via e-mail to kathleen.armstrong@loudoun.gov.

Q11. Has a budget been approved for this project? If so, for how much?

A11. The budget information for this initiative is not available at this time since the RFP requirements are still being developed.

Q12. Please provide the County's number of unique sub-recipient organizations.

A12. The County currently has forty-eight (48) unique sub-recipient organizations through the Human Service Non-profit Grant Program (HSNP) process and approximately an additional twenty (20) with American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds. There is the potential for an additional forty (40) sub-recipients or external users once the GMS is fully implemented.

Q13. Does the County intend to use the selected GMS to manage ARPA or COVID relief funds? If so, how much funding does the County anticipate receiving?

A13. The County intends to use the selected Grants Management System to manage the ARPA and COVID relief funds. The amount of funding anticipated is not available at this time.

Q14. Questions pertaining to number of grant programs.

a. How many active grant programs does the County manage during a given fiscal year?

A14.a. Two programs.

b. How many grants does the County manage as a grantee?

A14.b. The County currently holds over one hundred (100) grants for which staff must complete an application to State and Federal sources.

- c. How many grant programs does the County solicit for applications and administers?

A5.c. The number of grant programs solicited is not available at this time. Regarding the administration of grants, the Department of Finance and Budget (DFS) administers the HSNP, Restricted Transient Occupancy Tax (RTOT) and Core Service agreements. And, in the past eighteen (18) months, it has also administered Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) and ARPA.

- d. How many applications or solicitations does the County plan on per year?

A5.d. County anticipates no less than thirty (30) competitive applications per year. This is in addition to over one hundred (100) non-competitive applications for funding.

- e. How much in total funding does the County plan on giving out per year?

A5.e. The County plans to give at least \$2.5 Million in funding per year.

- Q15. Would the County consider a blended implementation plan with some on-site training sessions and some virtual sessions? Please confirm if the County expects all working sessions to be on-site.

A15. The County would consider a blended implementation plan with an on-site/virtual training approach.

- Q16. Does the County expect to migrate existing data into AmpliFund? If so, please provide a list of systems currently housing on-going/historical grant information and for each please provide the data schemas and approximate number of records to be extracted, transformed, and loaded into the new system.

A16. The County intends to migrate existing data into AmpliFund. 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.

The data schemas and approximate number of records to be extracted, transformed, and loaded into the new system is not available at this time.

- Q17. The RFI states: "Another integration would involve existing Laserfiche repositories containing previously-submitted applications, documents and correspondence." In order for offerors to better determine the level of effort and propose the best values solution to the County, please provide the number of Laserfiche repositories and the total number of documentation contained within.

A17. Please refer to the response to question 16.

- Q18. Does the County have a preference regarding a Software as a Solution (SaaS) vs a non-SaaS solution?

A18. The only preference the County has is the solution must integrate with the County's current Oracle E-Business Solution. The County does not utilize Oracle SaaS.

- Q19. Does the County intend to release the solicitation as a small-business set-aside? If not, please describe the small-business goals for this solicitation.

A19. There are no preferences recognized. The solicitation will not be released as a small business set-aside.

- Q20. What is the security classification of the solution? Are security clearances required any resultant solicitation? If so, what level and type (e.g., Public Trust 6c, etc.)?

A20. The County does not anticipate receiving or writing grants requiring security clearance. No security clearance will be required in any resultant solicitation.

- Q21. Will the data contain Personal Identifiable Information (PII)?

A21. The data will not contain PII.

Q22. Are there any GMS COTS solutions currently in place in the thirty-seven (37) departments? If so, what are they?

A22. There is one GMS COTS solution currently in place with one of the departments. It is called WizeHive.

Q23. Has a best-in-class analysis been conducted for the thirty-seven (37) departments? If not, we recommend the County to consider this as part of the scope of services for any resultant solicitation.

A23. The County has not conducted a best-in-class analysis for the thirty-seven (37) departments; however, the County will consider this suggestion.

Q24. What does "Atomic Time" mean? We recommend the County to express the time for the Acceptance Date in Eastern Prevailing Time.

A24. Atomic time is produced by an atomic clock which is the most accurate time piece in the world and can be found at <https://www.time.gov> .

Q25. The RFI, Section 4.2 C. states: "There could be as many as two-hundred (200) credentialed, external applicant-users accessing the online Grants Portal." What is the anticipated number of concurrent users?

A25. The anticipated number of concurrent users are up to twenty-five (25) accessing the Grants Portal.

Q26. The relationship between the \$72M received and \$2M disbursed.

a. Are the \$72M received and \$2M disbursed related, and if so, how is the remaining \$70M utilized?

A26.a. The two numbers are not related. The \$72M represents monies received by the County from grants from Federal and State sources which are used to fund operations and programming.

b. Do you expect to process \$72M through the new grants system or \$2M, or something else?

A26.b. The new system would process both incoming revenue and out-going disbursements through grants

to non-profit organizations. It is difficult to determine what those numbers may look like in the future,

- c. How are grants funded under CARES and other support bills that provide for rental assistance, housing assistance, broadband being distributed?

A26.c. Those grants are being distributed using our current grantor processes. The new system would support the distribution of those grants.

- d. Would the County be interested in a single system that could handle all of the above?

A26.d. The County is interested in a single system that could handle all of the above.

- Q27. Could you clarify what differentiates between a non-credentialed and credentialed user?

A27. There are no non-credentialed users in the system.

- Q28. Can the County provide an example of the types of data/information that needs to be shared with the new GMS? Can the County provide what that data flow looks like?

A28. The new GMS would be integrated with current County systems. Refer to the RFI for an explanation/description. The County is not able to provide the data flow at this time.

- Q29. Reference page 4, Section D. Is it expected that payments would be processed out of Oracle (ACH, check, etc.), through a payment file integration with the new system?

A29. Payments would be processed out of Oracle, however, not through a payment file integration with the new GMS. The County is willing to explore different options depending on the feasibility of the required integration with Oracle.

- Q30. Is there any data in the Laserfiche system that would need to be imported into the new GMS? Would data cleansing and/or transformation be included in the scope?

A30. There is data in the Laserfiche system that will need to be imported into the new GMS. No data cleansing and/or transformation would be required nor will data cleansing and/or transformation be a requirement in the scope of the upcoming RFP.

Q31. Does the County currently license or use Microsoft software for County business? If so, what products? Examples would include Office 365, Azure, Business Applications, etc.

A31. The County utilizes the standard suite of Microsoft business products, including Office 365.

Q32. What does the County currently spend in administrative costs for software related to grants management today?

A32. The County does not currently track the administrative costs associated with the GMS.