



City of Raleigh

Request for Proposals #: 274-IT2026-02

Title: *Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Modernization*

Proposal Due Date and Time: *April 20, 2026 not later than 3:00PM ET*

ADDENDUM NO. #2

Issue Date: *March 25, 2026*

Issuing Department:
Direct all inquiries concerning this RFP to:
Parijat Malla
Technology Supervisor
Email: Parijat.malla@raleighnc.gov

City of Raleigh
Addendum #2 to RFP 274-IT2026-02

Issue Date:

To: All Proposers

This Addendum, containing the following additions, clarifications, and/or changes, is issued prior to receipt of proposal packages and does hereby become part of the original RFP documents and supersedes the original RFP documents in case of conflict.

Receipt of this addendum must be acknowledged by signing in the area indicated below. Please make the follow additions, clarifications, and/or changes to the RFP as listed below and **sign and return this addendum with your proposal package.**

Parijat Malla
Technology Supervisor

Sign below and return this addendum with your proposal.

Proposer Name & Company: _____ **Date:** _____

Signature: _____ **Title:** _____



| SN | Question | Response |
|----|--|--|
| 1 | Can proposers submit exceptions to the sample contract or specific RFP terms, and if so, how should they be submitted? | While the City does not encourage exceptions to contract terms and conditions, you may submit exceptions for review. Please note that submission does not constitute approval. All requested edits must be shown directly in the redlined document, including any explanatory comments or justification for the change. |
| 2 | Are there any non-negotiable terms in the sample contract in Appendix IV? | The terms in Appendix IV represent the City's standard contract and the terms we agree to. The City does not encourage modifications to these terms. However, if a vendor has a specific exception, it may be submitted through a redlined version of Appendix IV for review. Please note that submission of proposed exceptions does not constitute approval. |
| 3 | Is the City open to negotiating material contract provisions such as liability caps, SLA credits, and data return timelines? | Yes, the City is open to exploring this provided it meets business needs and legal requirements. |
| 4 | Will the City consider a pro-rata refund model for unused SaaS subscription periods on termination for convenience, which is standard market practice? | Yes, the City is open to exploring this |
| 5 | What intellectual property ownership terms would apply to any custom development performed specifically for the City? Would the City expect to own the resulting code, or would vendor ownership with a perpetual license be acceptable? | The City is not looking to have custom developed code as we want to rely on standard processes or configurations within the platform. The IP ownership would be a contract term and part of negotiations. |

| | | |
|----|---|---|
| 6 | Does the indemnification clause extend to third-party IP claims arising from AI/ML components embedded in the vendor's platform? | No. |
| 7 | Are subprocessors and offshore development or support resources permissible, given the continental US data sovereignty requirement? | As long as City data does not leave the US, development can happen offshore. Offshore support or development is not permissible if interaction with City data is required. |
| 8 | Will a Business Associate Agreement (BAA) be required, given that PHI is handled through benefits administration in the ERP? | Some agreement will be required to protect PHI and other City data. |
| 9 | What are the City's expectations around source code escrow and access to code in the event of vendor insolvency for a purpose-built solution? | The City is not looking to have custom developed code as we want to rely on standard processes or configurations within the platform. The IP ownership would be a contract term and part of negotiations. |
| 10 | May proposers submit exceptions to the Sample Contract (Appendix IV) and/or to specific RFP terms? If yes, should they be returned at proposal time as part of Tab 4 – Contract Alignment & Due Diligence (§2.1.3), or deferred until negotiations post-selection (§2.5, §2.6)? [Refs: §2.1.3; §2.3; §2.5; §2.6; Appendix IV] | While the City does not encourage exceptions to contract terms and conditions, you may submit exceptions for review. Please note that submission does not constitute approval. All requested edits must be shown directly in the redlined document, including any explanatory comments or justification for the change. |
| 11 | If exceptions are permitted, what is the City's preferred format: (a) tracked-changes redline of Appendix IV or (b) a clean Exceptions Table in Tab 4 that cites section-by-section proposed language and rationale [Refs: §2.1.3; §2.3; Appendix IV] | While the City does not encourage exceptions to contract terms and conditions, you may submit exceptions for review. Please note that submission does not constitute approval. All requested edits must be shown directly in the redlined document, including any explanatory comments or justification for the change. |
| 12 | If exceptions are not permitted at proposal time, please confirm whether a "No Exceptions/Accept As-Is" statement is expected in Tab 4 and that contract terms will be negotiated post-selection per §2.5. [Refs: §2.1.3; §2.5; Appendix IV] | While the City does not encourage exceptions to contract terms and conditions, you may submit exceptions for review. Please note that submission does not constitute approval. All requested edits must be shown directly in the redlined document, including any explanatory comments or justification for the change. |

| | | |
|----|---|---|
| 13 | Should the Appendix IV (Sample Contract) be submitted with the proposal? If so, does it need to be provided in hardcopy under Tab 4 and also on the USB? If the City prefers not to receive a marked-up contract in hardcopy, please state that preference. If hardcopy is required does this count against page limits?[Refs: §2.1.3; Appendix IV] | Yes. Appendix IV (Sample Contract) must be submitted if the proposer is suggesting any exceptions. All requested edits must be shown directly in the redlined document, including any explanatory comments or justification for the change and the same redlined version must also be included on the USB. Submission of Appendix IV does not count against the page limits. |
| 14 | The cost template includes components for solution design, architecture, consulting, and testing. If the RFP is only for software, should these components be included? | The cost template can be used to capture optional ERP software & platform related service(s) for advisory support, if your company offers such services (e.g., data conversion/migration, organizational change management, training, etc.). Implementation services and the cost for solution design, architecture, etc. will be part of the SI procurement. If you do not intend to offer optional services, only include the cost for software in the price quote. |
| 15 | What is the length of the contract? Is it a multi-year contract or a one-time contract? | While we anticipate that this will be a multi-year contract, the City will evaluate the proposals and determine the contract duration that best aligns with our needs. |
| 16 | What is the required validity for the cost submission? | All pricing provided in the Proposal shall remain valid for the duration of the evaluation period and through contract award. The City may request that proposers extend the validity of their pricing if the evaluation or negotiation period exceeds the initial validity period. |

| | | |
|----|--|---|
| 17 | What is the intended proposal validity period for the "XXX days" placeholder in the cost submission tab? | All pricing provided in the Proposal shall remain valid for the duration of the evaluation period and through contract award. The City may request that proposers extend the validity of their pricing if the evaluation or negotiation period exceeds the initial validity period. An Addendum was issued to provide clarity on the validity period. |
| 18 | Page 4 states that a SI selection will be made following the Software vendor selection. However, the pricing table on page 22 references to Implementation Support as a factor of costs. Please clarify what is meant by implementation support? | If the software vendor is capable of providing advisory services to the SI to assist with implementation the cost of such services can be included in the Cost factor. If software vendors do not offer advisory services, the cost shouldn't include them. |
| 19 | If a purpose-built solution is proposed, will the City accept an alternative pricing structure reflecting development economics rather than the subscription model in the pricing template? | The City will adhere to the pricing template that was included in the RFP package |
| 20 | The pricing template includes a line item for "Development" under one-time costs. Should vendors price only standard configuration here, or are bespoke development activities also in scope for vendor-provided services? | All costs associated with development/configuration are expected to be included in vendor responses, While configuration may be a responsibility of the SI, the SW vendor should divulge any known level of configuration or customization that may be needed to meet identified requirements. |
| 21 | When does the subscription fee clock start at contract signing, at the start of implementation, or at go-live? | The City would prefer the subscription clock starting at Go-Live. At the least, the SW subscription will be contracted to initiate in alignment with the SI implementation project timeline. |
| 22 | Please confirm how many days following the submission deadline vendor proposal content and cost should be valid. Currently, RFP says XXX days. | All pricing provided in the Proposal shall remain valid for the duration of the evaluation period and through contract award. The City may request that proposers extend the validity of their pricing if the evaluation or negotiation period exceeds the initial validity period. |
| 23 | §2.1.4 states the cost submission signifies the proposal is valid for "XXX days". Please confirm the exact validity period (e.g., 90/120/180 days) measured from the Proposal Due Date. [Ref: §2.1.4] | All pricing provided in the Proposal shall remain valid for the duration of the evaluation period and through contract award. The City may request that proposers extend the validity of their pricing if the evaluation or negotiation period exceeds the initial validity period. |

| | | |
|----|--|---|
| 24 | <p>For the Cost Proposal, please confirm that both Appendix I (signed cost form) and the separate Excel Pricing Workbook referenced in §2.1.4 must be printed and placed in a separate sealed COST envelope, and also included on the USB, or if the Excel Pricing Workbook can be excluded from printing. [Refs: §2.1.4; Appendix I]</p> | <p>Please refer to section 2.1.4 Section/Tab 5: Cost In a separate submittal provide a cost proposal that itemizes the costs for the CoR to obtain and maintain the ERP software solution. Include a detailed cost form and any additional cost breakdown or price schedule that outlines all costs over a five-year period of performance. (i.e., acquisition, subscription, update/upgrade/maintenance, new releases, etc.). The City has provided a pricing cost form (ref: attachment to be used by the software vendors for the software costs.) Appendix I and excel pricing worksheet needs to be submitted both physically and in digital format</p> |
| 25 | <p>This tab requests estimates for implementation services. Assuming this is a software-only RFP and the RFP states that implementation will be procured separately through a future System Integrator selection process, how should vendors complete this tab?</p> | <p>Vendors should complete this tab if you provide advisory services/support that may be complimentary to the SI. If you don't provide any type of additive implementation support that would be beneficial to the SI or project, use "not applicable" for the response.</p> |
| 26 | <p>1. Will the city consider a data conversion approach to support a green-field implementation. In this case, all master data is brought over with open A/P and A/R items as well as encumbrances and ending balances. Historical transactional data would be stored in a data warehouse, indexed against the new data structures, and made available for query and reporting purposed?</p> | <p>We are open to solutions that enable the City to maintain critical data records from the past 15+ years, meet legal and fiscal responsibilities, create year end or other period close reports, and access historical data when necessary while managing ongoing operational costs.</p> |
| 27 | <p>Can the City share a high-level data conversion inventory (modules, data volumes, retention periods, data quality concerns) across all in-scope legacy systems?</p> | <p>The City has a large amount of data in both the Financial and Human Capital portions of our current ERP but data conversion requirements have not yet been defined. The City has engaged with an outside vendor to perform data readiness assessments and preparation work in this space. This work is currently in progress and will be shared with the selected vendor when it is appropriate. Sample data and volumetrics can be found starting on page 10 of the RFP</p> |
| 28 | <p>What historical depth is required online vs archived for Finance, HCM, Payroll, Grants, Fixed Assets, and other modules (e.g., 7 years online; 10+ years in archive)?</p> | <p>For the Software, we are open to best practice or other recommendations from the Software vendor. The City will follow retention rules but is open to historical data stored in other locations that allow easy reporting.</p> |
| 29 | <p>What is the expected division of responsibilities between the selected ERP software vendor and the future System Integrator (SI) around data migration?</p> | <p>Yes. If the core ERP system cannot be configured to meet the City's functional requirements, we are open to considering fit-for-purpose solutions that are able to seamlessly integrate/interface with the ERP system. If the ERP software vendor intends to bid a hybrid approach, the City is interested in understanding the vendor's extensibility approach (e.g. extensibility on the iPaaS, purpose built Third Party add/bolt on solutions/modules etc.) to evaluate its feasibility/suitability.</p> |
| 30 | <p>Are vendors expected to propose data migration tooling and lead the migration effort, or will that be the SI's responsibility?</p> | <p>Software vendors do not need to provide data migration tooling as this will be led by another vendor but should highlight any unique capabilities within the Software platform for this purpose.</p> |

| | | |
|----|---|---|
| 31 | What is the expected scope of historical data migration, full history since 2007, or a defined cutover period? | The City has a large amount of data in both the Financial and Human Capital portions of our current ERP but data conversion requirements have not yet been defined. The City has engaged with an outside vendor to perform data readiness assessments and preparation work in this space. This work is currently in progress and will be shared with the selected vendor when it is appropriate. Sample data and volumetrics can be found starting on page 10 of the RFP. |
| 32 | Has any data cleansing or archival exercise already been initiated that vendors should factor into their migration approach? | Software vendors do not need to provide data migration activities as this will be lead by another vendor but should highlight any unique capabilities within the Software platform for this purpose. |
| 33 | 2. Can you provide approximate data volumes (rows for data conversion) for your historical data by data type? | Exact data conversion requirements have not yet been defined but certain data types and volumes are included in the RFP starting on Page 10. |
| 34 | 3. On your user counts: How many users from these modules only require read-only and self-service procurement capabilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial Accounting • Grants Management • Budgeting & Planning • Treasury & Cash Mgmt. • Procure to Pay • Inventory and Warehouse Mgmt. | None, the counts listed are for users that have above a standard self-service capability and all would need more than just read-only access. |
| 35 | 4. In the following user counts, how many are duplicate - for example are the 24 people in Financial Accounting the same 24 as in Grants Management. Financial Accounting 24 Grants Management 24 Budgeting & Planning 3 Treasury & Cash Mgmt. 19 Procure to Pay 36 Inventory and Warehouse Mgmt. 40 | Most users in Financial Accounting, Grants Management, Budget & Planning, and Treasury & Cash Management are the same, with a small number of users unique to each area. Procure-to-Pay has approximately 50% overlap with these roles, while Inventory and Warehouse Management has about 25% overlap. |
| 36 | How many unique users do you have? | Unique user counts are included in the published RFP on page 10. |

| | | |
|----|--|--|
| 37 | How many inventory and management users only use the system to record goods issues/ receipts and other inventory transactions? | There are currently about 65 users that utilize the inventory components in this manner. |
| 38 | Approximately how many users across City departments will require access to the ERP system, and how many of those users will require full transactional access versus reporting or inquiry access? | The RFP contained all HCM and Finance users. It also contained the number of admin users per module. All ERP users should have the ability to perform some reporting or inquiry based on their system access and permissions. |
| 39 | Can the City provide estimates regarding the volume of data and number of legacy systems that will require migration to the new ERP platform? | The City has a large amount of data in both the Financial and Human Capital portions of our current ERP but data conversion requirements have not yet been defined. The City has engaged with an outside vendor to perform data readiness assessments and preparation work in this space. This work is currently in progress and will be shared with the selected vendor when it is appropriate. Sample data and volumetrics can be found starting on page 10 of the RFP |
| 40 | Which critical reports (statutory, management, operational) must be reproduced or improved in the new system on day one, and in what formats (PDF, Excel, dashboards)? | The City has a number of standard reports already listed in the RFP. The City wants to have modern reporting tools that are easy to configure that can be provided in a variety of formats (dashboards, PDF, CSV, etc) |
| 41 | What are the City's expectations for self-service analytics and ad-hoc reporting by Finance, HR, and operational departments versus centralized report development? | The City wants to have modern reporting tools that are easy to configure that can be provided in a variety of formats (dashboards, PDF, CSV, etc). There should be standard reports but also the ability for users to create reports maintaining their data access levels. |
| 42 | Who is conducting the evaluation of the RFP responses? Is it in-house or outsourced to an independent party? | The evaluation will be conducted internally by City of Raleigh staff. |
| 43 | Do the jobs require a public trust or any type of security clearance? | No |
| 44 | Can the proposer meet the minimum reference requirement using its OEM partner references when the proposer is a reseller prime? | For the Software, references should be people using the software that the proposer is authorized to provide. |
| 45 | Do the required 3-5 references in Tab 2 (§2.1.1) have to be for the submitting entity (the proposer), or may the proposer meet the minimum reference requirement using its OEM/partner references when the proposer is a reseller prime? [Refs: §2.1.1; Appendix II; Appendix III] | For the Software, references should be from entities using the software that the proposer is authorized to provide. |
| 46 | Are there any special points for minority or women-owned businesses? If companies with special designations like veteran, disabled, woman-owned, or hub zone get more points during the evaluation process. | No |

| | | |
|----|--|---|
| 47 | Do the required 3–5 references in Tab 2 (§2.1.1) have to be for the submitting entity (the proposer), or may the proposer meet the minimum reference requirement using its OEM/partner references when the proposer is a reseller prime? [Refs: §2.1.1; Appendix II; Appendix III] | For the Software, references should be people using the software that the proposer is authorized to provide. |
| 48 | Must all references submitted to meet the minimum three-reference requirement come exclusively from the prime vendor itself? | For the Software, references should be people using the software that the proposer is authorized to provide. |
| 49 | Can references from a proposed subcontractor's prior engagements be used to satisfy the reference requirement? | For the Software, references should be people using the software that the proposer is authorized to provide. |
| 50 | Could you please clarify whether any AI or machine learning capabilities are used in the RFX evaluation process (e.g., auto-scoring, semantic similarity, or summarization)? If so, please indicate the platform and specific features in use, how evaluator decisions and AI-assisted outputs are audited and made explainable, and what data residency and privacy controls are applied to supplier submissions. | AI will be used as a tool to assist with evaluating vendor proposals. Specifics regarding the AI platform, data & privacy controls, etc. are confidential and restricted to the City's evaluation team. |
| 51 | Will point-solution vendors be scored on the same 1,000-point scale as full-suite vendors, or on a pro-rated basis reflecting their narrower scope? | All solutions will be scored using our standard 1000 point scoring system |
| 52 | If a third-party advisory firm has been engaged, will that firm participate in proposal evaluation and scoring? | Our 3rd party partners will not be scoring vendor bids |
| 53 | Will shortlisted vendors be invited to conduct product demonstrations or solution presentations as part of the evaluation process? | Yes |
| 54 | How does the City currently manage grants lifecycle (application, budgeting, drawdown, reporting, close-out), and where are the biggest pain points? | The City currently uses both our ERP system, an external third party provider and manual processes to support the grants life cycle. An end-to-end grants lifecycle process is not currently embedded within our existing ERP system. |

| | | |
|----|---|--|
| 55 | What level of budget formulation sophistication is required (multi-year budgets, position budgeting, scenario modeling, performance-based budgeting)? | Currently the city budgets operating one year at a time and programs capital budgets five-year, although only the next year is actually adopted by Council. We need to have a system that provides for position budgeting and provides the opportunity to model various scenarios for merit/cost of living increases for the various types of pay plans. The ability to collect business cases for new operational and capital requests is important and critical that these feed directly into the system when approved. The system also needs to be able to communicate with our capital project management system: Unity Construct. |
| 56 | Are credit cards issued for expensing travel related items for employees on business trips? Which card program/vendor? | Yes. Bank Of America. |
| 57 | Are budgets encumbered and unencumbered as part of the Travel Authorization/Reimbursement process? | Yes. |
| 58 | What kind of reporting does CoR use today? What types of reports are being used today and what is the scope of their reporting requirements? | High level report needs were provided in the RFP. |
| 59 | Please clarify if payment to a retired employee is referring to a retro payment from when they were a W-2 employee, and will be reported on a W-2? Will NCRS make all retirement 1099 payments? | The payments referred to in the RFP are to retired Law Enforcement Officers who are eligible for the monthly Separation Allowance (state law) and those retired officers are paid by the City and they receive a W-2. Retirement earnings are handled by the NC Retirement system for all retirees. |
| 60 | How are Workers Compensations claims managed, approved and paid? Do you currently have a Workers Compensation management software or third party administrator? What type(s) of Workers Compensation Payments will be approved and made through Payroll? Please describe the process as related to Payroll. | The City uses a Third Party Administrator (TPA) and their portal in conjunction with HR to manage, approve and pay claims. Payroll is notified when employees are out on Worker's Comp and processes the first week out of work as sick during the NC waiting period and/or manages if an employee is placed on light duty for hours worked and manage timesheets. Payroll also provides the TPA with time and earnings data. |
| 61 | Please describe the filing with CoR for Forms listed in the requirement. | We file W3 and W2's electronically as well as quarterly unemployment - these files are pulled from our current system and uploaded to the repective agencies so that there is no need to manually complete said forms. |
| 62 | Please describe "Tier 5 and Tier 6" as it applies to OT limits for NCS Retirement system and what are the OT Parameters which must be followed? | The NC Retirement system does not have Tiered OT limits and therefore this does not apply to the City of Raleigh and payments sent to NC Retirement. |

| | | |
|----|--|--|
| 63 | The Finance, HCM, and Inventory requirements workbooks contain two separate "For Vendor Only" response columns per requirement. Should vendors treat these as responses for two separate proposed modules, or is the second column intended for a different purpose? | Columns J-R were hidden in the Requirements Excel workbook. Columns S-AA should be populated as part of vendor responses. |
| 64 | The Procurement requirements workbook has only a single vendor response column, while Finance and HCM workbooks have two. Is this intentional, and if so, what does it indicate about how point-solution vendors covering only Procurement should respond? | Columns J-R were hidden in the Requirements Excel workbook. Columns S-AA should be populated as part of vendor responses. |
| 65 | In the Request for Proposals #274-IT2026-02 (Word) file, in the Scope of Services section, there is a clear delineation of desired capabilities as both the Grantor and the Grantee. The Functional Financial capabilities seem largely focused on capabilities as the Grantee. Does the CoR require robust Grantor capabilities as well, capabilities as highlighted in section A.2.1.9 of the RFP document? | The City's grantee portfolio (recipient of Federal, State, or local grants) is much larger than the grantor portfolio. Annually the City allocates funding to not for profits and in these instances, the City is a grantor. The City is open to exploring ERP solutions which support both Grantee and Grantor capabilities but the primary focus would be on grantee capabilities. |
| 66 | For a multi-year staged rollout, how does the City envision phasing the implementation across Financials, HCM/Payroll, Budget, Grants, Inventory, and other modules (single go-live vs staged rollouts)? | The City is open to proposals but the City's initial plan is to migrate to HCM and then to Finance after HCM is operational. Proposers should recommend the best approach for the City to achieve its ERP modernization objectives. |
| 67 | How many SMEs per dept are assigned to the project of this scope and magnitude? How many resources or roles will be engaged throughout the lifecycle of the modernization portfolio? Example: you may have a Finance, HCM, and Procurement individual projects yet there will be universal needs across the entire organization such as OCM, testing, and Enduser training? | The City is still currently identifying the number of SMEs that will be assigned to this project and fully anticipate to have coverage for all universal needs. |
| 68 | What is the City's philosophy for preparing the project team with training to ensure they are ready to guide project team and design decisions? | The City is taking the appropriate steps to ensure its project team is ready and prepared to work with vendors to successfully complete the ERP modernization. |
| 69 | How is success for this project going to be measured (KPIs, SLAs, adoption metrics, audit results, cycle times, error rates)? | The City intends to use a combination of quantitative and qualitative measures and metrics to determine project success. |
| 70 | How much annual spend is expected to be managed by the new procurement system. | The system will be expected to support and manage the City's overall procurement needs, and the spend managed through the system will ultimately align with the City's approved budget. |

| | | |
|----|---|--|
| 71 | Is the City seeking an existing commercial off-the-shelf ERP product, or would a solution involving significant custom development also be considered responsive? | The City is looking for a platform already designed for ERP. Software that requires substantial development and ongoing maintenance is not desired. |
| 72 | Who is currently providing ERP software and implementation support services to the city beyond the Oracle PeopleSoft license itself? | The ERP software vendor is not expected to provide change management or end-user training support. The SI will be responsible for end-user training. If software vendors are interested in providing change management support, include the cost in the "One-Time Upfront Cost" tab of the Software Pricing template Excel file. |
| 73 | Is the incumbent ERP software vendor or any party currently providing services related to the existing PeopleSoft system eligible to bid on this RFP? | The City has not precluded any vendors from bidding on this RFP. |
| 74 | Has the City conducted any prior market research, RFI, or vendor engagement process ahead of this RFP that vendors should be aware of? | The City did not facilitate any RFI ahead of this RFP |
| 75 | Is the City open to replacing UKG entirely within the new ERP, or is UKG considered a long-term keeper? | The City is open to new solutions for timeclocks. |
| 76 | Does City of Raleigh intend to continue using NeoGov for your HCM Management/HR? | The City will evaluate all proposal responses, including HCM/HR functionality, as part of this process. Through that evaluation, the City will determine whether continuing with NeoGov or transitioning to another solution that best supports the City's future needs. |
| 77 | Is NEOGOV expected to be replaced by the new ERP's HCM module, or retained as a separate system? | The City will evaluate all proposal responses, including HCM/HR functionality, as part of this process. Through that evaluation, the City will determine whether continuing with NeoGov or transitioning to another solution that best supports the City's future needs. |
| 78 | What are the top pain points with the current PeopleSoft implementation that this modernization must address? | The City is looking to address a number of business and technical pain points through the ERP modernization. Human capital management is a critical area/pain point that the City would like to address first, however the City is open to Proposer's recommendation(s) on which functional area to address first. |
| 79 | Which PeopleSoft customizations does the City consider critical to retain in the new system? | The City is open to moving to platform best practices and reducing customizations where possible. The City still need to be compliant with laws and regulations. |
| 80 | Which PeopleSoft customizations are candidates for elimination or standardization in the new system? | The City is open to moving to platform best practices and reducing customizations where possible. The City still need to be compliant with laws and regulations. |

| | | |
|----|--|---|
| 81 | What is the expected role of Snowflake in the future-state architecture? Will it remain the primary analytics layer, or is the City open to consolidating analytics within the ERP platform? | Snowflake is serving as the data repository for all City analytics. While the ERP platform may have reporting and analytics, ERP data will most likely need to be stored in Snowflake to be used in conjunction with other data for reporting and visualizations. |
| 82 | Does the City have a preferred integration middleware or iPaaS platform, or should vendors propose their own? | There is no current preferred platform. |
| 83 | What level of change management and end-user training support is expected from the ERP software vendor, as distinct from what the City expects the SI to deliver? | The ERP software vendor is not expected to provide change management or end-user training support (we should also clarify - training is expected to be provided by the SI). If software vendors are interested in providing change management and/or training support, include the cost in the "One-Time Upfront Cost" tab of the Software Pricing template Excel file. |
| 84 | What is the City's tolerance for business process re-engineering vs. configuring the system to match existing workflows? | The City is open to moving to platform best practices and reducing customizations where possible. The City still need to be compliant with laws and regulations. |
| 85 | Which functional modules does the City consider highest priority for Phase 1 go-live? | The City views all ERP modules as crucial to performing City business. Decisions on phasing and functionality will be decided as part of the SI selection process. |
| 86 | Are there any functional capabilities the City would accept deferring to a later implementation phase? | The City views all ERP modules as crucial to performing City business. Decisions on phasing and functionality will be decided as part of the SI selection process. |
| 87 | Will the City consider a phased implementation approach, or is a simultaneous big-bang go-live across all modules expected? | The City is open to proposals but the City's initial plan is to migrate to HCM and then to Finance after HCM is operational. |
| 88 | Does the City anticipate selecting a single ERP vendor for all functional areas, or potentially multiple vendors providing best-of-breed solutions for different modules as referenced in the RFP? | The City is open to a best of breed approach provided the requirements are met and the ability to integrate the platforms is not technical risk, resource intensive, or financially excessive. |

| | | |
|----|---|---|
| 89 | Does the City have a preference for a single-suite ERP over a best-of-breed multi-vendor approach? | The City is open to a best of breed approach provided the requirements are met and the ability to integrate the platforms is not technical risk, resource intensive, or financially excessive. |
| 90 | Does the City have a preferred implementation timeline or phased deployment approach for ERP modules? | The City views all ERP modules as crucial to performing City business. Decisions on phasing and functionality will be decided as part of the SI selection process. |
| 91 | Would the City consider a hybrid model where a core commercial ERP is extended with purpose-built modules for areas where no off-the-shelf capability adequately meets requirements? | Yes. If the core ERP system cannot be configured to meet the City's functional requirements, we are open to considering fit-for-purpose solutions that are able to seamlessly integrate/interface with the ERP system. CoR is interested to know more about ERP vendor extensibility approach (e.g. extensibility on the iPaaS, purpose built Third Party add/bolt on solutions/modules etc.) |
| 92 | If a purpose-built solution under active development is proposed, would the City consider a staged delivery model where core Finance and Payroll modules are delivered first, with remaining modules following, provided the full solution is contractually committed at award? | The City is willing to explore all solutions proposed by vendors if the proposed solution meets all requirements that were included in the RFP package |
| 93 | For the approximately 978 Time and Attendance users, are these self-service employees entering their own time or dedicated timekeepers? | The 978 Time and Attendance users have rights above self service capabilities. These would be the ones that have permission to approve time for staff, enter time in on behalf of staff, and approve absences. The number for self-service employees entering in their time would be the total number of users listed on page 10 of the RFP. |
| 94 | Is the Chart of Accounts restructuring exercise expected to happen as part of this ERP project, or as a separate initiative? | Yes, the City is open to exploring a COA redesign as part of the implementation. |
| 95 | How does the City want to organize the Chart of Accounts, project/grant structure, and organizational hierarchy going forward, and are COA redesign or rationalization in scope? | Yes, the City is open to exploring a COA redesign as part of the implementation. |
| 96 | What is the City's target go-live fiscal year or date following contract award? | The City's target go-live ranges between FY28 -FY30 but is willing to explore proposed project plans submitted by vendors |
| 97 | Are there any funding deadlines or regulatory drivers that constrain the implementation timeline? | No there is currently no funding deadlines or regulatory drivers that have been identified at this time |
| 98 | How does the City define "key personnel" for this engagement, specifically, which roles are considered key? | Key Personnel are individuals that are essential for the successful execution of the project. The roles for key personnel include the Project Manager, Subject Matter Experts, Partners/Principals that can commit the company/firm and be held accountable for performance. |
| 99 | For a purpose-built solution, what evidence of technical capability and delivery record would the City expect in place of a traditional product demonstration? | The City needs to see a demonstration of the product and references using the product. |

| | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 100 | Will the City share the full requirements workbooks in a machine-readable or structured format to support solution design for purpose-built proposals before submission? | The full requirements workbook (and instructions on how to use it) was included in the RFP package that is published. |
| 101 | For a purpose-built or heavily customized solution, how should vendors respond to the requirements workbook columns, given that a bespoke solution meets all requirements through development rather than out-of-the-box capability? | The City seeks to acquire a SaaS/Cloud ERP solution that can be configured to meet the requirements. The City does not seek to acquire a purpose-built/customized solution. |
| 102 | Is there an estimated not-to-exceed budget for this engagement? | There has not been a not-to-exceed budget identified at this time |
| 103 | Has the City engaged a third-party advisory firm for this procurement? | Yes, the City has 3rd party vendor partners in an advisory role for this procurement |
| 104 | Will vendors be permitted to demonstrate roadmap capabilities during Stage 2 demonstrations, or will scoring be based strictly on current generally available functionality? | Vendors that have been selected to participate with the stage 2 demonstrations can choose to include roadmap capabilities |
| 105 | Are there upcoming North Carolina legislative changes or new GASB standards that the ERP must be certified to support at go-live? | The ERP software must be able to accommodate current GASB standards. New GASB standards are required to be implemented by the City as they are approved. Many new standards require financial reporting changes and our preference would be have an ERP solution to allow flexibility within all reporting modules. Further, the City may be similarly asked to implement future NC legislative changes. |
| 106 | The Technical Requirements workbook has priority designations only on the General Architecture tab; all other technical tabs have no priority populated. Should vendors treat all unprioritized technical requirements as equally required? | All tabs have Priority column populated with 'Required' vs 'Preferred'. 'Required' ones are higher priority. |
| 107 | How many non-production environments does the City anticipate requiring, and should vendors price these as fully provisioned from day one? | This depends on the SW upgrade and patching approach. We would like to know the standard environments and understand the cost and availability of any additional ones. |
| 108 | During the pre-bid call it was stated that there are “vendors supporting the process” and that you will be posting the names of those vendors in the Q&A addenda. What has been their role in the process? | 3rd Party Vendor Partners have been supporting the City's requirements strategy and pre-implementation activities. |
| 109 | Over the last 18 months, has the City had any engagement or demos with vendors? If so, who are they? | The City has not had engagements related to the ERP RFP. The IT team does have regular cadences with existing vendors that cover current offerings, future roadmaps, and AI innovations. |
| 110 | Will the City be considering Vertically Integrated providers (i.e. can we submit a response for both software and services)? The pricing spreadsheet has a tab for services. | Vertically Integrated Providers can submit separate proposals for the software and services RFPs |
| 111 | The four requirements' spreadsheets have version numbers in their file names. Are these the final version of the spreadsheets, or will there be revised versions to be released for our final response? | These are the final spreadsheets |

| | | |
|-----|--|--|
| 112 | Please confirm that (a) the City understands that proposal content remains the intellectual property of the proposer and its subcontractors, and (b) “property of the City” will be interpreted to mean right to retain copies and use them for evaluation and record-keeping, not a transfer of intellectual property rights, and (c) vendors will be given an opportunity to assert applicable public-records exemptions for materials marked confidential before disclosure. | The City follows all applicable statutory requirements regarding proposal materials, intellectual property, and public-records handling. |
| 113 | §2.1 requests that proposals be divided into sections using tabs. When a ring binder is not used (e.g., clip-bound set or electronic PDF), is it acceptable to use clearly labeled section headers matching “Section/Tab 1–5” plus a table of contents and embedded PDF bookmarks? Please confirm this satisfies the requirement. If physical tab dividers are mandatory in the hardcopy even without a ring binder, please confirm the required format. [Refs: §2.1; §2.1.1–§2.1.4] | A printed copy may include physical tabs or section cover pages; as long as each section is clearly labeled and easy to identify. |
| 114 | Section 2.1 requires a “Proposed Solution” response in Tab 3. Can the City please confirm whether Tab 3 requires both a narrative describing the proposed ERP solution and the completed functional and technical requirement workbooks, or if the completed workbooks alone will satisfy the requirements for this section? [Ref: §2.1] | Provide a narrative description for how your company's ERP software platform meet the City's needs. Describe the core functionality and features of your ERP platform and how it's able to meet the City's requirements. |
| 115 | In light of the complexity and volume of the required functional and technical workbooks, along with the narrative content, will the City consider granting a two-week extension to the Proposal Due Date to ensure a complete and high-quality response? | The City has no plans to extend the due date of this RFP |
| 116 | The ‘Project Understanding’ section requests a description of each task, deliverable, and schedule, which appears to be implementation-focused. Assuming this is a software-only RFP, how should vendors address this requirement? | This is not applicable for software vendors. A description of tasks, deliverables, schedule, etc.is required. |
| 117 | What ERP or enterprise systems are currently used by the City for Finance, Human Resources, Payroll, Procurement, and related functions? | Currently, the city uses PeopleSoft platform. |
| 118 | Has the City established a preliminary budget range for the ERP modernization initiative? | The City is currently establishing the preliminary budget for this project at this time. |
| 119 | What level of ongoing operational support does the City expect from the selected vendor following ERP implementation (e.g., application support, managed services, enhancement support)? | The City has limited dedicated staff that support the ERP platform. Currently, the City also contracts with a 3rd party vendor for additional support. Vendors may propose additional support services as they see fit. |
| 120 | The Pre-Proposal Virtual Meeting that happened on Wednesday March 11th, was this recorded and can we gain access to the recording for review | No, the recording will not be published; however all the questions brought up will be published with response in Addendum for 3/25. |

| | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 121 | What is the name of the vendor who implemented the current ERP? | Cherry Road was the vendor used for the original implementation of PeopleSoft (2008) |
| 122 | Can the current vendor participate in this RFP? | The City has not restricted any vendors to participate in this RFP process |
| 123 | Can the city share the recording of the pre-proposal meeting? | No, the recording will not be published; however all the questions brought up will be published with response in Addendum for 3/25. |
| 124 | How complex are the City's pay rules (differentials, overtime rules, stipends, multiple pay calendars, FLSA rules) and how many distinct rule sets exist today? | <p>The City's pay rules are highly complex and encompass a wide range of compensation structures across employee groups. Within each payroll cycle, the City administers four separate pay periods, each governed by unique business requirements. The City also administers a monthly payroll to retired employees, with different tax calculations and benefit rules.</p> <p>The City also maintains multiple FLSA and overtime frameworks, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 27 day overtime cycle for Fire Suppression employees • 28 day overtime cycle for Police employees • Daily time provisions for other employees, who earn a minimum of 10 hours per day when working more than eight hours • 7-day overtime cycle for remainder of employees. <p>Compensation structures vary significantly across the workforce. Some employees receive stipends integrated into base pay, while others earn daily stipends based on the specific work performed. Additional pay elements include shift differentials for some employees, as well as scenarios where employees earn either overtime pay or overtime via compensatory leave. The complexity is further increased by employees working in multiple job assignments, requiring overtime to be calculated using a weighted average methodology across job classifications.</p> <p>In total, the City currently supports approximately 50 distinct workgroups operating under about 30 unique pay rule programs, reflecting the substantial variation and specificity required to support City operations.</p> <p>Importantly, as part of the upcoming system migration, the City is hopeful that many of these rules and processes can be simplified, leveraging modern functionality and best practices to streamline administration and reduce manual intervention.</p> |

| | | |
|-----|--|---|
| 125 | <p>What is the current approach to scheduling, time capture (time clocks, web, mobile), and approvals; and which parts must be preserved vs re-designed?</p> | <p>The City's current scheduling and time capture processes use a combination of prepopulated schedules, electronic time entry methods, and supervisory approval workflows. Full time employee schedules are prepopulated within the system, whereas part time employees manually enter schedules and hours worked due to the variability of their assignments.</p> <p>Time capture is supported through a mixed method environment, including punch time clocks, biometric clocks, and web based time entry which can also be accessed on mobile devices. This combination allows employees across diverse operational settings to record time using the method most appropriate to their work environment.</p> <p>Approval processes vary by employee group. Some employees follow a full approval workflow, requiring supervisors to review and approve all recorded time. Others use an exception-based model, in which only deviations from the prepopulated schedule require approval.</p> <p>Regarding which components should be preserved or re designed, the City is open to evaluating modern workforce management technology to determine the optimal future-state model. This will help guide decisions on where existing functionality should be maintained and where new capabilities or redesigned processes may better support operational needs</p> |
|-----|--|---|

| | | |
|-----|--|--|
| 126 | Which departments rely most on inventory management, and what are the current challenges (stock visibility, replenishment, valuation, integration with work orders)? | <p>The City's public utilities department utilizes PeopleSoft for inventory tracking, particularly in support of maintenance, repairs, and capital work. Inventory is essential to ensuring timely service delivery and operational continuity.</p> <p>With respect to the areas identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Stock Visibility: Real-time visibility across locations is essential and currently an area where improvements would be beneficial. · Replenishment: Effective and timely replenishment is critical to avoid stockouts that could impact operations. · Valuation: Accurate inventory valuation is necessary for financial reporting and accountability. · Integration with Work Orders: Tight integration between inventory and work order management is required to ensure accurate tracking of materials used in the field. <p>These capabilities are not only relevant but necessary for our operations today and will continue to be required moving forward. Enhancing efficiency, visibility, and integration in these areas is a priority.</p> |
| 127 | Are there plans to standardize or centralize procurement processes and catalogs across departments as part of the ERP deployment? | <p>The City will evaluate ERP system capabilities to determine the best options for standardizing or centralizing procurement processes and catalogs. No decisions have been made at this stage.</p> |
| 128 | What level of invoice automation is desired (e-invoicing, OCR, 3-way matching tolerances, exception handling, duplicate detection, fraud controls)? | <p>The City is open to all levels of invoice automation. At this stage, we will evaluate all available options—including e-invoicing, OCR, 3-way matching tolerances, exception handling, duplicate detection, and fraud controls—during the ERP solution assessment.</p> |
| 129 | How are Travel & Expense policies structured today, and what are the expectations for policy enforcement, mobile capture, card integration, and audit workflows? | <p>The City follows a centralized T&E policy supported by departmental procedures. Policy enforcement is required, and reviewers must verify complete and accurate documentation. We are open to enhanced enforcement features in a new solution. Strong audit workflows are expected.</p> |
| 130 | How many Expense Reports do you process annually? | <p>Estimated amount 3,700</p> |

| | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 131 | How many P-cards do you have issued? | Around 650 |
| 132 | Will Raleigh require a Trip Request process? | Yes. Raleigh currently requires a Travel Authorization (Trip Request) before any business travel occurs. All travel must be approved in advance, and a Travel Authorization is required for any trip involving costs or reimbursement. |
| 133 | What kind of Per Diem rates and rules will be used (e.g. USGSA.)? | Per diem follows the GSA standard rate. Meal deductions are required when meals are provided, and only overnight travel qualifies for meal per diem. Partial-day rules apply (reduced rate on first/last travel days). The City is open to explore GSA rate for travel location and lodging. |
| 134 | How is mileage reimbursed today? What kind of milage is being reimbursed currently (e.g. all day tracking while going from place to place or just airport runs, etc.) | Mileage to employees is reimbursed through PeopleSoft today. Departments complete an Expense Report through PeopleSoft which includes a mileage form of miles traveled, and a map printout or screenshot is required to support the mileage claimed. The reimbursement rate is updated annually according to the IRS rate. Mileage is reimbursed for documented business travel (e.g., travel between work locations, meetings, or airport runs), based on what is recorded and approved by the department on the form. A request is submitted through People Soft. |
| 135 | Are Travel Advances issued as part of the Trip Request process? | No |
| 136 | Are Travel Advances (per diems) issued as part of the pre-Trip Request process? | No |
| 137 | How are PCards leveraged for the procurement of goods and/or services? Which card program/vendor? | The City utilizes P-Cards for the procurement of certain goods and services in accordance with established purchasing thresholds and guidelines. The program is administered through Bank of America. Additional details on how P-Cards are used may be further evaluated as part of the ERP assessment. |
| 138 | Concur can provide reporting for 1099 as a custom report out of Concur Intelligence, but will 1099 reporting be provided out of the Business Suite reporting? | The City must report and send 1099 tax documents in accordance with federal and state guidelines. This functionality must exist and the method to produce any tax documents be included in the response. |
| 139 | Is the CoR looking for a new PCard and/or T&E card provider? | No |

| | | |
|-----|--|--|
| 140 | How many sourcing, contracts, and supplier management users does the city of Raleigh expect to use the new system. A requestor or approver are not counted for this purpose. | The City is currently in the process of restructuring our procurement processes. Our central procurement division consists of 13 users. However, we have departments that also manage AES, Construction, and General Services procurement processes. We roughly estimate 50 additional users. |
| 141 | Can the city specify the need to maintain a separate subledger for serialized inventory, as opposed to a sub-inventory for location tracking or a classification for reporting purposes? | The City requires the ability to track inventory items by serial number and currently uses warehouses to track by location. The City is open to solutions which support these requirements. |
| 142 | There is a separate "Manage Inventory Requirements v1" Excel file and a tab for "Manage Inventory" in the "Procurement Requirements v2" file. The separate excel file for Manage Inventory seems to be a CoR internal team file. Please confirm whether we need to respond to the requirements in both files, or if the standalone Manage Inventory file was a working file and software vendors should only respond to the Inventory requirements as embedded as a unique tab in the "Procurement Requirements v2" file. | Please refer to the "Manage Inventory Requirements v1" Excel file for requirements for Manage Inventory. |
| 143 | Please confirm that the correct versions of the functional spreadsheets have been provided. The files received include City of Raleigh instructions, "CoR Requirements – Review Only" columns, and tabs labeled "Not Required Reqs Removed." Additionally, the Manage Inventory Requirements sheet appears to duplicate content found in the Procurement Requirements – Manage Inventory tab. Clarification is requested regarding which Excel sheets are intended for completion to ensure work proceeds from the correct versions. | "CoR Requirements-Review Only" includes Priority from CoR perspective and if it needs to be included in Demo. "Not Required Reqs Removed" was obsolete and has been removed from latest version. Please refer "Manage Inventory Requirements v1" Excel file for requirements for Manage Inventory. |
| 144 | Are credit cards issued for expensing travel related items for employees on business trips? Which card program/vendor? | Yes. Bank Of America. |
| 145 | Can we provide financial statements electronically on a USB due to their large size? | Yes, large files for financial statements can be provided electronically on a USB. |

| | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 146 | Can you clarify what counts towards the 50-page limit for the proposal submission? | Proposals shall not exceed fifty (50) pages, excluding appendices. The 50-page limit applies to all core proposal content. Appendix materials including supporting documents, resumes, detailed requirements, and other supplementary information are not counted toward the 50-page limit. |
| 147 | Due to the size of our company's audited financial reports—which would add approximately 100–200 additional printed pages—may we provide these financial statements electronically on the USB only? Section §2.1 indicates that appendices and supporting documents, including financial statements referenced in §2.1.1, are excluded from the 50 page limit and does not explicitly require them to be printed. Please confirm that an electronic only submission is acceptable, with a placeholder page in Tab 2 noting their inclusion on the USB. | Yes, large files for financial statements can be provided electronically on a USB. |
| 148 | Please confirm the 50-page limit applies to 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.3. Are our responses to the cost proposal and the functional and technical Excel files outside of that 50-page limit. | Proposals shall not exceed fifty (50) pages, excluding appendices. The 50-page limit applies to all core proposal content. Appendix materials including supporting documents, resumes, detailed requirements, and other supplementary information are not counted toward the 50-page limit. |
| 149 | Is the City willing to accept a dual submission consisting of a redacted public version and a separate unredacted confidential version for evaluation purposes? | No |
| 150 | If dual submission is permissible, what is the prescribed format and labeling requirement for each version? | No |
| 151 | Are resumes required for non-key personnel, or only for executive, managerial, and functional leads explicitly named in the RFP? | Please refer to section 2.1.1 The Vendor shall provide information as to the Proposals and experience of all executive, managerial, and other key personnel assigned to the project, including project managers, solution architects, and functional leads. Include resumes or summaries that highlight their qualifications and previous experience with similar ERP projects. |
| 152 | If resumes are required for non-key personnel, will sample or representative resumes be acceptable instead of named individuals not yet assigned? | Please refer to section 2.1.1 The Vendor shall provide information as to the Proposals and experience of all executive, managerial, and other key personnel assigned to the project, including project managers, solution architects, and functional leads. Include resumes or summaries that highlight their qualifications and previous experience with similar ERP projects. |

| | | |
|-----|--|---|
| 153 | In alignment with our commitment to sustainability and our goal to reduce physical waste, would the City accept proposals submitted exclusively via electronic delivery, e.g. email, in lieu of shipment of a hard copy and flash drive? | No. Please refer to section 1.9 Proposal Submission Requirements and Contact Information. |
| 154 | Please confirm the exact items that must be printed in the hardcopy (Tabs 1–4) versus items that may be USB-only. Our understanding: Print Tabs 1–4 narratives and Appendix I (signed cost form) for hard copy. Place financial statements, the requirements workbooks, and pricing workbook on the USB only, no hard copy. [Refs: §2.1; §2.1.1–§2.1.3; Appendix IV] | The vendors must provide a hard-copy of the proposal sections 1–4 and all appendices. For section 2.1.1 Vendor Qualifications and Experience larger files such as financial statements may be provided electronically only due to file size. The electronic submission should contain the same documentation as the hard copy, in addition shall include all the attachments (requirement worksheet, technical requirements and cost/pricing template). |
| 155 | Please confirm the Functional & Technical Requirements Workbooks referenced in §2.1.2 must be completed and included on the USB (Excel), and that printing is excluded from the 50-page limit. [Refs: §2.1; §2.1.2] | Yes, the Functional and Technical Requirements workbook should be completed by vendor per Instruction and must be included on USB. Proposals shall not exceed fifty (50) pages, excluding appendices. The 50-page limit applies to all core proposal content. Appendix materials including supporting documents, resumes, detailed requirements, and other supplementary information are not counted toward the 50-page limit. |
| 156 | Please confirm that the 50-page limit applies only to core proposal content in Tabs 1–4 and excludes appendices/supporting documents such as financial statements, resumes, Appendix IV, and the requirements workbooks. [Ref: §2.1] | Proposals shall not exceed fifty (50) pages, excluding appendices. The 50-page limit applies to all core proposal content. Appendix materials including supporting documents, resumes, detailed requirements, and other supplementary information are not counted toward the 50-page limit. |
| 157 | Please confirm whether the cover/title page, table of contents, and Tab 1 Cover Letter are included in the 50-page limit for core proposal content, given §2.1 states the limit applies to all core content and excludes only appendices. [Ref: §2.1] | Proposals shall not exceed fifty (50) pages, excluding appendices. The 50-page limit applies to all core proposal content. Appendix materials including supporting documents, resumes, detailed requirements, and other supplementary information are not counted toward the 50-page limit. |
| 158 | Should the printed copy include physical tabs, or is a cover page required for each section/tab? | A printed copy may include physical tabs or section cover pages; as long as each section is clearly labeled and easy to identify. |

| | | |
|-----|--|--|
| 159 | Where in the proposal should be included attachment X? | The City is unable to answer this question as there is no attachment X in the document. |
| 160 | Is attachment X required to be included with the submission? | The City is unable to answer this question as there is no attachment X in the document. |
| 161 | Does attachment X need to be submitted physically or just included in the digital version of the proposal? | The City is unable to answer this question as there is no attachment X in the document. |
| 162 | Does the Attachment X need to be printed and submitted separately? | The City is unable to answer this question as there is no attachment X in the document. |
| 163 | Does the pricing/cost need to be submitted physically or just included in the digital version of the proposal? | The pricing/cost attachment needs to be submitted both physically and in digital format. |
| 164 | Where in the proposal should the appendices I, II & III be included? | At the end, you can labeled the section as Appendices |
| 165 | Is this initial RFP just for the software platform selection, and will there be a different stage for the systems integrator (SI) selection once the platform is selected? | Yes, this initial RFP is just for the software platform selection. There will be a separate RFP for the systems integrator (SI). |
| 166 | Will vendors that provide licenses and services be required to respond to both RFPs (software and SI)? | Yes, they will be required to respond to both RFPs if they are the SW vendors and also want to be considered for System Implementor. |

| | | |
|-----|--|---|
| 167 | Is the City of Raleigh looking for a platform change from PeopleSoft to another platform like Oracle or SAP, or is this just a study of the platform change? | The City of Raleigh is looking to replace the current PeopleSoft platform. |
| 168 | Do you have an ERP consultant supporting you in the procurement, or are you doing it independently? | We have a consultant assisting us with developing the requirements; however, the procurement process itself is being managed internally. |
| 169 | If there is a need for physical hardware, should it be included within the software or SI response? | The cost template can be used to capture optional ERP software & platform related services for advisory support, if your company offers such services (e.g., data conversion/migration, organizational change management, training, etc.). Implementation services and the cost for solution design, architecture, etc. will be part of the SI procurement. If you do not intend to offer optional services, only include the cost for software in the price quote. |

| | | |
|------------|--|---|
| <p>170</p> | <p>The RFP indicates that the City intends to select the ERP software vendor now and procure a separate System Integrator (SI) through a later competitive process (§1.1). However, several requirements throughout the RFP appear service-or implementation-oriented rather than software-vendor-or product-oriented. Examples include, but are not limited to: SLA, support, and maintenance requirements in Tab 4 (§2.1.3), Data Conversion expectations in A.2.5.6, Backup/DR targets and operational recovery requirements in §14.13–§14.16, Security incident notification timelines and investigative obligations in §14.7, and Certain “Company Qualifications & Financial Stability” criteria in Tab 2 (§2.1.1) that appear tailored to implementers or service delivery organizations—for example, requirements referencing detailed staffing plans, team composition, project-specific reporting structures, and similar capabilities typically associated with implementation services rather than software licensing.</p> <p>Given this, please clarify the City’s expectations regarding which of these requirements the software vendor should respond to directly as part of the software procurement — versus which items the City anticipates will be addressed by the future SI. Additionally, will the City consider amending or clarifying service-leaning requirements to distinguish between responsibilities of the software vendor and responsibilities that will be fulfilled by the SI? In addition, can the City please update the cost proposal attachment to reflect a software only procurement? [Refs: §1.1; §2.1.1; §2.1.3; A.2.5.6; §14.7; §14.13–§14.16</p> | <p>2.1.3 Service Level Agree (SLA) alignment, support, and maintenance are applicable, as the ERP software vendor's service quality, responsiveness and accountability are important to the City. ERP software vendors should provide insight into the SLAs associated with their solution.</p> <p>2.5.6 is applicable for this procurement. The City needs to understand how the new ERP platform is able to convert data from the old system into the new system. Specifically, the City needs to understand data migration tools/approaches offered by ERP software vendors. There will also be an opportunity for System Integrators to further explain data migration tools and approaches during the services evaluation process.</p> <p>14.7 and 14.13-14.16 are part of the sample contract. If the vendor takes exception to the sample contract, please redline changes to the contract or provide a contract addendum. Additionally, The city is looking for a cloud solution so it needs to understand the ERP software vendors' procedures for high availability and disaster recovery.</p> <p>2.1.1 Company Qualifications and Financial Stability are required for the proposal response. If information such as staffing plans, team composition, project-specific reporting structure, etc. are not applicable, you can indicate as such in the proposal.</p> <p>The new ERP platform will be an important component of the City's learning capability, therefore learning requirements should be addressed in the software vendor's response.</p> |
|------------|--|---|

| | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 171 | <p>The RFP indicates that the City intends to select the ERP software vendor now and procure a separate System Integrator (SI) through a later competitive process (§1.1). However, several requirements throughout the RFP appear service-or implementation-oriented rather than software-vendor-or product-oriented. Examples include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data Conversion expectations in A.2.5.6, • Security incident notification timelines and investigative obligations in §14.7, and • Certain “Company Qualifications & Financial Stability” criteria in Tab 2 (§2.1.1) that appear tailored to implementers or service delivery organizations—for example, requirements referencing detailed staffing plans, team composition, project-specific reporting structures, and similar capabilities typically associated with implementation services rather than software licensing. <p>Given this, please clarify the City’s expectations regarding which of these requirements the software vendor should respond to directly as part of the software procurement — versus which items the City anticipates will be addressed by the future SI. Additionally, will the City consider amending or clarifying service-leaning requirements to distinguish between responsibilities of the software vendor and responsibilities that will be fulfilled by the SI? In addition, can the City please update the cost proposal attachment to reflect a software only procurement? [Refs: § 1.1; §2.1.1; §2.1.3; A.2.5.6; §14.7; §14.13–§14.16</p> | <p>2.1.3 Service Level Agree (SLA) alignment, support, and maintenance are applicable, as the ERP software vendor's service quality, responsiveness and accountability are important to the City. ERP software vendors should provide insight into the SLAs associated with their solution.</p> <p>2.5.6 is applicable for this procurement. The City needs to understand how the new ERP platform is able to convert data from the old system into the new system. Specifically, the City needs to understand data migration tools/approaches offered by ERP software vendors. There will also be an opportunity for System Integrators to further explain data migration tools and approaches during the services evaluation process.</p> <p>14.7 and 14.13-14.16 are part of the sample contract. If the vendor takes exception to the sample contract, please redline changes to the contract or provide a contract addendum. Additionally, The city is looking for a cloud solution so it needs to understand the ERP software vendors' procedures for high availability and disaster recovery.</p> <p>2.1.1 Company Qualifications and Financial Stability are required for the proposal response. If information such as staffing plans, team composition, project-specific reporting structure, etc. are not applicable, you can indicate as such in the proposal.</p> <p>The new ERP platform will be an important component of the City's learning capability, therefore learning requirements should be addressed in the software vendor's response.</p> |
| 172 | <p>does this opportunity include training or other support services or is this installation and licenses only?</p> | <p>This solicitation is for the City of Raleigh to procure an ERP software solution. Training and implementation support service are out of this for this procurement and will be addressed by the selected System Integrator. If the software vendor has an on-line learning platform/tools, include them as an optional SKU in the software pricing.</p> |
| 173 | <p>do you have vendors supporting you? Is the name of the vendor available?</p> | <p>Yes, Gartner Inc. has been supporting the City</p> |
| 174 | <p>To protect proprietary financial data while still ensuring the City’s due diligence requirements are met, would the City of Raleigh accept a Revenue Verification Form from one of the following sources in lieu of full balance sheets or P&L statements?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Certified Public Accountant (CPA) / Inc. 5000 verification document. • An official Bank Letter confirming financial standing and creditworthiness. | <p>No. Please submit one of the three required financial statement formats as listed in the RFP.</p> |

| | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 175 | We note that the RFP references the 'Scope of Services' under different section numbers. On page 8 it is identified as Section 4, whereas on page 25 it is referenced as Section 3. Could you please clarify which section number correctly corresponds to the Scope of Services? | Please refer page 25 Section 3 for Scope of Services. |
| 176 | Will the System Integrator (SI) selection process happen before or after software vendor selection? | After SW selection |
| 177 | Will the System Integrator (SI) have any input into the software vendor evaluation and scoring process? | No |
| 178 | What is the expected division of responsibilities between the selected ERP software vendor and the future System Integrator (SI) around integration architecture? | The SI will be responsible for configuring and implementing the new ERP system. The ERP software vendor will be responsible for providing the software and O&M of the software, via a SaaS based support model. |
| 179 | What is the expected division of responsibilities between the selected ERP software vendor and the future System Integrator (SI) around go-live support and hypercare? | The SI will be responsible for go-live support and hypercare, however if the ERP vendor provides specialized go-live support or hypercare that may be complimentary to the SI, include the cost of services within your cost proposal. |
| 180 | Will the ERP vendor be permitted or expected to recommend a specific System Integrator (SI), or must the System Integrator (SI) selection remain fully independent of the software vendor? | The ERP software vendor should remain independent. An SI will be selected based on their proposal response and the City's due diligence. |

| | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 181 | Can the software vendor and the System Integrator be the same entity, or does the City require them to be separate organizations? | There is no requirement that the software vendor and system integrator be the same entity |
| 182 | If the software vendor also offers implementation services, will those value-added services be evaluated as part of this RFP or deferred to the separate System Integrator (SI) procurement? | This will be deferred for the separate SI procurement. |
| 183 | Does the City anticipate an invoice in full for the entire 5-year period, or annual invoices? | Annual Invoices |
| 184 | States: "Once the CoR selects a software vendor, a separate selection process will be initiated for a System Integrator (SI) to provide implementation services." Please confirm that this RFP is for software only. | This RFP is for ERP software only. |
| 185 | The RFP requests proposed staffing, deployment, and key personnel—including project managers, solution architects, and functional leads. If this is a software-only RFP, how should vendors address this section? | If vendors have personnel that the City should interact with as it pertains to the procurement of the ERP software and/or negotiating terms and conditions, please provide names and their respective roles & responsibilities. Additionally, if there are personnel that have expertise in implementation of the ERP system and would be fit for an implementation advisory role, feel free to bid them as key personnel. |
| 186 | This section is labeled 'Product Management Roadmap & Strategy,' but the requirement – 'Provide a prioritized time-phased plan outlining the vision, approach, and key milestones for evolving the ERP system' - appears implementation-focused. Can you clarify what is expected here? | If your company has plans (i.e., product roadmap) to update/refresh the ERP platform over the next 2-3 years, provide a description of how the changes that will be made and the intended benefits/outcomes. The City is interested in understanding where ERP software system is headed/how it will evolve and how it may align with the City's future-state. |
| 187 | are there any limits on how many sub-contractors are allowed? | No, there is no set limit on the number of subcontractors a vendor may use. However, the prime contractor remains fully responsible for the performance, oversight, and compliance of all subcontractors engaged on the project. Additionally, all subcontractor information — including name, address, and location — must be fully disclosed as part of the proposal. |
| 188 | Is this for US companies only meaning can a US company partner with Canadian company | Yes. A U.S. company may partner with a Canadian company, provided all requirements in the solicitation are met. |
| 189 | How does the City envision using ECM together with ERP (what content will live in ECM vs ERP, and what level of "in-context" access is required)? | The City does not have a Document Management Platform but uses SharePoint to store documents. For web content, the City has an internal web platform that contains link and information. The City is open to the portal experience that comes with a modern ERP solution and what capabilities may overlap with current enterprise document and content management platforms. |
| 190 | Will the Regulatory Change Manager be provided as a play? | The City is unable to determine the intent of the question as written. |

| | | |
|-----|--|--|
| 191 | Do you think the SoSC be interested in the use of AI for the capture of receipt data and the auditing of expense reports? | The City is open to AI features that make the work in an ERP system more efficient but the AI would have to be self contained and meet security standards. |
| 192 | Do you think the CoR would be interested in the use of AI for the capture of receipt data and the auditing of expense reports? | The City is open to AI features that make the work in an ERP system more efficient but the AI would have to be self contained and meet security standards. |
| 193 | Which integrations listed as "Potential" in Table 1 is the City most likely to activate at go-live vs. defer post-implementation? | The integrations listed as potential are marked as such because those integrations may no longer be needed if the solution proposed meets the City's need and can replace the existing solution. If the proposed solution does not meet the City's need in one of those spaces, than an integration with the existing system would need to be in place at go-live. |
| 194 | What identity provider does the City currently use for SSO/MFA? | Microsoft Entra ID |
| 195 | Is federation between the City's existing identity provider and the new ERP required at go-live? | yes |
| 196 | Does the City require SaaS-only deployment, or would a vendor-hosted PaaS or private cloud solution also be considered responsive? | The City is open to on prem, hybrid, or cloud solutions. |
| 197 | Does the City prefer a fully SaaS ERP solution, or will vendor-hosted cloud solutions (e.g., Microsoft Azure) also be considered? | The City is open to on prem, hybrid, or cloud solutions. |
| 198 | Does the City have a preferred cloud infrastructure provider, such as AWS, Microsoft Azure, or Google Cloud Platform, or is the choice left entirely to the vendor? | We prefer Azure but if the City is not maintaining the infrastructure, we have no preference. |
| 199 | If the City has no cloud provider preference, are there any existing enterprise agreements with a hyperscaler that a vendor could leverage to reduce hosting costs? | Enterprise Agreement exists with Microsoft Azure |
| 200 | Is the City open to a government community cloud deployment model such as Microsoft Azure Government or AWS GovCloud? | Open to a Government Cloud environment provided it does not sacrifice functionality |
| 201 | Does the City require a dedicated single-tenant environment, or would a multi-tenant SaaS deployment be acceptable? | The City is open to either provided security and performance requirements are met. |
| 202 | Does the City require geographically separate active-active data centers, or would an active-passive failover configuration be acceptable? | No geographic requirements and Active-Passive is acceptable provided the City's RTO/RPO can be met. |
| 203 | The Technical Capabilities section asks for "a detailed description of the tools and capabilities utilized for data migration." This appears to focus on implementation details. Please clarify how vendors should address this section. | If there are data migration tools that best support/enable data migration for your ERP software solution, please list the tools and provide a high-level description. |

| | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 204 | <p>1. The Vendor must provide the City with an annual SOC 2 Type II report (or equivalent), including coverage of Security, Availability, and Confidentiality controls. Acceptable equivalents include ISO 27001:2022 and HITRUST. The Vendor must also provide evidence of its FISMA compliance posture upon request. [Vendor: We are just an ERP expert with no adherence to SOC2 Type II report, etc. as we are not into Cloud Operations - our ERP deployments are on Microsoft and Google clouds for our clients]</p> <p>2. The RFP requirements are: Tier III datacenter resiliency Audit logging, security controls, encryption, DR, RTO/RPO Data residency in the US High availability cloud architecture Robust security practices Independently audited uptime reports [Vendor: As mentioned above, we deploy our solutions on Cloud and do not operate Cloud. That said, we are unclear on our ability to provide aforementioned pointers]</p> <p>3. These above requirements provided in the RFP documents required the following certifications which supports evaluation purposes especially for a cloud ERP. SOC 1 Type II SOC 2 Type II ISO 27001 ISO 27017 ISO 27018 PCI DSS (if handling P Card data) Tier III datacenter certification [Vendor: Is it mandatory to have one or more compliance? At the moment, our organization does not have any]</p> | <p>1. Potential vendors must supply the City with proof of a mature Information Security program. The options listed are the evidence that is acceptable to the City.</p> <p>2. Even if a solution is deployed to the Cloud, the vendor must provide this information in relation to their Information Security operations. Although the vendor may not operate the Cloud, the Cloud provider would be a subprocessor for the vendor and their documentation should reflect such.</p> <p>3. Yes, the vendor must have at least a SOC 2 Type II or ISO certification. If the vendor's solution will handle card payments, they must also supply a copy of their PCI DSS Attestation. If the solution is Cloud-based, a Tier III datacenter certification must also be provided.</p> |
| 205 | <p>Can the City provide a list of key systems that must integrate with the ERP platform (e.g., permitting systems, asset management, GIS, procurement platforms)?</p> | <p>Current, integration list is provided in RFP page 4 and 5.</p> |