



City of Raleigh

Request for Proposals #: 274-IT2025-06

Title: New Data Collection & Management Platform

Proposal Due Date and Time: *January 23, 2026, no later than 4:00
PM EST*

Proposal Deadline Extended

LATE PROPOSALS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED

ADDENDUM NO. 1

Issue Date: January 9, 2026

Issuing Department: Information Technology
Direct all inquiries concerning this RFP to:

Veronica Luna
Enterprise IT Senior Business Analyst
Email: veronica.luna@raleighnc.gov

City of Raleigh
Addendum #1 to RFP 274- IT2025-06 New Data Collection & Management Platform

Issue Date: January 9, 2026

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.**

1. Are offshore resources allowed (e.g., India, Canada)?
Answer: The City will work with international companies only if they have a location or headquarters in the U.S. Additionally, the City will only pay in U.S. Dollars and to a U.S. Bank account.
2. Appendix 2 asks for copies of applicable licenses/certifications—what specifically is required?
Answer: For this RFP, there are no specific licenses/certifications required beyond the Security Questionnaire.
3. Is there any preference for local vendors?
Answer: No local vendor preference. (The U.S. headquarters or location condition above still applies for international firms.)
4. During demo phase, must shortlisted vendors demonstrate the full platform, or is an MVP sufficient?
Answer: A full demonstration aligned to the RFP requirements is expected.
5. Is there a specific budget range the City can share?
Answer: No specific budget can be shared at this moment; the City will confer internally and respond via addendum.

6. How many systems need integration? Are they third-party or inhouse?
Answer: Data is managed in-house. Primary interface will be with the PeopleSoft financial system (version 9.2 and PUM update/image 52).
7. What's the expected data volume (daily/ballpark)?
Answer: A starting baseline of ~200 contracts monitored annually, with room to scale as the scope expands.
8. Any preferred reporting tools (Tableau/MicroStrategy/Power BI), or open to platform-native reports?
Answer: Open to platform-native reports; the City also uses Power BI internally.
9. Target timeline—when should go-live occur?
Answer: Desired go-live is July 1, 2026 (start of the new fiscal year).
10. Will most contract work be handled virtually or is travel to Raleigh desired?
Answer: Open to a combination of virtual and travel as needed.
11. Are the links to the Security Questionnaire and Vendor Response Matrix working?
Answer: If not, contact Veronica (veronica.luna@raleighnc.gov) for the direct links.
12. Will recipients/vendors load data directly into the UI or submit data for manual entry?
Answer: Vendors will log in to confirm/add information (e.g., subcontractors), with initial contract data seeded via PeopleSoft.
13. Will vendor performance against terms/conditions be monitored (e.g., compliance surveys/certifications)?
Answer: Potentially in the future; the initial implementation focuses on baseline needs with scalability for added modules later.
14. Was budget discussed?
Answer: Yes—the City will respond on budget via addendum.
15. To confirm: the request is not for a procurement solution, correct?
Answer: Correct, is not a procurement system; it's a data collection & management platform. Procurement is handled through PeopleSoft.
16. What data will be captured? What questions are you trying to answer? Which staff will handle analytics once live?
Answer: Focus is on tracking City spending across procurement categories and tiers (prime/subs). Analytics/use will be led by the Business Engagement & Opportunities Program division, collaborating with stakeholders; the platform must provide reports/KPIs related to spending based on procurement type/categories, commodity type/code, contract types, prime contractors and subcontractors.
17. Does the scope primarily budget/spend and not performance/KPIs?
Answer: Primary focus is spent; some KPIs (esp. business/community engagement) may be included depending on capabilities. Performance is not the forefront.
18. What's currently used to capture budget/spend data?
Answer: Mostly Excel; some fields in PeopleSoft.
19. Will analytics include redundancy/overlap analysis across vendors/departments (e.g., contract ingestion, scope comparisons, preferred vendor insights)?
Answer: The City is open to such capabilities as platform features; internal process standardization efforts are also underway, and collaboration will continue.

20. Are there parallel consulting opportunities for workflow optimization/internal process design?
Answer: Not currently; prior work (post-study) is underway; no new opportunities at the moment.
21. How will proposals coordinate with internal process teams to ensure platform alignment?
Answer: After vendor selection, stakeholders (including IT/PeopleSoft and process teams) will collaborate to align efforts; ongoing internal work will be considered.
22. Is there an opportunity to engage with those leading internal post-study efforts *before* proposals to ensure fit?
Answer: The City noted substantial precursor work since 2023, yielding solid baseline requirements in the RFP; proposals/demos should align to those requirements.
23. Who is the consultant providing post-study consultation from the 2023 disparity study?
Answer: Miller3 Consulting, Inc.
24. Since this is not a procurement system, does that mean the platform must be tailored and demoed without discovery?
Answer: Yes, the platform must meet the requirements in the Vendor Response Matrix.
25. For Stage 2 demos: must vendors demo without access to current data/staff/consultants (i.e., “blind”)?
Answer: Yes, demos are expected without prior discovery, based strictly on the RFP requirements.
26. Are there small business/minority goals? Which agency certifications are recognized?
Answer: For RFPs, there are no aspirational minority or women-owned business participation goals (in order to comply with state law, the 15% MWBE goal applies to construction/repair contracts of \$300,000 or more or construction/repair contracts with state funding of \$100,000 or more). Use of small, emerging, and growing businesses is encouraged for this solicitation, but no specific MWBE participation goal applies to this RFP.
27. Please repeat the answer regarding required certifications/licenses.
Answer: No certifications/licenses are required for this RFP; Security Questionnaire is the main requirement.
28. RFP mentions vendor registration—do you expect a new system or integration with your current one?
Answer: Vendor registration is via Raleigh Supplier Connection. The new platform will need to interface with PeopleSoft and the existing registration system.
29. Beyond the 2023 disparity study, are there additional materials to review? Will that consultant work on this implementation too?
Answer: No additional study; a consultant supports post-study implementation. The selected vendor for this RFP will also have an implementation role for the software.
30. Do you use local government tech (e.g., CivicPlus/OpenGov)?
Answer: No; tooling is internal—PeopleSoft and Excel.
31. Is AI being requested/used to analyze contracts/documents?
Answer: AI is out of scope for this effort at this time; any use would require further internal discussion.
32. Will the City accept a configurable low-code platform or is a fully pre-built procurement system required?

Answer: The City will consider options; preference is a solution that already offers needed features rather than building from scratch. Also, this is not a procurement system, it's a data collection & management platform.

33. Question: Please confirm whether the RFP requires a fully pre-built Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS) procurement/eProcurement system, or whether solutions based on configurable platforms are within scope.

Answer: The City is not acquiring a new procurement system. The City currently uses PeopleSoft (version 9.2 and PUM update/image 52) and is not replacing its existing procurement system as part of this RFP.

34. Question: The RFP references bid posting, bid submission, and bid evaluation. Please clarify the specific functional capabilities required within these areas and identify which capabilities must be available at initial go-live.

Answer: Essential functions include electronic bidding, sourcing responses, and evaluation. Initial capabilities required at go-live will be determined by the City's needs and must comply with the Vendor Response Matrix requirements.

35. Question: Please confirm whether the RFP anticipates a single deployment covering all required functionality at once, or whether implementation sequencing is defined elsewhere in the RFP.

Answer: A single deployment is anticipated.

36. Question: Please identify any existing City systems that the proposed solution is required to integrate with and indicate whether interface specifications or APIs are available.

Answer: Integration with the City's ERP system (PeopleSoft, version 9.2 and PUM update/image 52) will be required.

37. Question: Please confirm whether migration of existing data is required as part of this project and, if so, whether details regarding source systems and data volumes will be provided.

Answer: Migration of existing data is required from the source system, PeopleSoft version 9.2 with PUM update/image 52. Data volumes are to be determined (TBD).

38. Question: Please clarify whether specific reports or dashboards are required at go-live or if reporting requirements will be detailed during implementation.

Answer: Go-live reports should summarize various key performance indicators (KPIs) from data collected for utilization, vendor engagement, and other procurement KPIs.

39. Question: The sample contract references ownership of deliverables and intellectual property. Please confirm the scope of deliverables subject to this provision.

Answer: Deliverables covered by this provision are detailed in section 4 of the RFP (Scope of Services).

40. Question: Please confirm whether the City will provide specific scenarios or use cases to be demonstrated during the software demonstration portion of the evaluation.

Answer: Software demonstrations will be evaluated against the City's requirements listed in the Vendor Response Matrix document. Marketing-oriented demonstrations are not permitted.

41. Question: How many users will be accessing the system?

Answer: To start, there will be at least 5 internal users accessing the system, with the potential for this number to increase. To manage vendor/bidder registration and electronic bid submissions, or verify subcontractor payments, an unlimited number of external users is required.

42. Question: Of those, how many are internal and external users?
Answer: All 5 internal users and unlimited external users.
43. Question: Of the internal users, how many will need read only vs edit access?
Answer: All 5 users will require edit access. Additional users, if identified, may need read-only access.
44. Question: Which platforms should the system integrate with?
Answer: PeopleSoft version 9.2 and PUM update/image 52.
45. Question: What is the anticipated go-live date for the platform?
Answer: July 1, 2026
46. Question: Can the City provide any information regarding the current system? I.e. vendor, how many records there are.
Answer: Data collection is currently managed using PeopleSoft, Excel, and Trimble Unity Construct (TUC).
47. Question: Does the system have a preference for COTS vs Configurable solutions?
Answer: The preferred system configuration is COTS, providing flexibility to customize the initial module implementation based on current needs and allowing for future expansion of modules as necessary.
48. Question: Which specific existing City systems must the platform integrate with at go-live (ERP/AP, procurement/ePMA, vendor master, document management, SSO)? Please include product names if possible.
Answer: Integration with the City's ERP system (PeopleSoft, version 9.2 with PUM update/image 52). Data volumes are to be determined (TBD).
49. Question: Is there an existing vendor master system that should be treated as the system of record, or will the new platform become the system of record post-implementation?
Answer: The City's ERP (PeopleSoft) system is the system of record.
50. Question: What integration methods are preferred or already available (REST APIs, SFTP/CSV, middleware/ESB)?
Answer: The City already has SFTP/CSV and middleware integrated in our current system.
51. Question: Is real-time data synchronization required for any domain, or are scheduled batch updates acceptable?
Answer: Real time data synchronization is preferred, but hybrid also works
52. Question: Will the City provide test/sandbox access and sample datasets for integration and validation during implementation?
Answer: Yes, access will be given to sample datasets and a non-production environment for testing and configuration.
53. Question: What historical data is required to be migrated (years of data, entities, attachments)?
Answer: The City expects data migration to start on July 1, 2026.
54. Question: Are historical audit trails and workflow histories required, or only data from go-live forward?
Answer: The City expects data migration to start on July 1, 2026.

55. Question: Can the City provide sample exports (de-identified) of vendor, contract, and spend data to validate mapping assumptions?
Answer: Yes, if proprietary information is de-identified or redacted.
56. Question: Which procurement lifecycle stages must be supported at go-live (bid posting, bid submission, evaluation, award, post-award compliance)?
Answer: Initial selected capabilities will be based on the City's needs. Specific functional capabilities must comply with the requirements outlined in the Vendor Response Matrix.
57. Question: For subcontractor payment verification, is automated reconciliation with AP payments required, or is a manual/attestation workflow acceptable initially?
Answer: The City doesn't pay subcontractors directly, so reconciliation with AP in PeopleSoft isn't needed. Payments to subcontractors are reported by the prime contractor using a form. The solution should provide a systematic process to record the payments to subcontractors for tracking and reporting purposes.
58. Question: Is a vendor self-service portal required for registration, certification uploads, and renewals?
Answer: No, the City plans to transfer data from the current vendor registration to the new platform.
59. Question: Does the platform need to generate transactional artifacts (e.g., purchase orders, invoices) or only consume/exchange data with existing finance systems?
Answer: The platform will only need to consume/exchange data with the existing finance system.
60. Question: Are there department-specific approval workflows or delegated authorities that must be supported out of the box?
Answer: Yes, workflow and notifications must be supported/included.
61. Question: Can the City provide sample exports (de-identified) of vendor, contract, and spend data to validate mapping assumptions?
Answer: Yes, if proprietary information is de-identified or redacted.
62. Question: Are there specific data export or formatting requirements to support public records requests and audits?
Answer: The system must provide the ability to export records in open, machine-readable formats (e.g., CSV, XML, PDF). Exported data must include all relevant metadata. The system should support both individual and bulk record exports. The system must maintain an audit log of exports and access for compliance tracking.
63. Question: Are any High-priority requirements in the Vendor Response Matrix considered pass/fail (i.e., non-negotiable)?
Answer: Delivered functionality or non-delivered functionality, if not applicable please explain.
64. Question: If a High-priority item is marked "Partial / Planned," will a documented roadmap be acceptable, or must it be fully available at submission?
Answer: A documented roadmap within 3-6 months post go-live will be acceptable.
65. Question: What types of supporting evidence are weighted most heavily in the Matrix evaluation (screenshots, live demo, customer references, documentation)?
Answer: The live demo is weighed most heavily for supporting evidence.

66. Question: Is the City expecting a phased rollout (pilot department → citywide), or a single go-live, and are there target dates or blackout periods?
Answer: The City plans a phased rollout starting with pilot departments by July 1, 2026. The Procurement system blackout period is expected to be between July 10-15, 2026, with other blackout dates to be determined.
67. Question: What acceptance criteria will be used to sign off the solution (UAT, data validation, reporting validation, accessibility checks)?
Answer: To Be Determined (TBD).
68. Question: In section 4 scope of services, objective 1 is centralized vendor registration and certification tracking, Is the City looking to replace their current vendor registration with a new vendor registration process? Or is the city looking to integrate their current vendor registration into a certification tracking system?
Answer: The City is expecting to transfer data from the current vendor registration into the new platform.
69. Question: If the City is looking for a new vendor registration system, approx. how many vendors does the City currently have? Approximately how many does the City add each year?
Answer: The City is expecting to transfer data from the current vendor registration into the new platform, not seek a new one.
70. In section 4 scope of services, objective 3 enable real-time data capture and reporting across the procurement lifecycle, Is the City looking to capture vendor/sub-contractor certification status pre award?
Answer: The City does anticipate capturing vendor MWBE certification status pre-award for those construction/repair projects of \$300,000 or more (or \$100,000 or more in state funding) where state law mandates compliance with MWBE good faith efforts requirements.
71. Question: Is the City looking to have Single Sign On for use by City Staff?
Answer: Yes
72. Question: What groups (MBE, WBE, MWBE) do the city track? What certifying entities does the City accept?
Answer: In compliance with N.C.G.S. 143-128.2, the City recognizes the certification programs of the NC Department of Administration and the NC Department of Transportation with respect to the use of MWBE participation goals and good faith efforts for construction/repair contracts of \$300,000 or more (or \$100,000 or more with state funding). Please refer to N.C.G.S. 143-128.2(g) for the list of MWBE classifications that are certified by the NC Department of Administration and the NC Department of Transportation.
73. Question: With this RFP, is the City looking to find one system that is end to end? From Bidding, Finding and managing certified vendors, Tracking certified vendors and tracking all spend with vendors, both certified and non-certified?
Answer: Yes, with initial capabilities based on the City's needs. Specific functional capabilities must comply with the requirements outlined in the Vendor Response Matrix.
74. Question: With this RFP, is the City replacing an existing procurement / bidding tool?
Answer: No. The City is not replacing or acquiring a new procurement system. The new data platform must integrate with PeopleSoft, the existing procurement system.

75. Question: This RFP asked for certification status of bidders. Does the City require a % of each bidder's quote be from a certified vendor? Or that a vendor be certified themselves?
Answer: For RFPs, there are no aspirational minority or women-owned business participation goals (in order to comply with state law, the 15% MWBE goal applies to construction/repair contracts of \$300,000 or more or construction/repair contracts with state funding of \$100,000 or more). Use of small, emerging, and growing businesses is encouraged for this solicitation, but no specific MWBE participation goal applies to this RFP.
76. Question: What is the approximate number of contracts that the City tracks the status of payments to subcontractors on?
Answer: The city tracks subcontractor payments for 40-50 contracts annually. A new platform will help expand these efforts.
77. Question: In Section 4 Scope of Services, objective 5 mentions performance dashboards. Does the City want these dashboards to be for their internal team or are these public interfacing dashboards?
Answer: The performance dashboards will be for internal City use.
78. Question: Are any of the reporting requirements custom or unique to the City or are all the reports standard? Can you provide examples or any reports that might be unique?
Answer: No, reports would be standard. Any unique reports to be determined. Question: Can you clarify whether "City spend" refers only to the City's direct expenditures (e.g., contract payments), or whether it also includes post-award monitoring and reporting on the use of funds by small, emerging, and under-capitalized businesses receiving City awards or funding?
Answer: "City Spend" refers to contract payments, including post-award monitoring and reporting as detailed in the Vendor Response Matrix.
79. If both monitoring and reporting of CoR direct expenditures and post-award use of funds by the businesses is in scope, can you provide some details on the current workflow process and frequency used to collect, review, and approve uses of awarded funds from the businesses. Any sample reports or templates would be useful.
Answer: Currently, monitoring and reporting are conducted manually, primarily utilizing Excel, with some fields managed within PeopleSoft.
80. Can you provide some details on the current workflow process and frequency used to collect, review, and approve vendor certifications? Any sample reports or templates would be useful.
Answer: The City currently has a simple one-step approval process: vendor submits registration and the registration sits in a "pending status" until approved by Procurement – staff; when the registration is submitted by the vendor, system workflow notification is sent to Procurement staff. Once the registration is approved by Procurement, the system auto-creates the supplier account (including the ID number) from the registration data submitted by the vendor.
81. Question: Section 4.2 Should the Vendor Response Matrix be submitted as Excel or as PDF and placed behind a Tab?
Answer: No preference, Read only Excel, PDF and in a separate folder if it is distinct and identifiable as the Vendor Response Matrix.
82. Question: For bid posting, submission and evaluation, does the City require bid posting for outreach and monitoring purposes and submission of compliance related documents such as waiver requests, subcontractor plans, good faith efforts forms? Does the City want full

eProcurement System functionality for submission of bids and proposals and managing due dates and bid access and openings? If so, please provide guidelines for types of bids and requirements for bid document submissions. Does the City require reverse auction bidding?

Answer: Initial selected capabilities will be based on the City's needs. Specific functional capabilities must comply with the requirements outlined in the Vendor Response Matrix. The City does not require reverse auction bidding.

83. Question: What financial management system does the City utilize and will it interface the system with the Data Collection and Management Platform?

Answer: Integration with the City's ERP system (PeopleSoft) will be required.

84. Question: How will the City evaluate financial stability of small versus large businesses? Is there a formula for this?

Answer: There's no difference or consideration given to either a small business or a large business. As a government agency utilizing public tax-payer funds, the City will not pre-pay or pay a "deposit" for services or deliverables, so the financial information is used to determine if the company (whether "small" or "large") is financially sound and stable enough to provide the services/solution and perform under the contract without the reliance of funding from the City prior to doing so. Question: Are the maximum points for the demo 5 (shown on page 9) or 10 (shown on page 10)?

Answer: 10 points

85. Question: How many contracts does the City of Raleigh track annually?

Answer: On an annual basis, the City currently tracks 40-50 contracts manually. The new platform will help the City expand this effort.

86. Question: What is the annual dollar amount of contracts being managed?

Answer: Currently, contracts of \$300,000 or more are tracked. Total annual dollar amount of contracts managed for FY2024-2025 is \$32,319,565.00. The new platform will help the City expand this effort.

87. Question: How do primes and subcontractors submit verified receipt of payments?

Answer: Currently, primes and subcontractors are not verifying payment receipts. A systematic solution is needed for verifying, tracking, and reporting payments.

88. Question: What is the City of Raleigh's prompt payment policy?

Answer: The City pays invoices Net 30-days from the date the City approves the invoice – the payment occurs after the invoice is matched in our system to a receipt entered by the City department.

89. Question: What type of training is preferred for the City of Raleigh staff during implementation? Live training or pre-recorded?

Answer: All available training options are preferred.

90. Question: Demonstration Expectations For the Stage 2 demonstration, should vendors show how their system works using sample test data based on the RFP requirements, or does the City expect vendors to use actual City data obtained before the demo?

Answer: Vendors would use sample test data based on the RFP requirements.

91. Question: Demonstration Scoring Criteria. Will the City provide specific evaluation criteria or scoring guidelines for the demonstration/interview phase, or will demonstrations be evaluated as a whole against the original RFP requirements?

Answer: Demonstrations will be evaluated against the requirements outlined in the Vendor Response Matrix.

92. Question: Raleigh Supply Connection Integration. Should the proposed platform connect to Raleigh Supply Connection for vendor registration and certification data, rather than replacing or duplicating the vendor registration system?

Answer: Yes.

93. Question: PeopleSoft Integration Approach. If connecting directly to PeopleSoft is delayed due to City IT timing, will the City accept a go live solution that imports data from file exports (such as CSV or Excel files) as a temporary approach until direct connection is ready, provided all reporting requirements are still met?

Answer: Yes.

94. Question: Subcontractor Payment Tracking. How does the City currently capture and validate subcontractor payment information (e.g., via PeopleSoft, manual reporting, or other processes), and which elements are expected to be supported by the proposed platform at go-live?

Answer: Subcontractor payments are currently being captured mostly in Excel (from a form provided by the prime contractor); some fields are captured in PeopleSoft. Integration with the City's ERP system (PeopleSoft) will be required.

95. Question: Business Classification Definitions. Does the City have official definitions for business categories (such as small, emerging, under-capitalized, and growing businesses) that the system should use for vendor categorization and compliance reporting?

Answer: As used by the City's Business Engagement and Opportunities Program (BEOP), these terms have the following definitions: Small Business Enterprise: An entity that has had less than \$500,000 in gross. Emerging Business: A small or relatively new business that is in the early stages of development and growth. Under-Capitalized Business: A business or organization that lacks sufficient funding or financial resources to effectively operate, grow, or meet its obligations. Growing Business: A business that has demonstrated stability and is actively expanding its operations, revenue, customer base, or workforce.

96. Question: Historical Data Scope. Does the City have expectations regarding how much historical contract and spend data should be loaded into the new system (e.g., recent fiscal years versus longer-term history), or should proposers recommend an approach aligned with July 1, 2026, go-live?

Answer: Proposers should recommend an approach aligned with the July 1, 2026, go-live date.

97. Question: Phased Go-Live Approach. Is the City open to a phased go-live approach in which core spend tracking and compliance functionality is operational by July 1, 2026, with additional features deployed in later phases?

Answer: Yes.

Resending the correct link to the Vendor Response Matrix and Supplier Cybersecurity Questionnaire.

[Links to the Vendor Response Matrix and Supplier Cybersecurity Questionnaire.](#)

[Link to the Asana submittal form.](#)

Reference Questionnaire Form - Appendix III:

Extended Deadline is January 9, 2026, no later than 4:00 PM EST.

Request For Proposal (RFP) Submission Due Date

Extended Deadline is January 23, 2026, no later than 4:00 PM EST.

SIGN BELOW AND RETURN THIS ADDENDUM WITH YOUR PROPOSAL.

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

Signature: _____ **Title:** _____