January 28, 2026

ADDENDUM NO. 07

Your reference is directed to Solicitation Number Doc1704604241 for the Request for Proposal (RFP) for Grant Management System Information Technology Services for OCD which is scheduled to open at 10:00 A.M. CT on February 4, 2026.

****

Proposal Opening Date Change – The Proposal Opening Date shall be changed to March 04, 2026, at 10:00 A.M. CT.

RFP Event Section 1, Request for Proposal, RFP Document has been revised on Pages 3, 17,18, 20, 23, 26, 44 & 48. – Document has been revised. Words which are ~~struck through~~ are deletions. Words in **bold, underscored, and highlighted** are additions.

RFP Event Section 1, Request for Proposal, RFP Document, Software License and Maintenance Agreement has been added on Pages 62 - 75. – The Title is **bolded, underscored, and highlighted**.

RFP Event Section 2.5, Part 5: Proposed Modifications to Sample Contract; 2.5.2, Attachment E, Sample Contract – Document has been revised. Words which are ~~struck through~~ are deletions. Words in **bold, underscored, and highlighted** are additions.

RFP Event Section 2.5, Part 5: Proposed Modifications to Sample Contract; 2.5.2, Sample Software Maintenance Agreement has been added.

Written Inquiries – All Proposer written inquiries received by the inquiry deadline of May 5, 2025 and the States responses are included on pages 2 through 46.

****

THIS ADDENDUM IS HEREBY OFFICIALLY MADE A PART OF THE REFERENCED PROPOSAL.

RFP for Grant Management System Information Technology Services for OCD
Solicitation Number Doc1704604241

1. **Question:** Attachment D – RFP Evaluation Plan (Page 35–36) → Financial Proposal and Cost Evaluation Section. Has OCD-DR established an estimated budget range or ceiling for this GMS initiative?

   Response: Yes, the estimated budget for this Grant Management System (GMS) is $15,000,000.

2. **Question:** Attachment C – Scope of Work, Section IV: Background. How many active grant programs are currently managed under LOCD-DR (across Housing, Infrastructure, Economic Development, Mitigation, and Buyout)?

   Response: Please refer to the *LOCD* website at https://locddr.la.gov/ for access to its Action Plans, which provides detailed information on the divisions' active programs and grants. Additional information can also be found in the *HUD Exchange QPR reports* for Louisiana at https://www.hudexchange.info/.

3. **Question**: Attachment B – Special RFP Terms and Conditions & RFP Overview. Will the State award multiple vendors by module (Housing, Infrastructure, etc.) or a single prime contractor?

   Response: The State may award contracts to multiple vendors by grant system (e.g., Housing, Reporting and/or Infrastructure), depending on the proposals received and at the State's discretion.

4. **Question:** Attachment C, Section IV (Background) and Reporting sections. How many applications or grants are processed annually across all programs?

   Response: LOCD cannot provide a specific annual number, as application and grant volumes vary based on disaster occurrence, timing, and the availability of Federal funding. Generally, please refer to the *LOCD* website at https://locddr.la.gov/ for access to its Action Plans, which provide detailed information on the divisions' active programs and grants. Additional information can also be found in the *HUD Exchange QPR reports* for Louisiana at https://www.hudexchange.info/.

5. **Question:** Attachment C – Scope of Work. Which existing systems (eGrantsPlus, IGX, GIOS, Metastorm, SAGE, etc.) will be retired or replaced under this initiative?

   Response: LOCD has not yet determined which existing systems will be retired or replaced under this initiative. This determination will be based on the awarded Contract(s), system functionality, delivery timeline, and the current status of active programs within those systems. At this stage, system migration is not the primary priority; rather, the focus is on ensuring data integration across all active systems, both old and new, to support complete and accurate reporting.

6. **Question:** Attachment C – Scope of Work. Does OCD-DR have estimates for data volume (records, files, or database size) that will need to be migrated into the new GMS? How many years of historical data are required for migration or archival purposes?

   Response: Data migration will be determined if and when it becomes necessary, based on the development and configuration of the new system. LOCD estimates that the total data volume may range up to 4 terabytes. As noted in our response to question #5, the primary focus of this initiative is on the new system and ensuring data integration across all active systems (both old and new) for complete and accurate reporting. Migration is not the current priority and will be addressed as a future decision if required.

7. **Question:** Attachment C – Scope of Work. Approximately how many internal LOCD-DR staff will use the new GMS?

   Response: Approximately 150 internal LOCD staff are expected to use the new GMS. This estimate does not include the Contractor staff.

8. **Question:** Attachment C – Scope of Work. How many external users (grantees, subrecipients, consultants, and local governments) will access the system?

   Response: Approximately 300 external users currently access the system. Depending on the disaster and the programs administered, LOCD has historically supported as many as 3,000 external users, including grantees, subrecipients, consultants, and local governments.

9. **Question:** Attachment C – Purpose Section. Does OCD-DR expect separate portals for Housing, Infrastructure, and Mitigation programs, or a unified applicant portal with dynamic workflows?

   Response: The Proposer should present their recommended solutions in the appropriate sections of their proposal. The State will evaluate proposals in accordance with RFP Document, Attachment D, RFP Evaluation Plan. This approach allows the State to assess each Proposer's understanding of our work and the suitability of their proposed solution, rather than prescribing a specific configuration.

10. **Question:** Attachment C – Reporting and Dashboards. What are the key reporting requirements (HUD, FEMA, State Legislature, internal dashboards)?

    Response: Please refer to the *LOCD* website at https://locddr.la.gov/ for access to its Action Plans, which provide detailed information on the divisions' active programs and grants. Additional information can also be found in the *HUD Exchange QPR reports* for Louisiana at https://www.hudexchange.info/.

11. **Question:** Attachment C – Reporting and Dashboards. How many recurring reports must be automated in the new system?

    Response: The exact number of recurring reports in the new system is unknown. The number of recurring reports will depend on the active programs at the time. For examples of recurring reports, please refer to the *LOCD* website at https://locddr.la.gov/.

12. **Question:** Attachment C – Project Requirements. Are there any third-party integrations (FEMA PA Match, GIS, USPS, DocuSign, or geospatial data) expected at launch?

    Response: Yes. Third-party integrations—such as FEMA PA Match, GIS, USPS, DocuSign, and geospatial data—are among the highest priorities for the system. LOCD desires a system that can provide this functionality.

13. **Question:** Attachment C – Personnel Qualifications. The RFP specifies a Project Consultant with five years of HUD CDBG-DR and CDBG-MIT experience — is this a mandatory role or can equivalent experience be distributed among multiple key personnel?

    Response: LOCD desires a single Project Consultant with at least five years of HUD CDBG-DR and CDBG-MIT experience. Having a dedicated Project Consultant ensures that there is a member of the Contractor(s) team with the expertise to understand HUD regulations and to guide the proper configuration of the system in accordance with those requirements.

14. **Question:** Attachment C – Goals & Objectives. Should the proposal include a phased rollout approach by program or a single unified deployment?

    Response: Proposers should present their recommended solutions, including any phased rollout or unified deployment approach, in the appropriate section of their proposal. The State will evaluate proposals in accordance with RFP Document, Attachment D, RFP Evaluation Plan. This approach allows the State to assess each Proposer's understanding of our work and the suitability of their proposed solution, rather than prescribing a specific deployment strategy.

    As stated in RFP Document, Attachment C, Section III, Goals and Objectives, "It is permissible to propose, as part of the solution, a SaaS or Commercial—off-the-shelf (COTS) software that is customizable to meet the needs and requirements of this RFP." As such, LOCD would consider a customized design and

implementation of non-SAAS / non-COTS solutions if the Proposer can demonstrate that this is a preferred solution to developing a GMS.

15. **Question:** There is requirement such as "Provide on-site personnel at the request of LOCD-DR, if requested." and "Contractor(s) staff may include at least one full-time, onsite experienced Project Manager" - will it be required that the selected contractor have staff on-site?

    Response: Yes. If requested by LOCD, the Contractor(s) must be able to provide on-site personnel. This requirement may apply only during specific periods of the Contract and does not necessarily require a full on-site team at all times.

16. **Question:** Are the only systems that need to be integrated with the new solution DRGR, and LaGov? Are there others and do all of these systems allow for integration?

    Response: While DRGR and LaGov are the primary systems identified for integration with the new solution, they are not the only sources of relevant data. In this context, "integration" refers to the extraction and consolidation of data from multiple systems to support reporting, analytics, and dashboard development.

    In addition to DRGR and LaGov, several other systems contain essential program and financial data. However, many of these systems do not currently support direct integration methods such as Application Programming Interfaces (API) or web services. For these systems, data will be provided through scheduled exports—typically in the form of flat files, spreadsheets, or database tables. These data sets will then be ingested and integrated with information from the new solution to ensure comprehensive, accurate, and timely reporting.

    This approach allows for both automated integration where supported (e.g., DRGR and LaGov) and batch file processing where direct integration is not available. The result is a unified data environment that enables complete visibility across all relevant systems.

17. **Question:** Will the migration of data only come from the GIOS, Metastorm Platform, and SAGE or would there be any additional sources of data to be migrated?

    Response: There are additional sources of data to migrate; see RFP Document, Attachment C, Scope of Work, Section IV: Background.

18. **Question:** Is this event and RFI or RFP referred to as both in the attached screenshot?

    Response: This solicitation is for an RFP.

19. **Question:** Where will the recorded video from the pre-RFP conference be posted?

    Response: See Addendum No.01 to this RFP.

20. **Question:** RFP page 1, General, Could the State please confirm whether the total anticipated budget for the Grant Management System Information Technology Services for OCD is $20 million to $25 million, as listed on the RFP website (https://portal.us.bn.cloud.ariba.com/discovery/public/rfx/23479716/preview)?

    Response: See response to question #1.

21. **Question:** RFP Page 1, General, Will the State consider proposals with total costs outside the Opportunity Amount range ($20 million – $25 million) displayed on the RFP website, or would such proposals be deemed ineligible or non-responsive for award consideration?

    Response: The opportunity amount range is an estimated amount. Proposals will be evaluated for cost based on the information provided in accordance with RFP Document, Attachment D, Evaluation Plan.

22. **Question:** RFP Page 1, General, Could the State please confirm whether any external firms, contractors, or consultants assisted LOCD-DR in developing or drafting this Request for Proposals? If so, could the State identify those entities and clarify whether they will be eligible to participate, directly or indirectly, in this procurement?

    Response: Yes. A consultant, Scott Meyer, assisted LOCD in the development of this Request for Proposals. In accordance with procurement regulations, consultants and any affiliated entities are not eligible to participate, directly or indirectly, in this procurement.

23. **Question:** RFP Page 1, General, The RFP uses terms like "Proposer" and "company" to describe to organizations submitting proposals. Many firms are comprised of multiple legal entities (e.g. parent companies, affiliates, subsidiaries). Could the State confirm please confirm that, for purposes of this procurement, the term "Proposer" and "company" refers specifically to the legal entity submitting the proposal (i.e., the bidding entity), and not to any other related corporate entities, subcontractors, or consultants?

    Response: As stated in RFP Document, Attachment A, Standard RFP Terms and Conditions, Proposer is defined as "an entity or individual submitting a proposal in response to this RFP. The successful Proposer responsive to this RFP is also described as the Contractor in this document." Yes, company refers to the legal entity submitting the Proposal.

24. **Question:** RFP Page 3, Overview, I. Introduction, the RFP states, "the State intends to award to multiple Proposers."

    Could the State please clarify how coordination among awarded vendors will be managed?
    Specifically, will LOCD-DR designate a lead or systems integrator to coordinate deliverables across vendors? Or will LOCD-DR be responsible for acting as the systems integrator?
    How will ownership, licensing rights, and protection of intellectual property be defined and enforced when multiple vendors contribute to the same system or shared modules?
    What level of project-management or PMO oversight does the State anticipate providing to ensure integration across contractors?

    Response: All Contractor(s) will be managed by the State Project Manager (SPM) in accordance with their respective contractual agreements. LOCD does not anticipate multiple vendors contributing to the same system or shared modules. Rather, if multiple awards are made, each vendor will be assigned work related to a distinct program area or system (e.g., Housing, Infrastructure).

    Each Contractor will be responsible for the successful delivery of its assigned scope, and coordination will occur through the SPM and established project management processes. Intellectual property ownership, licensing rights, and related protections will be defined and enforced in accordance with the terms and conditions of each Contract and applicable State procurement regulations.

25. **Question:** RFP Page 3, RFP Overview, I. Introduction, During the pre-proposal conference, the State noted that awards may be divided among multiple vendors by program category (for example, Housing Module to one vendor and Economic Development and Infrastructure Modules to another).

    Could the State please clarify whether this remains the intended approach, and if so, how the scope of work and deliverables described in Attachment C will be allocated or segmented among vendors?

    Response: LOCD may award multiple vendors by grant systems (i.e., Housing, infrastructure), depending on the proposals received, subject to the State's discretion. If the RFP is multi-awarded, each Contract will have a scope of work and deliverables specific to the grant system awarded.

26. **Question:** RFP Page 3, RFP Overview, I. Introduction, The RFP notes that awards may be issued to multiple proposers and that program data must be consolidated for reporting.

    Could the State please clarify which party will be responsible for ensuring technical integration across vendor systems, such as consolidating data at the grant or program level for enterprise reporting?
    Will LOCD-DR serve as the integration lead, or should each awarded vendor plan to develop and maintain

data interfaces to a State-designated reporting environment?

Response: LOCD will serve as the integration lead and will be responsible for consolidating program data to support enterprise-level reporting. All Contractor(s) will be managed by the State Project Manager (SPM) in accordance with their respective contractual agreements.

LOCD does not anticipate multiple vendors contributing to the same system. If multiple awards are made, each vendor will be assigned work related to a distinct program area or system (e.g., Housing, Infrastructure). Reporting responsibilities, including the development and maintenance of data interfaces to the State-designated reporting environment, will likely be assigned to a single Contractor under a defined task order to ensure consistency and data integrity across all program areas.

27. **Question:** RFP Page 3, RFP Overview, Introduction, The RFP states that "Neither the Contractor nor any of its subcontractors shall also contract for services under the separate Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) contract entered into by State for program monitoring services."

    Could the State confirm whether this statement refers to an existing active QA/QC contract?
    If so, could the State identify the current prime contractor and any subcontractors performing work under the separate QA/QC contract?

    Response: See changes made in this Addendum No. 07.

28. **Question:** RFP Page 3, RFP Overview, I. Introduction, During the pre-proposal conference, the State indicated in response to a Q&A that the vendor awarded this RFP to develop and deliver the Grants Management System (GMS) for future disaster programs may be restricted from performing program implementation or case-management work associated with those same programs.

    Could the State please confirm whether such a restriction will apply, and if so, clarify to whom it applies (e.g., the primary awarded contractor, its subcontractors, or both)?
    Could the State also clarify whether it intends to make this determination before the release of future program-management RFPs?

    Response: The existing LOCD Contractor(s) and any Contractor(s) awarded under this RFP will not be prohibited from submitting proposals for future program-management or case-management work. However, LOCD may impose conditions, either contractually or through specific task orders, to mitigate or prevent potential conflicts of interest.

29. **Question:** RFP Page 3, RFP Overview I. Introduction, if this restriction applies, could the State please clarify its scope and applicability?

    Specifically:
    Would this restriction apply to both the primary awarded contractor and any subcontractors under this GMS RFP, and would it remain in effect only during the GMS contract term or extend beyond it?
    Would the restriction prevent the awarded vendor from participating in a subcontractor capacity to support or manage programs that will ultimately be stored in the GMS?
    If the scope of work is divided by program category to multiple vendors (e.g., Housing vs. Infrastructure/Economic Development), would the restriction apply only to the awarded category or to all program categories within the same disaster?

    Response: See response to question #27.

30. **Question:** RFP Page 6, RFP Overview, V. Evaluation, The RFP identifies key dates between December 9, 2025 (proposal opening) and January 1, 2026 (anticipated contract award).

    Could the State please confirm whether oral presentations or interviews are expected to occur during this period?
    If so, could the State provide additional details on the anticipated timing, format (virtual or in-person), and expected duration of these sessions?

Response: The dates provided in RFP Document, Attachment E, Sample Contract are estimates. The State may conduct Written or Oral Clarifications/Presentations in accordance with the RFP as stated in Attachment, A Standard RFP Terms and Conditions, Section IV. Proposals, P. Written or Oral Clarifications/Presentations. If this option is exercised, the State will provide more information to those Proposers selected at the appropriate time.

31. **Question:** RFP Pages 21 and 23, Attachment C, Scope of Work, III. Goals and Objectives and IV. Background, The RFP refers to Economic Development and Infrastructure separately under "Goals and Objectives" (p. 21) but later combines them as Economic Development and Infrastructure (ED&I) under "Background" (p. 23).

    Because these can represent two separate program categories with multiple programs under each, could the State please clarify its desired outcome. Should Economic Development and Infrastructure be developed and managed as two distinct program modules, or is the reference to ED&I intended to indicate a combined functional area within the GMS?

    Response: The Proposer should present their recommended solutions in the appropriate section of their proposal. The State will evaluate proposals in accordance with RFP Document, Attachment D, RFP Evaluation Plan. This approach allows the State to assess each Contractor's understanding of our work and the suitability of their proposed solution, rather than prescribing a specific configuration.

32. **Question:** RFP Pages 22-23, Attachment C, Scope of Work, IV. Background, The RFP references multiple existing legacy GMS applications used by LOCD-DR, including eGrants/eGrantsPlus, IGX (Intelligrants), Metastorm Platform, GIOS, and SAGE.

    Could the State please confirm whether the currently developed data models, database schemas, or data dictionaries from these legacy applications will be made available to the selected Contractor to support data mapping, migration, and reporting design?
    If so, at what stage of the project (e.g., initiation or requirements-definition) would these materials be provided?

    Response: Yes, LOCD will provide this to the Contractor(s) at the start of the Contract.

33. **Question:** RFP Page 23, Attachment C, Scope of Work, IV. Background, The RFP references multiple legacy GMS applications used by LOCD-DR, including eGrants/eGrantsPlus, IGX (Intelligrants), Metastorm Platform, GIOS, and SAGE.

    Could the State please confirm whether the new Grants Management System is expected to report on data from these legacy applications, integrate with them for active programs, or both?
    If integration is expected, could the State identify which systems and datasets must remain connected for continuity of reporting and program management?

    Response: The new Grants Management System is expected to support reporting on data from the legacy applications. Data from these systems will be consolidated in a reporting environment, such as a data warehouse, where the Contractor can design and generate comprehensive reports. The intent is to provide a single, unified report for program management and reporting purposes, rather than maintaining separate reports in each legacy system.

34. **Question:** RFP page 23, Attachment C, Scope of Work, IV. Background, The RFP references multiple legacy systems currently in use by LOCD-DR, including eGrantsPlus, IGX (Intelligrants), Metastorm Platform, GIOS, and SAGE.

    To help proposers accurately assess migration and integration requirements, could the State please clarify the ownership or licensing structure for each of these systems? Specifically, does LOCD-DR hold ownership or perpetual licensing rights to the software and underlying databases, or are these systems operated under vendor-managed or time-limited license agreements? Understanding these ownership and licensing arrangements, including whether LOCD-DR holds any perpetual usage rights, active support agreements, or data-access provisions, will help ensure accurate planning for transition, migration, and sustainability under the new GMS.

Response: LOCD holds licensing rights to all active grant systems and owns and maintains all underlying databases. This includes full access to the software and data necessary to support transition, migration, and ongoing reporting under the new Grants Management System.

35. **Question:** RFP Page 25, Attachment C, Scope of Work, VI. Detailed Requirements, A. Tasks and Services, The RFP requires the Contractor to oversee "comprehensive data migration." However, Section IV (Background) notes that LOCD-DR does not anticipate migrating any of the eGrantsPlus systems and that these legacy systems will remain operational until closed.

    To help proposers accurately estimate level of effort and cost, could the State please indicate—by program or legacy system—whether each is expected to involve (a) data migration, (b) data integration only, or (c) reporting access only?
    For example, it is assumed that more recent programs such as Mitigation, 2020–2021 Disaster Events, and Hurricane Francine may require migration or integration, while earlier programs such as Katrina/Rita through the 2016 Floods would likely not require migration, integration, or reporting connections. Could the State please confirm or correct these assumptions?

    Response: LOCD has not yet determined which existing systems will be retired or replaced under this initiative. Decisions regarding system retirement or replacement will depend on the awarded Contract(s), system functionality, delivery timelines, and the current status of active programs. At this stage, the primary focus is not on full system migration, but on ensuring that data from all active systems—both legacy and new—can be consolidated to support complete and accurate reporting.
    To clarify, "data integration" in this context does not mean migrating legacy systems into the new Grants Management System. Instead, data from legacy and new systems will be made available in a reporting environment, such as a data warehouse, where the Contractor can design and generate unified, comprehensive reports. This approach allows LOCD to maintain operational legacy systems while ensuring program and financial data are consolidated for accurate enterprise-level reporting.

36. **Question:** RFP Page 25, Attachment C, Scope of Work, VI. Detailed Requirements, A. Tasks and Services, Page 25 of the RFP requires the Contractor to provide Geospatial Information Systems (GIS) services and analyses, noting that LOCD-DR programs rely on GIS data for program operations, oversight, and public information.

    Could the State please clarify whether existing GIS datasets (such as project boundaries, parcel data, or mapped infrastructure) are expected to be migrated into the new GMS or integrated through external GIS services (e.g., Esri), and how the State envisions managing updates and ongoing maintenance of those legacy datasets?

    Response: The Proposer should present their recommended solutions in the appropriate section of their proposal. The State will evaluate proposals in accordance with RFP Document, Attachment D, RFP Evaluation Plan. This approach allows the State to assess each Contractor's understanding of our work and the suitability of their proposed solution, rather than prescribing a specific configuration.

37. **Question:** RFP Page 25, Attachment C, Scope of Work, VI. Detailed Requirements, A. Tasks and Services, Does the Office of Community Development currently hold any Esri or other GIS technology licenses that could be incorporated into the proposed GMS architecture?
    If so, could the State clarify whether the selected Contractor may leverage those existing licenses within the new system environment, or if the Contractor should plan to procure separate licensing?
    How many users does OCD anticipate wanting to have access to GIS technology such as ArcGIS Online?

    Response: LOCD currently relies on the Office of Technology Services and multiple Contractors for GIS services and anticipates a minimal number (approximately 10) of contributors in comparison to more users with read access only. LOCD does not currently hold any licenses that could be used for leverage.

38. **Question:** RFP Page 25, Attachment C, Scope of Work, VI. Detailed Requirements, A. Tasks and Services, Page 25 of the RFP requires the Contractor to provide "application help desk and support for LOCD-DR users and other contractors involved in the GMS."

Could the State please clarify whether this help desk is expected to be integrated with the State's existing helpdesk and ticketing infrastructure (e.g., OTS support systems) or established as a dedicated GMS-specific help desk operated by the Contractor?
If integrated, could the State specify the platform and interface requirements?

Response: LOCD anticipates a dedicated GMS specific help desk.

39. **Question:** RFP Pages 25-26, VI. Detailed Requirements, B. Technical Requirements, The RFP states that "The GMS and application software must be owned by or licensed to LOCD-DR and must have a functional life beyond this Contract" and that "The GMS and application software should be available for use free of charge by any LOCD-DR grantee and that grantee's contractors...." These provisions could imply that the State expects continued access or use of the system after the contract term.

Could the State please confirm whether it anticipates issuing follow-on Operations & Maintenance (O&M) task orders or extensions to sustain system hosting, licensing, and user support beyond the initial 36-month period?
Alternatively, should proposers assume that LOCD-DR will procure ongoing maintenance under a separate contract to maintain access and system functionality after contract expiration?
For clarity, please confirm that the State does not expect vendors to transfer proprietary IP or provide perpetual use of vendor-hosted software at no cost beyond the contract period.

Response: Any software developed under the Contract resulting from this RFP and paid for by LOCD is the property of LOCD. As such, LOCD reserves the right to use it in any way it wants after the end of the Contract. Whether or not LOCD will issue a follow-on Contract is not decided at this point. LOCD may modify and extend the Contract or issue an RFP for support after the end of the Contract.

The State does not expect vendors to transfer proprietary IP or provide perpetual use of vendor-hosted software at no cost beyond the Contract period, however, the Contractor(s) must understand that any and all software developed under the Contract is the property of the State.

40. **Question:** RFP Page 26, Attachment C, Scope of Work, VI. Detailed Requirements, B. Technical Requirements/Application Software, this section states that the Bayh-Dole Act does not apply and contractors should waive any application of the Act.

Would LOCD-DR please consider removing the requirement found in this section given that Contractors may propose using existing contractor-owned IP solutions?

Response: No, LOCD-DR will not consider removing this requirement. Please refer to the Bayh-Dole Act for guidance regarding its applicability. Proposers should review the Act to determine what requirements, if any, apply under this RFP.

41. **Question:** RFP Page 35, Attachment D, RFP Evaluation Plan, V. Veteran-Owned and Service-Connected Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Entrepreneurships (Veteran
Initiative) and Louisiana Initiative for Small Entrepreneurships (Hudson Initiative) Programs
Participation, the solicitation states "If the Proposer demonstrates its intent to use certified small entrepreneurship(s) in the performance of contract work resulting from this solicitation, the Proposer shall receive points equal to the net percentage extent of contract work which is projected to be performed by or through certified small entrepreneurship subcontractors, multiplied by the appropriate number of evaluation points."

Could the State please clarify how a prime contractor that is not itself certified may earn the full 12 % allocation through subcontracting? Specifically, if the prime contractor demonstrates that certified small entrepreneurships will perform at least 12 % of the total contract value, will the proposer receive the full 12 % (24 points), or will points be prorated based on the projected percentage of work performed by certified subcontractors?

Response: If the Proposer uses a certified Veteran or Hudson subcontractor, the Proposer shall only receive a percentage of the possible points assigned to Veteran and Hudson Initiative. In order to receive the full 12%, the Proposer itself must be Veteran-Owned Small Entrepreneurship certified. For more

information on Proposer Status and Allotment of Reserved Points, please refer to the RFP Document, Attachment D, RFP Evaluation Plan, Section V: Veteran-Owned and Service-Connected Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Entrepreneurships (Veteran Initiative) and Louisiana Initiative for Small Entrepreneurships (Hudson Initiative) Programs Participation.

42. **Question:** RFP Page 38, Attachment E, Sample Contract, 3.2 State Furnished Resources, This section states that "[a]ny software, licenses or other expenses required to perform the services of this Contract, subject to approval from the State, will be reimbursable as an Other Direct Cost (ODC). Any such software will be hosted by the State. Upon termination of this Contract such software and licenses shall be transferred to the State."

Would LOCD-DR consider amending this term to exempt COTS software licensed during the term of a resultant contract as well as contractor pre-existing intellectual property?
If a stand alone of the instance of the COTS software is desired would LOCD-DR consider an annual licensing fee for both the COTS software as well as the contractor pre-existing intellectual property?

Response: See Part 5: Proposed Modifications to Sample Contract for information on how to submit proposed modifications to Attachment E, Sample Contract. The State will own any software developed under the Contract(s) resulting from this RFP. Rights to any third-party proprietary software systems that pre-exists this RFP and are used within the grants management system designed by the Contractor will remain with the Contractor or other third parties as appropriate.

43. **Question:** RFP Page 38, Attachment E, Sample Contract, 3.2 State Furnished Resources, Section 3.2 states that "any such software will be hosted by the State."

Could the State please clarify whether this requirement means the system must be deployed within State-managed infrastructure, or whether the State would consider a Contractor-managed, FEDRAMP-authorized cloud environment that complies with the Louisiana OTS Information Security Policy?

Response: The State prefers that the Grants Management System (GMS) be hosted within State-managed infrastructure, which may include cloud-based accounts owned by the State (e.g., AWS or Azure). However, Proposers may propose an alternative hosting solution. The Proposer's recommended solutions should be provided in the appropriate section of their proposal for the State's consideration. LOCD cannot confirm the infrastructure or environment at this time as it will likely be subject to review and approval by OTS pursuant to OTS security allowances once all design and build out details can be determined. The State will evaluate proposals in accordance with RFP Document, Attachment D, RFP Evaluation Plan

44. **Question:** RFP Page 45, Attachment E, Sample Contract, 7.0 Indemnification and Limitation of Liability, Would the State consider capping total contractor liability under the Contract, including indemnification and IP indemnification? For example, would Louisiana entertain a cap of 3x the value of the contract?

Response: See Part 5: Proposed Modifications to Sample Contract for information on how to submit proposed modifications to Attachment E, Sample Contract

45. **Question:** RFP Page 51, Attachment E, Sample Contract, 29.0 Ownership of Documents, This section states that "[a]ll records, reports, documents, or other material or data, including electronic data, related to this Contract and/or obtained or prepared by Contractor, and all repositories and databases compiled or used, regardless of the source of information included therein, in connection with performance of the Services contracted for herein shall become
the property of the LOCD-DR, and shall, upon request, be returned by Contractor to the LOCD-DR at termination or expiration of this Contract."

Would LOCD-DR consider amending this section to carve out any pre-existing contractor intellectual property or third-party intellectual property that may be provided in the delivery of a resultant contract?

Response: See response to question #42.

46. **Question:** RFP Page 54, Attachment E, Sample Contract, 43.0 Copyright, This section states "[n]o materials, to include but not limited to reports, maps, or documents produced as a result of this Contract, in whole or in part, shall be available to Contractor for copyright purposes. Any such material produced as a result of this Contract that might be subject to copyright shall be the property of the LOCD-DR and all such rights shall belong to the LOCD-DR."

   Would Louisiana consider granting waivers to this requirement for Contractors who propose solutions that include contractor-owned or third-party owned proprietary IP?
   Also, has Louisiana contemplated situations where IP has become co-mingled between the parties and the process by which the parties would adjudicate which IP belongs to which party?
   Could the State please clarify how it intends to address ownership of deliverables that incorporate or are built upon pre-existing contractor or third-party software components, so that proposers can accurately define the boundaries of State ownership versus license rights?

   Response: See response to question #42.

47. **Question:** RFP Page 57, Attachment E, Sample Contract, 57.0 Warranties, Paragraph E, this section states that "[t]he Contractor will arrange to transfer title or the perpetual license for the use of such components to the State for purposes of the contract."

   Would LOCD-DR consider amending this term for contractor or third-party pre-existing intellectual property?

   Response: See response to questions #42 and #43.

48. **Question:** RFP Page 57, Attachment E, Sample Contract, 57.0 Warranties, Paragraph E, During the pre-proposal conference, the State indicated that it intends to own the system outright. Section 57.0 (Paragraph E. Original Development) states that if the Contractor incorporates pre-existing components with the State's consent, the Contractor will arrange to transfer title or a perpetual license for their use.

   Could the State please clarify whether its statement at the conference was intended to apply only to the new components developed under this contract, or also to pre-existing contractor-owned intellectual property that may be incorporated into the solution with State approval? This clarification will help ensure a shared understanding of ownership and licensing under Section 57.0 (Paragraph E).

   Response: See response to questions #42 and #43. LOCD intends to "own" all components, pre-existing or new, that are required for system functionality throughout the period of performance of the applicable grant and consistent with any record retention requirements applicable to information housed in the system, with the intent to purchase whatever licenses are needed beyond the termination of the Contract to ensure sustained system functionality.

49. **Question:** Price Schedule, General, Could the State please confirm whether the prices (including the rates) provided in the Price Schedule are intended to cover the entire 5-year potential term (36-month base + 24-month extension), or only the initial 36-month base period?

   Response: The Price Schedule Attachment is intended to cover the initial 36 months of the Contract.

50. **Question:** Price Schedule, Pricing Schedule C: Software, To help proposers accurately estimate software licensing and user access needs, could the State please provide the approximate number of users by group, including:
   Housing program applicants who will apply through the system;
   Subrecipient users who will apply for Economic Development and Infrastructure programs; and
   Internal users, including LOCD-DR staff and contracted implementation staff, who will require read/write access for program management and reporting?

   Response: LOCD intends to receive a single license with no restrictions in terms of users. LOCD does not expect the GMS to provide licenses to any applicants or subrecipients. Please refer to Pricing Schedule C: Software of the Price Schedule Attachment.

51. **Question:** Price Schedule, Pricing Schedule D: Hourly Rate Labor Costs, Will the State please provide the "specific number of hours for each job classification title in the table for the purposes of computed the evaluated cost" as specified in Price Schedule D?

    Response: No, the State is using a Sealed Financial Model for evaluation purposes. The actual Financial Evaluation Model shall be sealed and shall be made public upon the issuance of the Notice of Award.

52. **Question:** Price Schedule, Pricing Schedule E, Could the State please clarify whether the Support Monthly Rate in Pricing Schedule E should include costs for post-production support and operations & maintenance (O&M) hours, such as user assistance, system administration, and minor enhancements after system go-live?

    Response: Pricing Schedule E: Support of the Price Schedule Attachment intends to cover all support costs including post-production support and operations & maintenance (O&M) hours, such as user assistance, and system administration. If minor enhancements are required, a Task Order will be issued.

53. **Question:** Price Schedule, Pricing Schedule D: Hourly Labor Rate Labor Costs, Could the State please confirm whether proposers may add additional job classifications beyond those listed, provided that all required classifications are also completed as written?

    Response: No, Proposers shall provide an hourly rate for each job classifications listed in Pricing Schedule D: Hourly Rate Labor Costs of the Price Schedule Attachment. No changes shall be made to the job classification titles listed.

54. **Question:** Pre-Proposal Conference, During the pre-proposal conference, LOCD-DR referred to existing business logic termed as "Calculations" when showing eGrantsPlus.

    Could the State please confirm whether these existing calculations and related business rules will be made available to the awarded vendor after contract execution to support configuration, testing, and validation of the new Grants Management System?
    Additionally, could the State describe the current format or location of these rules (e.g., within legacy systems, documentation, or stored logic tables) to help proposers understand the level of effort required for transition?
    Would LOCD-DR make available all the currently developed business logic termed as "Calculations" in the pre-proposal conference?

    Response: Existing calculations and related business rules for programs are publicly available and can be accessed on the *LOCD* website at https://locddr.la.gov/ within the Policy and Procedures for each program. These materials include the calculations, examples, and eligibility requirements, providing transparency and supporting configuration, testing, and validation of the new Grants Management System.

55. **Question:** Pre-Proposal Conference, During the pre-proposal conference LOCD-DR mentioned a "Data Warehouse."

    Could the State please clarify whether the awarded vendor will be required to maintain the existing Data Warehouse, ingest legacy Data Warehouse data into the new solution, or develop a new reporting warehouse as part of the proposed system?
    If applicable, could the State provide the current Data Warehouse architecture and technology stack to assist proposers in estimating integration and migration efforts?

    Response: The awarded Contractor(s) will be responsible for establishing and maintaining a data environment to support comprehensive, transparent, and accurate reporting. This environment may be hosted by the State, but the Contractor(s) is responsible for its setup, configuration, and ongoing use to consolidate data from both legacy and new systems for reporting purposes. LOCD is relying on the expertise of the Contractor(s) to efficiently and effectively review LOCD's existing data/data systems and best advise LOCD on next steps, if any, for LOCD's current data/data warehouse(s).

56. **Question:** Addendum No. 01, Please confirm that information and statements made by LA OCD personnel verbally during the pre-proposal conference have the full force and effect of written requirements contained in the RFP.

   Response: As stated in the Pre-Proposal Conference and RFP Document, all questions needing an official response must be submitted in writing. The State's responses to all written inquiries received by the deadline date can be found in this Addendum No. 07.

57. **Question:** Hosting Environment(Reference: Attachment C – Scope of Work; Attachment B – Special RFP Terms and Conditions)
   Can OCD confirm whether the Grant Management System (GMS) must be hosted within State-managed infrastructure (e.g., Louisiana OTS or LaGov) or if a vendor-provided cloud-hosted solution (SaaS) or on-premises data center deployment will be acceptable under State security policies?

   Response: The State prefers that the Grants Management System (GMS) be hosted within State-managed infrastructure, which may include cloud-based accounts owned by the State (e.g., AWS or Azure). However, Proposers may propose an alternative hosting solution. The Proposer's recommended solutions should be provided in the appropriate section of their proposal for the State's consideration. The State will evaluate proposals in accordance with RFP Document, Attachment D, RFP Evaluation Plan.

58. **Question**: Existing Systems (Reference: Attachment C – Scope of Work)
   Given the State's existing grant management platforms, is OCD seeking a complete system replacement, or should this engagement focus on reusing, updating, and enhancing existing solutions where feasible?

   Response: See RFP Document, Attachment C, Scope of Work, Section I: Overview.

59. **Question:** Task Order Structure (Reference: Attachment B – Special RFP Terms and Conditions, Definitions: "Task Order")
   How does OCD anticipate dividing work under the master contract? Can the State provide examples of the types of Task Orders expected (e.g., new program implementations, workflow automation, data migration, system enhancements, or training initiatives)?

   Response: LOCD will determine the structure of task orders based on the Proposer(s) proposal and awarded Contract(s).

60. **Question:** Technology Stack (Reference: Attachment C – Scope of Work)
   Does OCD have a preferred software platform or development framework in mind for the GMS, or will the State consider solutions built using any modern, secure, and compliant technology stack that meets all functional and performance requirements?

   Response: Proposers should provide their recommended solutions and proposed approach in the appropriate section of their proposals. Proposer responses will be evaluated by the State in accordance with RFP Document, Attachment D, Evaluation Plan. The awarded Contractor(s) shall comply with the OTS Information Security Policy detailed in the RFP.

61. **Question:** User Volume and Licensing (Reference: Attachment C – Scope of Work)
   What is the anticipated number of internal and external system users, and should pricing be structured based on named users, concurrent users, or enterprise-wide licensing?

   Response: LOCD desires enterprise-wide licensing not dependent on the number of users for pricing. See responses to questions #7 and #8 for number of estimated users.

62. **Question:** Data Migration (Reference: Attachment C – Scope of Work)
   Will the new Grant Management System be required to import and maintain historical data from existing programs?

   Response: See response to question #35.

63. **Question:** For Attachment H - Proposal, which is difficult to work with in PDF formatt, can LOCD-DR please provide an MS Word version for RFP respondents? Alternatively, can respondents transfer the questions and requests in the PDF to an MS Word or similar document?

Response: Microsoft Word versions of the attachments are available in the RFP Website by clicking References in the appropriate section.

64. **Question:** For the estimated budget, what was the LOCD-DR methodology for estimating or arriving at the budget? What are the main component of the budget (e.g., software vs implementation vs maintenance)? What number of years? Any other relevant context for understanding the published budget estimate?

Response: The published budget estimate represents LOCD's comprehensive budget for the overall Grants Management System project and is not exclusive to the Contract. The estimate is based on prior IT Contracts for disaster services and serves as a planning reference. Final budget allocations will be determined based on the proposals received and negotiated. See the Price Schedule Attachment within the RFP Event for additional context.

65. **Question:** For estimating the types and costs of software licenses, what are the main roles and number of users (preferably by role) planned for the new GMS? For internal users, how many core users who need full functionality versus limited users who need mainly dashboards and access to data created by the staff and front-line managers? How many external users (e.g., applicants and subrecipients) who will access the GMS via a portal interface? How many administrators / configurators?

Response: See response to question #61.

66. **Question:** For estimating effort and schedule for data migrations, from which of the legacy systems in the RFP (pp. 22-23) does LOCD-DR seek to migrate the legacy data to the new, consolidated GMS? What guidance can LOCD-DR give as to the data that it does and does not wish to migrate? Is LOCD-DR open to strategies that will retain legacy data for reference while also minimizing data-migration costs (as part of the implementation project)?

Response: See response to question #35.

67. **Question:** For GIS, is LOCD-DR seeking for bidders to include a GIS capability within their proposed solutions? And/or is LOCD-DR seeking for bidders to integrate with an existing GIS operated by the State / Agency? To what degree do the legacy grants-related systems (pp. 22-23) include GIS capabilities (services, layers, etc) that might serve as blueprint for any new GIS capabilities? Please provide bidders further context and expectations relating to GIS, so that we can plan our solutions and services appropriately.

Response: LOCD is not currently utilizing any GIS capabilities. Proposers should propose potential GIS capabilities as part of their proposals. Proposer responses will be evaluated by the State in accordance with RFP Document, Attachment D, Evaluation Plan.

68. **Question:** RFP Overview, Section I: Introduction, the RFP states that "the states intend to award to multiple proposers."
Can the Louisiana Office of Community Development – Disaster Recovery (LOCD-DR) clarify what is meant by this statement?
Specifically, will multiple awards be made for different project components or service areas?
How would such an arrangement affect contract management, deliverables, and coordination among multiple awardees?

Response: All Contractor(s) will be managed by the State Project Manager (SPM) in accordance with their contractual agreement. LOCD does not anticipate multiple vendors contributing to the same system. The State may award multiple vendors by grant system (e.g., Housing, Infrastructure), depending on the proposals received and at the State's discretion. If multiple Contractors are awarded, each will work on unique, separate systems, and only one Contractor would likely be assigned reporting requirements in their task order.

Also, see response to question #24.

69. **Question:** RFP Overview, Section II: General Information and Instructions, Does LOCD-DR have an approved budget for the new Grant Management System (GMS)? If yes, can you please share the maximum budget for implementation, maintenance, and licenses?

    Response: See response to question #1.

70. **Question:** RFP Overview, Section IV (A), since the response to the RFP needs to be uploaded to the Ariba portal, are there any requirements or limitations on file sizes or file names (e.g., character lengths of file names)?

    Response: LESA's file size limitation is 100MB per attachment. The state desires the file names reflect the part, or subpart, of the Proposal being submitted.

71. **Question:** Attachment A, Section III – RFP Documents - Section P – Written or Oral Clarifications / Presentations, what is the notice period that will be provided to proposers for scheduling oral presentations or clarifications?
    Will proposers receive advance notice (e.g., number of business days) before the presentation date?
    Can presentations be conducted virtually, or are they expected to be in person?

    Response: See response to question #30.

72. **Question:** Attachment C – Section II Purpose/ Section VI Detailed Requirements (Links to External Databases), as per the information mentioned in the RFP, known systems requiring integration include, but are not limited to, the following:
    - LaGov
    - Disaster Recovery Grant Reporting System (DRGR)
    - FEMA Damage Assessment Database(s)
    - Current Floodplain Data Sources
    - Louisiana Office of Facility and Financial Services (OFFS)
    - U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Data Exports (e.g., .csv formats)

    What additional internal or external systems (legacy grant systems, financial systems, GIS, Active Directory, Power BI, etc.) should the new GMS integrate with? For each system, please describe the integration requirements — including the type of data to be imported or exported, data formats, frequency of data exchange, etc

    Response: The new Grants Management System must integrate with legacy systems to support consolidated reporting. LOCD will provide the awarded Contractor(s) access to the necessary data. The awarded Contractor(s) will be responsible for establishing and maintaining a data environment—potentially hosted by the State—to consolidate data from both legacy and new systems and ensure complete, transparent, and accurate reporting.

    Proposers should provide their recommended solutions, including integration approach, data management, and reporting methodology, in the appropriate section of their proposals. Proposer responses will be evaluated by the State in accordance with RFP Document, Attachment D, Evaluation Plan. LOCD may issue a time-and-materials task order based on the specific integration and reporting needs identified.

73. **Question:** Attachment C – Section II Purpose, could you please confirm which version of the LaGov (ERP) financial management system is currently in use?
    Please specify the LaGov modules that are currently implemented and actively used for financial management.
    Could you also clarify the expected integration approach with LaGov—e.g., whether it would involve web services, file-based exchanges, one-way, or bidirectional data flows?

Response: LOCD has not yet determined which existing systems will be retired or replaced under this initiative. Decisions regarding system retirement or replacement will depend on the awarded Contract, system functionality, delivery timelines, and the current status of active programs. At this stage, the primary focus is not on full system migration, but on ensuring that data from all active systems—both legacy and new—can be consolidated to support complete and accurate reporting.

To clarify, "data integration" in this context does not mean migrating legacy systems into the new Grants Management System. Instead, data from legacy and new systems will be made available in a reporting environment, such as a data warehouse, where the Contractor can design and generate unified, comprehensive reports. This approach allows LOCD to maintain operational legacy systems while ensuring program and financial data are consolidated for accurate enterprise-level reporting. Nothing related to LaGov is being requested.

74. **Question:** Attachment C – Section IV Background, can you provide the total annual grant funding you received for the current fiscal year?

    Response: LOCD does not receive annual grant funding. Instead, LOCD receives grants based on congressional appropriations, which are then allocated to State grantees by HUD.

75. **Question:** Attachment C – Section IV Background, what dollar volume of these grants are pass-through grants to sub-grantees?

    Response: For information on pass-through grant volumes to sub-grantees, please refer to the LOCD Action Plans available on the *LOCD* website at https://locddr.la.gov/, which detail active programs and grants. Additional information can be found in the *HUD Exchange QPR reports* for Louisiana at https://www.hudexchange.info/.

76. **Question:** Attachment C – Section IV Background, what is the total dollar amount of grants distributed?

    Response: Please refer to the *LOCD* website at https://locddr.la.gov/ for access to its Action Plans, which provides detailed information on the divisions' active programs and grants. Additional information can also be found in the *HUD Exchange QPR reports* for Louisiana at https://www.hudexchange.info/.

77. **Question:** Attachment C – Section IV Background, how many separate grant programs does LOCD-DR manage? Please provide a list, if possible.
    Do the business processes (application, pre-award, award, etc.) and associated forms vary with each type of program, or are all methods and forms standardized?
    When do each program's application periods begin in a given fiscal year?

    Response: Application periods do not begin on a fiscal year basis**.** Application periods will begin upon approval of submitted Action Plans. Please refer to the *LOCD* website at https://locddr.la.gov/ for access to its Action Plans, which provides further information on the divisions' active programs and grants. Additional information can also be found in the *HUD Exchange QPR reports* for Louisiana at https://www.hudexchange.info/.

78. **Question:** Attachment C - Section VI – Detailed Requirements - Section C Project Requirements – Project Management, does LOCD-DR have a timeline / anticipated go-live date for the new system?

    Response: LOCD expects Proposer(s) to define proposed timelines, including anticipated go-live dates, within the appropriate section of their proposals.

79. **Question:** Attachment C - Section VI – Detailed Requirements - Section C Project Requirements – Project Management, what is the total volume of grants LOCD-DR anticipates managing in the new GMS?

    Response: Please refer to the *LOCD* website at https://locddr.la.gov/ for access to its Action Plans, which provides detailed information on the divisions' active programs and grants. Additional information can also be found in the *HUD Exchange QPR reports* for Louisiana at https://www.hudexchange.info/. The total volume of grants can increase or decrease based on current need.

80. **Question:** Attachment C - Section VI – Detailed Requirements - Section C Project Requirements – Project Management, Please provide the following details for the data that needs to be migrated to the new GMS: Years of data, number of programs for which data needs to be migrated, pre-award vs post-award data, number of data sources, and whether migration includes file attachments.

    Response: LOCD has not yet determined which existing systems will be retired or replaced under this initiative. Decisions regarding system retirement or replacement will depend on the awarded Contract, system functionality, delivery timelines, and the current status of active programs. At this stage, the primary focus is not on full system migration, but on ensuring that data from all active systems—both legacy and new—can be consolidated to support complete and accurate reporting. It is highly unlikely that any data from the eGrants system will be migrated.

81. **Question:** Attachment C, Section VI – Detailed Requirements - Section C Project Requirements – Project Management, the RFP mentions that "The Contractor(s) staff may include at least one full-time, on-site, experienced Project Manager."
    Can the agency clarify whether the expectation is for the Project Manager to be on-site for the entire duration of the project, including both implementation and maintenance phases?
    The statement seems to contradict other parts of the document (Section VII – Location/Hours of Operation, pg 32) that suggest flexibility in staffing arrangements. Can the agency specify whether a hybrid or remote project management structure is acceptable?

    Response: As specified in the RFP, the Contractor's personnel may be required to be on-site for portions of the Contract term. While LOCD cannot provide a precise schedule at this time, it is anticipated that the majority of meetings can be conducted virtually. At the onset of the Contract, however, more in-person meetings are expected. Historically, the State has not required developers to be on site, though program managers and consultants have been present during initial start-up. During the life of the Contract, the State typically maintains a minimum of two on-site personnel—one Help Desk staff and reporting staff member and one business analyst—to support capturing new requirements, training, and User Acceptance Test (UAT) activities. The specific on-site presence will be negotiated and determined based on project needs.

82. **Question:** Attachment C, Section VI – Detailed Requirements – Section A: Task and Services, is LOCD-DR using an existing Geospatial Information Systems (GIS) software? If not, should we include the cost for the GIS software in our price quote?

    Response: LOCD does not currently utilize any GIS capabilities but is seeking potential capabilities within the Proposer's approach and methodology outlined in its proposal.

83. **Question:** Attachment C, Section VI – Detailed Requirements – Section A: Task and Services, page 25 of the RFP says, "Provide Geospatial Information Systems (GIS) services and analyses. LOCD-DR programs use GIS analysis. Program operations, State oversight, and public information services all rely on GIS data and services. The Contractor(s) will be required to provide services and analyses that require expertise in geography, spatial analysis, spatial data analytics, and web development, as well as application help desk and support for LOCD-DR users and other contractors involved in the GMS." Is LOCD-DR expecting the selected vendor for the new GMS to take over the development, maintenance, and helpdesk support of an existing GIS web-based software platform?

    Response: LOCD is not currently utilizing any GIS capabilities. Proposers should include their recommended GIS solutions, if any, within the appropriate section of their proposal, including proposed functionality, implementation, and associated costs.

84. **Question:** Attachment C, Section VI – Detailed Requirements – Section B: Technical Requirements – Application Software, page 26 of the RFP lists all modules that the new GMS should support. Is there any documentation that LOCD-DR can provide explaining the capabilities required (or requirements) within each module?

    Response: The Proposer should present their recommended solutions in the appropriate sections of their proposal. The State will evaluate these proposals in accordance with RFP Document, Attachment D, RFP Evaluation Plan based on how well the recommended solutions align with LOCD's needs and objectives.

This approach allows the State to assess each Proposer's understanding of our work and the suitability of their proposed solution, rather than prescribing a specific configuration.

85. **Question:** Attachment E – Sample Contract, is the proposer required to provide confirmation of registration with the LA Secretary of State, with LaGov, and produce a Louisiana Tax Clearance certificate with its proposal, or can this be completed upon award?

    Response: Proposers are not required to provide confirmation of registration with the LA Secretary of State, LaGov, or confirmation of Louisiana Tax Clearance at the time of Proposal submissions, however, this is a requirement for Contract Execution.

86. **Question:** Attachment E – Sample Contract, can the proposer request a reduction in the insurance limits at the time of submission? Please confirm this is accomplished by redlining Attachment E, Sample Contract.

    Response: Proposers may propose modifications to the RFP Document, Attachment E, Sample Contract for the State's consideration. See Part 5: Proposed Modifications to Sample Contract for information on how to submit proposed modifications to Attachment E, Sample Contract.

87. **Question:** Price Schedule, please provide the following breakdown:
    How many LOCD-DR staff will access/log into the GMS more than 20 hours a month?
    How many LOCD-DR staff will access/log into the GMS less than 20 hours a month?
    How many Grantee/Recipient users will need access to the GMS?
    How many internal staff only review applications?

    Response: LOCD does not intend to have limitations on access to the system. Also, see responses to questions #7 and #8.

88. **Question:** RFP Overview — I. Introduction; Attachment B — Special RFP Terms & Conditions (Definitions: "Task Order"), should LOCD-DR award multiple proposers, may LOCD-DR please describe the subsequent ordering procedure among multiple awardees? Will LOCD-DR assign specific scope and/or Task Orders directly or conduct secondary competition? Provide the Task Order template, typical response timelines, and decision factors among awardees, if possible.

    Response: LOCD may award multiple contracts by grant systems (e.g., Housing, Infrastructure), dependent on the proposals received and at the State's discretion. Each Contractor will be assigned task orders by the SPM to manage scope within their awarded Contract. Refer to the RFP Document, Attachment C, Scope of Work, Section VI: Detailed Requirements, Task Orders for additional details. Each Contractor(s)' work is expected to be unique, and multiple Contractors will not be assigned overlapping work on the same system.

89. **Question:** Attachment C — Scope of Work (SaaS/COTS allowed); Attachment E — Sample Contract (VPN/State hosting), should the GMS be hosted in the State's OTS environment, vendor cloud (SaaS), or either? If vendor-hosted is allowed, confirm required security baselines (OTS policy + any FedRAMP expectations) and SSO/MFA integration requirements.

    Response: See response to question #57.

90. **Question:** Attachment C — Scope of Work; Attachment E — Sample Contract ("E. Original Development"), clarify the "Original Development" warranty given SaaS/COTS are permitted: is the clause intended only for custom components? Do any perpetual rights apply to configured COTS?

    Response: Refer to RFP Document, Attachment E, Sample Contract, Section 57: Warranties, "Original Development." The State will own any software developed under the Contract(s) resulting from this RFP. Rights to third party proprietary software systems pre-existing the RFP used within the grants management system designed by the Contractor will remain with the Contractor or other third parties as appropriate. LOCD intends to "own" all components, pre-existing or new, that are required for system functionality throughout the period of performance of the applicable grant and consistent with any record retention requirements applicable to information housed in the system, with the intent to purchase whatever licenses

are needed beyond the termination of the Contract to ensure sustained system functionality.

91. **Question:** Attachment E — Sample Contract (Close-outs; Return of Records), confirm data hand-back and retention rules at closeout: how will legally required backups/audit trails be handled, and are cloud provider backups considered "copies" requiring sanitization and certification? Define timing (during contract vs. at closeout).

    Response: Refer to RFP Document. Attachment E, Sample Contract, Section 17: Documentation and Record Keeping.

92. **Question:** Attachment C — Scope of Work (Overview; Legacy/Integrations), please provide required inbound/outbound data flows for DRGR and LaGov (push/pull, frequency, interface methods), whether State middleware/integration hubs are provided, and when data dictionaries/credentials will be furnished.

    Response: LOCD will provide this to the Contractor(s) at the start of the Contract.

93. **Question:** Attachment C — Scope of Work (Analytics platforms), LOCD-DR references Power BI and Business Objects as existing tools in their current technology stack. Will LOCD-DR provide licenses to these tools to be leveraged by the awardee for the purposes of fulfilling the reporting and data analytics scope included in this RFP? Does LOCD-DR have a preference for one or both of these platforms to be leveraged for this this contract?

    Response: LOCD currently utilizes Power BI through its Microsoft enterprise agreement. Proposers should provide their recommended solutions in the appropriate sections of their proposal.

94. **Question:** Attachment E — Sample Contract (Performance Measures; Monitoring Plan), specify target uptime SLAs, incident response/restoration SLAs, and RTO/RPO expectations. Do late-deliverable penalties apply to operational incidents or only to formal deliverables? Are penalty caps per deliverable and per Task Order?

    Response: Late deliverable penalties apply only to the formal deliverables listed in the Sample Contract. If a Task Order includes specific deliverables, any associated penalties will be listed and agreed upon within that Task Order. Refer to RFP Document, Attachment E, Sample Contract, Section 5.7, for additional details.

95. **Question:** Attachment E — Sample Contract (Scope references to "desktop support" and "GIS support"), define the scope boundaries for "desktop support" (limited to GMS/admin functions vs. general endpoint support) and "GIS support" (stack/tooling such as Esri, licensing responsibility, and data sources).

    Response: This is yet to be determined and will be finalized during contract negotiation.

96. **Question:** RFP Overview (Schedule of Events context), with proposal opening on December 9, 2025, please confirm anticipated award date and whether a mobilization/transition window before substantive performance is expected (and billable).

    Response: The anticipated award date will be determined following the proposal evaluation and selection process. The Contract will have an executed date, which marks the official start of the agreement. Work is expected to commence on this executed date, and it will also be the first date on which expenses may be incurred and billed. Any mobilization or transition activities prior to the executed date are not billable.

97. **Question:** RFP Overview (Schedule of Events), will the State post a recording and slide deck from the October 23, 2025 Pre-Proposal Conference to the RFP website (LESA "Event Messages" or References)?

    Response: See response to question #19.

98. **Question:** Section I Overview on Pg. 20 of the RFP states that: "the GMS must be capable of integrating with multiple systems and data sources to provide seamless functionality and comprehensive reporting across the agency." The terms "integrate" is defined in Attachment B, Section I.Z. as follows: "the term "integrate" is used to describe a process where related systems share information with each other

immediately in "real-time". Section I.Y goes on to define the term "interface" as: "the term "interface" is used to define a process where data from one system is extracted and loaded into another system through an offline batch process." Should the GMS requirements at Section I, pg. 20 that is quoted above have used the term "interfacing" rather than "integrating." Meaning, is it the State's intent that the GMS interact live with an incumbent system or rather to just be capable of ingesting its data for reporting purposes?

Response: The State's intent is for the GMS to interface with other systems to ingest data for reporting purposes, rather than requiring real-time, live integration with incumbent systems. See changes in this Addendum No. 07.

99. **Question:** Is it OCD's intent to contract with a cloud service provider to host the operational environment? If so, would the successful bidder be expected to obtain the cloud environment and establish baseline services on behalf of OCD or is there an existing cloud service provider and Service Level Agreement (SLA) in place?

   Response: See response to question #57.

100. **Question:** Does OCD desire an Agile process that would assist in the establishment, vetting and prioritization of requirements, incorporate user and stakeholder feedback in the development, improvement of user experience and provide improved performance metrics?

   Response: The Proposer's recommended solutions should be detailed in the appropriate section of their proposal for the State's consideration.

101. **Question:** In concert with a system Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery Plan, does OCD desire an operational environment to be maintained for fallback and an associated risk/vulnerability management assessment plan in place and to be updated throughout the year to annotate various risk determined by the customer to of concern and both establish risk levels and/or mitigation?

   Response: Further requirements will be provided at contract negotiation LOCD cannot confirm the operational environment at this time as it will likely be subject to review and approval by OTS pursuant to OTS security allowances once all applicable design and build out detail can be determined.

102. **Question:** Is it OCD intent that the proposed system be SAAS based?

   Response: See response to question #43.

103. **Question:** Can OCD provide the proposers with comprehensive data dictionaries, schema documentation, and relational definitions for each legacy system from which data will be migrated into the new Grant Management System (GMS)? Specifically, will OCD furnish sufficient metadata and contextual information—such as entity relationships, field definitions, data types, and validation rules—to enable accurate mapping, transformation, and quality assurance during data migration and system integration?This information is essential to ensure that the Contractor understands the level of effort that will be required and can develop an accurate budget and complete Data Migration Plan, perform data normalization and validation, and maintain the integrity and traceability of all records imported into the new system of record.

   Response: LOCD has not yet determined which existing systems will be retired or replaced under this initiative. This determination will be based on the awarded Contract(s), system functionality, delivery timeline, and the current status of active programs within those systems. At this stage, system migration is not the primary priority; the focus is on ensuring data integration across all active systems, both old and new, to support complete and accurate reporting.

104. **Question:** Does OCD intend for the new Grant Management System to include native document storage and management functionality, or will integration with an external, State-approved document repository (e.g., SharePoint, AWS, or other) be required or preferred for long-term document retention and compliance with federal records management standards?

   Response: The Proposer's recommended solutions should be provided in the appropriate sections of

their proposal for the State's consideration.

105. **Question:** Please confirm whether the new Grant Management System (GMS) is expected to process and execute disbursement transactions directly—such as initiating payments, interfacing with banking systems, and generating electronic funds transfer (EFT) files—or if the GMS is intended solely to track, reconcile, and report on financial data imported from the State or vendor/Contractor existing financial management systems.

Response: Proposers should present their recommended solutions for the State's consideration. The proposed solution(s) should be clearly detailed in the appropriate sections of the Proposer's proposal. The State will evaluate proposals in accordance with RFP Document, Attachment D, RFP Evaluation Plan.

106. **Question:** Please clarify the expected number, categories, and roles of system users for the new Grant Management System (GMS). Specifically, please confirm the anticipated counts or ranges for each user type, including but not limited to:

- Internal users: OCD staff, program administrators, financial officers, and IT/system administrators;

- External users: applicants, subrecipients, contractors, consultants, and partner agencies;

- Auditors and oversight users: internal auditors, HUD representatives, or other authorized federal or state monitors; and

- Public or limited-access users: individuals accessing public-facing components such as application portals, program dashboards, or transparency reports.

Response: For clarification, the number of user types may vary depending to how user type is defined. As DRU defines it, Internal users: ~150, External users 500-3000, Auditors and oversight users: ~25, Public or limited-access users: dependent on nature and size of impacted potential applicants.
See also, response to questions 7, 8 and 65.

107. **Question:** Are there any role-based access control (RBAC) or identity management standards that must be followed?

Response: OTS provides IT security and quality control policies that LOCD and its Contractors are required to follow. For role-based access control (RBAC), identity management standards, and other security requirements, refer to the OTS Information Security Policy provided in RFP Document, Attachment C, Scope of Work, VI. Detailed Requirements, Section C, Project Requirements.

108. **Question:** Does OCD have a defined target period or milestone schedule within which the Contractor is expected to complete implementation and have the new Grant Management System (GMS) ready for go-live? If no specific implementation period has been established, please clarify whether proposers should prioritize: (1) accelerated deployment and time-to-production, emphasizing speed and early operational readiness; or (ii) budget optimization and long-term cost efficiency, emphasizing frugal resource management over rapid deployment?

Response: LOCD expects the Proposers to address timelines and performance in their proposals. Rapid deployment is desired.

109. **Question:** Can OCD clarify how many users will require training and whether the proposers should include a plan and budget for on-demand training?

Response: LOCD may issue a time and material task order based upon the required training needs.

110. **Question:** Can OCD clarify its expectations regarding the level and hours of post-implementation support required for the new (GMS)? Specifically: (i) should proposers assume a 24x7x365 support model, including weekends and holidays, to address critical system incidents and availability issues; or (ii) will

OCD accept a standard business-hours support model (e.g., Monday–Friday, 8:00 a.m.–5:00 p.m. Central Time) with defined escalation procedures for after-hours emergencies?

Response: Post-implementation support is expected during normal business hours (e.g., Monday–Friday, 8:00 a.m.–5:00 p.m. Central Time). Defined escalation procedures should be in place for any critical issues that may arise outside of these hours.

111. Question: Can OCD provide the proposers with a comprehensive inventory of all external databases and data sources from which it currently acquires data for program management and reporting purposes? Specifically, the column headers, field names, or schema for each dataset regularly received or integrated; and any metadata identifying the frequency, format, and transfer mechanism (e.g., API, SFTP, flat-file import) used for each data exchange? And if any of these external data sources are accessed under the authority of a Cooperative Endeavor Agreement (CEA) or Data Sharing Agreement (DSA) with another state or federal agency, please indicate whether OCD will authorize the selected Contractor to access, process, or receive data under the auspices of those existing CEAs or DSAs.

Response: LOCD will provide this information to Contractor(s) at the start of the Contract.

112. Question: On page 23 within Section IV, Background, the RFP states that eGrantsPlus systems will not be migrated to the new system and that "new housing programs and homeowner recovery efforts will utilize a new housing software solution." Can LOCD-DR clarify whether new housing programs and homeowner recovery efforts are intended to use the system procured under this RFP or if LOCD-DR intends to keep future housing programs in a separate system?

If the latter (separate system for housing programs), can the government please specify which elements of housing/homeowner recovery programs might be included in scope for the system procured through this RFP? For example, does LOCD-DR have interest in seeing a complete picture of financials for reporting across all programs, even if the transactional details for housing programs are managed in a separate system?

Response: LOCD desires a new GMS that will support any new housing recovery programs.

113. Question: Budget, Do you have an anticipated budget for this project? If so, will you share the budget amount?

Response: See response to question #1.

114. Question: Licensing, Please provide the number of internal users (agency employees and other reviewers) who will need access to the system.

Response: See response to question # 7.

115. Question: Licensing, Please provide the number of external users (grant recipients) who will need access to the system.

Response: This is dependent on future Disaster Recovery Programs. eGrants and eGrantsPlus currently has between 200-1,000 external users. Other legacy systems have between 50 and 500 external users.

116. Question: Volume, How much grant funding is typically managed by the agency in a given fiscal year?

Response: This will depend on future Disaster Recovery Programs. LOCD budget authority for FY26 is $1,073,000,000.

117. Question: Volume, How many grant programs are currently being managed by the agency that will also be managed in the new system? Do you anticipate adding other grant programs this year, and if so, how many?

Response: Please refer to the LOCD website at https://locddr.la.gov/ for access to its Action Plans, which provide detailed information on the divisions' active programs and grants. Additional information can also be found in the *HUD Exchange QPR reports* for Louisiana at https://www.hudexchange.info/.

At this time, it is unknown whether any new grant programs will be added during the current year.

118. **Question:** Data, Regarding data:
    a. Will legacy data be migrated or will there be an expectation of an integration or data lake solution to "leave"data where it is?

    b. In either case, please describe the legacy Grants Management platforms and include the rough numbers of key data points, numbers of Years, Programs, Financial and other data record counts (estimated).

    c. Will files associated with Legacy Data be migrated to the new platform?

    Response: Data migration will be determined if and when it becomes necessary, based on the development and configuration of the new system. LOCD estimates that the total data volume may range up to nearly 4 terabytes. The primary focus of this initiative is on the new system and ensuring data integration across all active systems (both old and new) for complete and accurate reporting. Migration is not the current priority and will be addressed as a future decision if required.

119. **Question:** Integrations, Will the system need to integrate with any existing systems such as payment systems? If so, please provide a list of needed integrations.

    Response: No, the system will not need to integrate with any existing systems.

120. **Question:** Integrations, Do the systems you wish this solution to interface with have APIs available? If so, are they available for review? If not, please describe integration capabilities.

    Response: LOCD does not intend that the new GMS will interface with existing GMS used by LOCD. LOCD intends that the new GMS will access data from these programs for reporting purposes. The awarded Contractor(s) will have access to any current reporting databases.

121. **Question:** Tools, Does the agency hold licenses for an electronic signature tool you would like to use as part of this solution? If so, please provide the name. If not, do you have a preferred tool or would you like this to be included in the proposal?

    Response: Currently, LOCD uses DocuSign for electronic signatures in their current grants management systems. However, if a Proposer wishes to propose a different electronic signature system, LOCD will review that recommendation during proposal evaluations.

122. **Question:** Maintenance, please elaborate on the agency's preference for future systems maintenance. Does the agency prefer future support and maintenance is done by the selected partner, internal team or a combination of both?

    Response: During the course of the Contract, LOCD will expect Contractors to maintain their systems.

123. **Question:** On-site Work, Is the vendor required to be on site for any portion of the contract term?

    Response: See response to question #15.

124. **Question:** General, have you seen demonstrations of any grant management systems prior to issuing this RFP? If so, will you share which systems?

    Response: LOCD did not invite or solicit the demonstration of any GMS. Potential Proposers that respond to this RFP may be provided an opportunity to demonstrate systems as allowed by the RFP, if LOCD

determines that such demonstrations are warranted.

125. **Question:** Tools, can you confirm that Docusign is the selected document generation tool?

Response: See response to question #121.

126. **Question:** GIS, Will the GIS services be bidirectional?

Response: GIS services may be bidirectional depending on program needs and the proposed solution. Proposers should present their recommended solutions and proposed approach in the appropriate sections of their proposal for the State's consideration.

127. **Question:** Document Management, is there a preferred document management took (e.g. AWS/Azure/Other)?

Response: No, LOCD does not have a preferred document management tool. Proposers should present their recommended solutions in the appropriate sections of their proposal.

128. **Question:** Attachment C, Scope of Work (I. Overview), this solution will enhance operational efficiency across all LOCD-DR programs including Housing, Economic Development and Infrastructure. Could you please clarify how many individual grant programs are expected to use the system?

Response: Please refer to the LOCD website at https://locddr.la.gov/ for access to its Action Plans, which provide detailed information on the divisions' active programs and grants. Additional information can also be found in the *HUD Exchange QPR* reports for Louisiana at https://www.hudexchange.info/.

129. **Question:** Attachment C, Scope of Work (I. Overview), the GMS may replace and enhance current LOCD-DR software solutions. The new system may be adopted for all future programs and current programs where data migration is feasible. To confirm, does this mean that data migration is included in the scope of this project, but only applies to non-eGrants Plus applications such as IGX and GIOS?

Response: LOCD has not yet determined which existing systems will be retired or replaced under this initiative. This determination will be based on the awarded Contract, system functionality, delivery timeline, and the current status of active programs within those systems. At this stage, system migration is not the primary priority; the focus is on ensuring data integration across all active systems, both old and new, to support complete and accurate reporting. It is highly certain that no eGrants data will be migrated. Data from the legacy applications will be consolidated in a reporting environment, such as a data warehouse, enabling the Contractor to design and generate comprehensive, unified reports for program management and reporting purposes, rather than maintaining separate reports in each legacy system.

130. **Question:** Attachment C, Scope of Work (I. Overview), the GMS must be capable of reporting across multiple grant data systems that may remain operational or be newly developed." Is the State of Louisiana seeking an independent reporting tool capable of integrating data from sources outside of the system included in this bid?

Response: Data from the legacy applications will be consolidated in a reporting environment, such as a data warehouse, enabling the Contractor to design and generate comprehensive, unified reports for program management and reporting purposes, rather than maintaining separate reports in each legacy system.

131. **Question:** Attachment C, Scope of Work (II. Purpose), the consolidated database must integrate data from existing disaster recovery software applications, LaGov, the Disaster Recovery Grant Reporting System (DRGR), and other relevant sources to support comprehensive, accurate, and timely reporting. The solution must also be capable of integrating with legacy systems that may remain active due to program life cycles, ensuring continuity and consistency of data across the agency. Could you please identify which legacy systems are expected to be integrated into the new solution?

Response: The new solution must be capable of integrating with legacy systems for reporting purposes.

LOCD will provide the Contractor(s) with access to the necessary data. Proposers should present their recommended solutions in the appropriate sections of their proposal for the State's consideration.

132. Question: Attachment C, Scope of Work (IV. Background; Note) LOCD-DR does not anticipate migrating any of the eGrants. Plus systems to a new software platform. These legacy systems will remain operational for existing program management until closed. New housing programs and homeowner recovery efforts will utilize a new housing software solution. To confirm, does this mean that data migration is included in the scope of this project, but only for non–eGrants Plus applications such as IGX and GIOS?

Response: See response to question #129.

133. Question: Attachment C, Scope of Work (IV Background) 2. Provide a comprehensive Information Technology (IT) software solution. The solution will manage all Housing, Economic Development and Infrastructure (ED&I), Mitigation, and CDBG Programs with integrated financial and reporting support. Could you please confirm which system is currently being used to manage financial activities?

Response: The State's financial system is LaGov. Reports are prepared and data are exported from this system to ensure that the grant management requisition and payment modules reconcile properly. The Contractor(s) will need to integrate data pulls from both LaGov and HUD's DRGR system to provide accurate reporting to LOCD. These data files are provided daily by LOCD.

134. Question: Security, the Security element ensures that LOCD-DR Program information is being created, transmitted, processed, and stored by systems that generate and maintain the attributes of confidentiality, integrity, and availability. All security protocols must follow accepted and approved processes established by the Office of Technology (OTS) within the Division of Administration. Security protocols must also adhere to FEDRAMP (Federal Risk and Authorization Management Program). The maintenance of hardware and software compatible with OTS Information Security Policy requirements must be adhered to throughout the Contract. The OTS Information Security Policy may be viewed online at: https://www.doa.la.gov/doa/ots/about-us/infosec/.   To confirm, is the expectation that the solution must be hosted within a FedRAMP-authorized environment (such as AWS GovCloud), or will demonstrating alignment with FedRAMP-equivalent security controls be sufficient?

Response: See response to question #57.

135. Question: General, could you please clarify how many internal users (employees or contractors) from LA OCD are expected to use the system?

Response: See response to question #7, #8.

136. Question: Section I.E – Conflict of Interest (Page 7), RFP Language: "Any Offeror who has participated in the drafting of specifications or requirements for this solicitation, or who has been involved in any decision relative to the solicitation, or has access to information that is not available to other Offerors, must disclose such involvement or access... Such involvement or access may result in the disqualification of the Offeror." Question: If a vendor is selected for this RFP, will they be conflicted out of winning a proposal for Case Management or Professional Services contracts that are associated with this Grant Management System?

Response: See response to question #28.

137. Question: Section VI.D – Personnel Qualifications (Page 22), RFP Language: "All staff will be reviewed and subject to the approval of LOCD. All staff proposed for assignment to this engagement must have a resume that includes education, training, experience, dates and names of employers and types of projects and professional certifications." The RFP then defines specific qualifications for "Key Personnel" (Project Manager and Project Consultant) and "Staff Personnel" (Database Specialist, Database Analyst, IT Reporting Specialist, Program Specialist, Software Product Developer, Business Analyst). Question: Should resumes be provided for all proposed staff classifications listed in Section VI.D (both Key Personnel and Staff Personnel), or only for the Key Personnel positions (Project Manager and Project Consultant)?

Response: As stated in RFP Document, Attachment H: Proposal, Subpart D: Proposed Staff

Qualifications, Proposers should "provide detailed information about the experience and qualifications of the Proposer's assigned personnel considered key to the success of the project" Resumes for other staff are not required at the proposal stage, though all staff will be subject to LOCD approval during contract performance.

138.   **Question:** Section II – Purpose (Page 8); Section VI.B – Technical Requirements (Page 15); Section VI.C – Links to External Databases (Page 19) RFP Language: Section II states the GMS "must integrate data from existing disaster recovery software applications... including but not limited to: eGrants Road Home, eGrantsPlus variants (Restore 2016/2020/2024, Buyout), IGX, GIOS, Metastorm, SAGE, LaGov, DRGR, and other relevant sources." Section VI.B requires integration with "FEMA IA, SBA, DocuSign" and Section VI.C states "The Contractor shall identify... external databases to import data" and "Once approved, the Contractor shall import/export data in proper formats." Question: The RFP references multiple legacy systems (eGrants Road Home, eGrantsPlus variants, IGX, GIOS, Metastorm, SAGE) but states that "LOCD-DR does not anticipate migrating any of the eGrantsPlus systems." Please clarify:
    a) Which specific legacy systems, if any, require data migration into the new GMS versus read-only reporting integration?
    b) Will LOCD-DR provide data dictionaries, APIs, or middleware support for systems requiring integration, or should offerors account for reverse-engineering legacy data structures?

    Response: LOCD does not anticipate migrating any of the eGrants systems. LOCD has not yet determined which existing systems will be retired or replaced under this initiative. This determination will be based on the awarded Contract, system functionality, delivery timeline, and the current status of active programs within those systems. At this stage, system migration is not the primary priority; rather, the focus is on ensuring data integration across all active systems, both old and new, to support complete and accurate reporting. LOCD will provide all required data to the Contractor(s) at the start of the Contract.

139.   **Question:** Section IV.A.1 – Deliverables (Page 9); Section VI.C – Project Management (Page 20) RFP Language: Section IV.A.1 lists "Initial License Installation and Configuration" as a deliverable, and the Pre-Proposal Conference notes emphasized the need for testing environments and training capabilities. However, the RFP does not explicitly state whether these environments must persist beyond implementation. Question: Does LOCD-DR expect the sandbox (UAT) and training environments to be permanent environments maintained throughout the contract term, or are they only needed during the implementation phase? If permanent, should they be refreshed periodically with production data?

    Response: The Contractor(s) must maintain the sandbox (UAT) and training environments as long as required to test new releases and to train LOCD employees on any new features in the GMS software. The State will request the data to be refreshed when needed.

140.   **Question:** Section VI.A – Tasks and Services (Page 11); Section VI.C – Reporting and Dashboards (Page 19); Pre-Proposal Conference RFP Language: Section VI.C states "Static Dashboards showing current, relevant key information should be viewable and printable." The Pre-Proposal Conference mention PowerBI integration multiple times, but do not specify whether LOCD-DR uses cloud-based or on-premises infrastructure. Question: Does the State of Louisiana use PowerBI Cloud (Microsoft Azure-hosted) or an on-premises PowerBI Report Server? This will determine the appropriate integration method and data sync approach.

    Response: Currently, both systems are being used during the transition to Power BI Cloud.

141.   **Question:** Section VI.A – Tasks and Services (Page 11); Section VI.C – Reporting and Dashboards (Page 19); Pre-Proposal Conference Notes RFP Language: Section VI.A states the Contractor shall "Utilize AI to enable 'English-like' queries" and the Pre-Proposal Conference emphasized AI capabilities for document processing and natural language queries. However, the RFP does not address data privacy considerations for AI models. Question: The Pre-Proposal Conference notes emphasize AI capabilities for "English-like queries" and document processing. Please clarify:

    a) Are AI features (OCR, NLP, predictive analytics) mandatory requirements or desired capabilities?
    b) Are there restrictions on using AI models that train on LOCD-DR data or third-party datasets?
    c) Should AI-generated queries be auditable and explainable for federal compliance purposes?

Response: LOCD does not require the Contractor to use AI to develop query capabilities to access data and create reports. LOCD desires that the GMS would allow non-technical staff to access data on an ad-hoc basis without having to have a software engineer write a query using a software language. The RFP mentioned AI to emphasize the desire to let non-technical users access data and create reports using "English like" questions without having to write (or have others write) computer code.

Proposers should present their recommended solutions in the appropriate sections of their proposal. Proposer responses will be evaluated by the State in accordance with RFP Document, Attachment D, Evaluation Plan. Prior to initiating or developing any Artificial Intelligence (AI) project, the Contractor must obtain authorization from the Office of Technology Services (OTS) and ensure full compliance with all current policies and guidelines.

142. **Question:** Section VI.C – Project Management (Page 20) vs. Section VII – Location (Page 23) RFP Language: Section VI.C states: "Contractor staff may include at least one full-time, on-site, experienced Project Manager." However, Section VII states: "Personnel are permitted to work remotely. All work shall be coordinated with and accessible to LOCD during LOCD's normal hours of operation." Question: There appears to be a contradiction regarding the Project Manager's location. Section VI.C (Project Management, Page 20) requires "at least one full-time, on-site, experienced Project Manager" (emphasis added). However, Section VII (Location, Page 23) states "personnel are permitted to work remotely." Please clarify: Is the Project Manager required to be physically on-site in Baton Rouge 40 hours per week, or is this key role permitted to work remotely with travel for in-person meetings as needed?

    Response: See response to question #81.

143. **Question:** Section VI.B – Technical Requirements (Pages 15-18); Section VI.C – Project Requirements (Page 19); Section VIII – Performance Requirements (Page 24) RFP Language:
    Section VI.B includes various technical requirements but does not specify measurable performance thresholds (e.g., page load times, concurrent user capacity). Section VIII states "Performance shall be measured by the SPM" but does not define specific metrics. Question:
    The RFP requires the system to "allow multiple people to work at the same time" (Section VI.B, Page 16) and emphasizes concurrent user support in the Pre-Proposal Conference notes. Please clarify:

    a) What is the expected number of concurrent users (internal staff, contractors, applicants) the system must support?
    b) Are there specific, measurable performance requirements or Service Level Agreements (SLAs) that the proposed system must meet (e.g., page load times <3 seconds, report generation times <10 seconds, system uptime 99.9%)?
    c) Will performance testing be conducted during UAT, and if so, what are the acceptance criteria?

    Response: The GMS must allow concurrent users (either applicants or State employees).
    a) The expected number of concurrent users (internal staff, contractors, applicants) the system must support is >1000.
    b) Specific, measurable performance requirements or Service Level Agreements (SLAs) that the proposed system must meet (e.g., page load times <3 seconds, report generation times <10 seconds, system uptime 99.9%) will be negotiated with the selected Proposer(s).
    c) Performance testing will be conducted during UAT. The acceptance criteria will be negotiated with the selected Proposer(s).

144. **Question:** What are the detailed measurable performance metrics and requirements the State Program Manager will use to evaluate both monthly progress and overall contract success?

    Response: These detailed measurable performance metrics and requirements are yet to be determined and will be finalized during contract negotiation.

145. **Question:** Is there a preferred reporting platform or format for monthly task order tracking reports and other required project documentation?

    Response: The Proposers proposed solutions should be detailed in the appropriate sections of their proposal for the State's consideration. The State will evaluate proposals in accordance with RFP

Document, Attachment D, RFP Evaluation Plan.

146. Question: Is there a maximum allowable budget or ceiling amount for the configuration of this new grant management solution?

Response: See the response to question #1.

147. Question: How often will in-person meetings in Baton Rouge be required for contractor personnel, and will travel accommodation or costs be reimbursed by the State?

Response: LOCD cannot determine, at this time, how frequent meetings requiring Contractor personnel attendance will occur. For information regarding travel requirements and related provisions, refer to RFP Document, Attachment E, Sample Contract.

148. Question: Will aggregate data sets generated for State reporting need to be delivered in any particular format or according to specific privacy standards?

Response: Yes, the Contractor(s) will need to comply with OTS security policies and procedures for data sets generated and transferred. The Contractor(s) will work with OTS support for data transfers outside of the network.

149. Question: Does the state have a preferred cloud hosting provider (e.g. AWS, Azure, etc) or will this decision be left to the vendor's discretion?

Response: See response to question #43.

150. Question: Given the complexities of managing a cloud-hosted environment and the tight integration of CI/CD pipelines, security protocols, and applications designed natively for cloud environments, is a vendor-hosted solution acceptable?

Response: See response to question #43.

151. Question: Legacy Systems (Pages 23 & 26)
A) Could the State confirm whether the selected vendor will have any responsibility for ongoing maintenance, operational support, or case management within the legacy eGrantsPlus systems, or if that responsibility will remain with the State or incumbent?
B) For non-migrated systems, what level of data access (e.g., read-only, API) will be provided to the new GMS for reporting purposes?
C) Could the State provide estimates on the volume of data (e.g., number of records, total data size in GB/TB) for all systems in scope for either migration or integration?

Response: The Contractor will not have any responsibilities for ongoing maintenance, operational support, or case management within the legacy eGrantsPlus systems. The new GMS system will have access to data in eGrants and other legacy systems for reporting purposes. The volume of data in Legacy system is estimated to 4 terabytes.

152. Question: External Integration Requirements (Page 26)
A) Could the State provide a complete list of all anticipated external data sources (beyond FEMA and Floodplain data) and detail the format and frequency of their availability?
B) For the LaGov integration, which modules are in scope, and what is the nature of the required integration (e.g., real-time API, scheduled batch file)?

Response: LOCD anticipates receiving scheduled batch files daily from legacy systems, including LaGov and DRGR, as these systems currently do not have APIs. Integration of additional external data sources will depend on the Contractor's proposed approach and methodology. LOCD currently maintains data-sharing agreements with FEMA (Public Assistance and Individual Assistance), SBA, NFIP, the Workforce Commission, and state tax agencies, as well as access to publicly available data sources such as HUD LMI information, LSU Ag and U.S. Census data.

153. **Question:** AI-Enabled Queries (Pages 25 & 27)
   A) Could the State elaborate on the expected complexity of the 'English-like' queries and identify the primary user profiles who would utilize this feature?
   B) Is there a specific technical approach envisioned (e.g., Natural Language to SQL, LLM integration) or a particular user interface (e.g., search bar, chatbot)?

   Response: LOCD is required to submit regular reports to State and Federal agencies on disaster recovery programs. These reports include information on the number of homes, businesses, and infrastructures receiving assistance as well as budget information. Proposers should provide their recommended solutions in the appropriate sections of their proposal for the State's consideration. Prior to initiating or developing any Artificial Intelligence (AI) project, the Contractor must obtain authorization from the Office of Technology Services (OTS) and ensure full compliance with all current policies and guidelines.

154. **Question:** System Go-Live and Phased Implementation (Pages 22 & 26)
   A) Does the State have a target go-live date for a Minimum Viable Product (MVP)?
   B) Is the State open to a phased implementation? If so, what would be the priority for the initial rollout of core modules?

   Response: Proposers should provide their recommended solutions in the appropriate sections of their proposal. The State will evaluate proposals in accordance with RFP Document, Attachment D, RFP Evaluation Plan. LOCD is not seeking a Minimum Viable Product (MVP); the expectation is for a fully functional, integrated solution that meets all requirements.

155. **Question:** FedRAMP Compliance (Page 27)
   A) Is the expectation for the proposed solution to be formally 'FedRAMP Authorized' at a specific impact level by a certain date?
   B) Or is it sufficient for the solution to be 'FedRAMP Ready' or architected in alignment with FedRAMP controls without pursuing formal certification?

   Response: The proposed system must be designed and configured to meet any formal certification requirements applicable to the State. While current certification is not required at the time of proposal submission, the system must be fully capable of achieving such certification without modification or delay if required by the State or federal regulations.

156. **Question:** Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery (Page 24) Could the State provide its target Recovery Time Objectives (RTOs) and Recovery Point Objectives (RPOs) for the new GMS?

   Response: The State expects recovery timeframes that are reasonable and sufficient to prevent delays or loss of production during operational business hours.

157. **Question:** Awarding Multiple Proposers (Page 35) Could the State elaborate on how the scope of work would be divided or managed among multiple contractors if this occurs?

   Response: See response to question #68.

158. **Question:** On-Site Presence (Page 32) Can the State provide an estimate of the expected frequency and duration of on-site presence required for key personnel to attend in-person meetings in Baton Rouge?

   Response: See response to questions #81 and #147.

159. **Question:** Commitment of Key Personnel (Page 29)
   A) Does the term 'duration' refer to the 36-month base period or the entire potential 60-month term?
   B) Is the State open to reducing the level of effort (e.g., to part-time) for certain key roles during the post-implementation Operations and Maintenance (O&M) phase?

   Response: Duration refers to the 36-month base period, but if the Contract is extended beyond 36 months, then Key Personnel must be committed for that time period. LOCD will consider reducing the level of effort for certain key roles during post-implementation, provided the Contractor can provide someone with the knowledge and background to fulfill contractual obligations.

160.   Question: Key Performance Indicators (Page 33) Beyond the project deliverables, what are the top 3-5 key performance indicators (KPIs) the State will use to measure the success of the new GMS in its first year of operation?

Response: Key Performance Indicators for the success of the new GMS will be negotiated with selected proposers and documented accordingly. The KPIs are expected to include:

1. System continuity and reliability – consistent uptime and stable performance.
2. Ease and accuracy of reporting – ability to generate required reports efficiently with minimal manual intervention.
3. Minimal code modification requirements – flexibility to adapt to program changes without extensive redevelopment.
4. High system performance – fast processing and response times across all modules.
5. Low volume of help desk tickets – minimal user issues and support requests, indicating strong usability and system stability.

161.   Question: Change Management Activities (Page 24) The RFP lists a "Training Plan" and "Training Materials" as deliverables. Beyond these materials, what are the State's broader plans or expectations for contractor involvement in change management activities to ensure a smooth transition and high user adoption rate?

Response: LOCD expects the Contractor(s) to be partners with LOCD and involved in change management activities to ensure a smooth transition and high adoption rates.

162.   Question: Pre-Proposal Meeting Question During the pre-proposal meeting, the question arose whether a vendor winning this RFP would be precluded from serving on any future program management or implementation work utilizing the platform. Could you please confirm if this is the case?

Response: See changes made in this Addendum No. 07. See response to question #28.

163.   Question: Can a data dictionary be provided for data types (extensions) that will be handled?

 Response: Yes, LOCD will provide this to the Contractor(s) at the start of the Contract.

164.   Question: What are the specific data sources that will need to be linked to the GMS solution? Are there existing APIs or data sharing agreements in place?

Response: There is no existing API. LOCD will provide all required data to the Contractor(s) at the start of the Contract.

165.   Question: Is there a specific GIS platform being used?

Response: See response to question #67.

166.   Question: Award Structure (RFP Overview, I. Introduction), RFP Page 3 of 80
The RFP states the State intends to award multiple proposers. Can you clarify how work will be allocated among multiple awardees? Will there be a primary vendor, or will task orders be completed among selected vendors?

Response: See response to question #68.

167.   Question: QA/QC Contract Restriction (RFP Overview, I. Introduction), RFP Page 3 of 80
Please provide more details about the scope of the separate QA/QC contract to ensure there is no overlap with services proposed under this RFP.

Response: The Contract can be found on LOCD website at https://locddr.la.gov/. See changes made in this Addendum No. 07.

168. Question: Legacy Systems Integration (Attachment C, Section I & IV):
Will the new GMS need to interface with legacy eGrantsPlus or IGX systems for reporting or data exchange, or will these systems operate independently? If there is any interface, what is the preferred integration method (API, batch, etc.)?

Response: The only required integration involves data collection, which is necessary to ensure accurate reporting for grants and programs.

169. Question: AI Functionality (Attachment C, Section IV.A):
Is there a preferred AI platform or technology stack for enabling "English-like" queries and report generation, or are vendors free to propose any solution?

Response: No. LOCD is looking for Proposers to propose a best approach to developing "English-like" queries and report generation.

170. Question: GIS Requirements (Attachment C, Section IV.A):
What GIS platforms and data formats are currently in use, and are there specific requirements for integration or reporting?

Response: LOCD does not have any GIS platforms currently in use. We do have some reporting capacity through Power BI that uses multiple GIS layers.

171. Question: Warranty Period (Attachment C, Section IV):
Can you clarify the expected warranty period for deliverables, and whether it differs for software vs. services?
Response: See Attachment E, Sample Contract, Section 57.0 Warranties.

172. Question: Security Standards (Attachment C, Section IV.B): If the underlying infrastructure is already FedRAMP certified, must the proposed SaaS or COTS products also obtain separate FedRAMP certification?

Response: The product itself must be FedRAMP certified depending on the type of federally regulated data being stored or interacted with.

173. Question: Training Deliverables – Training Plan (Attachment C, Section V): The scope of work indicates the production of training materials – is it intended that the selected consultant will also provide the training sessions? Please provide details and minimum requirements for training duration, format (in-person, virtual, self-paced), or number of sessions.

Response: Details and minimum requirements for training duration, format, and number of sessions will be specified in Task Orders issued to the Contractor. Historically, Contractors have provided virtual training during User Acceptance Test (UAT) with LOCD and key project management contractors, along with release notes and test scripts. LOCD and the consulting services contractor typically train their own staff. While the majority of training and meetings are expected to be virtual.

174. Question: Veteran/Hudson Initiative Points (Attachment D, Section V): If a proposer uses multiple certified small entrepreneurships as subcontractors, how is the percentage of points calculated? Is it cumulative or based on the largest subcontract?

Response: If the Proposer demonstrates its intent to use certified small entrepreneurship(s) in the performance of contract work resulting from this solicitation, the Proposer shall receive points equal to the net percentage extent of contract work which is projected to be performed by or through certified small entrepreneurship subcontractors, multiplied by the appropriate number of evaluation points.

175. Question: Pricing Schedule (Attachment H, Part 3: Financial Proposal): Will LOCD-DR allow bidders to submit additional Job Classification Titles and corresponding information (No. of Employees Available, No. of Hours, Hourly Rate, and Evaluated Cost) to include a broader set of program delivery participants?

Response: See response to question #53.

176. **Question:** Pricing Schedule D: Are any roles listed in Pricing Schedule D, with the exception of Project Manager, expected to be periodically on site?

Response: Yes, other Contractor personnel may be required to be on-site during the Contract. While the majority of meetings and work are anticipated to be virtual, at the onset of the Contract the State may have more in-person meetings. Historically, the State has had program managers and consultants on site during initial startup. Additionally, during the life of the Contract, it is typical to have a minimum of two on-site Contractor employees: (1) an Help Desk (HD) and reporting staff member, and (2) a business analyst to assist with capturing new requirements, training, User Acceptance Test (UAT) support, and other project needs. The exact on-site presence will be negotiated and based on actual project requirements.

177. **Question:** Pricing Schedule B: Deliverables: Are there estimated timeframes for completing the deliverables listed in Pricing Schedule B? For example, completing the GMS Project Work Plan within 15 days of contract start, or defining system requirements within 60 days of contract start.

Response: Proposers recommended solutions should be provided in the appropriate sections of their proposal for the State's consideration.

178. **Question:** V. Deliverables, RFP Page 24 of 80: When does LOCD anticipate that the system will need to be ready for use?

Response: The GMS is anticipated to be fully operational within one year from the Contract start date.

179. **Question:** B. Technical Requirements, Application Software, RFP Page 26 of 80: The modules listed on Page 26 do not include Construction Management/Oversight. Does LOCD have other systems that will provide those services, or should that module be added to this list? If other systems are being used or will be utilized, please provide details.

Response: LOCD currently has contractual deliverables for construction management, and status data and aging reports help enforce these deliverables, including final inspections required for payment. Additionally, reporting timeframes within the system support timely monitoring and compliance. Proposers recommended solutions should be detailed in the appropriate sections of their proposal for the State's consideration.

180. **Question:** B. Technical Requirements, Application Software, RFP Page 26 of 80: The modules listed on Page 26 do not include individual project close-out. Does LOCD have other systems that will provide those services, or should that module be added to this list? If other systems are being used or will be utilized, please provide details.

Response: Proposers recommended solutions should be detailed in the appropriate sections of their proposal for the State's consideration.

181. **Question:** B. Technical Requirements, Application Software, RFP Page 26 of 80: The modules listed on Page 26 do not include Duplication of Benefits (DOB). Is DOB analysis included in the Eligibility Reviews module?

Response: Since Duplication of Benefits (DOB) is required to calculate the basis of an award, it is expected to be included within the Case Management modules, such as Eligibility Reviews.

182. **Question:** Pricing Schedule: The pricing schedule does not include nor allow the insertion of hours for each individual labor category. Will LOCD be providing those anticipated levels of effort for each category? If yes, can those details be provided so that bidders can fully understand the anticipated level of effort?

Response: The State has allocated a specific number of hours for each job category in the table for the purposes of computing the evaluated cost. The State is using a Sealed Financial Model for evaluation purposes. The actual Financial Evaluation Model shall be made public upon the issuance of the Notice of Award.

183. **Question:** IV. Detailed Requirements, A. Tasks and Services, RFP Page 25 of 80: As new disasters occur with subsequent Action Plans, will the selected consultant be utilized to make any adjustments that may be necessary at that time? Or will the State have to re-procure supporting services at that time?

Response: If new Action Plans are written and approved for future disasters that occur during the life of the awarded Contract(s) that require changes to the GMS, the current Contractor(s) may be issued task orders to make those changes.

184. **Question:** VI Detailed Requirements, C. Project Requirements, Project Management, 5. System Integration, RFP Page 28 of 80: System Migration: What is the volume and type of data to be migrated into the GMS (Number of records, format, size in MB or GB, data quality...)?

Response: See responses to questions #5 and #6.

185. **Question:** VI. Detailed Requirements, C. Project Requirements, Project Management, 5. System Integration, RFP Page 28 of 80: System Migration: Are there file attachments that will need to be included in the migration? If so, what platform are they currently stored in?

Response: See responses to questions #5 and #6.

186. **Question:** V. Deliverables, RFP Page 24 of 80: System Functionality: Does the GMS require mobile device compatibility?

Response: Users should be able to access the GMS from laptop computers and/or mobile devices.

187. **Question:** V. Deliverables, RFP Page 24 of 80: System Functionality: Does the GMS require offline data collection capabilities?

Response: As appropriate, users should be able to upload data from mobile devices.

188. **Question:** V. Deliverables, RFP Page 24 of 80: System Functionality: How many users and/or transactions are expected per year? Define users for "staff or contractors" and transactions with external parties, like those applying for and receiving aid.

Response: Refer to LOCD website at https://locddr.la.gov/ for reports which contain executive summaries to assist you in understanding the number of potential applicants that may apply using the system outside of internal staff and contractors. Also, see responses to questions #7 and #8.

189. **Question:** Pricing Schedule: Where do we include estimated costs for ongoing support requirements not included in the Pricing Schedule, like GIS analysis, report modifications, Action Plan analysis, and change management, etc?

Response: Proposers shall respond in Pricing Schedule B: Hourly Rate Labor Costs by providing the hourly rates for skill sets which may be requested through Task Orders for needs other than Schedule B, Schedule C, Schedule E. The State has allocated a specific number of hours for each job classification title in the table that will be revealed upon proposal opening. The allocated hours are being utilized for evaluation purposes.

190. **Question:** B. Technical Requirements, Application Software, RFP Page 26 of 80: How many users and/or transactions are expected per year? Define users for "staff or contractors" and transactions with external parties, like those applying for and receiving aid.

Response: See response to question #188.

191. **Question:** B. Technical Requirements, Application Software, RFP Page 26 of 80: Are there any requirements for mobile device compatibility?

Response: See response to question #186.

192. **Question:** B. Technical Requirements, Application Software, RFP Page 26 of 80: Does this application need offline capabilities?

Response: See response to question #187.

193. **Question:** Can the State clarify whether the intent is to implement a single enterprise system across all LOCD-DR programs or allow multiple modular systems (for example, separate platforms for housing vs. mitigation)?

Response: The State's intent is to have a single GMS that meets the needs across all LOCD-DR programs. Whether this is accomplished through multiple modules selected from a single sign-on screen or some other design is the choice of the Proposer to propose. LOCD will select the proposal(s) that is in the best interest of the State, in accordance with RFP Document, Attachment D: Evaluation Plan.

194. **Question:** Which of the existing systems (eGrantsPlus, IGX, GIOS, Metastorm, SAGE, Power BI, Business Objects) are still actively maintained, and what level of data migration is expected for each?

Response: See RFP Document, Attachment C, Scope of Work, Section IV Background for current system information. Also, see responses to questions #5 and #6.

Data migration will be determined if and when it becomes necessary, based on the development and configuration of the new system. As noted in our response to Question #5, the primary focus of this initiative is on the new system and ensuring data integration across all active systems (both old and new) for complete and accurate reporting. Migration is not the current priority and will be addressed as a future decision if required.

195. **Question:** RFP page 20 states "The GMS may replace and enhance current LOCD-DR software solutions. The new system may be adopted for all future programs and current programs where data migration is feasible." RFP Page 23 has a seemingly conflicting statement: "Note: LOCD-DR does not anticipate migrating any of the eGrantsPlus systems to a new software platform. These legacy systems will remain operational for existing program management until closed. New housing programs and homeowner recovery efforts will utilize a new housing software solution." Please clarify the State's intent and provide detail (volume, number of records, data types, etc) on any desired historical data migration from existing systems into the new solution.

Response: See response to question #35.

196. **Question:** Were any vendors invited to demonstrate a system prior to the issuance of this RFP? If so, which solutions or products were shown, and were all potential vendors offered an equal opportunity to participate?

Response: See response to question #124.

197. **Question:** Can the State provide examples of prior surveys? The more detail that can be provided the better, as this is a critical component of the overall solution. For example, please describe the typical data fields, logic, workflow, and scoring methodology used to prioritize applicants in previous programs? Are any changes to the survey process or features desired for the new system?

Response: LOCD website (https://locddr.la.gov/) lists the information that potential recipients needed to provide in a survey for various disaster programs. Much of this information can also be found in the Policies and Procedures on the LOCD website or the Restore (https://restore.la.gov/) website. What information will be required for future disaster recovery programs will depend on the approved Action Plan.

198. **Question:** Will LOCD-DR and OTS staff assigned to this project be dedicated full-time, or will they have competing responsibilities that could affect their availability for workshops, testing, or other activities? (RFP p. 37–38)

Response: LOCD will make every effort to ensure the appropriate staff are available as needed for workshops, testing, or other activities.

199. Question: Are there any known or anticipated "blackout periods" (for example, during HUD reporting, audits, or fiscal year closeout) when in-house resources will be unavailable for project participation? (RFP p. 37–38)

Response: No blackout periods are known at this time, other than those associated with this RFP.

200. Question: Does the State desire a phased rollout (by program or function) or a single go-live implementation? (RFP p. 37–38)

Response: See response to question #14.

201. Question: Can the State provide details on existing data exchange mechanisms or APIs for LaGov and DRGR? (RFP p. 25)

Response: There is no existing API. LOCD will provide all required data to the awarded Contractor(s).

202. Question: Does the State have preferred AI or natural language query frameworks (for example, tools conforming to NIST AI RMF) to support the RFP's "English-like query" requirement? (RFP p. 25)

Response: No, the State does not have preferred AI or natural language query frameworks. Proposers should present their recommended solutions in the appropriate sections of their proposal.

203. Question: What is the State's preferred hosting model — State-managed, Contractor-managed, or SaaS/COTS hosted?

Response. See response to question #57.

204. Question: For GIS functionality, what datasets and mapping tools are currently in use? Will those data sources be available to the vendor for system integration purposes? (RFP p. 25)

Response: No GIS mapping tools are currently in use. Any GIS data layers owned by LOCD may be provided, if relevant, to support software development.

205. Question: Are there specific performance metrics (for example, response times, uptime) that the proposed solution must meet? (RFP p. 25)
Response: See response to question #144.

206. Question: Will the State consider extending the proposal submission deadline if responses to vendor questions result in material clarifications? (RFP p. 3, 11)

Response: See changes made in this Addendum No. 07.

207. Question: Will the State allow an opportunity for clarification questions if the initial round of Q&A yields additional questions? (RFP p. 11)

Response: No, the State does not anticipate another round of Q&A for this solicitation.

208. Question: The RFP requires that the GMS be available for use "free of charge by any LOCD-DR grantee and that grantee's contractors." Can the State clarify the expected user counts and access tiers (administrators, grantees, read-only users)? (RFP p. 33)

Response: Approximately 150 LOCD staff will have access to GMS, some on a read-only basis. LOCD website lists the information that potential recipients needed to provide in a survey for various disaster programs. Much of this information can also be found in the Policies and Procedures on the LOCD website at https://locddr.la.gov/ or the Restore (https://restore.la.gov/) website. What information will be required for future disaster recovery programs will depend on the approved Action Plan.

209. **Question:** Will LOCD-DR retain sole ownership of all data, and are there specific retention or purging requirements after contract completion? (RFP p. 49–51)

Response: LOCD will retain ownership of all data produced or created within the GMS.

210. **Question:** What is the State's Identity Management System(s)? Will the vendor be allowed to leverage these system(s) for the proposed solution? (RFP p. 25, 37)

Response: The States' Identity Management System is Microsoft Active Directory with standard SSO integrations (SAML v2 / JWT). Yes, these systems will be leveraged for authentication and authorization.

211. **Question:** What systems will need to push or pull data from the new GMS?

Response: All active systems mentioned in the RFP Document, Attachment C, Scope of Work, Section IV, Background are included.

212. **Question:** Are there system-specific APIs or data formats already in place to enable integration (e.g., REST API, XML, flat files)?

Response: No, there are no system-specific APIs or data formations already in place to enable integration.

213. **Question:** Is the State open to a central aggregation point for data from the new GMS and other legacy GMS systems, even if those systems continue to manage workflows independently?

Response: Yes, the State is open to a central aggregation point for data from the new GMS and other legacy GMS systems.

214. **Question:** What historical or current data will need to be ingested or synchronized into the GMS for cross-system reporting?

Response: LOCD has not yet determined which existing systems will be retired or replaced under this initiative. Decisions regarding system retirement or replacement will depend on the awarded Contract, system functionality, delivery timelines, and the current status of active programs. At this stage, the primary focus is not on full system migration, but on ensuring that data from all active systems—both legacy and new—can be consolidated to support complete and accurate reporting.
To clarify, "data integration" in this context does not mean migrating legacy systems into the new Grants Management System. Instead, data from legacy and new systems will be made available in a reporting environment, such as a data warehouse, where the Contractor can design and generate unified, comprehensive reports. This approach allows LOCD to maintain operational legacy systems while ensuring program and financial data are consolidated for accurate enterprise-level reporting.

215. **Question:** What tools are currently used for grant reporting (e.g., Tableau, Power BI, etc.)?

Response: Power BI, Tableau, and Business Objects are currently our main grant reporting tools.

216. **Question:** Are there current pain points with reporting tools — e.g., lack of access, inability to customize, performance, or data silos?

Response: While the system is functional, there is a strong opportunity to enhance efficiency, accuracy, and speed through new technology and solutions that better support reporting needs and streamline workflows.

217. **Question:** What types of reports are critical for executive leadership, program managers, and grantees — and do those differ across systems?

Response: Proposers should present their recommended solutions in the appropriate sections of their proposal. The State will evaluate proposals in accordance with RFP Document, Attachment D, RFP Evaluation Plan.

218. **Question:** What are the expectations for self-service analytics (e.g., ad hoc filtering, custom dashboards) by non-technical users?

Response: Proposers should present their recommended solutions in their proposal. The State will evaluate proposals in accordance with RFP Document, Attachment D, RFP Evaluation Plan.

219. **Question:** Are specific data visualizations, KPIs, or compliance metrics required for federal reporting (e.g., HUD, FEMA, Treasury)?

Response: Yes. Please refer to the LOCD website at https://locddr.la.gov/ for its Action Plans, which provide further information on the divisions' active programs and grants. Additional information can also be found in the *HUD Exchange QPR* reports for Louisiana at https://www.hudexchange.info/.

220. **Question:** Will there be requirements for geospatial visualizations, equity impact analysis, or demographic segmentation in reporting?

Response: Yes. Please refer to the LOCD website at https://locddr.la.gov/ for its Action Plans, which provide further information on the divisions' active programs and grants. Additional information can also be found in the *HUD Exchange QPR reports* for Louisiana at https://www.hudexchange.info/.

221. **Question:** Does the State require historical trend analysis, forecasting, or comparative metrics across funding programs?

Response: Yes, historical trend analysis, forecasting, and comparative metrics across funding programs are samples of the types of reports LOCD wishes to be available for users, but they are not limited to only these reports.

222. **Question:** Will there be a centralized data warehouse or data lake to support business intelligence, or should the GMS include its own embedded analytics layer?

Response: LOCD is looking for a Contractor(s) to design a reporting system that meets the needs of LOCD. LOCD will consider a data warehouse or data lake to support business intelligence or an embedded analytics layer in the GMS.

223. **Question:** Are there future programs or funding sources anticipated (e.g., Infrastructure, Broadband, Mitigation, ESG) that will require a GMS but are not currently mapped to the current scope?

Response: LOCD cannot define future programs of funding sources that may require the GMS to support. LOCD is seeking a GMS that is highly flexible and configurable to meet the needs of future, undefined programs.

224. **Question:** Is the State interested in a modular platform that can support net-new program launches without the need for new RFPs or platforms?

Response: The State's intent is to have a single GMS that meets the needs across all LOCD programs. Whether this is accomplished through multiple modules selected from a single sign-on screen or some other design is the choice of the Proposer to propose. Any new programs required during the life of the Contract would be expected to be added, augmented, or enhanced within the GMS by the Contractor.

225. **Question:** Would the State benefit from the ability to pilot smaller programs or local initiatives within the GMS without needing major system reconfiguration?

Response: No, the State would not benefit from this.

226. **Question:** What is the estimated number of concurrent internal users and grantee users the system must support?

Response: See response to question #7 for estimated internal users. The number of users applying for

aid is expected to range from approximately 100 to 3,000. This estimate does not include potential homeowners applying for assistance, as that number will vary depending on the nature and impact of the disaster in Louisiana.

227. **Question:** Does "Initial License Installation and Configuration" refer to provisioning a cloud-based SaaS environment (e.g., URL setup, SSO, API keys), or is on-premise installation required?

     Response: See response to question #57.

228. **Question:** Who is expected to provide and manage the software licenses — the vendor via SaaS subscription, or the State via separately purchased licenses?

     Response: The State is open to considering either option and will consider the solution proposed.

229. **Question:** To what extent is custom configuration (e.g., code-level customization, plugin development) expected versus standard SaaS parameter configuration?

     Response: The priority is for the system to fully support program design, implementation, audit, and reporting requirements. The Proposer is responsible for proposing the approach to achieving this, whether through standard SaaS configuration, custom development, or a combination of methods, in a way that meets all program objectives. As stated in RFP Document, Attachment C, Scope of Work, Section III, Goals and Objectives, "It is permissible to propose, as part of the solution, a SaaS or Commercial—off-the-shelf (COTS) software that is customizable to meet the needs and requirements of this RFP." As such, LOCD would consider a customized design and implementation of non-SAAS / non-COTS solutions if the Proposer can demonstrate that this is a preferred solution to developing a GMS.

230. **Question:** Should the Operations & Maintenance Plan include vendor-provided post-implementation support such as admin services, help desk, or system configuration changes?

     Response: Yes, the Operations & Maintenance Plan should include admin services, help desk, and system configuration changes.

231. **Question:** Will the vendor be responsible for meeting defined service level agreements (SLAs) for uptime, issue resolution, and response time?

     Response: Yes, the Contractor(s) will be responsible for meeting defined service level agreements which will be negotiated in the awarded Contract(s).

232. **Question:** Should the Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery Plan address only the application layer, or the full SaaS stack including hosting infrastructure (e.g., AWS, Azure)?

     Response: The Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery Plan should address the full SaaS stack including hosting infrastructure (e.g., AWS, Azure)

233. **Question:** Are specific RTO (Recovery Time Objective) and RPO (Recovery Point Objective) thresholds already defined by the State?

     Response: See response to question #144.

234. **Question:** Is the vendor required to conduct periodic disaster recovery tests with the State, or is submission of a written plan sufficient?

     Response: A written plan is sufficient unless additional testing is required by OTS; at that point, the Contractor(s) will be notified. The Contractor(s) shall comply with the OTS Information Security Policy detailed in the RFP Document.

235. **Question:** Regarding the State's ownership/licensing after contract term: If you stop paying license fees and we stop your service and extract your data, is that ok? E.g., as long as you are paying licensing you will have access.

Response: Any software developed under this Contract will be owned perpetually by the State. Any third-party software to be used by the State will be procured and maintained in accordance with the terms and conditions of the applicable software license.

236. **Question:** Are there any non-negotiable clauses in the Sample Contract (Attachment E), particularly around IP ownership or indemnity?

    Response: See Part 5: Proposed Modifications to Sample Contract of the RFP Document.

237. **Question:** Are there specific cybersecurity frameworks the solution must comply with beyond SOC 2 Type 2?

    Response: The State Information Security Policy, which is based off of the NIST 800-53 framework.

238. **Question:** Will penetration testing or third-party vulnerability assessments be required prior to go-live?

    Response: Yes, penetration testing and/or third-party vulnerability assessments will be required prior to go-live.

239. **Question:** Does this procurement fall under any cooperative purchasing agreement that would allow use by other Louisiana agencies or entities?

    Response: No, the Contract resulting from this RFP will be between the awarded Contractor(s) and LOCD.

240. **Question:** Will multiple vendors be selected under this RFP, and if so, how will task orders be distributed among them?

    Response: See response to question #68.

241. **Question:** How will the State score the financial proposal relative to technical? (e.g., what is the weighting from Attachment D?)

    Response: See RFP Document, Attachment D, RFP Evaluation Plan, Section VI. Evaluation Summary. Technical and financial proposals will be evaluated and scored separately in accordance with the evaluation process described in the RFP. The technical evaluation will be completed independently of the financial evaluation, and financial proposals will not influence technical scores.

242. **Question:** Will the State allow annual subscription fee increases, and if so, what CPI or % cap applies?

    Response: At contract award, LOCD may agree to an appropriate CPI or % cap on subscription fees.

243. **Question:** If pricing is based on task orders, will pricing be firm-fixed, T&M, or rate card-based?

    Response: This will be determined during contract negotiation.

244. **Question:** Are there any goals for subcontracting to Hudson or Veteran Initiative businesses?

    Response: See RFP Document, Attachment D, RFP Evaluation Plan, Section V.

245. **Question:** Can the system be deployed in the vendor's cloud, or is hosting on State-owned infrastructure required?

    Response: See response to question #57.

246. **Question:** Can the State confirm that any mutually agreed SaaS Addendum would take precedence for SaaS-specific terms (e.g., data ownership, IP, SLAs, and liability)?

Response: Any proposed modifications to terms would be handled in accordance with the RFP. See Part 5: Proposed Modifications to Sample Contract for information on how to submit proposed modifications to Attachment E, Sample Contract.

247.   **Question:** Will the State allow inclusion of an attachment or addendum that supersedes conflicting boilerplate terms relating to SaaS/IP and data handling?

Response: No, the State will not allow inclusion of an attachment or addendum that supersedes conflicting boilerplate terms relating to SaaS/IP and data handling.

248.   **Question:** Can the State provide the hierarchy of documents (RFP, response, contract, attachments) that will govern in case of conflict?

Response: See Attachment E, Sample Contract, Section 38.0 Order of Precedence of the RFP.

249.   **Question:** Will the State confirm that it only seeks ownership of State Data and deliverables specifically produced for this engagement, not the underlying SaaS platform, configurations, or templates?

Response: The State will own any software developed under the Contract(s) resulting from this RFP. Rights to third party proprietary software systems pre-existing the RFP used within the grants management system designed by the Contractor will remain with the Contractor or other third parties as appropriate.

250.   **Question:** Will the State accept that [Proposer] retains ownership of its proprietary system, tools, and aggregated/anonymized data?

Response: See response to question #249.

251.   **Question:** Can third-party or off-the-shelf components used in providing the service remain under their respective licenses?

Response: See response to question #249. Terms of licenses for third-party or off-the-shelf components will be negotiated with the awarded Contractor(s).

252.   **Question:** Can the State confirm that data export and deletion obligations will align with NIST SP 800-88 and allow for standard retention periods for encrypted backups? What is the preferred format for post-termination data exports (e.g., CSV, JSON, API)?

Response: Yes. The State's data sanitization aligns with NIST SP 800-88. Backup retention follows agency requirements. Post-termination data export format will be determined in consultation with the agency. The State's policy is available on the Division of Administration website.

253.   **Question:** Will the State accept certification of data deletion within a defined timeframe (e.g., 60 days) post-termination?

Response: The State may accept certification of data deletion within a defined timeframe post-termination, subject to State review and acceptance of the certification documentation.

254.   **Question:** Can the State confirm whether any protected health information (PHI) or special categories of personal data will be exchanged under this contract?

Response: The State does not foresee at this time that any protected health information (PHI) or special categories of personal data will be included in the GMS.

255.   **Question:** Will the State accept [Proposer's] standard confidentiality terms, including carve-outs for information already known or independently developed?

Response: See response to question #42 and #43. The State will own any software developed under the awarded Contract(s)*. * Rights to third party proprietary software systems pre-existing the RFP used within the grants management system designed by the Contractor will remain with the Contractor or other third

parties as appropriate.

256.   **Question:** Can the State clarify which portions of its OTS Information Security Policy apply to multi-tenant SaaS platforms?

Response: The OTS Information Security Policy is applicable to all platforms.

257.   **Question:** Will the State accept 48-hour incident notice for confirmed breaches instead of 24 hours, with ongoing updates?

Response: See response to question #43.

258.   **Question:** Can the State confirm that compliance with SOC 2 Type 2 controls meets the security audit requirement?

Response: LOCD may confirm compliance upon receipt and review of the report.

259.   **Question:** Can the State limit audit rights to State-specific data and records rather than shared SaaS infrastructure?

Response: See response to question #43.

260.   **Question:** Will the State accept review of SOC 2 Type 2 reports and completion of security questionnaires in lieu of on-site audits?

Response: See response to question #43.

261.   **Question:** Can the State clarify the frequency and scope of audit requests (e.g., once per year or for cause only)?

Response: The frequency and scope of audit requests is unknown at this time, but audits are a routine occurrence. LOCD reserves the rights to audit as requested.

262.   **Question:** Will the State accept limiting indemnification to third-party claims for gross negligence, willful misconduct, or IP infringement?

Response: Any proposed modifications to indemnification terms would be handled in accordance with Part 5: Proposed Modifications to the Sample Contract. See Part 5: Proposed Modifications to Sample Contract for information on how to submit proposed modifications to Attachment E, Sample Contract.

263.   **Question:** Can the duty to defend be satisfied by [Proposer] providing defense through counsel reasonably acceptable to the State?

Response: See response to question #43.

264.   **Question:** Will the State agree to remove "without limitation" language and tie indemnity obligations to liability caps?

Response: See response to question #43.

265.   **Question:** Can the State confirm that direct damages will be capped at twelve (12) months of fees under the applicable Order or SOW?

Response: No, direct damages will not be capped at twelve months of fees under the applicable task order or Scope of Work.

266.   **Question:** Will the State consider a sub-cap for statutory data-breach costs (e.g., 2x annual fees)?

Response: See response to question #43.

267. **Question:** Will the State agree to remove liquidated penalties in favor of SLA-based remedies?

Response: See response to question #43.

268. **Question:** Can the State confirm that performance obligations will be defined through measurable SaaS SLAs (e.g., 99.9% uptime) instead of penalty clauses?

Response: The State and the awarded Contractor(s) will define performance standards and outline penalties/remedies for failures during contract negotiations.

269. **Question:** Will the State accept [Proposer's] standard SLA credits and cure periods in place of financial penalties?

Response: The State cannot confirm whether the Proposer's standard SLA credits and cure periods would be accepted in place of financial penalties at this time. Any proposed SLA terms or modifications including standard SLA credits and cure periods, may be submitted in accordance with Part 5: Proposed Modifications to the Sample Contract."?
The State and the awarded Contractor(s) will define performance standards and outline penalties/remedies for failures during contract negotiations.

270. **Question:** Can the State clarify whether the proposed 25% reduction for late invoicing applies to SaaS subscription fees or only professional services?

Response: The 25% reduction for late invoicing is applicable to all invoices.

271. **Question:** Will the State allow electronic invoicing and payment processing?

Response: See RFP Document, Attachment E, Sample Contract, Section 5.1 Payment Terms.

272. **Question:** Can the State confirm that, in the event of termination for non-appropriation, payment will be made for services rendered and a pro-rata refund will be issued for prepaid unused subscriptions?

Response: See response to question #271.

273. **Question:** Will the State consider removing or narrowing the right to terminate for convenience?

Response: See response to question #43.

274. **Question:** Can the State confirm that a 30-day cure period will apply to any termination for cause?

Response: See response to question #271.

275. **Question:** Can the State confirm which specific background check requirements apply to vendor personnel?

Response: All background checks listed in the RFP Document apply to all Contractor(s) personnel.

276. **Question:** Will the State accept secure connectivity methods short of full VPN tunneling for multi-tenant SaaS?

Response: OTS will provide all acceptable methods to the Contractor(s).

277. **Question:** Is hosting within U.S. data centers acceptable to meet data residency requirements?

Response: Yes Hosting within U.S. data centers is generally acceptable to meet data residency requirements, subject to final approval by OTS.

278. **Question:** Section III. Scope of Work and Term of Contract - Given the State's intent to establish a long-term system of record for disaster recovery, does the State anticipate re-bidding the contract after the optional 24-month extension, or would the awarded Contractor be expected to continue providing services under an extended agreement or renewal?

Response: Any decisions regarding rebidding or renewal beyond the optional extensions will be made at the State's discretion.

279. **Question:** Section I: Proposed Modifications to the Sample Contract - Would the State be open to reviewing a proposer's Master Services Agreement (MSA) as the governing contract framework, provided that the proposer includes a detailed redline to demonstrate alignment with the State's Sample Contract and identifies any material variances?

Response: See response to question #43.

280. **Question:** Attachment C, Scope of Work – Section I. Overview - Given that LOCD-DR anticipates maintaining some existing software solutions during program transitions, can the State confirm whether the required system integrations will be defined and agreed upon post-award, allowing the selected vendor to scope and price those efforts once technical specifications are available?

Response: For any required systems integration needs, LOCD may issue a time and materials task order based on the required needs.

281. **Question:** Attachment C, Scope of Work – Section I. Overview - To ensure accurate pricing and implementation planning, can the State confirm that integrations and reporting related to existing or future grant data systems will be addressed post-award as separate, defined tasks once system details and data structures are known?

Response: See responses to questions #5 and #6. LOCD may issue a time and materials task order based on the required needs.

282. **Question:** Attachment C, Scope of Work – Section II. Purpose - To ensure accurate pricing and implementation planning, can the State clarify whether the requirement to "integrate data from existing disaster recovery software applications, LaGov, DRGR, and other relevant sources" refers only to data migration and reporting integration for current systems, or if ongoing real-time integrations with these and other systems are expected as part of the base scope?

Response: See responses to questions #5 and #6. LOCD may issue a time and materials task order based on the required needs.

283. **Question:** Section IV. Background #2 in Summary Level Requirements - Can the State clarify whether "integrated financial and reporting support" refers to functionality within the proposed Grants Management System itself (e.g., internal modules that manage financial transactions and reporting), or if external integrations with financial systems such as LaGov or other accounting platforms are expected as part of this scope?

Response: See response to questions #5 and #6. LOCD may issue a time and materials task order based on the required needs.

284. **Question:** Attachment C, Scope of Work – Section B. Technical Requirements (Application Software) - Can the State confirm that "the GMS and application software must be owned by or licensed to LOCD-DR" refers to a right-to-use license under a Software-as-a-Service (SaaS) subscription model, and does not require transfer of ownership, source code, or on-premises deployment?

Response: Any software developed under the Contract is owned perpetually by the State. The State understands that it is responsible for paying the license fees and if it stops paying those fees, it must abide by the terms of the license.

285. **Question:** Attachment C, Scope of Work – Section B. Technical Requirements (Application Software) - Can the State confirm that "available for use free of charge by any LOCD-DR grantee and that grantee's contractors, including all tiers of subcontractors and subgrantees/subrecipients" refers to front-end or portal-level access for data entry and reporting, and does not require administrative or back-office access rights within the GMS?

Response: The State cannot confirm that access is limited to front-end or portal-level use only. There may be circumstances, such as audits or investigations, where administrative or back-office access is required by grantees, subrecipients, or the State.

286. **Question:** Attachment C – Scope of Work - Security Section - Can the State confirm that a FedRAMP-authorized cloud hosting environment meeting or exceeding State OTS security standards is acceptable, and that on-premises hosting within State infrastructure is not required for a SaaS-based solution?

Response: See response to question #57.

287. **Question:** Section VI. Detailed Requirements - C Project Requirements - Project Management - 5. System Migration - Can the State clarify whether the requirement for "data conversion and import of data or files from existing systems" is limited to migration of essential program and applicant data required for continuity, or if full historical data conversion and system-to-system integrations are expected? Additionally, will the State provide an inventory of legacy systems and data volumes during implementation planning to define the level of effort and scope for migration?

Response: The new solutions must be integrated with the legacy systems for reporting purposes. LOCD will provide the awarded Contractor(s) access to the data. Proposers should present their recommended solutions in the appropriate sections of their proposal. The State will evaluate proposals in accordance with RFP Document, Attachment D, RFP Evaluation Plan. LOCD may issue a time and materials task order based on the required needs.

288. **Question:** Section VI. Detailed Requirements – D. Personnel Qualifications – B. Staffing - Can the State clarify whether the requirement that "key personnel must be committed full-time for the duration of the Contract term" applies only during periods of active work or implementation (i.e., may key personnel remain assigned and available to the project without being dedicated full-time when workload does not require continuous effort)?

Response: Key personnel may remain assigned and available to the project without being dedicated full-time when the workload does not require continuous efforts.

289. **Question:** Attachment E, Sample Contract – 3.2 State Furnished Resources - Can the State confirm that the requirement stating "any such software will be hosted by the State" and "licenses shall be transferred to the State upon termination" applies only to third-party software or tools procured specifically for project performance, and not to the vendor's proprietary, SaaS-hosted Grants Management System?

Response: This does not apply to any Contractor's proprietary software or systems developed prior to the Contract.

290. **Question:** Attachment E, Sample Contract – 5.1 Payment Terms - Can the State confirm whether an annual, in-advance subscription billing structure would be acceptable for a licensing model, in lieu of monthly invoicing?

Response: License or subscription fees shall be provided in the Price Schedule Attachment. Payment terms for these costs will be negotiated.

291. **Question:** Attachment E, Sample Contract – 29.0 Ownership of Documents - Can the State confirm that the "Ownership of Documents" clause refers solely to project-related data, records, and materials created or collected under this contract, and does not extend to the Contractor's proprietary software, data model, or database architecture used to deliver the solution? Additionally, can the State confirm that upon termination, data will be returned in a standard export format?

Response: See response to question #249.

292. **Question:** Part 2: Technical Proposal – X states "Describe exactly how the data and software will be transferred beyond the contract agreement" - Please confirm that the intent of this requirement is to ensure the State's continued access to its program data after contract expiration, and not to require transfer of the Contractor's proprietary software, database schema, or hosting environment.

    Response: LOCD intends to ensure continued access to program data and will require transfer of Contractor's proprietary software, database schema, or hosting environment for the period of the license purchased (which could extend beyond the life of the Contract) by the State.

293. **Question:** Task Order Pricing: Pricing Schedule D: Hourly Rate Labor Costs requires the proposer to provide hourly rates for additional services that may be requested through task orders. Please confirm that these tasks orders will be priced using hourly rates and estimated hours but could be invoiced on either a fixed price or hourly basis, depending on the scope of the task order. This would provide price certainty, and guaranteed outcomes, for task orders with clearly defined scope and deliverables.

    Response: Task orders for additional services will be issued on a project-by-project basis and are anticipated to be based on time and materials, but may be negotiated as a fixed price if it's in the best interest of the State.

294. **Question:** The RFP indicates that it is permissible to propose SaaS or commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) software that is customizable to meet the needs and requirements of the RFP. Does the RFP also contemplate the design and implementation of non-SAAS / non-COTS solutions, that meet the RFP requirements and timelines?

    Response: As stated in RFP Document, Attachment C, Scope of Work, Section III, Goals and Objectives, "It is permissible to propose, as part of the solution, a SaaS or Commercial—off-the-shelf (COTS) software that is customizable to meet the needs and requirements of this RFP." As such, LOCD would consider a customized design and implementation of non-SAAS / non-COTS solutions if the Proposer can demonstrate that this is a preferred solution to developing a GMS.

295. **Question:** Attachment C, II. Purpose, paragraph 2: In what format is the current data that needs to be integrated from the existing disaster recovery software applications, LaGov, DRGR, and other sources?

    Response: The current data may be provided in the following formats: SQL database; CSV (Comma-Separated Values).

296. **Question:** Attachment C, II. Purpose, paragraph 2: Do legacy systems allow for API integrations?

    Response: No, legacy systems do not allow for API integrations.

297. **Question:** Attachment C, IV. Background: In what format is the current data on the Metastorm platform?

    Response: The current data on the Metastorm platform is stored in a flat file format, and the State receives it as a CSV file.

298. **Question:** Attachment C, IV. Background, #1 within list of GMS services include: How many current programs (and their program types) does the new GMS need to meet the needs of?

    Response: Please refer to the Action Plans on LOCD's website (https://locddr.la.gov/) for all potential programs that may be included, which encompass homeowner, housing, infrastructure and economic development active programs.

299. **Question:** Attachment C, D. Personnel Qualifications, B. Staffing, a. Key Personnel: As it relates to the Program Specialist role, what hardware issues or hardware replacement does LOCD anticipate potentially occurring as it related to this GMS system?

Response: This information is unknown at this time.