**Q&A #6**

**RFP #583908**

**ERP Advisory Services**

1. Question: Given the current lack of maturity of cloud-based solutions for Student Information Systems, is the UA System willing to entertain other approaches than cloud-based?

Answer: All options will be considered.

1. Question: In addition, for the purposes of defining “cloud-based” for this project, can the UA System please provide their definition of what this means?

Answer: A cloud-based solution would be a product that is hosted, maintained, secured, and upgraded by the software vendor.

1. Question: Who is the executive sponsor(s) of this project? Is it the Vice President for Administration at the UA System?

Answer: Yes; Ann Kemp, Vice President for Administration.

1. Question: Will the UA System be willing to provide advance materials, transmitted securely, to allow the successful consultant to review documentation and make preparations prior to conducting on-site work at the various campuses?

Answer: Yes.

1. Question: Do any of the existing contracts for current administrative systems expire within the next three years? If yes, please specify.

Answer: This information is not available at this time.

1. Question: It is our understanding that we should include the Bid Sheet (page 1 of the RFP) within our proposal document and not as a separate, stand-alone document. Please confirm or clarify.

Answer: The Bid Sheet should remain attached to the entire RFP response, not as a separate sheet.

1. Question: Regarding Section 1.5 of the RFP (page 2): Is this relevant to this RFP? We are planning to include our proposed project timeline in our proposal. Will this be sufficient to address the information requested in Section 1.5?

Answer: The Timetable in Section 1.5 is what the UofA plans to adhere to. Vendor may include their own timetable as part of their RFP response. Please refer to the “Notes” under the Timetable which state that this proposed schedule is tentative.

1. Question: Regarding the “IMPORTAN” note on Page 5 of the RFP: Are we correct in understanding that answers to all question submitted by bidders will be made available on the University’s Hogbid website? If no, may we receive answers to all questions submitted by bidders?

Answer: All questions from prospective bidders will be answered and posted on the Hogbid website as “QA” documents.

1. Question: Regarding the Voluntary Product Accessibility Template (VPAT) information on pages 6 and 7 of the RFP: It is our understanding that VPAT would not be relevant to this solicitation. Please confirm or clarify.

Answer: That is correct.

1. Question: Do we need to complete and return a VPAT form in our proposal response?

Answer: No; the VPAT is not relevant to this RFP.

1. Question: Regarding the Contract and Grant Disclosure and Certification Form found on pages 12 and 13 of the RFP:
	1. If we include a subcontractor(s) in our project team, does the subcontractor need to complete the Contract and Grant Disclosure and Certification Form for inclusion in our proposal?

Answer: Yes.

* 1. Is the statement in Item #3 on page 13 regarding the dollar amount of the subcontract required in our proposal submission? If yes, does the prime contractor or the subcontractor provide this statement?

Answer: No.

1. Question: Assuming the project commences on February 20 as anticipated, does the System have any expectations for the duration of the project? Does it need to be completed by a particular date? Are there any other project milestones that the selected consultant should plan for to meet the System’s needs?

Answer: The University of Arkansas System expects that vendors will provide a timeline in their proposals.

1. Question: It is our understanding, from language in the following sections of the RFP, that we are supposed to return the entire RFP in our proposal response and insert our responses directly into the RFP document. Is that correct? Please confirm or clarify.
	1. Section 1.6.2 (page 19): “Respondents must respond . . . the total bid response.”
	2. Section 4 (page 26): “Proposals submitted . . . the sections below.”

Answer: That is correct.

1. Question: It is our understanding that the Letter of Transmittal (4.1 on page 26) and Executive Summary (4.2 on page 27) are the only sections of our proposal response with page limit restrictions. Please confirm or clarify.

Answer: That is correct.

1. Question: Regarding Section 4.4 of the RFP (page 27): Will the System accept a reference from a higher education institution in Canada?

Answer: Yes.

1. Question: We prefer to ship our proposal (via overnight carrier) two days before the due date to ensure that our proposal arrives before the deadline, in case of any weather delays or other service interruptions. Since the deadline is on a Tuesday and given the Thanksgiving holiday, would the System be willing to extend the deadline to later in the week of November 30?

Answer: The submittal deadline has been extended to December 8, 2015. Please refer to Addendum #2 posted on the Hogbid website.

1. Question: When we ship our proposal, should it be directed to the attention of any specific individual? No name appears in the shipping address on Page 14 of the RFP and we want to double check that this is correct.

Answer: The proposal may be addressed to the attention of Ann Kemp, Vice President for Administration.

1. Question: Does the System have a budget estimate or range for this project that you can share? If yes, please provide detail.

Answer: No.