Department of Human Resources
Office of Technology for Human Services
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)
Automated Fiscal System Modernization Project
SOLICITATION NO.: NOOR7400021
OTHS/OTHS-17-013-S
* * * *
Wednesday, January 11, 2017
10:30 a.m.
* * * * *
Held at:
State of Maryland
Department of Human Resources
Essex, Maryland
* * * * *
COURT REPORTERS, ETCetera, INC.
Maryland Washington
(410) 653-1115 (202) 628-DEPO
"We'll cover your job ANYWHERE in the country!"
1-800-947-DEPO

IN ATTENDANCE

MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES:
RICHARD WRIGHT, Procurement Officer
KENYATTA POWERS, CIO
DONNELL JOSIAH, Project Manager
JIM JONES, Project Management Office
ANTOINETTE CHILLIOUS, ECMS App. Supervisor
LEAH HINSON, Director Budget & Procurement
TANYA WILLIAMS, Deputy CIO
LAUREN GRAZIANO, MBE Director (via phone)
DAPHENY McCRAY, Procurement Officer

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL:

SCOTT MOORE

MICROSOFT:
DAVID WALSH
EVE MACHOL, Dynamics Solutions Specialist
GREG WORKS

DK CONSULTING:

ERIN HAMILTON, Account Support Specialist

CA TECH:
BRYANT HATCHER

ITNOVA:

JAMES BLACK, Project Manager
DWIGHT SCHMIDT, Senior Business Developer

IN ATTENDANCE (cont'd.)

AP VENTURES:
THERESA BOYLE, Officer Manager

DECISIONS ORIENTED:
JENNIFER LUIK, Co-Owner

KBM GROUP:
MARTIN ECKES
KTEBA DUNLAP, Senior Consultant

RAFFA, P.C.:
SETH ZARNY, Partner
JEREMY TARO, Account Executive

C&R BUSINESS SYSTEM ANALYSIS:
CYNTHIA FLOYD

WORKDAY:
STEVE TROST

DOCUMENT MANAGERS:
DARRYL WIGGINS, Principal
JANEL MERRITT, Chief Operating Officer

IN ATTENDANCE (cont'd.)

GROUP Z:
NORA PRESTI, Vice President
PANTELIS (Pete) ZAIRIS, Senior Manager

DMI:
ADAM BASHA, VP Bl Services

ICUBE SYSTEMS, INC.:
NARAYAN ATHREYA, Principal

INFOSYS QUALITY SERVICES:
CHRISTINE WALLACE

MS TECHLOGISTICS:
MAULIK ZALAVADIA

STRATEGIC RESULTS NETWORK:
WILLIAM FLEISHMAN, Principal/Consulting Mgr.

SQN SYSTEMS:
LOUIS BULLOCK, Partner

DMI:
ALEXANDRA BIRRELL, Consultant

IN ATTENDANCE (cont'd.)

COLLABORATIVE SOLUTIONS:
MARY ROSSMEIER, Regional Sales Manager

NAVIGATOR MANAGEMENT PARTNERS:
RICHARD WALEGA, Senior Vice President

KCS, INC.:
PARTHIV ZAVERI, Sr. Manager - Projects

TECHNOGEN, INC.:
RAJAN NATARAJAN, Ph.D., MDA, President

OAKLAND CONSULTING:
RICHARD WHEELER, VP Business Development

CONDUENT:
VALLIMANAIAN THIRUGNANAM
KIM RINGOLD

TCC SOFTWARE SOLUTIONS:
MIKE BOYLE, Director of Business Development

APPLICATIONS ALTERNATIVES:
DAVID KIASI, President

IN ATTENDANCE (cont'd.)

OMNI TECHNOLOGY:
GERALD WILLIAMS (via phone)

MOMENTUM, INC.:
SHANNON BRADLEY (via phone)

PHOENIX BUSINESS CONSULTING:
JOHN EAGLES (via phone)
JAMES WINCHESTER (via phone)

SAMRIO (phonetic) TECHNOLOGY:
SRANA SAMBANGI (via phone)

-oOo-

A-G-E-N-G-A

ITEM:		PAGE:
I.	Welcome and Introductions Richard Wright	9
II.	Opening Remarks Kenyatta Powers	17
III.	Key Information	
	A. MBE Goal - Lauren Graziano	20
	B. VSBE Goals - Daphney McCray	24
	C. DHR Living Wage - Richard Wright	26
IV.	Required Submissions (addition to TP) Richard Wright	27
V.	Required Submissions (addition to FP) Richard Wright	29
VI.	Discussion of Section 1 Richard Wright	29
VII.	Discussion of Section 2 Richard Wright	36
VIII.	Discussion of Section 4 Richard Wright	37

A-G-E-N-D-A (cont'd.)

		PAGE:
IX.	Discussion of Section 5 Richard Wright	37
X.	General Comments - Section 3 Donnell Josiah	39
XI.	Discussion of Section 3 Donnell Josiah	39
XII.	Call for Questions & Reminders Richard Wright	73
XIII.	Closing Remarks Kenyatta Powers	74

-oOo-

PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE

(10:40 a.m.)

Welcome and Introductions

RICHARD WRIGHT: Welcome to the Pre-Proposal Conference. My name is Richard Wright, a Procurement Specialist with DHR's Office of Technology for Human Services (OTHS).

Before we begin, just a few housekeeping notes: Restrooms are located along the main hallway near the entrance. Water fountains can also be found near the restrooms and there's also restrooms and water fountains near the rear exit.

All visitors should have signed in with the security guard upon entering the building and received a visitor's sticker. Please note visitors are not permitted throughout the building without an escort. I guess he wasn't really giving out the stickers. That's all right.

In the event of emergency, please

proceed to the nearest exit. Exits are located in the front of the building this way and then the rear.

Today we'll be sharing information regarding the RFP for the Automated Fiscal System Modernization Project, Agency Control Number OTHS/OTHS-17-013-S.

If you haven't done so already, please make sure you sign the sign-in sheet, leave your business card and identify yourself as either a Minority Business Enterprise, or Veteran Business Enterprise, or Small Business Reserve Vendor, if applicable.

As we move through each section of the Agenda, please hold your questions until we reach the end of each section.

Also, for the purposes of the transcription, please remember to state your name and identify your firm or corporation prior to asking your question. Court Reporters, ETCetera, Inc. is recording today's proceedings.

We'll proceed now with introductions. First we'll go around the room and have State personnel introduce themselves.

KENYATTA POWERS: Kenyatta Powers, Chief Information Officer for DHR.

JIM JONES: Jim Jones, Project Management Office.

ANTOINETTE CHILLIOUS: Antoinette Chillious, ECMS Application Supervisor at DHR.

LEAH HINSON: Leah Hinson, Director of Budget and Procurement for DHR-OTHS.

TANYA WILLIAMS: Tanya Williams, Deputy Chief Information Officer for OTHS.

SCOTT MOORE: Scott Moore with the Attorney General's Office.

DAPHENY McCRAY: Dapheny McCray, Procurement Officer.

DONNELL JOSIAH: Donnell Josiah, Project Manager.

RICHARD WRIGHT: Now I would ask that the representatives from our vendors in

attendance introduce themselves going around the room clockwise, I believe. And please speak up.

ERIN HAMILTON: My name is Erin Hamilton, I'm with DK Consulting, a woman-owned MBE.

DAVID WALSH: David Walsh with Microsoft, in our public sector practice.

BRYANT HATCHER: Bryant Hatcher with CA Tech.

JIM BLACK: Jim Black, ITNOVA, MBE.

DWIGHT SCHMIDT: Dwight Schmidt, also ITNOVA, EDWOSB, MBE.

THERESA BOYLE: Theresa Boyle, AP Ventures, a woman-owned MBE and FCR.

JENNIFER LUIK: Jen Luik, Decisions Oriented, Inc. We are Veteran-owned and will soon be MBE.

MARTIN ECKES: Marty Eckes, KBM Group, minority and woman-owned.

PARTHIV ZAVERI: Parthiv Zaveri, KCS, Inc.

JEREMY TARO: Jeremy Taro, Raffa PC.
SETH ZARNY: Seth Zarny, Raffa PC.
CYNTHIA FLOYD: My name is Cynthia Floyd, I'm C&R Business System Analysis, and we're from New Jersey.
STEVE TROST: Steve Trost from Workday.
JANEL MERRITT: Janel Merritt, Document Managers, MBE.
DARRYL WIGGINS: Darryl Wiggins, Document Managers, MBE.
GREG WORKS: Greg Works, Microsoft.
EVE MACHOL: Eve Machol, Microsoft.
NORA PRESTI: Nora Presti, Presti, woman-owned MBE, Group Z.
PANTELIS (PETE) ZAIRIS: Pete Zairis, Group Z.
ADAM BASHA: I'm from DMI, my name is Adam.
THE REPORTER: Last name?
ADAM BASHA: Basha.

THE REPORTER: Thank you.
NARAYAN ATHREYA: Narayan Athreya from ICUBE Systems, MBE and SBR.
CHRISTINE WALLACE: Christine Wallace, Infosys Quality Services, and it's a subsidiary of Infosys.
MAULIK ZALAVADIA: Maulik Zalavadia, I'm from MS Techlogistics. We're a woman-owned minority business and SBR.
WILLIAM FLEISHMAN: Bill Fleishman, I'm with Strategic Results Network.
LOUIS BULLOCK: Louis Bullock, SQN Systems, we're an MBE and also Veteran-owned.
ALEX BIRRELL: Alex Birrell from DMI.
MARY ROSSMEIER: Mary Rossmeier, I'm with Collaborative Solutions.
RICHARD WALEGA: I'm Rich Walega with Navigator Management Partners.
RAJAN NATARAJAN: Rajan Natarajan, TechnoGen.
RICHARD WHEELER: Rick Wheeler,

Oakland Consulting, Veteran-owned, minority-owned and SBR.

VALLIMANALAN THIRUGNANAM: Vallimanalan Thirugnanam, Conduent.

MIKE BOYLE: Mike Boyle, TCC Software Solutions, MBE.

KIM RINGOLD: Kim Ringold, Conduent.

RICHARD WRIGHT: Okay. And is that everyone?

KTEBA DUNLAP: Kteba Dunlap, KBM Group, woman-owned minority.

RICHARD WRIGHT: Okay. And I'd like to try to get anyone who is on the telephone bridge to report in, give us your name and firm, the name of your firm.

GERALD WILLIAMS: This is Gerald Williams, Omni Technology, service disabled and Veteran-owned, minority-owned small business.

RICHARD WRIGHT: Thank you.

Anyone one else?

(Multiple Speakers.)

RICHARD WRIGHT: One at a time, please. Shannon, go ahead.

SHANNON BRADLEY: This is Shannon Bradley (phonetic) with Momemtum, Inc., and we are a WBE.

RICHARD WRIGHT: Thank you.

And the gentleman who was speaking?

JOHN EAGLES: This is John Eagles (phonetic) with Phoenix (phonetic) Business Consulting.

RICHARD WRIGHT: Okay. Anyone else on the telephone bridge?

(Multiple Speakers.)

RICHARD WRIGHT: One at a time, please.

JAMES WINCHESTER: This is James Winchester (phonetic) also with Phoenix (phonetic) Business Consulting.

RICHARD WRIGHT: Anyone else?

MR. SAMBANGI: This is Srana (phonetic) Sambangi with Sambrio (phonetic)

Technology. We are a MBE in Maryland.

RICHARD WRIGHT: Could you repeat your name, please?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: S-R-A-N-A, and I didn't get his last name.

RICHARD WRIGHT: What was your last name, sir?

MR. SAMBANGI: Sambangi. It's spelled S-A-M-B-A-N-G-I.

RICHARD WRIGHT: Okay. Anyone else on the telephone bridge?

(No Response.)

RICHARD WRIGHT: All right. Thank you.

We'll proceed now with opening remarks from Kenyatta Powers, the Chief Information Officer for DHR.

Opening Remarks

KENYATTA POWERS: Good morning everyone. First, I welcome you all to the AFS, the Automated Fiscal System's Pre-Bid Proposal

meeting. I do apologize there's a little tight quarters. We didn't anticipate so many, but we do thank each and every one of you for actually being here.

The Department of Human Resource is issuing this Request for Proposal to procure a financial management solution to replace the current legacy Automated Fiscal System otherwise known as AFS.

So AFS is a computerized tracking system that provides DHR statewide fiscal users with a number of financial tracking and disbursement capabilities, including the ability to process payments for child care and foster care providers. The current AFS is written in an antiquated and unsupported Delphi technology. It's at the end of life and requires a complete application refresh.

AFS modernization project, through this RFP, will replace the current legacy AFS application, allowing DHR to take advantage of

newer technologies and provide a scalable solution aimed at improving DHR business operations by eliminating those inefficient business processes and workarounds that are currently being used today.

This Request for Proposal will enable DHR to procure a robust financial management solution that delivers all of the functional capabilities of the legacy AFS, provide additional security, performance enhancements, and better user experience in accordance with State requirements.

We are delighted to have released the AFS-RFP and look forward to working with an experienced business partner that will provide a solution that shall meet all of the business and technical requirements.

Again, we welcome you to the Pre-Bid Proposal.

RICHARD WRIGHT: Okay. Thank you, Kenyatta.

We were going to proceed next with remarks from Lauren Graziano, who is --

LAUREN GRAZIANO: Rick, can you hear me? I am on the phone. I didn't want to interrupt earlier and I'm having some trouble phoning in.

RICHARD WRIGHT: Oh, okay. Great. Glad you're with use.

LAUREN GRAZIANO: My apology.

RICHARD WRIGHT: Not a problem.

We'll proceed now with remarks from Ms. Lauren Graziano, DHR's Director of Minority Business Enterprise, who will discuss the MBE requirements of the RFP. Lauren.

MBE Goal:

LAUREN GRAZIANO: Hi, everyone. Good morning. Like Rick said, I'm Lauren Graziano. I'm DHR's Director of Minority Business Enterprise.

I'm sure a lot of you know this sort of by way of introduction: The MBE program is to

ensure that disadvantaged businesses are included in these procurement and contracting opportunities. And, so, in order to do that, we examine our procurements and set specific minority participation goals on a contract-by-contract basis. And, so, you've probably already noted, but for this solicitation we set any overall MBE Goal of 35%, and we have Subgoals at 7 and 8% for African American firms, for women-owned firms respectively. And, so, as the prime contractor, you'll be required to certify that you're willing to make a good faith effort in order to meet those goals.

I just want to say a quick word about the MBE forms: The most important one at this stage is the D-1A. The D-1A is the MBE Utilization and Fair Solicitation Affidavit, as well as the MBE Participation Schedule. That's where you certify that you intend to meet the MBE goal. And I say that one's the most important at this stage because that's the only one that's

required to be submitted with your bid. In fact, if you don't, your bid is considered unresponsive, so that one's important.

The other one I wanted to make note of is Waiver. If after taking all the necessary steps to secure an MBE subcontractor you're still unable to do so, you can request a Waiver. That one, along with a couple of the other MBE forms that were provided in your attachments, those are not required until ten (10) business days of being notified of award. That, if you need it, is explained in further detail on Page 28 of your solicitation because I know, if you're not an auditory learner like me, that might have gone over your head.

The other thing I wanted to note are payment reports. That's part of the compliance monitoring piece of the program. Every month prime contractors and MBE subs are required to submit invoice reports through the administration. Should you be the contract

awardee, we'll have more in-depth conversations about that at the kickoff meeting in terms of who to send them to, where to send them to, et cetera. But for now, you should just be aware there are those requirements.

The last thing I just wanted to cover is amendments to the MBE Participation Schedule: One, the contracts been awarded and your MBE agreements are solidified, if you wanted to change the MBE sub, you need express approval of the administration, and that is only granted for good cause. And when we look for good cause, we look for things like ineligibility or failure to perform or unavailability. But you cannot terminate an MBE just out of convenience.

So those were my big ticket items. Again, some of those are things we have more in-depth discussion at the kickoff meeting.

Again, I'm Lauren Graziano and if you have any questions about anything I covered today, please feel free to contact me. I'm sure

someone in there can pass along my contact information. And that's all I got.

RICHARD WRIGHT: Okay. Thank you, Lauren.

LAUREN GRAZIANO: Yep.

RICHARD WRIGHT: If there aren't any questions regarding MBE, we'll proceed now with remarks from Dapheny McCray, Procurement Officer from DHR Central Procurement, who will discuss the Veteran-Owned Small Business Enterprise Goal of 1%. Dapheny.

VSBE Goals:

DAPHENY McCRAY: I'm going to cover some areas from the RFP which is going to be primarily Section 1.42.1. I'm just going to highlight some of the very important areas we'd like for you to really pay attention to.

Questions or concerns regarding the Veteran-Owned Small Business Enterprise subcontractor participation goal of this solicitation must be raised before the due date

for submission of the Proposals.

A VSBE subcontract participation goal of 1% of the total contract dollar amount has been established for this procurement.

An Offeror must include with its Proposal a completed Veteran-Owned Small Business Enterprise Utilization Affidavit and Subcontractor Participation Schedule, which is Attachment N as in Nancy 1.

The Offeror must acknowledge that it either: a) intends to meet the VSBE participation goal; or b) request a full or partial waiver of the VSBE participation goal.

The Offeror shall specifically specify the percentage of the contract value associated with each VSBE prime subcontractor identified in the VSBE Participation Schedule.

This area I'm going to really stress that is very important regarding this RFP: If the apparent awardee fails to return each completed document within the required time, the

Procurement Officer may determine that the apparent awardee is not responsible and therefore not eligible for contract award. So that area I just really wanted to re-emphasize. That is coming from 1.42.4.

Thank you. That's all I have.

RICHARD WRIGHT: Okay. Thank you, Dapheny.

Living Wage

RICHARD WRIGHT: We'd also like to draw your attention to the Living Wage Requirements of this RFP as found in Section 1.34. Please note that the current Living Wage Requirements are $13.63 per hour in Tier 11 Areas, and $10.24 in Tier 2 areas. This contract will occur in Tier 1, Baltimore County. We'll proceed with an overview of Section 1 shortly.

But first a reminder that the following documents shall be completed, signed and included in the Technical Proposal under Tab O that follows the material submitted in

response to Section 4.2:

Required Submission to the Technical Proposal

1. Completed Bid Proposal Affidavit (Attachment B).

2. Completed MDOT Certified MBE Utilization and Fair Solicitation Affidavit (Attachment D-1A) as Lauren mentioned.

3. Completed Living Wage Requirements Affidavit of Agreement (Attachment G-1).

4. Completed Federal Funds Attachment (Attachment H).

5. Completed Conflict of Interest Affidavit and Disclosure (Attachment I).

6. Completed Veteran-Owned Small Business Enterprise (VSBE) Utilization Affidavit as Dapheny mentioned, and Subcontractor Participation Schedule which is (Attachment N-1).

7. Completed Location of the Performance of Services Disclosure (Attachment O).

8. Labor Classification Personnel

Resume Summary (Attachment Q).

9. Functional, Technical, Reporting and Form Requirements (Attachment V).

Additionally, the following are required to be submitted under Tab P:

1. Proposed Data Security Plan that describes the Offeror's information security processes for ensuring the security of DHR's data. The plan shall also describe DR processes.

2. The Offeror here shall detail if the proposed system was developed using workers outside the United States, or future plans to use workers outside of the United States for development or support.

3. Copy of any software licensing agreement for any software proposed to be licensed to the State under this Contract (e.g., EULA, Enterprise License Agreements, Professional Service Agreements, Master Agreements).

4. Copies of the Acceptable User Policy for each organization, including

subcontractors proposed to perform services under this Contract.

Required Submission to the Financial Proposal

RICHARD WRIGHT: The following attachments shall be included with the Financial Proposal: Attachment F, the Price Proposal.

Section 1: General Information

RICHARD WRIGHT: The Department of Human Resources (DHR) is issuing this Request for Proposals to procure a financial management solution to replace the current legacy Automated Fiscal System (AFS) application. The modernization project will replace the current legacy application with a scalable solution aimed at improving DHR business operations by eliminating inefficient business processes and workarounds that are currently being used statewide. This solicitation will enable the DHR to procure a robust financial management solution that provides advanced security, performance, and user experience in accordance with the State's

business needs and requirements. The Department is seeking the recommendation of prospective bidders for the most optimal solution that can take the form of either a vendor-hosted Software-As-A-Service (SaaS) solution or a Commercially available Off-The-Shelf (COTS) solution as described in Section 3 of the solicitation.

It is the State's intention to obtain products and services, as specified in this RFP, through a Contract between the successful Offeror and the State.

DHR intends to make a single award as a result of this RFP.

Offerors, either directly or through their subcontractor(s), must be able to deliver all products/services and meet all of the requirements requested in this solicitation. The successful Offeror (the Contractor) shall remain responsible for Contract performance regardless of Subcontractor participation in the work.

As you're no doubt aware, if you're doing business with the State of Maryland, you're required to register with the Maryland Department of Assessments and Taxation, as well as with the Department of Labor and Licensing. Failure to complete registration with the Department of Assessments and Taxation may disqualify an otherwise successful contractor from final consideration and recommendation for contract award.

Also, please remember that Dapheny McCray, the Procurement Officer for DHR Central Procurement, is the sole point of contact for any questions you may have during the procurement process both before and after the closing date.

If you have any questions or if you are sending in any documentation, you need to send them to her attention. The deadline for submitting questions prior to the closing date is 2:30 p.m. March 22, 2017, and this deadline will be strictly enforced.

Proposals must be received no later than 2:30 p.m. local time on March 29, 2017. This deadline will also be strictly enforced.

Additionally, we ask that for any questions that you present at today's meeting, that you follow up by e-mailing the questions as soon as possible to Dapheny. Her e-mail address is dapheny.mccray@maryland.gov.

The Subsections of Section 1 are primarily standard RFP boilerplate developed by the State of Maryland Department of Information Technology. I'm confident everyone has had a chance to review these Subsections.

At this time, I'll open the floor to anyone who has any questions pertaining to Section 1. Please remember to state your name and identify your firm or corporation prior to asking your questions.

Does anyone have any questions on Section 1?

LOUIS BULLOCK: Louis Bullock, SQN

Systems. My question is: If a company is duly certified as an MBE and a VSBE, can they fulfill both requirements on this RFP?

RICHARD WRIGHT: I'm going to go ahead and take that under advisement.

LAUREN GRAZIANO: I'm sorry, can you repeat that question? I didn't quite catch the end of it.

LOUIS BULLOCK: Yes. I was saying if a company is duly certified as an MBE and VSBE, can they fulfill both requirements on this RFP?

LAUREN GRAZIANO: So as far as from the MBE standpoint, I know if the prime is a certified MBE, they can allocate their MBE participation percentage to fulfill up to half of the overall MBE goals. I'm not sure if maybe Dapheny can address the Veteran-own business piece.

DAPHENY McCRAY: If you just send that to me, I'll provide a response and post it on e-marylandmarketplace.

RICHARD WRIGHT: Okay. Thank you, Lauren. Thank you, Dapheny.

I'm going to take the second half of that question regarding VSBE under advisement. And if you could e-mail us the question, we'll give you a definitive answer as soon as possible.

Any other questions on Section 1?

VALLIMANALAN THIRUGNANAM: I have a question. Vallimanalan Thirugnanam, Conduent.

So this is related to the Oral Presentation section on Page 18. I have a question regarding Bullet F under 1.16.2. It says that if we are going to do the demonstration of the software, it also says the product must be in production and used by at least three customers. Is that a requirement?

RICHARD WRIGHT: Yes, it is.

VALLIMANALAN THIRUGNANAM: So additional question on that: Under the Minimum Qualification, we did not see any requirement related to that.

RICHARD WRIGHT: Okay. Donnell, do you want to address that?

DONNELL JOSIAH: Yes. The minimum requirements for the company have been removed from this RFP. You may be aware that the previous RFP there were some pretty strict company minimum requirements. We have relaxed those requirements so that we can widely pull up potential vendors.

VALLIMANALAN THIRUGNANAM: But you still have the requirement applying to the product?

DONNELL JOSIAH: To the product because we want to make sure the product is a mature product.

VALLIMANALAN THIRUGNANAM: Okay. Thank you.

RICHARD WRIGHT: Thank you, Donnell. Thank you, sir.

RICHARD WRIGHT: Are there any other questions on Section 1?

(No Response.)

Section 2: Minimum Qualifications

RICHARD WRIGHT: We'll move on to Section 2, which details Personnel Minimum Qualifications. I'll now open the floor to any questions pertaining to Section 2. Please remember to state your name and identify your firm or corporation prior to asking your questions.

(No Response.)

RICHARD WRIGHT: Well, we'll move on now to Section 4, which details the manner in which --

SETH ZARNY: Did you say Section 3?

RICHARD WRIGHT: No, Section 2. We're doing them out of order.

SETH ZARNY: Okay.

RICHARD WRIGHT: We'll do 1, 2, 4 and 3.

SETH ZARNY: Sorry.

RICHARD WRIGHT: We do 3 last.

SETH ZARNY: Of course.

Section 4: Proposal Format

RICHARD WRIGHT: In the meantime, we'll move on to Section 4, which details the manner in which technical and financial proposals are to be submitted. Please remember that e-mail submissions are not acceptable for this RFP and must be delivered to the address listed in the Key Information Sheet in the form of hard copies and electronic media exactly as specified in Sections 4.1 through 4.5.

I'll now open the floor to any questions pertaining to Section 4. Please remember to state your name and identify your firm or corporation prior to asking your questions.

(No Response.)

RICHARD WRIGHT: Okay. Thank you.

Section 5: Evaluation Criteria and Procedure

RICHARD WRIGHT: We'll now move to Section 5, which describes the procedures that

will be used for Evaluation and Award.

I trust that everyone has had a chance to read Section 5. Please remember that prior to Price Proposals being opened, the Technical Proposals will be evaluated and ranked. The Technical Proposals carry more weight in terms of evaluation.

At this time, I'll open up the floor to anyone who has any questions pertaining to Section 5. Please remember to state your name and identify your firm or corporation prior to asking your question.

SCOTT MOORE: I just want to clarify one thing. Scott Moore with the State of Maryland.

You mentioned the technical factors receive more weight than financial?

RICHARD WRIGHT: Correct.

SCOTT MOORE: Okay. If that's true, we need to just revise the RFP. It currently states it will receive equal weight.

RICHARD WRIGHT: Okay. Thank you. We'll have to do an amendment on that. Thank you for pointing that out, Scott.

Okay. Before we go into Section 3, the Scope of Objectives, which is really the heart of the matter, I'd like to introduce Donnell Josiah, the AFS Project Manager, who will provide general comments regarding this section. Donnell.

Section 3: Scope Objectives

DONNELL JOSIAH: First of all, thank you for your interest in this project. We are very optimistic that we will be receiving qualified bids for this project.

Most of you are at least aware of the RFP that we released in August. And while we had to revisit many aspects of that RFP, we want to point out the three core areas of the document that was changed. First one was the Minimum Requirements that I alluded to earlier in response to the gentleman's question in the room.

We noted that there were some pretty high bars, if you will, in terms of looking for innovative solutions. But at the same time, in meeting the standards for innovative solutions, we had to also -- made it very difficult for companies to respond. So we removed those Minimum Requirements that required a company to provide, you know, a lot of past performance information and other onerous standards. So that should be to your relief. So hopefully the products that you have we will be able to actually see them when we get to the evaluation phase.

The other thing that we did: We widened the deployment modalities. So instead of simply being a SaaS solution, which is a Software as a Service solution, we also expanded that so that we could also look at COTS solution as well. So that's one of the important changes from the previous iteration of the RFP. We also think that that would also provide -- not only generate more interest on potential solutions, but I think

it will actually make the deployment much more scalable as well.

The third change that we made to the RFP, and this is really important: We included or we are allowing the past performance of subcontractors to count towards the actual Evaluation Criteria.

In the previous iteration of the project, in the RFP, what it was is that the prime contractors' past performance only counted towards the Evaluation.

In this version of the RFP, we're allowing prime and subs, especially for small subs who would like to team with a larger company and have the experience of the larger company, their experience count towards the Evaluation Criteria.

Those are the three core areas of the RFP that would change from the initial version that was released back in August.

I'm going to pause to see if you have

any questions on those three things because that's really why we're here. That's where the main change is from the first iteration of the RFP.

Are there any questions?

DAVID WALSH: David Walsh with Microsoft.

When you reference the differences between the SaaS offering and just COTS, you can have a common off-the-shelf VRP platform that's going to address your functional requirements.

DONNELL JOSIAH: That is correct.

DAVID WALSH: That can be deployed either for Infrastructure as a Service or Software as a Service. So it's the same platform; it's just how you decide to deploy.

DONNELL JOSIAH: That is correct. And we're open to both of those as --

DAVID WALSH: Okay. So Infrastructure as a Service or Software as a Service?

DONNELL JOSIAH: Yes. But I would

hasten to your question in the RFP: We underscored and bolded our preferred method being SaaS.

DAVID WALSH: Okay.

DONNELL JOSIAH: But if you do have a solution, we'll be entertaining those discussions as well.

DAVID WALSH: Okay. That would be deployed within the State data center or an agency data center?

DONNELL JOSIAH: The State.

DAVID WALSH: The State. Okay. Thank you.

DARRYL WIGGINS: Darryl Wiggins, Document Managers.

When you decide to look at on-prem, are we responsible for the computing environment? Who's going to own that environment?

DONNELL JOSIAH: The State will provide the infrastructure on which the software will be deployed, and that environment will be

determined at a time after contract award.

We do have two options that are available to us, but we'll make the best decision in terms of what's most important for deployment strategy.

Good questions. Keep them coming.

(Multiple Speakers.)

DONNELL JOSIAH: Ladies first.

EVE MACHOL: Eve Machol, Microsoft.

This is kind of a tangential question: Is it preferred that there be a SaaS -- if all things ever equal and you could deploy the same solution in your on-premises state data center or in an otherwise-hosted SaaS offering, is the SaaS offering preferred?

DONNELL JOSIAH: It is.

EVE MACHOL: Okay.

DONNELL JOSIAH: It is.

Question, sir?

DWIGHT SCHMIDT: Dwight Schmidt, ITNOVA.

So you guys are going to provide the computers. Is work going to be done on your location or at the contractor's location?

DONNELL JOSIAH: I believe your question -- on our computers, I believe your question: It will be done on premises.

DWIGHT SCHMIDT: On what?

DONNELL JOSIAH: On premises.

DWIGHT SCHMIDT: On premises. Okay.

DONNELL JOSIAH: Now, I will also amend that question in the event that you do have remote teams, we'll have to provide you access to those systems.

Other questions?

DARRYL WIGGINS: Darryl Wiggins.

So if it's a COTS solution and it's a lot of customization, configuration and so forth associated with that COTS solution, are you going to allow our resources to VPN in? Let's say we have remote resources. Or do you want them on site to be able to do their modernization piece?

Because that really impacts what our cost looks like in terms of being able to configure that COTS solution?

DONNELL JOSIAH: There are three resources that we do require. Project manager, the architect, and business analyst. If there are additional support resources that would be configuring the applications, they can be VPN into the environment. We'll have to work out the logistics in terms of what that looks like and we can facilitate that, especially depending on those services that we will be getting.

GREG WORKS: Greg Works, Microsoft.

Is there any integration with the AFS between the AFS and FMIS?

DONNELL JOSIAH: No direct integration, meaning that there is no physical data come between those two applications.

There is currently a manual batch transfer that allows data to be exported from AFS. But there will be no direct integration

with the FMIS.

Good question. Additional questions?

SETH ZARNY: This is Seth Zarny with Raffa.

So in the RFP, you don't spend a lot of time talking about system functions and reportings and integrations. As we put together a solution, it would be good for you to maybe spend a few minutes talking what -- you know, you talk about a COTS off-the-shelf system. You can talk about general ledger. You can talk about accounts payable. You can talk about vendor management. You can talk about vendor reports. You can talk about --

RICHARD WRIGHT: Sir, we need you to speak up.

SETH ZARNY: So as you talk about a financial system and particularly a COTS off-the-shelf package when you talk about financial systems, you're generally talking about an ERP of some sort. You could be talking about

a general ledger. You could be talking about an accounts payable system, which you are talking about briefly. There could be integrations that are required. We don't know how many from this RFP.

You don't talk about standard financial reports that could be output from the system off a standard off-the-shelf package. So getting a sense of the real requirements to replace your Delphi system, which is what I think someone referenced here, needs to meet the requirements of your AFS system now, there's no statement in here that really talks about the detail of that.

DONNELL JOSIAH: I believe in Section 3.15 of the RFP, we discuss the requirements traceability matrix. I was hesitant to talk about that right now because it's a pretty voluminous document. It was included with the RFP as Attach V as in Victor. That document goes into pretty substantive detail in terms of the

requirements that we're looking for. It covers not only the functional requirements; it covers the nonfunctional, technical and the reporting requirements, as well, in various subsections as relates to those requirements. So that may be one area that may address the concerns you may have had in terms of specificity, but those requirements are detailed in Attachment V.

We're not going to go through in detail Attachment V, because what I want you to understand is: In as much as these are the requirements for the existing platform, we're looking for a solution that can build upon the requirements and make improvements where necessary. So the requirements are the requirements. This is what the existing system is doing today.

SETH ZARNY: Right.

DONNELL JOSIAH: But if you have a solution that can provide additional capabilities above and beyond what we currently do today, we

want to hear about it.

But Attachment V provides and addresses the questions you asked.

SETH ZARNY: Seth Zarny.

Attachment V in the document that I downloaded here, unless it's a separate document --

DONNELL JOSIAH: It's a separate document.

SETH ZARNY: Thank you.

DONNELL JOSIAH: Good question.

And since we are on Attachment V, are there any specific questions relating to attachment V that we can address before we go on? Your silence tells me that you're totally ready.

(Laughter.)

DONNELL JOSIAH: No other requirements. That's good.

DAVID WALSH: David Walsh with Microsoft. Just as a follow-up, because some of those are isolated functional requirements, but

when you look at a business process and continuity, then that changes it. And, so, maybe I could use that as a lead-in.

You developed -- my understanding is you developed these requirements in-house and there weren't any changes from the first release to this.

DONNELL JOSIAH: Basically.

DAVID WALSH: So have you had any other prior interactions with vendors to help you define the functional requirements, or presentations, or discovery sessions, or any interaction over the --

DONNELL JOSIAH: We have not.

DAVID WALSH: Okay.

DONNELL JOSIAH: But I will tell you: Prior to releasing the RFP, we did conduct a market research for systems that may meet the high-level requirements that we are interested in meeting. But we have not had any discussions, particularly after our first releasing the RFP,

to expand upon the requirements --
DAVID WALSH: So just looking at different platforms or approaches at a high level but not --
DONNELL JOSIAH: Correct.
DAVID WALSH: At the requirements level?
DONNELL JOSIAH: At the requirements level, that is correct.
DAVID WALSH: Okay.
DONNELL JOSIAH: Additional questions?
(No Response.)
RICHARD WRIGHT: Okay. My intention, after Donnell's comments, were to move into Section 3, but I think we kind of already did that.
DONNELL JOSIAH: Are those all the questions for Section 3?
DAVID WALSH: We're going to have follow-up that we'll submit in writing for clarification on functional.

DONNELL JOSIAH: All right. Very well.

I do want to state, since I have the floor, is that Business Process Analysis -- I see most of you are shaking your head -- we are approaching this as an organizational change effort, as part of a wider modernization effort. We would like to partner with a vendor that has a depth of understanding of OCM, meaning that we want someone who has the capacity to assist the State in Business Process Review and Business Process Re-Engineering. Not only mapping out the 2-B processes -- which that will be your expertise -- but also partner with us to look at the existing limitations of our business processes, the workaround that we currently have in the system, and define more formal system processes that will allow us to be more efficient in our roll-out.

We're also looking for a solution that is scalable both vertically and horizontally, so

we're looking for a system that can grow with us over time.

Any questions?

DARRYL WIGGINS: Darryl Wiggins, Document Managers.

So in reviewing this, I looked at the traceability matrix; I looked at the requirements that you have for your key folks. But I didn't see any discussion about the vendor being responsible for establishing or setting up a PMO to manage the project. Does the State have a PMO already set up that we'll interface with? Or do we have the responsibility of having a PMO set up?

DONNELL JOSIAH: The State will provide the program oversight and will also provide the PMO leadership as well. There is a project team, but there's also a larger PMO group that this project reports in to.

The vendor will not be required to provide a PMO. They will be required to provide

a project manager that would be our primary point of contact in engagement with the vendor. They will work with me closely to make sure that the system is deployed as we're expecting it to be deployed. But they will not be required to set up their own PMO. Because when that comes, the process then is a number of different things, especially in reporting in management. We'll be doing that.

DARRYL WIGGINS: Okay.

DONNELL JOSIAH: Good question. What's your question, sir?

WILLIAM FLEISHMAN: Bill Fleishman, Strategic Results Network.

You had just mentioned that you're looking for a vendor that would provide business process analysis and organizational change management. What do you see as the timing of that engagement as it relates to this project?

I mean, I would think that it would be ideal that it would precede the work of this, you

know, the vendor we're talking about for the AFS system, to position them -- to help them with that discovery process. Do you see that one being input into the other?

DONNELL JOSIAH: Yes, yes. There is a matter of precedence in terms of what occurs first. We're not going to stand up a solution without having done the Business Process Analysis. So once the vendor has been selected, the very next stage would be for them to begin working with us to begin that discovery process, so they can be involved in not only the collection of our existing requirements for business processes, but also mapping what the new processes would look like in their system.

One of the reasons why we have waited to do the BPR work is because processes change over a period of time. And if we had conducted the in-depth business process gathering exercise, chances are there are some components that would have changed that would have required us to

engage back in that process again. We wanted to do the Business Process Analysis, but also to wait until the application's going to be stood up.

We think that there's going to be a 12- to a 16-month time frame where this entire process would be rolled out from vendor award, Business Process Analysis, configuration and migration, standard OCM training, and then deployment of --

THE REPORTER: I can't hear you.

WILLIAM FLEISHMAN: So the vendors --

KENYATTA POWERS: She can't hear you. If you can stand up, she can't hear you.

WILLIAM FLEISHMAN: The vendors bidding on this project then would not be -- I guess my question is: Would the vendors bidding on this project also be taking on the requirements to do the business process mapping and the organizational change management and they need to include that in their bid? Or is that

something you see as a separate engagement that will be a separate RFP?

DONNELL JOSIAH: No, it will not be a separate engagement, nor will it be a separate RFP.

WILLIAM FLEISHMAN: So they should include --

DONNELL JOSIAH: They should include -- just as they would include at the RFP, as I pointed out, that they should include efforts for their conversion migration as well. So there's some general, high-level skillsets and systems and services that should be included in standing up their system: Configuration of the application. Migration of the data that we currently have in our system, how the business processes, the re-engineering processes, as well, that should be included in the --

WILLIAM FLEISHMAN: Because that's a significant cost --

DONNELL JOSIAH: It potentially could

be.

WILLIAM FLEISHMAN: -- in terms of manpower, and the time from that would take --

DONNELL JOSIAH: Yes. But, again, not to be in rebuttal to you: The State owns the work of doing a lot of the business process work, but we are doing this in partnership with a vendor.

WILLIAM FLEISHMAN: Okay. I gotcha.

DONNELL JOSIAH: We wanted to be at the table and not come in and inherit a document that says, "This is what our business processes are." We want them to guide us throughout the Business Process Analysis stage, especially if they have proven methods and techniques that allow us to utilize their platform.

WILLIAM FLEISHMAN: So it's integrated and it's somewhat in parallel?

DONNELL JOSIAH: That is correct. The assumption that the State has -- and, again, I have to emphasize this: The assumption that we

are making is that you know your systems best. You know how your systems work.

So, for example, if we're doing bank reconciliation, which is one of the requirements in the RTM, and you already have prior methods interfaced with existing banks, we need to know how that works in your system, and then help us map how we're doing it today in your system, which is why we're trying to make this a process that is closely aligned for what we're doing now, but what it will eventually look like in your system.

Does that make sense?

DARRYL WIGGINS: Yeah.

WILLIAM FLEISHMAN: Yes.

DARRYL WIGGINS: Darryl Wiggins.

DONNELL JOSIAH: I'm sorry, sir. May I take her question first since you've asked a lot of questions?

DARRYL WIGGINS: That's fine.

EVE MACHOL: Eve Machol, Microsoft.

I guess one of the questions I have is related to business process modernization and also technology. You know, it can be approached in two ways: One is, you know, a flexible, open technology that can be configured to your processes. And, so, then the question would be defining scope. Or using a pre-configured technology tool and modifying your processes to match the tool, which sounds a little bit like the second part of your response just now. So I wasn't sure if the agency has a preference --

DONNELL JOSIAH: It does.

EVE MACHOL: -- regarding, you know, optimizing the tool to your requirements or optimizing your requirements to the available --

DONNELL JOSIAH: The latter of the two: Optimizing what we do now, because currently there are ways in which we can do things better. We don't want to automate a bad process. We want to improve on our existing processes so we can do things more efficiently

and so that we can maximize the use of the tools.

EVE MACHOL: So the presumption is that the tool will dictate a better process?

DONNELL JOSIAH: That's the presumption, correct. But if there are ways in which we can do things better than our tool is configured, that would be our approach. Because if your tool takes us through five steps to get in a desired outcome, but we are accustomed to seeing three steps using a different analogy, we will not go five steps. We will reconfigure the tool so that we can get it in three steps.

Again, what we're looking for is efficiency all around, ways in which we can improve what we're doing now, ways in which we can expand on what we're doing now, so that we have a best -- a good solution for the State in the long-term.

Does that answer your question?

EVE MACHOL: Yes, it does. Thank you.

DONNELL JOSIAH: Sir, your question?

DARRYL WIGGINS: So, I just want to kind of get my head around how we size our organization, right? Because you got delivery people; you got the PMO people. And since the State is going to own the PMO process, I want to understand, from an artifact perspective, how documented that's going to be? Are you going to have functional requirements documents that need to be signed off SSD documents that need to be signed off?

And the reason that I ask that: Because in aligning my organizational structure, if you're going to say I got FRDs and I got to sign off with the business people, I got system design documents, I got to sign off with the business people, then that requires me to have some alignment to be able to engage and get that sign-off. So I understand you're running a PMO on this side. But what artifacts are you going to require as far as an SDLC?

DONNELL JOSIAH: That's an excellent

question.

The assumption is that we're using an SDLC approach.

DARRYL WIGGINS: Okay.

DONNELL JOSIAH: We're using the Scalable Agile Framework, which is the new design the State is moving towards. And when I say "State," not just DHR DOIT (Department of Information Technology), is the deployment methodology that we are using for all future projects. So this is really one of the very first projects that DOIT has approved as the safe approach.

Now, under SDLC, yes, you're correct: Traditionally you would have to give up (inaudible) in accordance with SDLC. Stand up. Run the projects through its two phases--the PIR and the PLR. In this project, it is going to be slightly different.

Will there be documentation? Yes, but not as voluminous as the SDLC approach would have

required.

Does that answer your question?

NARAYAN ATHREYA: Donnell, can I ask a question on the BPR?

DONNELL JOSIAH: On the BPR?

NARAYAN ATHREYA: This is Narayan from ICUBE Systems.

You said you're approaching the Business Process Analysis and the BPR as a organizational change. Everybody in this room is nongovernment. We are going to bid on this. If we put together a BPR process, most likely it will be slightly different from the State DOIT standards and the State government processes. Are we going to get to implement that? Because that process will work very well with the software that we're going to give you. So if you have to implement that, are you going to change the process from the -- deviate from the State standards? Or you're going to get special approval for that?

Or are you going to come back and redo that process to match your stuff again and then customize the software again to that?

NARAYAN ATHREYA: We cannot -- I mean, I'm assuming, based on my experience here, you have to comply with the State defined standards and procedures. So you cannot deviate too much from that.

DONNELL JOSIAH: Well, a couple points because I'm hearing three things that you mention in your question.

One, the assumption that there are standards relating to Business Process Re-Engineering the State has mandated, there are none.

The Business Process Re-Engineering process that includes Business Process Analysis, will be the review of existing processes. The documentation of As-Is process is what we're doing now. And because it's largely finance-based, it's not an entire systemwide

process assessment like a program team would engage in, we don't foresee it to be a very onerous task. We don't foresee that.

Part 2 of your question assumes that the State's SDLC process would also inform how we do Business Processing Re-Engineering. There is not a method in the SDLC that does Business Processing Re-Engineering, so that doesn't really apply to us.

As it relates to the third portion of your question -- and it just slipped me. It has to do with personnel -- was it personnel you had asked about, or State standards?

NARAYAN ATHREYA: Standards.

DONNELL JOSIAH: State standards. I think what I just addressed dealt with that.

There's no SDLC documentation, there's no DOIT mandates that require us to conduct BPR in a specific way. We will be conducting that how we see fit for the BPR.

Does that answer your question?

NARAYAN ATHREYA: Yes.
JENNIFER LUIK: I have a question.
THE REPORTER: Your name?
JENNIFER LUIK: Jen Luik from Decisions Oriented.
After a year of doing BPR, if after you do all of the analysis and conduct all of your findings, you may find that the solution proposed may not fit the bill. So if that is the case, will there be an opportunity to revisit the proposed solution or conduct additional solution engineering? And should we include that in our bid?
KENYATTA POWERS: We'll answer that one in writing.
JENNIFER LUIK: Okay.
RICHARD WRIGHT: Could you please be sure to e-mail me that question?
JENNIFER LUIK: Yes.
RICHARD WRIGHT: So we can follow up in writing?

JENNIFER LUIK: Uh-huh.

DAVID WALSH: David Walsh with Microsoft.

I'd like to provide a clarification against -- not against, but just as a counter: There are packages that are designed to address specific functions within the State agencies, and we have one of those platforms. So I disagree with the gentleman's statement that every vendor in this room --

DONNELL JOSIAH: Okay. Question, ma'am?

EVE MACHOL: Eve Machol, Microsoft.

Kind of this is tangential to Jen's question back to, you know, earlier we were talking about there being a SaaS or COTS product that may map to your preferred method of doing business, you know, of conducting your new way events: Will there be a demonstration phase or some sort of down selects that you could evaluate the solution, which kind of goes to Jen's

question of: Otherwise, if you start with BPR, the solution that you're building your BPR around may not map to the processes -- you know, that the processes and technology may not map depending on which activity is happening first? I think those were some of our questions.

DONNELL JOSIAH: There's a lot of questions on BPR. And I appreciate the questions on BPR, by the way, because it -- I think that was -- the third part of your question that I forgot, the OCM, I'm going to come back to.

This is not a BPR project. It includes components of business process re-engineering, but it's not a BPR project. The deliverable out of this project is not going to be a BPR document. We are looking for a solution that meets some specific functional requirements that we have detailed in the tasks that we spoke about earlier.

In implementing the solution, it's only wise on the State side to look at what's

going to change from how we're doing business today to how we'll do business in the future, and that is a BPR component.

I would caution all the vendors in this room not to make this a BPR project. Don't price BPR to the point where you are priced out of the market.

Again, we're looking for a solution. But as we are implementing the solution, we want to partner with you on how we can conduct a BPR process to make sure that we are capturing all the pieces, all the nuances of what we're doing today and are representing that in our deployment when we're making a solution. I really want to make this understood, because there are several State agencies that are conducted BPR projects and those are full-length/full-term projects. That's not the intent of this project.

We are requiring a solution that will have some functional capabilities, and will give you a hint: In attachment V in each of those

worksheets there are categories, vendor management, bank reconciliation, batch transaction processing, account reconciliation. Those are the capabilities that we're looking for, you guys.

So we're purchasing a solution, but we dare not implement a solution and have not done our due diligence in how it would change our existing processes, which is why we're doing OCM, Organizational Change Management, as part of the roll-out, so that we are factoring in how our people's jobs will change.

Included in OCM would also be training. You know your platform best. Then you guide us on how we should maximize use of your system.

It is not a BPR project. It's a technology acquisition project. But it includes components of data conversion, which we have not spoken about yet, and also change management.

Does that make sense?

EVE MACHOL: Yep.
DONNELL JOSIAH: Okay.
Additional questions on Section 3?
(No Response.)
DONNELL JOSIAH: And please don't ask all at the same time.
(Laughter.)
Call for Questions and Reminders:
RICHARD WRIGHT: Okay. Before we conclude, I'd like to remind you to please remember that after today, any additional questions must be e-mailed to Dapheny McCray at dapheny.mccray@maryland.gov.
The cut-off date and time for submitting questions is 2:30 p.m., March 22nd, 2017. And, again, between now and then we ask that for any questions you presented at today's meeting, you follow up by e-mailing the questions as soon as possible to Dapheny.
The deadline for submissions of the RFP is 2:30 p.m., March 29, 2017.

At this time, Kenyatta, would you like to offer any closing remarks?

KENYATTA POWERS: Sure.

Closing Remarks

KENYATTA POWERS: First, I want to thank you all again for coming and your interest. I am overwhelmed and excited about all the interest that we have in this AFS-RFP. And I hope that you have received enough information today that you do want to and will bid on the AFS-RFP.

So, again, thank you for coming and hope to hear from you soon.

RICHARD WRIGHT: Okay. Again, we will be addressing the issue that Scott brought up -- I thank you for that -- regarding the relative weight of financial and technical. We will be addressing that and, if necessary, issuing an Addendum.

Okay. Thank you so much for joining us today. And as Kenyatta said, we look forward

to receiving your Proposals. We appreciate your involvement and enthusiasm.

(Conference concluded at 11:40 a.m.)

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, CHERYL JEFFERIES, a Certified Court Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing Pre-Proposal Conference was stenographically and electronically recorded by me and thereafter transcribed to the best of my ability.

As witness my hand this 24th day of January, 2017.

CHERYL JEFFERIES