

NOTICE TO PROPOSERS

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT THE CHAMPAIGN-URBANA MASS TRANSIT DISTRICT (MTD) will be receiving proposals in accordance with Requests for Proposals #2025-002 for the successful deployment of an Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) System and relevant implementation services until 2:00 PM (CDT), May 6, 2025.

Proposals shall be submitted electronically to procurement@mtd.org. Any proposals received after the time and date noted herein will not be considered and will not be opened. MTD reserves the right to accept any or any part or parts thereof or to reject any and all proposals received.

Any contract resulting from these proposals is subject to financial assistance contracts between MTD, Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT). MTD will be bound by the terms and conditions of the proposal only to the extent funds from whatever source are available.

MTD also hereby notifies proposers that they affirmatively ensure that all Disadvantaged Business Enterprises, as defined by the United States Government, are afforded full opportunity to submit statements in response to this RFP and will not knowingly discriminate against any proposer upon the grounds of gender, race, color, or national origin in the consideration of award of the contract.

The full RFP document may be obtained by contacting Victoria Carrington at procurement@mtd.org or (217) 384-8188.



Date: April 3, 2025

To: Prospective Proposers

Subject: Addendum No. 1 to the Bidding Documents for RFP No. 2025-002: ERP System & Implementation Services

Champaign-Urbana Mass Transit District (MTD)

Addendum No. 1 becomes a part of proposal documents and modifies the original request for proposals

CORRECTION TO BIDDING DOCUMENTS

Addendum No. 1 includes a revised version of Attachment 3, correcting an issue in the HR/Payroll tab where the drop-down options in Column F were not displaying properly.

PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE MEETING

Addendum No. 1 includes the pre-proposal conference meeting agenda.

Date & Time: March 31, 2025 @ 10:00 AM (CDT)

Location: Microsoft Teams Virtual Meeting

Project: RFP #2025-002: ERP System & Implementation Services

Owner: Champaign-Urbana Mass Transit District (MTD)

Consultant: Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA)

The following items were noted via presentation:

1. Four (4) agencies involved in this joint procurement:
 - a. Champaign-Urbana Mass Transit District (MTD)
 - b. Connect Transit (Bloomington-Normal)
 - c. MetroLINK (Rock Island Quad Cities)
 - d. Rockford Mass Transit District (RMTD)
2. Agency statistics are provided in Section A.3 of the RFP
3. All agencies are using FleetNet/Avail for ERP functions
 - a. MTD is using Paycom & RMTD is using Ceridian for HR/Payroll



- i. MTD & RMTD will need integrations with HR systems and the new ERP
- ii. Connect Transit & MetroLINK will need a full suite ERP (i.e., Finance & HR/Payroll)

b. Why are we doing this project?

- i. Looking for modern features & functionality
- ii. The agencies have found a lot of value in being a small Ad hoc FleetNet user community and intend to keep that procuring the same ERP system
- iii. The agencies are not planning to begin implementations at the same time, MTD will go first, and the other agencies will implement subsequent to that, with the intention of value add and to utilize lessons learned from MTD's implementation in the subsequent implementations

4. Functional scopes listed in Section A.10 of RFP

- a. The RFP includes the goals and needs for each of the functional areas
- b. Functional requirements are detailed for each functional scope in Attachment 3

5. Procurement schedule listed in Section A.8 of RFP

- a. Questions/clarifications may be submitted to procurement@mtd.org no later than Monday, April 7, 2025, at 2:00 PM (CDT)

6. The meeting was then opened for discussion with prospective proposers. Questions/clarifications discussed will be released in Addendum No. 2 on Monday, April 14, 2025.



Date: April 14, 2025

To: Prospective Proposers

Subject: Addendum No. 2 to the Bidding Documents for RFP No. 2025-002: ERP System & Implementation Services

Champaign-Urbana Mass Transit District (MTD)

Addendum No. 2 becomes a part of proposal documents and modifies the original request for proposals

CORRECTION TO BIDDING DOCUMENTS

Addendum No. 2 includes a revised version of Attachment 15, removing EAM conversions for all agencies and adding HR/Payroll data conversions to Connect Transit and MetroLINK's sheet tabs.

RESPONSES TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS/CLARIFICATIONS RECEIVED

Addendum No. 2 provides responses to the written questions/clarifications submitted by prospective proposers.

GENERAL QUESTIONS

Q1. This solicitation appears to be a re-release of a previous RFP, is that correct?

A1. MTD previously released an RFP in December 2024 for ERP + EAM solutions and implementation services. The RFP was cancelled, and no evaluations or selections occurred. This RFP is for an ERP solution and implementation services, exclusively. As noted in Sections A.2, A.11.6, A.11.9, and B.4 of the RFP, the agencies plan to procure an EAM solution subsequent to this procurement.

Q2. Is there a formal participant process?

A2. The formal process is submitting a proposal. The steps for submission are included in Section B of the RFP.



Q3. How many platforms/system integrators are being considered for the ERP and supporting systems? Please provide a list.

A3. The agencies do not have a pre-determined list of systems or integrators under consideration.

Q4. Does each agency have an approved budget for this project?

A4. Yes, each agency has a proposed budget to cover the implementation of a new ERP system (selected through this procurement) and a new EAM system (selected through a future procurement) to replace myAvail/FleetNet.

Q5. Can first year budgets for both software and services or a five-year budget for software and services be provided for each agency?

A5. To ensure a competitive and fair bidding process, the agencies are not disclosing specific budget information at this stage. The goal is to encourage a range of proposals based on the best solutions and value offered by vendors, rather than limiting submissions based on predefined budget constraints. We encourage proposers to submit their best possible proposals based on their expertise and understanding of the project needs.

Q6. Will submissions advocating the use of AI be considered?

A6. The agencies will consider proposals that include AI tools, though this is not a requirement.

Q7. Please provide a list of plan holders.

A7.

2iSolutions, Inc.	Ellipse Solutions, LLC	Intellias
365 Digital Technologies Ltd. Co.	Epicor Software Corporation	Kastech
Aarialife Technologies	ERP Success Partners	Kerridge Commercial Systems
Aclarian LLC	Euna Solutions	Meridian Business, LLC
Arctic IT	Forsys Inc.	Metaformers
Avail Technologies	FourthSquare	MGT Impact Solutions, LLC
Blytheco	Global Enterprise Services, LLC	Mythics Inc.
Business Technology Partners	GlobalPoint Inc.	NEOGOV
Business Solution Partners, Inc.	GNC Consulting, Inc.	Net at Work
Carahsoft Technology Corp.	Gratia	Niti Systems Consultants Inc
CEBA Solutions	Graviton Consulting Services Inc.	Novamodus Solutions Inc.
Cirrus ERP	Guide Technologies	Nsight
CliftonLarsonAllen LLP	iKW Solutions	OpenGov
ClearGov Inc.	Incresol Inc.	Oracle
Cloudvice	Infojini Consulting	OTT, Inc.
Crowe LLP	Infor	Pharos Solutions, Inc.
DMC Strategic IT	Infosys	Phoenix Business Consulting, LLC
Elire Consulting	InfoVision21 Inc.	Prime Vendor, Inc.



RPI Consultants, LLC
RubinBrown LLP
Sage Group PLC
SAP SE
SevenOutsource
Sierra-Cedar
Sikich LLC
SMX Tech

Software Simplified
Software Solutions, Inc.
Sparkrock 365
Tata Consultancy Services
Techfino LLC
The Groove
Trace3, LLC.
Trajectory, Inc.

Tyler Technologies
UKG, Inc.
Unit4
Velosio
Vigilant Technologies
YSL Technologies

A.2 PROJECT BACKGROUND

Q8. What have been the other operational improvement and/or technology initiatives undertaken by the agencies in the last 18 months and were they considered successful?

A8. The agencies have engaged with GFOA over the past year to review existing processes and plan for future processes with the implementation of a modern ERP.

Q9. Section A.2 states that each agency will contract separately but will follow the same scope. Can vendors assume that proposals shall include combined plan and estimates for all agencies?

A9. Proposals should include separate cost estimates for each agency, as noted in Section B.5 of the RFP.

A.3 ABOUT THE AGENCIES

Q10. Does QCGPG need to be set up as a separate entity under MetroLINK?

A10. QCGPG will not be “under” MetroLINK as they are separate entities. It will need a separate environment, as described in the RFP.

A.8 PROCUREMENT SCHEDULE

Q11. Will there be another opportunity for alignment after April 14, 2025, as needed?

A11. Proposers and the agencies will discuss implementation details and remaining questions through the demonstration and discovery processes laid out in Section A.8 of the RFP and through contract negotiation.

A.10 PROJECT SCOPE - OVERVIEW

Q12. Will the platform and implementer be decided at the same time, or will one be selected first?



A12. Please refer to Section A.10 of the RFP. Proposals shall contain both the software and the implementation services. The contract resulting from this procurement will be awarded to a single vendor.

Q13. Section A.10 includes Capital Assets as a functional scope to be used for financial tracking only. However, in Attachment 15, the data conversion list for MTD includes EAM functions. Please clarify whether EAM is in functional scope for maintenance activities or not. Note: there is no Asset Maintenance requirement in Attachment 3.

A13. EAM functional scope for maintenance activities is not included in this procurement. Please refer to updated Attachment 15 included in this Addendum #2.

Q14. It is understood that under supply chain management, procurement is in scope for both direct and indirect procurement. Is there any other area of supply chain in scope?

A14. Please refer to Attachment 3 for all procurement requirements.

A.11.1 ACCOUNTING

Q15. Do the agencies require a custom chart of accounts that should match the FTA's Uniform System of Accounts (USOA)?

A15. Please refer to Section A.11.1 of the RFP. The agencies anticipate that part of the implementation process will involve revising their charts of accounts to align with the USOA to facilitate federal and state reporting.

Q16. How many segments are part of the agencies Chart of Accounts?

A16. The agencies have three Chart of Accounts segments at the moment. As noted in Question 11, the agencies expect to revise their Charts of Accounts as part of the implementation process.

Q17. Are the agencies looking for business process re-engineering including Chart of Account Design as part of the ERP implementation?

A17. Yes, the agencies anticipate significant process change as part of implementing a modern ERP system.

Q18. Please describe the agencies allocation needs.

A18. Please refer to Attachment 3 for anticipated functional requirements related to cost allocation.

Q19. How many grants are reimbursable?



A19.

MTD	Connect Transit	MetroLINK	RMTD
8	20	20	15

Q20. How are the agencies billing for grants?

A20. Currently, receivables must be created manually in the current system. The agencies manage grant-related spending by monitoring invoices during processing and using Excel to track associated costs.

Q21. Is there a need to automate lease accounting for leases subject to GASB 87 and if so, how many?

A21. Please refer to Attachment 3 for anticipated functional requirements related to lease accounting.

A.11.2 BUDGET

Q22. Please clarify whether the budget application and processes will be the same across the agencies or if the agencies follow different budget processes and each agency will approve the developed application separately.

A22. The agencies do not have the same budget process currently.

Q23. Please confirm the functional areas for the budget application (e.g., financial, personnel, CAPEX, projects).

A23. Please refer to Attachment 3 for specific budget functional requirements.

Q24. Is there a need for a budgeting tool to help create the budget outside of excel? If yes, how many users manage the budget (create budget templates, manage who has access to, locks budget to entry)? If yes, how many department users are other contributors to budget process?

A24. Please refer to Attachment 3 for budgeting requirements and Section A.18 for estimated user counts.

Q25. Please explain Section A.11.2 scenario planning and how the agencies like for it to be reflected in the system in regard to budgets.

A25. Scenario planning in this case refers to creating draft budgets within certain parameters (i.e., 5% across the board cut, flat compared to previous year, etc.) for the purposes of comparison and decision making.



Q26. Please specify the planning and forecasting cycles (e.g., monthly, quarterly, yearly) the agencies expect the system to provide tools for.

A26. The agencies expect the system to cover typical forecasting cycles (e.g., monthly, quarterly, yearly, YTD, EOY, etc.).

Q27. Please explain the requirement to integrate service levels into the budgeting process.

A27. Service levels (hours and miles) drive a significant portion of each agency's budget and for some agencies, also drive revenue. The ability to integrate service levels into the budgeting process will allow for the automation of some portions of budget forecasting and generation.

A.11.3 PROCUREMENT & ACCOUNTS PAYABLE

Q28. Please describe the anticipated purchase order workflow.

A28. Please refer to Attachment 3 for anticipated purchase order functional requirements. Agencies are not committed to a specific workflow for purchase orders. Agencies also anticipate integrating the ERP and future EAM system to allow for the ordering of parts and automation of inventory replenishment.

Q29. Please describe AP approval workflows. Who is involved in the approval process?

A29. Staff involved in AP approval varies across agencies. Invoices are received centrally and reviewed before being approved by department staff if necessary. The agencies anticipate best practice functionality and practices after implementing a modern ERP system.

Q30. How many bills are paid monthly?

A30.

MTD	Connect Transit	MetroLINK	RMTD
800	500	250	300

A.11.4 TREASURY

Q31. Do the agencies use pre-determined splits that don't change much throughout the year or is there a need for month end allocation automation?

A31. Please refer to Attachment 3 for anticipated functional requirements related to cost allocation. Vendors are encouraged to propose any allocation process they believe best meets these requirements, while ensuring full alignment with the specified criteria.



A.11.5 CUSTOMER BILLING

Q32. Please explain the requirements of Section A.11.5 for CAD/AVL integrations with the ERP.

A32. In some cases, agencies bill for service provided (in terms of miles and/or hours of service), which would be drawn from the CAD/AVL system.

Q33. What types of data should flow through the CAD/AVL integration, in which direction (bidirectional or unidirectional), and should it be real-time or batch processing?

A33. In an ideal scenario, the ERP would be able to pull data from the CAD/AVL system to facilitate NTD reporting, billing, and budgeting, as noted below. The scope of this integration can be discussed in more detail as the procurement proceeds.

A.11.6 ASSET MANAGEMENT

Q34. What is the number of assets being tracked per entity?

A34.

MTD	Connect Transit	MetroLINK	RMTD
890	260	450	3,500

Q35. Do the agencies plan for the new ERP to integrate with FleetNet temporarily or will the integration only be with the new EAM selected?

A35. Yes, the ERP will need to integrate with FleetNet temporarily while a new EAM is selected and implemented.

Q36. Will the agencies still require an EAM system if the ERP is able to accommodate requirements via the Fixed Asset module?

A36. The EAM requirements are not included in this RFP, but vendors can indicate in their proposal if they believe their fixed asset module may be able to meet these requirements when the EAM RFP is released.

A.11.7 CUSTOMER SERVICE

Q37. Are the customer service requirements intended for citizens to engage with agencies, or are they meant for internal users to report issues, such as a damaged bus stop location? Can additional scope and insight be provided to that?

A37. The customer service requirements are intended to allow customers/passengers to submit comments, compliments, concerns, etc. to the agencies.



Q38. Please explain the type of cost tracking and integration with Chart of Accounts the agencies would like with the customer complaints, comments, and commendations data.

A38. Agencies would like to be able to assign customer service items to Chart of Accounts line(s) for the purposes of later cost reporting relating to time and other costs. Please refer to Attachment 3 for full requirements.

Q39. What are the NTD reporting categories?

A39. Agencies report a wide range of data to the NTD, not all of which is financial. Vendors can refer to the FTA's Uniform System of Accounts (USOA) for a general overview of required financial information: <https://www.transit.dot.gov/ntd/ntd-uniform-system-accounts>.

Q40. Is there any tracking of CIP?

A40. Please refer to Attachment 3 for anticipated functional requirements related to capital budgeting.

A.11.8 HUMAN RESOURCES (HR)

Q41. Please confirm that the existing HR software for MTD and RMTD will be the primary HR system used (i.e., employee data will be manually managed in it).

A41. Yes, please refer to Section A.11.8 and A.11.9.

Q42. Is there an HR system that Connect Transit and MetroLINK would like to use, or do proposers need to recommend one?

A42. Connect Transit and MetroLINK do not have a specific HR system in mind. Proposers are expected to recommend an HR software solution as part of their proposal and should include a clear explanation of why the proposed system was selected, including how it meets the needs outlined in the RFP.

Q43. Will any retirees or part-time employees need access to the future HR system and if so, please provide types and quantities for each agency.

A43. No retired employees will need system access. For part-time employee counts, please refer to Section A.2 of the RFP.

A.11.9 PAYROLL/TIME ENTRY

Q44. Will RMTD be moving to the new payroll system or continue to use Dayforce (formerly, Ceridian)?

A44. No, please refer to Section A.11.9 of the RFP.



Q45. Please confirm that MTD and RMTD's employee data management will continue to occur in existing HR systems whereas Connect Transit and MetroLINK will manage employee data in the new ERP system.

A45. Yes, please refer to Section A.11.8 and A.11.9 of the RFP.

Q46. Is there a payroll/time entry system that Connect Transit and MetroLINK would like to use, or do proposers need to recommend one?

A46. Connect Transit and MetroLINK do not have a specific payroll or time entry system preference. Proposers should recommend a system as part of their response and provide justification for the selection, explaining how the proposed solution meets the requirements outlined in the RFP.

A.12 TECHNICAL SCOPE

Q47. Are the agencies open to using an iPaaS layer for integrations, or is the requirement API only?

A47. Vendors may propose whatever integration method they feel would meet the agencies' needs.

A.13 IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE

Q48. An estimated timeline of Sept 2025 – Sept 2026 has been proposed for MTD. Have approximate schedules been estimated for all other agencies?

A48. No, approximate schedules for the other three agencies have not been estimated as schedules for subsequent agencies will vary depending on the vendor's proposed timeline.

Q49. Are there any specific timeline considerations for the other agencies implementations; please advise if Connect Transit, MetroLINK, and RMTD will be parallel implementation or sequential implementation?

A49. The agencies anticipate that implementations following MTD will be sequential. However, vendors are welcome to propose alternative implementation timelines for consideration.

Q50. Have implementation phases been considered for this initiative and would they be an acceptable part of the response?

A50. Vendors are welcome to propose a phased implementation schedule.

Q51. Does Section A.13 mean that the vendor is expected to propose timelines, cost, and a solution for the implementation for MTD only, and estimation and cost for other agencies should be prepared at the end of MTD deployment?



A51. The agencies anticipate that implementations following MTD will be sequential. However, vendors are welcome to propose alternative implementation timelines for consideration.

Q52. In reference to Section A.13, should vendors assume that the policies and procedures are common across the four agencies?

A52. There are some similarities of policies and procedures across agencies, but they are not uniform. The agencies will seek to harmonize some of these as part of implementation.

Q53. Do any of the agencies use middleware (integration platform) to integrate their current ERP system with their other applications/systems? If so, please provide the middleware software used. If not, can a vendor propose a middleware (integration platform) to be used with the future ERP solution?

A53. Vendors are welcome to propose an integration platform to be used with the ERP solution.

A.14 IMPLEMENTATION APPROACH

Q54. This initiative represents significant change and impact to the involved departments (Finance, Purchasing/Accounts Payable, Human Resources, Time Entry/Payroll), in addition to the staff who must enter their time. Therefore, the organizational impact of this initiative is significant. What organizational change management (OCM) activities, if any, are planned to occur in advance, parallel, or following this project?

A54. The agencies have engaged with GFOA to analyze current state processes and plan for future state process changes in advance of this procurement. Vendors are welcome to propose OCM services as an optional part of their proposal if they feel it would support the implementation.

Q55. What level of project management is required (e.g., expenditures only, resource management)?

A55. Agencies expect proposals to include a full project management scope as outlined in Section A.14 of the RFP. Vendors can use the proposal and Attachment 12 to outline their proposed level of project management.

Q56. Do the agencies use an LMS for training and if so, is there an expectation that vendors create a training plan for non-core team users?

A56. Yes, the agencies expect vendors to create a training plan and end-user training materials. Please refer to section A.14.6 of the RFP.



A.16 DATA CONVERSION

Q57. What data volumes are expected for conversion? Please clarify historical data years, number of records, and formats for each agency.

A57. Please refer to the revised copy of Attachment 15, included with this Addendum #2, for conversion details.

Q58. What type of transactions are expected to be sent by FleetNet to the new ERP?

A58. Please refer to the revised copy of Attachment 15, included with this Addendum #2. The agencies are interested in converting only essential data required for the new system.

Q59. What financial data is RMTD expecting to be sent by Clever Devices to the new ERP system?

A59. Please refer to the response for Question 75.

Q60. In what systems does the current accounting/payroll/customer service data reside and what must occur for it to be extracted into a CSV format? Can it easily be extracted in CSV templates?

A60. Please refer to the revised copy of Attachment 15, included with this Addendum #2, for data conversion information. In general, this data can be extracted in CSV templates.

Q61. Can vendors assume that the data migration related to EAM will occur once the EAM is procured and implemented?

A61. Yes, data related to EAM will be migrated as part of the EAM implementation.

Q62. What HR data needs to be migrated for MTD, MetroLINK, and RMTD as there are no HR elements in Attachment 15 for these agencies?

A62. No HR data will be migrated for MTD and RMTD as these agencies are not implementing HR functionality. Please refer to the revised copy of Attachment 15, included with this Addendum #2; this attachment has been revised to include HR data to be migrated for Connect Transit and MetroLINK.

Q63. Is the current data considered to be trustworthy, mostly trustworthy, partially trustworthy or not trustworthy?

A63. Data can be considered trustworthy but agencies are aware that data review and cleanup will be needed.



A.18 ESTIMATED NUMBER OF CORE USERS BY FUNCTION

Q64. How many licensed users will need access to the software solution?

A64. Please refer to Section A.18 of the RFP for a detailed table of users by function and agency.

Q65. What type of transactions are expected to be sent by FleetNet to the new ERP? In the table found in Section A.18, why are HR and time entry/payroll users listed as “N/A” for MTD and RMTD but there are users identified for Connect Transit and MetroLINK?

A65. These are marked as “N/A” as MTD and RMTD will not be implementing HR and time entry/functionality.

B.1 PROPOSAL SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS

Q66. Section B.1 of the RFP states “The proposal must be organized into major sections as defined in Section B. Any required attachments must be included in the proper section as indicated by the instructions herein.” Will the agencies please confirm if attachments should be embedded directly into the proposal response document, or should vendors submit the attachments as separate files with their proposal submission?

A66. Please refer to the table in Section B.1, which includes the required file format of the attachment submission requirements. Vendors should submit the attachments as separate files with their proposal submission, in the same manner in which the attachments were issued.

B.2 SUMMARY & OVERALL SCOPE

Q67. Is there a preference for a single vendor providing both the software and implementation services, or are the agencies open to separate vendors?

A67. The agencies do not have a preference for a single vendor providing both the software and implementation services. The agencies are open to proposals from separate vendors for software and implementation services. However, if multiple vendors collaborate in a joint proposal, one vendor must be identified as the primary contact. This primary contact will serve as the point of contact throughout the procurement process and will be responsible for the overall implementation, ensuring coordination and accountability for all partners involved in the proposal.

Q68. If a solution includes all functionality except customer service and the vendor marks it as "not available," how will that impact the scoring? Will the proposal be considered unresponsive or rejected?



A68. Proposals that do not include customer service functionality will not automatically be considered unresponsive or rejected. However, customer service is part of the functional requirements, and the ability of the software to support this functionality will be scored accordingly. Response to functional requirements is incorporated into the overall scoring process. While a proposal without customer service may still be submitted, proposers should be aware that this functionality will be evaluated based on the scoring criteria outlined in Section A.9 of the RFP. The RFP provides further details on how responses will be assessed.

Q69. Is applicant tracking in scope for recruitment?

A69. Please refer to the HR/Payroll tab of Attachment 3 for the desired functions in scope.

B.3 SOFTWARE PROPOSAL

Q70. Does RMTD have any requirements for union or retired railroad payroll?

A70. Please refer to Attachment 3 for functional requirements.

Q71. Will the agencies be considering point solutions/best-of-breed for certain software modules within the functional scope?

A71. Proposers are welcome to submit proposals that are either a single system or one or more integrated best-of-breed systems, so long as they are a single proposal.

Q72. Can multiple product solutions be proposed by a vendor?

A72. Yes, a vendor can propose multiple product solutions, so long as a single proposal is submitted.

Q73. Are there any specific compliance or cybersecurity standards (e.g., NIST, SOC 2) the software must comply with for hosting and data management?

A73. Yes, please refer to Attachment 3 for these requirements.

Q74. If a cloud-based (SaaS) solution is proposed, are the agencies still requiring implementation of specific disaster recovery (DR) tools and strategies, or would built-in cloud backups and vendor-native DR protocols be considered sufficient?

A74. Please refer to Attachment 8 to see specific questions related to SaaS backups and DR.

B.4 PROFESSIONAL SERVICES PROPOSAL

Q75. Do the agencies have technical and functional personnel resources available to perform the integrations with myAvail/FleetNet, Paycom, Ceridian, and CAD/AVL to the new



ERP or will the awarded vendor be providing the personnel resources to perform the integrations?

A75. The agencies have some technical and functional resources to facilitate the integration between the new ERP and existing systems. The agencies will be responsible for coordinating with the existing systems but the vendor will be expected to develop the integration, train agency staff on the integration tools, and provide any as-built documentation.

Q76. Are there any security regulations or specific location requirements for the implementation regarding the resources working on the project (e.g., onsite, offshore, hybrid)?

A76. No, there are no specific location requirements for implementation resources.

Q77. Are offshore resources allowed as part of the solution?

A77. Yes, proposals may include offshore resources.

Q78. Do each of the four agencies require a separate ERP implementation?

A78. Please refer to Section A.2 of the RFP and responses to Questions 48, 49, and 50. The agencies anticipate MTD implement first, and the other agencies to follow with sequential implementations. RFP Section B.4: Proposal Section 8 – Implementation Considerations allow for vendors to propose alternative implementation strategies if the vendor believes such methods would best meet the agencies' needs.

Q79. Can proposers limit the EAM scope to the extent of integration as the agencies plan to procure EAM software in the future as a separate procurement?

A79. Yes, this section is solely requesting proposers' past experience with EAM integration, exclusively.

B.5 PRICE PROPOSAL

Q80. Please confirm that costs for all agencies are required (i.e., 5 versions/tabs of Attachment 17 per agency, 2 for MetroLINK)?

A80. Yes, costs for all agencies are required to be submitted within proposals, with additional consideration of MetroLINK's need for both entities. Please refer to section B.5 of the RFP for further information regarding cost proposals.

Q81. Should separate pricing matrices be provided for each agency?



A81. Yes, each proposal submission should include four (4) separate cost proposals, one (1) for each agency, based on the user counts and functional requirements outlined in the RFP, with additional consideration to MetroLINK's need for both entities as described in Section A.3.3. The requirements for price proposals are outlined in Section B.5 of the RFP.

C.22 VENDOR REGISTRATION WITH IDHR

Q82. Is the Vendor Registration with the Illinois Department of Human Rights (IDHR) required upfront?

A82. Vendors who employ 15+ employees at the time of application or have employed 15+ individuals within 365 days prior to the application, are required to obtain an IDHR Eligibility Number. This number serves as proof of registration with IDHR and will be required to be provided to MTD upon selection for contract award, in order to execute the contract.