

#	Questions	Responses
1	Regarding the Minimum Qualifications requirements below, do these have to be met by the prime exclusively? Please clarify if these can be fulfilled by a partner instead? The minimum requirements include: - Providing evidence of being involved in similar projects; - Having a minimum of 5 years of successful experience in providing, implementing and customizing an Audit Management Software Solution; and - Providing 3 letters of reference from recent clients from similar projects.	Yes. As stated in <b>RFP Section 2 - Minimum Qualifications,</b> "BERS will only consider proposals where the Proposer (i.e., prime vendor) meets on their own <u>all</u> Minimum Qualifications, without the need to rely on any subcontractor(s) or other partners. The entity submitting the proposal must meet <u>all</u> Minimum Qualifications as stated herein. Proposals that fail to meet <u>all</u> Minimum Qualifications <u>will not</u> be considered."
2	Are there any restrictions or requirements around the use of offshore resources for this project?	Due to the sensitive nature of this project and the handling of protected data, BERS prefers a vendor with presence in the USA and the use of locally available resources for the entirety of this project. If a vendor intends to use offshore resources, this must be clearly indicated and described in detail in their proposal.
3	What audit management software is BERS currently using?	BERS does not currently use an audit management software.
4	What types of audits are currently conducted by BERS?	Operational, financial, compliance and information technology audits.
5	For each audit type, can you briefly describe the phases of the audit workflow?	All audits are performed in three phases - planning, fieldwork, and reporting.
6	RFP Section 4.3.4.8 Conversion / Migration / Integration states, "Proposer must identify and describe a detailed plan for conversion/migration of data. Proposer must provide details on integration capabilities, if available."	<ul> <li>(1) BERS does not currently use an audit management software. Workpapers are stored in commonly used file formats including, but not limited, to Microsoft Word and Excel, PDF, JPEG, etc.</li> <li>(2) The scope of services includes importing existing audit workpapers and files to the new audit management software. The vendor should also provide the ability to create customized audit programs, as needed.</li> </ul>



#	Questions	Responses
7	<ul> <li>Data Storage Requirements RFP Section 1.3 -</li> <li>Program Summary mentions unlimited data storage.</li> <li>(1) What types of data are expected to be stored in the system?</li> <li>(2) What is the current volume of stored data?</li> <li>(3) What is the estimated annual growth in data volume?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>(1) Audit workpapers and documentation including, but not limited to, planning documents, control documentation, policy documents, reference documents, test documentation, review documents, communication, issue tracking and remediation, supporting files, etc.</li> <li>(2) Approximately 700 GB.</li> <li>(3) Approximately 20%, though this may vary depending on audit needs.</li> </ul>
8	User Requirement <b>RFP Section 3.1</b> specifies support for unlimited stakeholder users. How many stakeholder users are anticipated to use the system concurrently and in total?	Currently, stakeholder users could be up to 30. In total, stakeholder users could be up to 100.
9	Implementation Timeline <b>RFP Section 3.4</b> references implementation. What is the expected duration of the implementation phase? Do we set this based on our response in Appendix E?	Yes. The vendor should specify their anticipated implementation timeline.
10	Client Operating System Support <b>RFP Section 3.5.3</b> notes support for client operating systems. Given that the application is web-based and intended for use with supported browsers (Microsoft Edge and Google Chrome, per <b>Section 3.5.6</b> ), what specific client OS support is expected beyond browser compatibility?	Windows OS.
11	Document Annotation Capabilities <b>RFP Section</b> <b>3.9.14</b> requires the ability to annotate MS Word, Excel, PowerPoint, and PDF documents within the application using standard tick marks and comments, without requiring additional software licenses. Can BERS clarify whether this functionality must include native in-application editing of the original file formats, or if annotations can be applied as overlays on converted PDF versions of those documents?	Annotations should be applied as overlays on existing documents.
12	Data Connector Requirements <b>RFP Section 3.10.6</b> mentions built-in data connectors for platforms such as SAP, Oracle, and/or Concur. Can you elaborate on which systems BERS currently uses or plans to integrate with, and what level of integration is required?	BERS has no immediate needs for integration but prefers the option for built-in data connectors.



#	Questions	Responses
	Audit Program Content Requirements RFP Section	"Import capabilities" refers to the ability to upload and store
	3.14.2 requires inclusion or import capabilities for	standard audit program documents.
13	standard audit programs from COBIT, COSO, IIA, and	
	AuditNet. Can BERS clarify whether "import	
	capabilities" refers to the ability to upload and store	
	standard audit program documents (e.g., Word, Excel,	
	PDF formats) for reference and manual use, or	
	whether it implies a requirement for the system to	
	dynamically parse and generate fully customized,	
	interactive audit programs from any uploaded file?	
	The latter would involve significant variability in file	
	structure and content, which may not be technically	
	feasible without strict format standards.	
	Product Documentation RFP Section 4.3.4.6	Product documentation refers to user guides, knowledge
	requires online materials that document the product.	base manuals, etc., that will be made available to core users
	Can BERS clarify whether this refers to documentation	and stakeholders.
14	that must be included in the proposal response, or if it	
14	refers to the product documentation (e.g., user	
	guides, knowledge base, manuals) that will be made	
	available to BERS staff and stakeholders as part of the	
	deployed Audit Management Software?	
	Full Value Agreements and Pricing Format <b>RFP</b>	Yes. Please carefully review <b>RFP Section 4.4 Pricing</b>
	Section 10 - Type of Contract states that this RFP	Proposal (Budget) in its entirety. Proposers are reminded,
	may result in the award of a full value (not-to-exceed)	per <b>RFP Section 4.4.3.4</b> that unit prices, hourly rates, fee for
	agreement.	service, flat rate, licensing fee, a combination of these, or any
	Given the limited visibility into BERS's current system	other pricing model are maximum, not-to-exceed amounts
15	architecture, audit workflows, and implementation	that will be incorporated into the contract. The proposed
	complexity, can our pricing proposal be structured	pricing (or any component thereof) are <b><u>not</u></b> subject to upward
	using hourly rates based on employee role or labor	adjustment. And the proposed budget must include <u>all</u> costs,
	category, rather than committing to a fixed not-to-	fees, rates, etc. associated with the proposed services. The
	exceed total at this stage?	awarded vendor <u>will not</u> be able to invoice for
		items/deliverables not included in the approved Pricing
		Proposal (Budget).



#	Questions	Responses
16	Can BERS clarify whether the scope of services includes full replication and implementation of all current audit processes in the new software, or if the expectation is to provide a configurable platform where BERS will create and manage its own customized audit programs during or after implementation?	The expectation is for the vendor to provide a configurable platform where BERS will create and manage its own customized audit programs after implementation. During implementation, the vendor will create and customize audit programs.
17	necessary when crafting your proposal response, but please be concise." Does this mean we are required to use the provided one-page Appendix E PDF form, or are we permitted to submit our responses to <b>Section</b>	<ul> <li>(1) Yes. Proposers are advised, though, they <u>must</u> complete and submit <u>all</u> required information/forms included in Appendix D - Proposal Form.</li> <li>(2) We have no particular preference - they may be submitted as separate or a single/combined document, as long as all required documents are submitted, they are clearly labeled, and the logical sequence is maintained, i.e., Appendix D1, D2, D3, and so on.</li> <li>(3) Proposers must use the forms included in Appendix D - Proposal Form, as these have been standardized for all submissions. However, proposers may use their own documents (MS Word or PDF) to provide the required information for Appendix D2 - Minimum Qualifications, Appendix D3 - Organizational Capacity, and Appendix D4 - Demonstrated Effectiveness, provided each is clearly labeled and addresses each document's requirement(s).</li> <li>(4) For Appendix E - Program Plan, Proposers may use the provided form or submit their own document (MS Word or PDF), as long as it is clearly labeled as Appendix E - Program Plan.</li> </ul>
18	Table of Contents Structure <b>RFP Section 11 -</b> <b>Proposer Checklist</b> states that the Table of Contents should be submitted as a separate document. Given that the full proposal may span multiple files and sections, can BERS confirm whether this Table of Contents should serve as a document index or matrix—referencing each RFP requirement and identifying the specific file names and locations where the corresponding responses can be found—rather than a traditional page-number-based table of contents?	<b>RFP Section 11 - Proposer Checklist</b> simply references all the documents that must be included with a vendor's proposal. Vendors should structure their proposals in a clear and logical manner where all required information and documents can be easily identified. Please refer to <b>RFP</b> <b>Section 6.1 - Proposal Intructions,</b> the proposal should include a traditional page number-based Table of Contents.



#	Questions	Responses
	Timeline Does BERS have an estimated timeline for	The estimated timeline for project completion is six months.
	completing this project? Specifically, when do you	It is anticipated that services will commence on or about
19	anticipate the key phases (e.g., meetings, data	September 2025.
	migration, system configuration, testing, and	
	implementation) will occur?	

# [END OF DOCUMENT]