OPM FORM 50A
(Rev. 08/20)

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAIʻI	**AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION**	PAGE 1 of 35

1. AMENDMENT NO.
   1

2. EFFECTIVE DATE
   November 4, 2026

3. REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) NO. 27-6284 Dated October, 2026

   Provide a Comprehensive Financial Budgeting, Planning and Management Software Solution, University of Hawaii System, Honolulu, Hawaii

4. ISSUED BY
   Director, Office of Procurement Management
   1400 Lower Campus Road, Room 15
   Honolulu Hawaiʻi 96822
   Procurement Specialist: Karlee Hisashima

5. CONTRACTOR (NAME AND ADDRESS)

   N/A

6. The RFP referenced above is amended as set forth in block 7. The hour and date for receipt of offers ☐ is extended ■ is not extended. This amendment is attached to HIePRO solicitation P27000600 for distribution and acknowledgement purposes.

7. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT

   a. The deadline for receipt pf proposals remains the same at 2:30 p.m., H.S.T., November 23, 2026.

   b. The questions and University responses pertaining to this RFP are attached hereto and made a part hereof.

   c. Replace pages of the RFP as follows:

      1) Replace Page 21 of 42 with the attached Revised Page 21 of 42 (Amendment No. 1).

      2) Replace Page 24 of 42 with the attached Revised Page 24 of 42 (Amendment No. 1).

      3) Replace Page 26 of 42 with the attached Revised Page 26 of 42 (Amendment No. 1).

      4) Replace Page 40 of 42 with the attached Revised Page 40 of 42 (Amendment No. 1).

      5) Replace Page 41 of 42 with the attached Revised Page 41 of 42 (Amendment No. 1).

      Changes are denoted in bold and highlighted.

EXCEPT AS PROVIDED HEREIN, ALL TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE DOCUMENT REFERENCED IN BLOCK 3 UNLESS HERETOFORE AMENDED, REMAIN UNCHANGED.

THE REMAINDER OF THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Questions and Answers for RFP No. 27-6284
HIePRO Solicitation No. P27000600
Financial Budgeting, Planning and Management Software Solution

1. Section 2.5.A.5 lists about 400 fiscal administrators, 30 campus supervisors, and 10 system-level users. Can you confirm all 440 of these users will need to log in to the system directly?

   University Response:

   At least half of the users' needs to be able to login to the system directly.

2. Does this RFP replace RFP 26-5356 for UH Hilo, and is UH Hilo included here as one of the ten campuses?

   University Response:

   Yes, this RFP does replace RFP 26-5356 and yes, Hilo will be included as one of the campuses.

3. Would the University be open to rolling the system out to campuses in phases within the 12 to 18 month implementation period (Section 5.9.a)? If so, is there a campus you would want to start with, a preferred order, or a budget cycle that all campuses need to be live for?

   University Response:

   Yes, the University is open to any suggestion, if it assists the implementation process and outcome delivery. If we do the implementation in phases, it will be very important that consistency is maintained and that data can easily be consolidated. We would start with our Manoa campus as it is the largest and most complex model.

4. Section 2.5.B.2.a mentions bringing in data from RCUH. What system does RCUH use for research financials, and how is data usually shared from it (for example, file exports or a direct connection)?

   University Response:

   RCUH feeds data nightly from the Kuali system via batch processing. This is high level summaries, variance reports and monthly details. Reports can be generated out of Jasper.

5. For single sign-on (Section 2.5.C.12), which identity system does the University use, and where does each user's campus and role information come from?

   University Response:

   The University uses Microsoft Entra ID (SAML) for single sign-on. Campus and Role Information: Role (faculty, staff, student) and campus information are available via attributes in Entra. The underlying source systems for that data are Banner and PeopleSoft.

6. Do all ten campuses use the same KFS chart of accounts and organization structure, or do some campuses have their own setup? (Sections 2.5.B.1.b and 2.5.B.1.m)

University Response:

The campuses use the same chart of account in KFS. They do not have their own set up.

7. Is capital planning in scope for every campus, and is capital project information kept anywhere other than KFS?

University Response:

Yes, Capital planning is in scope. The Capital budget is completed in Trimble (formerly known as e-Builder). Trimble is a comprehensive construction management tool that also includes all financial information associated with the project. The Project budget CIP expenditure plans are all tracked through Excel.

8. A few sections seem to conflict, so we wanted to confirm. Section 3.8 refers to the compliance matrix as Appendix H, but it is Appendix G in the RFP. Section 4.2 says the top three offerors will be contacted for web-based presentations, while Sections 3.9 and 4.2.2 say the top four will give in-person demonstrations. Section 4.2.2 also refers to a Section 3.10 that we couldn't find. Can you confirm the demonstrations will be in person for the top four offerors?

University Response:

The inconsistencies have been corrected. Refer to Amendment No. 1. It is up to the respondent to decide whether they want to present in person or online.

9. For the demonstrations, will the University share scenarios or a script ahead of time? And should we use our own sample data?

University Response:

The University will not share a script or a scenario ahead of time. The University is looking for respondents to showcase how the solution will address the requirements stipulated in the RFP.

The University will not supply any data to be used in the demonstrations.

10. Section 2.4 and Appendix E require a minimum of five (5) years of continuous experience providing financial budgeting, planning and management software solutions for higher education institutions of comparable size and scope to the UH System. Our firm has extensive experience delivering integrated financial planning and analysis platforms — including multi-year forecasting, scenario modeling, multi-entity consolidation, and executive reporting — to large-scale national public-sector organizations, including public utilities and government entities. These clients share many of the same financial planning structures as a public university system: multi-fund accounting, state general fund allocations, capital planning, workforce cost modeling, and regulatory reporting requirements. We note that in a prior UH procurement process (RFP No. 26-5356), the University responded favorably to a similar question, stating that it may consider a bidder responsive if their experience with complex public-sector entities is directly transferable and satisfies the functional needs of the RFP. Will the University apply a similar interpretation under RFP No. 27-6284, allowing offerors to demonstrate transferability of

experience from comparable public-sector environments — even if not specifically within higher education — provided the proposed solution fully addresses all functional, technical, and integration requirements described in the Scope of Work?

University Response:

Yes, the University is open to solutions that can address the Universities needs but having experience in Higher Education would be beneficial.

11. Section 5.9 establishes a 12–18-month implementation period and expresses the University's preference for the three-year software and maintenance term to commence upon successful implementation and acceptance. For purposes of the Cost Proposal Form, should proposers include subscription costs incurred during implementation separately from the three-year post-acceptance subscription term, or should the evaluated three-year subscription pricing include the implementation period?

University Response:

That is up to the respondents to decide how to price the solution and what support and costs will be provided or not provided during the scoping, implementation and delivery periods.

12. Reference: Sections 1.1 and 2.5(D); Section 5.9(a) Given the University-wide scope and the differing budgeting processes across its ten campuses, would the University consider a phased implementation with defined functionality and campus-level deployments, provided the complete solution is delivered within the specified 12–18-month period? If so, may individual phases be accepted and placed into production before final systemwide acceptance?

University Response:

Yes, the University is open to any suggestions or implementation best practice, if it assists the implementation process and outcome delivery. If we do the implementation in phases, it will be very important that consistency is maintained and that data can easily be consolidated.

13. Reference: Section 2.5(B)(1)(m)–(r), pages 12–13 The RFP requires line-item and account-level budgeting, historical actuals, and integration with existing KFS account structures. For implementation sizing and data conversion purposes, can the University confirm the anticipated level of historical financial detail and number of fiscal years required within the new solution, distinguishing detailed transaction-level history from summarized account-level actuals?

University Response:

The budgeting system should be able to plan at least 6 years ahead and have at least 4 years of historic data in the system. For historical data, this needs to be loaded at the level required for budgeting. We do not anticipate loading transactional data into the budgeting system but having a drill through to the transactional data would be very helpful.

14. Reference: Section 2.5(B)(2)(b)–(f), page 13; Section 2.5(B)(3)(d)–(e), page 14 The RFP includes GAAP financial statements, balance sheets, cash flow statements, and Composite Financial Index calculations. Does the University envision the proposed solution independently

producing official financial statements, or supporting the development, analysis, and reporting of financial projections using authoritative actuals and accounting balances maintained within KFS?

University Response:

Yes, the budget system should produce independent financial statements. Actual data has to be loaded and reconciled from KFS. There is no need to manipulate any actual data but the budget system may be required to consolidate the actual data in a different way than the KFS hierarchy. Actual data has to be locked for editing in the Budget system. For the Budget scenario there may be accruals that will be maintained in the budgeting system. The final approved budget will be loaded back into KFS so that KFS can run their financial reports.

15. Reference: Section 2.5(B)(2)(b)–(f), page 13; Section 2.5(B)(3)(d)–(e), page 14 The RFP includes GAAP financial statements, balance sheets, cash flow statements, and Composite Financial Index calculations. Does the University envision the proposed solution independently producing official financial statements, or supporting the development, analysis, and reporting of financial projections using authoritative actuals and accounting balances maintained within KFS? 5. Chart of Accounts and Financial Hierarchy Management Reference: Section 2.5(A)(2), page 11; Section 2.5(B)(1)(b) and (m), page 12 The RFP requires the proposed solution to utilize existing KFS account structures without translation or transformation while allowing University administrators to maintain planning hierarchies and structures. Would the University permit supplemental planning hierarchies, mappings, and reporting attributes within the proposed solution, provided the authoritative KFS account and coding structures are preserved and fully reconcilable?

University Response:

Yes, the budget system should produce independent financial statement. Actual data has to be loaded and reconciled from KFS using hierarchies that exit in KFS. There is no need to manipulate any actual data but there may be a requirement to do some mapping of hierarchies from KFS to the budgeting system.

Actual data has to be locked for editing in the Budget system. For the Budget scenario there may be accruals that will be maintained in the budgeting system. The final approved budget will be loaded back into KFS so that KFS can run their financial reports.

The budgeting system has to be able to handle multiple reporting hierarchies. These will be maintained in the budgeting tool.

16. Reference: Section 2.5(A)(5), page 11 The RFP identifies approximately 400 campus fiscal administrators, 30 campus-level supervisors, and 10 system administration users. For software licensing purposes, can the University clarify whether these users are expected to have budget preparation and modification capabilities, approval-only responsibilities, reporting-only access, or a combination of these functions? Additionally, are executive, dean, department chair, or other reporting-only users anticipated beyond the approximately 440 identified?

University Response:

The 30 campus-level supervisors are expected to have budget preparation and modification access. The 400 users will need to be a combination of budget data entry,

approve budgets, or only do reporting depending on the security access and workflow. Dean and Department chairs will be included in the categories just mentioned.

17. Reference: Section 2.5(B)(2)(a) and (d), page 13; Section 2.5(C), page 15 The RFP identifies KFS and PeopleSoft as primary integration sources and requests real-time or near-real-time data refreshes. Is this expectation intended primarily for updates and calculations within the planning platform, or does the University anticipate real-time or near-real-time synchronization with its enterprise source systems? Would scheduled, automated integration processes meeting established business refresh requirements be acceptable?

    University Response:

    Yes, scheduled, automated integration processes would be acceptable.

18. Reference: Section 3.5(D)(6)–(7), page 20 The Technical Proposal requirements request confirmation regarding protected health information and PCI compliance. Is the University anticipating that the financial planning solution will store or process PHI, payment cardholder information, or other regulated data subject to these specific requirements? Alternatively, would a solution architecture that excludes such data from the planning environment satisfy these provisions?

    University Response:

    No, the budgeting system will not store any health information, or process payments or other regulated data. Yes, if the solution is architected to exclude such data from the planning environment that would satisfy the provision.

19. Reference: Section 1.1, page 5; Appendix C, pages 5–7 Section 1.1 requests a five-year total cost of ownership for evaluation purposes, while Appendix C specifies that only the three-year total evaluated cost will be scored, with optional Years 4 and 5 shown separately. Can the University confirm that the financial evaluation will be based exclusively on the three-year total identified in Appendix C, Section C.5.4, with Years 4 and 5 provided for informational purposes only?

    University Response:

    Yes, the responses will only be evaluated based on years 1-3 and year 4 and 5 are for informational purposes only.

20. Reference: Sections 3.9 and 4.2 Section 3.9 provides for an in-person demonstration with key customer relationship and delivery personnel physically present, while Section 4.2 references web-based presentations. Can the University confirm whether shortlisted offerors should anticipate an in-person demonstration in Honolulu or whether a fully remote presentation will be permitted?

    University Response:

    In person or fully remote options are both acceptable.

21. Reference: Section 3.8, page 21; Appendix G Section 3.8 references Appendix H as the Requirements Compliance Matrix, although the RFP and accompanying appendix forms identify Appendix G. Can the University confirm that Appendix G is the required compliance matrix and

that completion of its ten listed requirements satisfies the mandatory matrix submission requirement?

University Response:

The inconsistencies have been corrected. Refer to Amendment No. 1.

22. Can you provide an inventory and representative samples of existing reports, dashboards and budget input templates.

University Response:

The University will provide sample report and existing budget templates. There are currently no dashboards as these will need to be developed. The University will not be providing an inventory of all reports.

23. As best practices they should but do all ten campuses share templates, calculations and workflows?

University Response:

Campuses construct their budgets with different templates and calculations but then transfer the numbers into uniform templates for the System Budgeting Office. The campuses follow different workflows but the budget office has a consistent workflow process.

24. Beyond PeopleSoft, please list all required interfaces by source system, data object, direction, and frequency, and confirm whether budget writeback to KFS is in scope.

University Response:

All data loads will be required monthly.

Data will only be extracted from Peoplesoft, there will be no need to push any data back into Peoplesoft . For KFS, data needs to be loaded into the budget system and then the final approved budget needs to be loaded back into KFS.

There will also be a requirement to load data from E-Banner and RCUH monthly. No need to load any data back into these systems.

25. Is it possible to get an extension for this RFP?

University Response:

No, the University is not able to extend the deadline for submission of proposals.

26. Do the planning methodology and modeling requirements differ across the various institutions / campuses and will they require separate and unique planning models or will they largely be the same? If different can you please provide some detail as to what the models will be and how they will differ? For example Tuition Planning – will this be one model / methodology or a separate model by campus / school

University Response:

The current processes differ across the various institutions / campuses. The new budgeting system has to standardize the planning process across all the institutions / campuses. Tuition and Personnel planning will be one model across all the campus/schools.

27. Are Kuali (KFS), Ellucian Banner and Peoplesoft the only 3 systems that require integration? Please list any other systems we need to connect with. Is there a central Data Warehouse or are we collecting directly to the sources? Where is reference data coming from (COA, Trees etc)?

University Response:

Yes, for this purpose these will be the only 3 systems that require data integration. There may be other data sources identifies during the scoping phase that could help drive budget data that could be considered.

There is no central Data Warehouse, the budgeting system will have to connect to the 3 sources directly. Reference data will come from the individual data directors and structures.

28. For the ~450 users – are all users contributing to plan and require read / write access or are some of them read-only? If read only can you pls estimate how many?

University Response:

We anticipate that there will be a 50/50 split between the categories. It would be helpful to understand if licenses can be changed in the future and what the pathway and cost would be to transition between license types.

29. How many years of history needs to be in the system?

University Response:

4 Years of historic data.

30. Can you please outline the approximate dimensions / attributes you will require – such as organization, account, campus, school, department, program, fund, cohort etc.

University Response:

We anticipate that the Tuition, Personnel and other models will have different dimensions and attributes that all feed into a single budget model that can deliver information across different scenarios, years, months, organizations, campuses, schools, departments and accounts. We will welcome feedback from the vendor around the number of dimensions but we anticipate that the model will have around 10 dimensions.

31. Can you please describe your Capital Budgeting requirements – high level overview of the model requirements and level of detail would be helpful

University Response:

High level planning, but at a level that is helpful for decisions around cashflow and timing impacts of the project. The capital budget needs to be able to generate budgets at the Legislative appropriation levels.

32. Line item detail – does this represent GL account line item level or do you require further breakdown below the GL (it items / transaction level detail)

University Response:

No, we do not require any breakdown below the GL account level.

33. Can you please describe the nature of Peoplesoft integration – is the objective to source name level detail and do workforce planning for the ~10,000 staff? If so can you please outline the methodology – name level vs position / function, detail for benefits and payroll taxes vs fringe benefit calculation etc

University Response:

During the scoping phase it will be determined what level of data will be loaded from Peoplesoft. It is important to load the position titles, the funding source, the mapping into the budget model, salary, fringe and what union type the position maps to.

34. Would the University consider revising Section E.1 and Appendix F to recognize experience serving organizations of comparable or greater size, scale, and complexity, such as U.S. state governments, in addition to higher education institutions? Vendors implementing statewide budgeting and financial management solutions often address requirements equally or more complex than those of higher education institutions, including multi-entity budgeting, diverse funding sources, personnel planning, financial reporting, and ERP/HR integrations. We respectfully request the following revisions: Section E.1 – Minimum Qualifications: "A minimum of five (5) years of continuous experience in providing financial budgeting, planning, and management software solutions for higher education institutions or other organizations of comparable size and complexity, including state and local governments." Appendix F – Client References: "Offeror shall provide THREE (3) references from higher education institutions or other organizations of comparable size and complexity, including state and local governments, that have utilized the Offeror's comprehensive cloud-based financial budgeting, planning and management software solution." These revisions would maintain the University's emphasis on demonstrated enterprise experience while encouraging broader competition and avoiding the exclusion of qualified vendors based solely on industry sector. Furthermore, Section E.2 already recognizes experience in "higher education or comparably complex environments." Applying this same standard to Section E.1 and Appendix F would ensure consistency across the University's qualification requirements.

University Response:

Yes, this would be acceptable. Refer to Amendment No. 1.

35. Reference: Appendix F, question F.2 Organizational Capability. Our reference sites in higher education are for statewide budget systems which include all state agencies including the state university system, however the contracts are signed with the central budget office or Department of Management or similar agencies. As such, they would have to be the nominated reference. Would the University accept such references where the institutions of higher education are subsidiary to the statewide budget system?

University Response:

Yes, that would be acceptable.

36. Please describe the on-site presence the University expects during implementation and training (e.g., kickoff, design workshops, campus training on neighbor islands) and confirm whether travel should be included as a fixed amount within C.5.1 or will be reimbursed separately at University rates.

University Response:

That is up to the vendor to decide what is the best approach to deliver a successful project for the University. This is a very important project for the University so we expect the vendor to deliver a high caliber project. It is up to the vendor to decide how they can best achieve this outcome.

37. Please confirm whether an Offeror must be registered to do business in Hawai‘i (DCCA) and compliant in Hawai‘i Compliance Express at the time of proposal submission, or only prior to contract execution.

University Response:

The offeror does not need to be registered to do business in Hawaii and does not need to have a valid certificate of vendor compliance at the time of proposal submission. A valid certificate of vendor compliance will be required prior to award, if an award is made.

38. Please confirm which organizations are in scope beyond the ten campuses and Systemwide Administration: the Research Corporation of the University of Hawai‘i (RCUH), the UH Foundation, the Cancer Center, JABSOM, athletics and auxiliary enterprises (housing, bookstores, parking). For RCUH data referenced in §2.5(B)(2)(a), please indicate whether integration is required for initial acceptance or is a later-phase objective.

University Response:

Yes, the whole University is in scope, all of the different entities that make up the University. RCUH data will need to be loaded in order to account for all revenue sources.

39. If RCUH, the UH Foundation, the Cancer Center, JABSOM, athletics or auxiliary enterprises are in scope, to what extent does the University expect the solution to accommodate the distinct ways each of these units budgets and operates (for example, sponsored-project and indirect-cost budgeting, gift and endowment spending rules, clinical and practice-plan revenue, ticket and auxiliary revenue models), rather than conforming them to a single systemwide budget methodology? Please also indicate when in the implementation the University expects to extend to these units the flexibility to budget and model at the level of detail their decentralized processes require, and whether that flexibility is a go-live requirement or a later-phase objective.

University Response:

UH Foundation is out of scope for this implementation. The Cancer Center and JABSOM are part of the Manoa Campus Budget and is in scope as well as auxiliary services. During the scoping phase we will design how each of the components will be handle and how they will be consolidated into the final budget. For go-live on phase 1 all components of the operating budget as to be included. The 6 year forward plan can be included in a phase 2 go-live.

40. Please provide a detailed account of all solutions and platforms currently used to support the as-is budgeting, planning and forecasting process at the System and campus levels (for example, the KFS Budget Construction module, spreadsheets and shared workbooks, departmental databases, reporting or BI tools, and any point solutions for position, tuition or capital planning), including the owning unit and the function each serves. Please also identify any other solutions or platforms in use within specialized groups, or being piloted anywhere across the institution, that the University may wish to leverage for this initiative if there is a compelling reason to do so.

University Response:

The current budget system is mainly Excel spreadsheets. The University does not want to replicate the old system. The University wants to build a new budgeting system that can used for scenario modelling, decision support over at least 6 years. The system should be able to do the required State budgeting reports and create a new budget model that connects to the KFS, PeopleSoft and E-Banner software to load data and help automate the budget drivers.

41. Is the Kuali DataMart the only data layer currently used to extract and report on KFS data, or does the University also maintain an enterprise data warehouse, operational data store or data lake that would serve as the preferred source for this solution? Please also describe the integration tooling and middleware available to the University (for example, an enterprise service bus or iPaaS, API gateway, managed file transfer, ETL/ELT tools, scheduling and orchestration), which of these the standardized ITS integration framework comprises, and whether Offerors are expected to use that tooling or may propose their own connectors.

University Response:

The University does not have a data warehouse or data lake. The University will use combination of API integration and file transfers. The University will be open to suggestions on other integration options.

42. Please confirm the relationship/connection between this RFP and UH Hilo RFP 26-5356 (April 2026): describe discrete reasons why that solicitation was cancelled or superseded, whether its requirements and published answers apply here, and what financial planning products the University or any of its campuses have evaluated or seen demonstrated to date as part of that cycle before its cancellation.

University Response:

The RFP replaces the UH Hilo RFP. The University has decided to implement a system wide integrated budgeting system that will benefit the whole University. This is a new

RFP and will not take into consideration any responses to the Hilo RFP 26-5356. We will not be supplying any information that pertains to that RFP. We suggest that all respondents focus on this RFP.

43. §2.5(C)(6) and (C)(15) require access from Windows, Linux and macOS through a browser- and device-agnostic interface, and (C)(5) requires mobile access. Please confirm that all end-user functions — budget input, workflow approvals, reporting and dashboards — must be available in a standard web browser on each of those platforms without a locally installed Excel add-in or desktop client, and that an Excel add-in may be offered only as an optional convenience but not used as the primary interface for aspect of this project or deployment.

University Response:

Yes, the input has to be through a web browser with the ability to also use Excel as an add-in for convenience. Excel should not be primary interface but most people would want to use Excel.

44. Appendix E.5 and §2.5(B)(2)(h) call for native, interactive data visualization that allows non-financial users to interpret budgets without manual manipulation. Please confirm that dashboards and visualizations must be delivered within the proposed planning platform itself, under the same security model and login, and that reliance on a separately licensed business-intelligence product (or export to one) would not satisfy E.5.

University Response:

Yes, the preference is to use the Budgeting tool to do the visualization and dashboards. The University does not want to purchase and maintain 2 software platforms.

45. §1.1 and §2.5(A)(4) and (B)(1)(f) require a single integrated platform that combines budget automation, workflow, short- and long-range planning, tuition and labor planning and financial reporting. Please confirm that §2.5(B)(1) through (B)(5) must be delivered within one platform sharing one data model, one security model and one user login, and that a proposal combining separately licensed modules or products from different publishers, or addressing only a subset of §2.5(B), would be considered non-responsive.

University Response:

Yes, the budgeting system must be provided on a single platform. The University does not want to maintain or purchase multiple systems.

46. §2.5(A)(1)–(2) require that the system be modified, maintained and run primarily by University finance staff with minimal coding and that administrators can change entities, hierarchies and calculation methodologies without vendor reconfiguration. Please confirm that the University expects budget-office staff — without scripting, SQL or programming skills and without IT involvement — to be able to add a campus or unit, change a hierarchy or driver methodology, change an approver, and build or modify a report, and that the skill level required to do so (§3.5(A)(3), (B)(7)) will be considered in the evaluation.

University Response:

Yes, that is correct. The University is open to receiving advice from the vendor around recommended skills requirements.

47. §2.5(B)(1)(i) requires that iterative what-if analysis remain quickly accessible on large data sets, and (C)(3) and (C)(7) require scalability and performance at quarter- and year-end. Please state the expected number of concurrent users during peak budget development and confirm that the University expects a six-year, all-campus, position-level scenario to recalculate interactively (seconds) rather than through scheduled or batch recalculation.

University Response:

During budget preparation we anticipate half of the user base will require assess to the budget models. The University would be open to explore scheduled or batch processing but would prefer real time calculations.

48. §2.5(A)(1)–(2) require that calculation methodologies be changed by University staff with minimal coding. Please confirm that budget drivers, allocation rules, labor and fringe calculations and forecast formulas must be defined and modified through a configurable, non-programmatic interface by finance staff, and that solutions in which such business rules are implemented in a programming or scripting language (for example VB.NET, Groovy, SQL or Python) will be assessed accordingly under §3.5(A)(3) and (B)(7) and potentially be deemed non-responsive.

University Response:

The Budgeting team at University will not be able to write VB.Net, Groovy , SQL scripts or Python coding. If that is a requirement for the Budget solution then that will not be acceptable.

49. §2.5(B)(1)(i) and (B)(1)(f) require iterative what-if analysis and long-range scenario planning. Please confirm that end users must be able to create, copy, compare and discard scenarios and versions on demand — across the full six-year horizon and at the position and account level — without administrator setup of new scenario members, data reloads or consolidation runs, and that the number of concurrent scenarios must not be limited by the proposed license or architecture.

University Response:

End users will not be required to create, copy and discard scenarios or version control. Administrators of the system will be able to perform these functions. Administrators will set up new scenarios and load data. Not sure what is meant by the number of concurrent scenarios must not be limited to the proposed license or architecture?

50. For the aggregation of data, used by Board of Regents and/or the system office, what level of detail is required? Would it be all of the chart field segments? Would it be at a more summary level across ‘some’ of the chart field segments?

University Response:

The Board of Regents will require a more summarized view but the system office will require access to the lowest level of data included in the solution.

51. For the Multi Year (6 year) Plan or Scenario Modeling, would this be executed at a system level, Campus level, college/school level, or more granular?

University Response:

The 6-year plan may be at a more summarized level than the operational budget.

52. Is the Kuali system and HR system managed at a central level? Or does each campus manage and own their own (is there a central repository of data for financials and HR)?

University Response:

Kuali and the HR systems are managed at a central level.

53. While the campuses are all using Kuali, are they all utilizing the same chart field segments and IDs? In other words, if Office Supplies is code 61000 at campus-1, is the same code also office supplies at campus-2? Or do they maintain different charts?

University Response:

All the campuses maintain the same chart of accounts.

54. For Tuition planning, is the goal to use counts of enrollment, credit hours, and rates, by various detail (career, residency, term, modality, etc.) to build up tuition, fees, and financial aid? Or is the need at a more summary level?

University Response:

The plan is to use forecasted enrollment numbers, financial aid overlay scholarships, waivers, fall out rates and other macro factors that could influence enrollment numbers to calculate the different tuition revenue based on the set tuition rates.

55. For labor planning, can you validate that you would like to plan Salaries and associated accounts by position detail? If so, does your HR system capture vacant positions?

University Response:

Yes, we would like position details and the HR system does capture vacant positions.

56. For labor planning, does the system have split-funding, where a position can be funded across various funding segments (depts, funds, etc.)?

University Response:

Yes, the system has split funding.

57. There is mention of “operating and capital” budgeting. For capital budgeting, is the need to plan/budget by individual capital projects? If so, are capital projects part of the chart of accounts? Or are they outside of this?

University Response:

Yes, capital projects and CIP has accounts in Kuali.

58. Is there an organizational data warehouse, or is metadata and data to be sourced directly from source systems (Kulai, Peoplesoft, and Banner)?

University Response:

There is no data warehouse, data has to be sources directly from the source systems.

59. For this statement, “…support transfers between units…” -- Does this refer to the idea of executing budget transfers as part of the initial budget build? Or does this refer to planners/admins executing budget adjustments after the budget is approved, and the cycle moves into the budget year?

University Response:

Both, budget transfer should be possible before and after the budget approval.

60. Is there a need to push budget data back to Kuali?

University Response:

Yes.

61. Does the 12–18 month implementation window in §5.9.a include hypercare and post-go-live support, and what must be operational by month 12? Is go-live a single event or phased by campus or user group?

University Response:

We would prefer a single go live for the integrated operational budget for all campuses and the 6-year plan can be phased after the operational go live.

62. Section 1.1 asks for a five-year total cost of ownership, but Appendix C.5.4 scores three years. Which governs the scored price, and how should Years 4–5 be shown?

University Response:

Only year 1-3 will be scored and year 4 and 5 will be for information only purposes.

63. Which Banner and RCUH data integrations are required at go-live, and which can follow in a later phase? Is Ethos the expected route to Banner enrollment and workload data?

University Response:

Yes, Banner data integration is needed to go live. Ethos is the expected route to Banner enrollment. RCUH data is needed for the new budgeting system but it can be loaded via a data extract file.

64. Section 5.9.b keeps prices firm through renewals, but Appendix C.2 asks for a cap on percentage increases. Which applies?

University Response:

That is up to the respondents to decide how to set the costs.

65. Section 5.9.b prefers the software term start at acceptance. How should software access during implementation be priced, and does Year 1 in C.5.2 begin at Notice to Proceed or acceptance?

University Response:

That is up to the respondent to decide.

66. Section 2.5.A.5 identifies approximately 400 fiscal administrators, 30 supervisors at the campus administration level, and 10 at the system administration level. Of these users, please specify how many will require full administrative access to configure the system, deploy updates, and manage security; how many will need to actively input data and run planning scenarios; and how many will need read-only dashboard and report access. Please also indicate whether any additional users, such as executives or Board of Regents members, will require read-only access beyond these counts.

University Response:

Ten (10) will require full administration access. Of the other users we estimate 50 % will require active participation into the budgeting system and 50% will be read only users. No need for any additional Board of Regents access.

67. Please identify the University's identity provider and protocol, the attributes available for role@campus, and whether automated user provisioning (e.g., SCIM) is supported.

University Response:

Campus and Role Information: Role (faculty, staff, student) and campus information are available via attributes in Entra.

68. Has the University established a budget range or not-to-exceed amount for the software subscription and implementation services under RFP No. 27-6284?

University Response:

Yes, we have.

69. Section 1.1 references a five-year total cost of ownership, while Appendix C, C.5.4 scores cost on a three-year Total Evaluated Cost. Please confirm which basis will be used for cost scoring and whether Years 4 and 5 will be considered in any way.

University Response:

Only year 1-3 will be scored and year 4 and 5 will be for information only purposes.

70. The University prefers the software term to begin after go-live and acceptance. Because SaaS subscriptions typically begin at provisioning, how should Offerors price subscription fees during the 12 to 18-month implementation period, and should those fees appear as a separate line in Appendix C?

University Response:

That is up to the respondent to decide how to best price the solution.

71. This solicitation expands scope from UH Hilo (RFP No. 26-5356) to 10 campuses, 7 education centers, and Systemwide Administration. Does the University prefer a phased rollout (e.g., by campus, user group, or capability), and which campuses or capabilities should be live in the first phase?

University Response:

We are open to suggestions to best implement the solution. We would start with the Manoa campus.

72. Does the University have a target Notice to Proceed date and a specific budget development cycle the first go-live must support? Are there blackout periods (e.g., fiscal year close, legislative session, Board of Regents budget submissions) Offerors should account for?

University Response:

We are targeting January / February 2027 as a Notice to Proceed date. We are aiming for a go live in December 2027, depending on the scoping phase. There will be no blackout period that we anticipate will affect the budget system implementation.

73. Are there concurrent or planned initiatives (e.g., Kuali Financial System upgrades or replacement, PeopleSoft HR updates, Banner changes) that could impact the implementation timeline?

University Response:

No, there is nothing planned at this point in time.

74. Section 2.5-B.1.m requires support for KFS account structures "without translation nor transformation." Please confirm whether this means the planning solution must use the KFS chart of accounts structure as-is for end users, or whether mapping within the integration layer is acceptable.

University Response:

Mapping at the integration layer would be acceptable

75. In the prior UH Hilo Q&A, the University confirmed that UH ITS owns and maintains source-side extracts and APIs from KFS and PeopleSoft. Does this responsibility apply across all campuses, and does it extend to Banner workload measures and RCUH research data?

University Response:

Yes, UH ITS will own and maintain source-side extracts and API's across all campuses but the respondent will have to be part of designing what data needs to be included in the extract in order to deliver the budget solution.

76. For RCUH research data, which source systems and data elements are in scope, and should Offerors treat this integration as required, optional, or a separately priced item given the "to the extent possible and practical" language?

University Response:

RCUH data needs to be included in the budget model as it is a source of revenue that needs to be budgeted. The respondents can price this up separately if so required.

77. Is the UH ITS standardized integration framework still the expected integration approach, and are there specific middleware tools, file transfer methods, or API standards Offerors should plan to use?

University Response:

Yes, please plan to use file transfer methods as well as API integrations.

78. Section 3.5-D.7 requests PCI compliance confirmation. Since a budgeting and planning solution is not expected to store or process cardholder data, please confirm whether PCI DSS applies or whether an attestation that no cardholder data is in scope will suffice.

University Response:

An attestation will suffice.

79. The RFP describes approximately 440 users (400 fiscal administrators, 30 campus supervisors, 10 system-level). Can the University provide a breakdown by campus and confirm whether view-only users (e.g., executives, Board of Regents) are in addition to this count for licensing?

University Response:

Yes, we anticipate that 50% of the users will be reporting and view only.

80. For labor planning from PeopleSoft position control, what level of detail is required (position, employee, or job classification), and should the solution model collective bargaining agreement rules, step increases, and fringe rates by campus?

University Response:

Job classification level. Yes the model should be able to include the collective bargaining rates negotiated and calculate personnel costs based on step increases and fringe rates by campus.

81. How many years of historical actuals, budget, and forecast data should be loaded, and is that requirement the same for every campus?

University Response:

Four (4) Years of historical data.

82. What onsite presence does the University expect during implementation (e.g., fully remote, onsite during key phases), and should travel costs be included in the fixed price or invoiced separately?

University Response:

That is up to the respondents to decide how they can best implement the solution successfully.

83. The prior UH Hilo Q&A allowed offshore or nearshore resources with full disclosure. Does that guidance still apply to this systemwide solicitation, including any additional approval requirements under EP 2.214 and AP 2.215?

University Response:

Yes, that will be allowed.

84. Does the University require a firm fixed price for all implementation services, or is time and materials acceptable for any portion (e.g., optional services or change orders based on a rate card)?

University Response:

Both options are acceptable.

85. Has funding been approved for the full systemwide implementation, or is any phase contingent on future appropriations?

University Response:

Yes, funding has been approved.

86. What hypercare duration does the University prefer after each go-live, and should Offerors propose optional post-go-live functional application support (e.g., integration monitoring, model enhancements) beyond standard vendor support?

University Response:

We are looking for 3 years of support. It is up to the respondents to recommend, based on their experience with similar project, what levels of support an implementation like this will require.

87. What training delivery formats does the University prefer (e.g., train-the-trainer, live instructor-led, recorded), and should Offerors plan to deliver training on each island or centrally?

University Response:

That is up to the vendor to decide how they can best deliver the requirements.

88. For the minimum qualifications in Section 2.4-A and the references in Section 2.6 and Appendix F, may an implementation partner and the software provider combine their higher education experience and references to meet these requirements?

University Response:

Yes, that would be acceptable.

89. Appendix F.3 requests contract values for similar projects. Where client agreements restrict disclosure, may Offerors provide a value range instead?

University Response:

Yes, that would be acceptable.

90. Should Hawai‘i General Excise Tax be included in the Appendix C pricing, or shown as a separate line?

University Response:

Shown as a separate line please.

91. Does “without translation nor transformation” mean users plan on native KFS coding? Or does it also rule out any mapping or summarization when loading data, such as rolling sub-accounts up to account?

University Response:

We want to load directly from KFS and some mapping and roll ups may be needed in the budgeting system.

92. Does the approved budget need to be loaded back into KFS? If so, at what level of detail, and how?

University Response:

Yes, we will load back at the level we budgeted at via an API or other connection.

93. About how many positions are budgeted each year? Can one position be split-funded across multiple KFS accounts?

University Response:

We have around 10,000 staff and yes, a position can be split over multiple funding sources.

94. Will all campuses and Systemwide Administration use the same budget process and forms, or does each campus need its own?

University Response:

We want to aim for as much standardization across the system and the campuses as possible.

95. Should the six-year forecast be built at the same detail as the operating budget, or at a summary level?

University Response:

The six-year model can be built after the operating model and a more summarized will be acceptable.

96. Should role and campus security be fully automated from UH's identity management system, or can some group assignments be maintained manually by an administrator?

University Response:

Automation should be supported, but there will be situations where the Budget Office will want to override group assignments.

97. Is a phased go-live acceptable? For example, operating budget and labor planning first, then the six-year forecast and tuition planning.

University Response:

It depends on the timing between phases. We cannot go live on the operating model without the tuition model to feed tuition revenue.

98. For implementation, is there a preference between using the vendor's in-house team or using a certified 3rd party implementation partner?

University Response:

There is no preference, we will be open to suggestions from respondents. The main focus is a successful implementation.

99. Is there a targeted go-live date for implementation? If so, what use cases or processes would be considered must haves for that phase 1 MVP?

University Response:

Yes, we want to go live around December, 2027.

100. The RFP includes 400 fiscal administrators, plus 30 supervisors and another 10 at the system administrator level. Can we assume that the 10 would be "power" users or have full admin? Can you please clarify how the other 430 are broken by user type - budget contributor (input) or view-only

University Response:

Yes, the 10 will be power or administration users. We estimate that the other users will be split 50/50 between view only and budget contribution users.

101. What is the total number of accounts currently being used?

University Response:

A few thousand accounts.

102. Do all 10 campuses and 7 Educational centers use the same chart of accounts?

University Response:

Yes.

103. Do all 10 campuses and 7 Educational centers use the same budgeting process? i.e. standard input forms, standard calculations, etc.

University Response:

No, they use different processes but all the data is supplied to the University System Budget Office in the same Excel formats.

104. Do you budget by Employee, Position, or both?

University Response:

By position.

105. Does the University budget by Unions?

University Response:

Yes.

106. How many unions are there?

University Response:

3 Unions.

107. Does each union have its own step and grade matrix?

University Response:

Yes.

108. Are Grade/Step calculations required?

University Response:

Yes.

109. How many different Step and Grade matrices are there?

University Response:

A few hundred.

110. Does the current system calculation salaries base on step and grade?

University Response:

Yes.

111. Do you budget at the same level that you report Actuals?

University Response:

There are many different levels that actuals are reported at. Budgets will also be reporting at multiple level but not at a transactional level.

112. Do you use an account code segment to define the data? i.e. account-cost center-fund-project, etc.

University Response:

Yes, we do.

113. Are allocation calculations required in the budget system?

University Response:

Yes.

114. Will business rules and calculations be performed in the budget system? If they are required, how many business rules/calculations are required?

University Response:

Yes, budget rules and calculations are required in the budget system. The number of rules and calculations will depend on the scoping phase.

115. Are the current state/desired future state calculations and processes relatively well documented?

University Response:

Some are and some are not.

116. How many reports are required to be produced using the new system?

University Response:

It depends on the requirements from the users that will be identified during the scoping phase.

117. Does the project team need to be on-site or is remote work acceptable?

University Response:

It is up to the respondents to decide what is the best way to deliver a successful project.

118. Is there a requirement for a budget book?

University Response:

There is a requirement for system training from the respondents. It is up to the respondents to decide what training format is the best to use for a large implementation such as this. The University will do our own end user training and manuals.

119. To what level of detail are you looking to budget capital projects?

University Response:

A more summarized level.

120. Would you like us to respond to Sections 2 & 3 in addition to Appendix D (D1-D5), or should we address the requirements of Sections 2 & 3 within Appendix D?

University Response:

Please include the requirements of Section 2 and 3 within Appendix D.

121. 1. Implementation approach Does the University expect all ten campuses and Systemwide Administration to be implemented and go live together, or would the University consider a phased implementation? 2. Implementation timing Within the stated 12–18 month implementation window, does the University have a target go-live date or budget cycle that the implementation must support? 3. Current-state process variation How different are the budgeting and forecasting processes across the ten campuses and Systemwide Administration? Should proposers assume the implementation will include process standardization in addition to system configuration? 4. Internal project team Does the University anticipate assigning a dedicated internal project team to support the implementation? If so, what roles or level of effort should proposers assume across Finance, IT, HR, and the campuses? 5. Data migration What historical budgeting, forecasting, and actual financial data does the University expect to migrate into the new solution? 6. Integrations Beyond KFS and PeopleSoft, should proposers include integration with Banner, RCUH, or other institutional data sources in the base implementation scope? If so, approximately how many additional data feeds should be assumed? 7. Integration readiness Are existing KFS, PeopleSoft, and other integration specifications/interface documentation available, or should proposers include time to define and document the required interfaces during implementation? 8. Reporting scope Should proposers assume the implementation will include recreating existing financial and budget reports, or primarily configuring new reporting and dashboards within the solution? 9. University resources What level of University staff participation should proposers assume during implementation, including finance, IT, HR, campus budget offices, and departmental users?

University Response:

1. **The University would prefer that all campuses, as well as the systemwide administration goes live at the same time for the operational budget.**

2. **The University would like to go live in December 2027.**

3. **The processes are very different between campuses but the budgeting solution must standardize configuration across all the areas of the University.**

4. **Yes, UH will provide the following staffing:**

   - **Project Sponsor (1 FTE)**
   - **Project Manager (1FTE)**
   - **Model Builder (1FTE)**
   - **Systems Administrator (1 FTE)**
   - **Data Analyst (1 FTE)**
   - **Budget Analyst (2 FTE)**

   UH will have 7 dedicated FTE's to the project but will have support from IT, HR, Procurement and all the campus budget office.

5. **4 Years of historic data.**

6. Data sources will only be KFS, Peoplesoft, and Banner.

7. There are some documentation available, but it would be prudent to include time to document the integration sources into the budgeting system to understand the data for reconciliation purposes.

8. Legislative reports will remain as it is currently required by the Legislature. For all other reports please include in the scope time to build new reports and dashboard.

9. See number 4 above.

122. 10. Training approach Does the University have a preferred training model, such as centralized training, train-the-trainer, or direct training of end users across the campuses? 11. Change readiness What readiness or organizational change assessments has the University completed to date related to implementing a systemwide budgeting and planning solution? What, if any, change management activities or plans are already underway? 12. Change and training resources Does the University have dedicated internal resources for change management, communications, training, and user adoption, or should proposers assume the implementation team will provide most or all of these capabilities? 13. On-site work Should proposers assume that implementation, training, and key project meetings will require an in-person presence in Hawai‘i, or may these activities be delivered primarily virtually? 14. Customization expectations Should proposers assume the University expects to primarily use standard/configurable functionality, or should the implementation scope include significant customization to accommodate existing University processes? 15. Post-go-live support What level and duration of post-go-live support should proposers assume in the base implementation scope? The RFP requires ongoing support but does not define a specific implementation/hypercare period.

University Response:

10. The University is open to suggestions on what training methodology will work best to train over 400 users across multiple islands and campuses.

11. The project team is using a modified Kotter's model. We are in phase 1 of communicating the vision. We are open to having the respondent also suggest and supply change frameworks and agents if the benefits will be a better project implementation.

12. The University will not have dedicated change management people on this project but change management will be part of the project managers role. For training and end user adoption the University budget office will have dedicated staff that will work with the respondent to best supply training and end user adoption.

13. It is up to the respondents to decide what is the best approach to deliver a successful project of this scale.

14. The University would prefer standard/configurable functionality and not significant customization.

15. That is up to the respondents to recommend based on their experience with large complex models like these.

123. For SSO, can you please clarify the University's identity provider?

University Response:

The University uses Microsoft Entra ID (SAML).

124. Our organization maintains a Certificate of Insurance (COI) that covers our operations. As a SaaS provider, our insurance coverage may differ from the requirements outlined. Could the university confirm whether alternative insurance coverage would be considered? A copy of our COI can be shared for your review upon signing a mutual NDA.

University Response:

The University Office of Risk Management and Procurement team will review the COI and determine if that is sufficient for the University.

125. Please describe UH's project pre-work to analyze the budget processes across the 10 campuses and additional locations across the UH System.

University Response:

UH System Budget Office have been conducting interviews with all the UH campuses around their budget process and data dependencies and data requirements. The campuses have also shared what their expectations are of the new budgeting system. Source data has also been looked at in terms of what data will be available to the budget system.

126. Is there a single budget and forecast process that all locations within UH follow?

University Response:

No, campuses follow their own processes. The campuses do provide a final budget in a consistent format to the UH Budget Office.

127. What would the budget leader at each campus describe as unique about the budget and forecast process across their individual location?

University Response:

This is a lot of information that will be shared with the successful respondent during the scoping phase of the project.

128. How would you handle a situation during the design phase where one location wants to budget differently from another location?

University Response:

The UH Budget system will facilitate the discussions to help create consensus. The Budget Office may get input from the CFO or President if needed. The Project Manager from UH will be responsible to coordinate a resolution for any design questions or conflicts.

129. What level of on-site presence is desired during the implementation?

University Response:

That depends on the recommendation from the respondent.

130. What is the planned staffing level from the University of Hawaii to support the project? Please provide Roles and estimated FTE.

University Response:

UH will provide the following staffing:

1. **Project Sponsor (1 FTE)**
2. **Project Manager (1FTE)**
3. **Model Builder (1FTE)**
4. **Systems Administrator (1 FTE)**
5. **Data Analyst (1 FTE)**
6. **Budget Analyst (2 FTE)**

UH will have 7 dedicated FTE's to the project but will have support from IT, HR, Procurement and all the campus budget offices.

131. Do you anticipate system administrators to be located at the System Office, Campuses, and/or Education Centers? (We assume end users will be at all locations, but we're specifically interested in system administrators.)

University Response:

System administration is the responsibility of the ITS system office and functional responsibility belongs to the Budget Office.

132. Can you provide the definitions for each Chart of Account (CoA) segment used in KFS for financial transactions?

University Response:

We will do that during the scoping phase.

133. What is UH's stance on two vendor agreements; one agreement with the software provider and one with an implementation partner?

University Response:

Yes, we are open to this type of arrangement.

134. 2.b - Do you desire to use the financial reports from the new system for UH's Annual Financial Statement?

University Response:

No, KFS will be used for the Annual Financial Statements.

135. A.5 - Of the expected users, do any users only require reporting access (view-only)?

University Response:

Yes, we anticipate only 50% of the users only need reporting access and the University would like to understand if there is a migration path and estimated cost for these licenses in the future to transition to contribution licenses.

136. Section 4.2 says the top four offerors give live presentations and also says the top three are contacted for web presentations. Section 3.9 allows up to four in-person demos. How many offerors will present, and in what format?

University Response:

The inconsistencies have been corrected. Refer to Amendment No. 1.

Offeror's may present in person or fully remote options are both are acceptable. It is up to the offeror to decided how they would want to present their solution.

137. Section 1.1 says evaluation uses a five-year total cost of ownership. Appendix C says cost is scored on a three-year evaluated cost, with years 4 and 5 shown but not scored. Which governs the cost score?

University Response:

The University will only score years 1-3 and years 4 and 5 are for information purposes only.

138. Does UH System expect to provide change management resources? Is there an in-house change management team at UH?

University Response:

UH System will not provide any inhouse change management resources. The UH project team will use some of the current UH change frameworks and we welcome suggested best practice or resources from the respondent's experience with project that are of this nature and size.

139. Section 1.8 may disqualify proposals with contradictory terms, and Section 5.14 says the RFP controls. Will the University accept a short list of stated exceptions, or must the proposal take no exceptions?

University Response:

The University will accept a short list of stated exceptions.

140. How many environments does UH need (production, test, development), and should they appear as priced line items in C.5.1?

University Response:

At least two: production and test.

141. Has UH seen or participated in any budgeting software demonstrations in the last 24 months? If so, what software did they see?

University Response:

The University System Budget Office has not been part of any budget demonstration in the last 24 months.

5. Services for adding data elements and corresponding reports.

6. Specify nature, costs, and conditions of any post-implementation support.

G. License and Maintenance Agreements

Append sample license and maintenance agreements/contracts to the proposal for all components and recommended solution.

3.6 MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS (Appendix E)

The Offeror Minimum Qualifications shown in Appendix E and referred to in Section 2.4 shall be submitted together with all of the required supporting documentation to establish that all minimum qualifications have been met.

3.7 EXPERIENCE & QUALIFICATIONS (Appendix F)

Offeror shall provide organizational information relevant to the University's decision-making process to support Offeror's ability to deliver a comprehensive cloud-based financial budgeting, planning and management software solution designed specifically for higher education institutions.

Offeror shall provide THREE (3) references from higher education institutions comparable to the University in student headcount and workforce, and have benefited from a comprehensive cloud-based financial budgeting, planning and management software solutions provided by the vendor. The various funding streams available to UH should also be considered: state general funds, tuition revenue, auxiliary operations, and extramurally funded research activities. The Offeror is highly encouraged to select references whose institutions utilize Kuali Financial System (KFS) and Oracle PeopleSoft as their financial and human resources management systems. The Offeror shall provide the name of the institution, address, contact persons and positions, phone numbers, email address, and full-time equivalent of the institution.

The University may at its sole discretion contact the references to determine the Offeror's expertise and knowledge in providing a comprehensive, cloud-based financial budgeting, planning and management software solution for higher education institutions of similar size.

3.8. REQUIREMENTS COMPLIANCE MATRIX (Appendix G)

Offerors shall complete the Requirements Compliance Matrix (**Appendix G**) to clearly indicate the extent to which the proposed solution meets each requirement specified in this RFP. For each requirement, Offerors must identify whether they comply ("Yes" or "No"), provide a concise description of how the requirement is met, and reference the specific section(s) of their proposal supporting the response.

The Compliance Matrix will be used by the evaluation committee to validate technical responsiveness, ensure consistency across proposals, and support a fair and transparent evaluation process. Failure to complete the matrix in its entirety, provide sufficient detail, or accurately represent compliance may result in a lower evaluation score or the proposal being deemed non-responsive.

initial evaluation. The University will select the top FOUR (4) Offerors receiving the highest total score for the initial evaluation.

The top FOUR (4) Offerors as determined by the initial evaluation shall be required to give a live presentation of their proposal to the evaluation committee. The University shall contact the top **four** offerors of the initial evaluation to schedule a date and time for the web-based presentations.

The final evaluation shall be based on the criteria set forth below in Section 4.2.2, Final Evaluation. Each individual on the evaluation committee will provide scores for each Offeror not to exceed the maximum number of points allowed for the final evaluation. The score of the evaluation committee will be totaled for each Offeror).

The University reserves the right to bypass the initial evaluation and move straight into the final evaluation in the event that only **four** proposals or less are received.

4.2.1 INITIAL EVALUATION CRITERIA AND POINT ALLOCATION:

Proposals will be initially evaluated based on a total of 100 points as follows:

A) Technical Solution and Approach – 30 points

Evaluation will be based on the Offeror's demonstrated ability to meet the functional and technical requirements of the RFP:

- Alignment with budgeting, forecasting, and financial planning requirements (10 points)
- System architecture, scalability, and configurability (5 points)
- Integration capability with enterprise systems (e.g., KFS, PeopleSoft, or equivalent) (5 points)
- Data management, reporting, and analytics functionality (5 points)
- Implementation methodology, including timeline, milestones, and risk mitigation (5 points)

B) Experience and Qualifications – 20 points

Evaluation will be based on:

- Experience implementing similar systems in higher education and/or public sector environments (5 points)
- Strategic commitment to higher education (5 points)
- Qualifications and experience of proposed key personnel (5 points)
- Demonstrated success with comparable project size, scope, and complexity (5 points)

F) Past Performance and References – 10 points

Evaluation will be based on:

- Quality and relevance of references for similar projects (5 points)

- Demonstrated record of successful implementation and customer satisfaction (5 points)

Total Possible Points for Initial Evaluation: 100

4.2.2 DEMONSTRATION AND FINAL EVALUATION:

The University's evaluation committee will select the top FOUR (4) Offerors receiving the highest total score for the initial evaluation. If fewer than FOUR (4) Offeror proposals are acceptable, then the University may, at its option, proceed with fewer than FOUR (4) Offeror proposals through the remainder of the evaluation process.

Those Offerors selected shall be required to provide a live demonstration of their proposal to the evaluation committee, as set forth in Section **3.9**. Up to 20 points may be awarded in addition to the initial evaluation to determine an Offeror's final score.

A) Initial Evaluation Score – Maximum 100 points

B) Solution Demonstration (20 Points)

Evaluation will be based on:

- Ease of use by end users and administrators (5 points)
- Responsiveness (5 points)
- Other factors as may be determined by the evaluation committee (10 points)

4.3 AWARD OF CONTRACT

Award of the contract, if awarded, shall be made to the Offeror receiving the highest total score after the final evaluation. The University reserves the right to bypass the initial evaluation and move straight into the final evaluation in the event that only **four** or fewer acceptable proposals are received.

APPENDIX E
MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS

The Offeror Minimum Qualifications shown in Appendix E and referred to in Section 2.4 shall be submitted together with all of the required documents and information to establish that all minimum qualifications have been met, and address the specific requirements as follows:

E.1 A minimum of five (5) years of continuous experience in providing financial budgeting, planning and management software solutions for higher education institutions**, or other organizations of comparable size and complexity, including state and local governments**.

E.2 Demonstrated experience integrating financial planning or budgeting solutions with enterprise resource planning and/or human resources systems in higher education or comparably complex environments. Experience with KFS and/or Oracle PeopleSoft is preferred.

E.3 Evidence of compliance with secure data transfer protocols, user authentication and data encryption, and applicable data privacy regulations.

E.4 Examples of ease of use for both financial staff and non-financial budget “end users”.

E.5 Examples that feature native, interactive data visualization tools (e.g., dashboards with charts, graphs, and heat maps) that allow non-financial end users to interpret department budgets without manual manipulation.

APPENDIX F
EXPERIENCE & QUALIFICATIONS / REFERENCES

Offeror shall provide organizational information relevant to the University's decision-making process to support Offeror's ability to deliver a comprehensive cloud-based financial budgeting, planning and management software solution designed specifically for higher education institutions.

F.1 Key Personnel

Provide:
- Name and role
- Qualifications and certifications
- Relevant experience

F.2 Organizational Capability

Describe the organization's ability to deliver and support the proposed solution

Offeror shall provide THREE (3) references from higher education institutions comparable to the University in size and project scope**, including state and local governments,** that have utilized the Offeror's comprehensive cloud-based financial budgeting, planning and management software solution.

The Offeror shall provide the institution name, address, contact person, title, phone number, email address, and institution size.

The University may contact references to evaluate the Offeror's experience, qualifications, and past performance."

F.3 Relevant Project Experience

Provide a minimum of three (3) projects of similar size and scope, including:

- Client name
- Project description
- Contract value
- Implementation timeline
- Outcome