DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES/OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY FOR HUMAN SERVICES (OTHS)
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) FOR
AUTOMATED FISCAL SYSTEM (AFS) MODERNIZATION PROJECT

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES #9

Question 29: What are the current transaction volumes per annum for the following?
a. Journal Entries b. Accounts Payable Invoices c. Check payments d. AR Receipts

Response: **DHR cannot provide this information. However, during State Fiscal Year 2015 (July 1, 2014- June 30, 2015), the legacy AFS processed $69,401.650.82 in payments.**

Question 30: DHR states in Section 1.1.1 that the replacement AFS "will be provisioned as a vendor-hosted Software-As-A-Service (SaaS) solution" and provides the definition of SaaS in Section 1.2. On its website, Gartner, Inc., defines software as a service (SaaS) as:

"Software that is owned, delivered and managed remotely by one or more providers. The provider delivers software based on one set of common code and data definitions that is consumed in a one-to-many model by all contracted customers at anytime on a pay-for-use basis or as a subscription based on use metrics."

While the definitions are similar, the "one-to-many model" is what differentiates SaaS from other cloud-like solutions, including hosted software. Is DHR considering hosted as well as SaaS solutions? If so, how will DHR evaluate the various proposed cloud platforms to account for the different delivery/deployment models? For example, it is recommended that the economic benefits should be considered over a 10-year timeline to truly understand the costs associated with the various types of cloud solutions and their ability to deliver continuous innovation and regulatory compliance.

Response: **The State wants to acquire a fully-functioning, vendor-managed solution that meets all stated functional and technical requirements. The State will be amenable to other "cloud-like" solutions if, and only if, the vendor's solution meets these stated requirements, including vendor-managed infrastructure provisioning, credential management, and the delivery of modular capabilities as stipulated within the solicitation.**

Question 31: Because SaaS relies on delivering a one-to-many solution for customers, will DHR consider evaluating the standard SLAs that are used to deliver SaaS solutions across a vendor's entire customer base while addressing the concerns outlined in the RFP's SLA (Section 3.12)?

Response: **No. DHR requires the SaaS solution to be customized/configured separately from any other customer/application user and provisioned for a DHR-specific environment. Therefore, DHR will analyze the SLAs in Section 3.12 based on how the system performs for DHR and its users, not a vendor's entire customer base.**

Question 32: Many SaaS vendors provide independent SOC 2/Type 2 reports (Section 3.11 of the RFP) for their entire customer base/infrastructure at predetermined timeframes. Paragraph 3.11.1 states that DHR will determine whether the Contractor and/or Subcontractors' current information security assessments are acceptable in lieu of the SOC 2 Report. Does this also apply to current SOC 2/Type 2 reports that do not incorporate the DHR/Maryland specific items listed in Section 3.11?

Response: **Yes, DHR will consider SOC 2/TYPE 2 reports that do not incorporate the DHR/Maryland-specific items listed in RFP Section 3.11.**

Question 33: Independent SOC 2/Type 2 reports for a vendor's entire customer base/infrastructure,that are provided at predetermined timeframes, are typically considered confidential and released only with a signed, two-way non-disclosure agreement. Is DHR willing to modify Attachment K (Non-Disclosure Agreement) to protect both DHR and the Contractor/Subcontractor's proprietary information?

Response: **DHR will _consider_ modifying the Non-Disclosure Agreement (NDA) in the event it awards the contract to a vendor who typically uses SOC 2/Type 2 reports that cover the vendor's entire user base. However, DHR will not commit to modifying the NDA at this time.**