COLUMBUS CONSOLIDATED GOVERNMENT
Georgia's First Consolidated Government

FINANCE DEPARTMENT
PURCHASING DIVISION

1111 1ST Avenue, P. O. Box 1340
Columbus, Georgia 31902-1340
706-225-4087 | www.columbusga.gov

November 9, 2026

ADDENDUM No. 4

Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) System
RFP No. 27-0008

Use the form provided in the solicitation to acknowledge receipt of this addendum. Failure to do so may result in your submittal being deemed non-responsive and not receiving further consideration for award.

Vendors are informed that the above subject solicitation is hereby modified, corrected, or supplemented as specified, described and set forth in this Addendum:

I. DUE DATE

The due date for this RFP remains as stated in Addendum No. 3:

Proposals are due Friday, November 13, 2026, no later than 5:00 PM.

The City will not be accepting any further questions or requests for clarification.

II. QUESTION(S)/RESPONSE(S)

Question 1: As written, complying with one mandatory submission requirement (Section 10.B) appears to trigger automatic disqualification under another (Section 7.A). Without clarification, vendors must either omit required documents or risk a non-responsive determination, and neither party can price contractual risk accurately.

Response: There is no known correlation between the two referenced sections which would trigger automatic disqualification.

Question 2: The RFP contains two different indemnity provisions: General Provisions Item I (and Detailed Specifications Section V) limits indemnity to losses "resulting from, arising out of, or in any way connected with the Contractor's intentional, negligent, or grossly negligent acts or omissions," while General Provisions Item R (Hold Harmless Agreement) requires the vendor to indemnify the City against "any loss or expense including attorney fees, by reason of any liability imposed by law upon the City, except in cases of the City's sole negligence." Which provision governs in the event of conflict? Additionally, the RFP contains no

limitation of liability and no separate third-party intellectual property infringement indemnity; will the City accept a mutual limitation of liability and a distinct IP infringement indemnity in the final agreement?

Response: **In the event of conflict, the City's attorney will determine which provision governs. However, offerors should submit all additional documents that the City should consider as an exception to their submission.**

Question 3: Please confirm which entities are in scope for the ERP implementation. Specifically, is the scope limited to the primary government, or does it also include any of the discretely presented or blended component units and related entities (Columbus Water Works, Columbus Airport Commission, Hospital Authority of Columbus, Columbus Iron Works Convention and Trade Center Authority, Columbus Golf Authority, Columbus Convention and Visitors Bureau, Columbus Department of Public Health, Land Bank Authority, Columbus Building Authority), and the separately elected/constitutional offices and courts (Sheriff, Tax Commissioner, Coroner, Clerk of Superior Court, Probate, Municipal/Recorder's, Magistrate, Muscogee County Prison)?

Response: **The RFP does not enumerate all entities included in the implementation and such is not relevant to evaluate ERP proposals. However, as a Consolidated Government, all city and county functions are considered to be part of the primary government.**

Question 4: The RFP does not provide any transaction or user volumes. Please provide:

a. the number of named and/or concurrent users required by module;

b. the number of employees paid per cycle, the number and frequency of pay cycles, and the number of pay groups;

c. annual counts of requisitions, purchase orders, AP invoices, checks/EFT payments, journal entries, and cash receipts;

d. the number of active vendors and the number of funds, departments, and budget units; and

e. the number of bank accounts requiring reconciliation. If a volume/user-count workbook exists, please issue it by addendum.

Response:

Number of users across all modules (active and inactive)	**9,686**
Number of active vendors	**5,393**
Number of Funds, Departments, and Units	**89 Funds, 76 Departments, 1,176 Units**
Number of Bank Account Reconciliations	**2**
Average number of employees paid per biweekly and monthly pay cycles	**3,400 Biweekly and 2,375 Monthly**
Average annual AP checks processed	**4,200**
Average annual EFT's processed	**350**

Average annual journal entries	**1,200**
Average annual cash receipts	**375**

Question 5: Section 3.4 (Accounts Receivable) lists only "Payment tracking, Delinquency tracking, Online bill payment." Please clarify whether the following revenue functions are in scope for the new ERP or will remain in separate systems: real and personal property tax billing and collection (including amounts billed and collected on behalf of the Muscogee County School District), occupation/business license tax, EMS/ambulance billing, court fines and fees (Recorder's, Municipal, State, Superior, Probate, Magistrate), integrated waste/sanitation billing, E-911 subscriber surcharge, hotel/motel and alcoholic beverage taxes, and centralized cash receipting/point-of-sale. If online payments are in scope, please confirm PCI DSS responsibilities and whether a specific payment gateway or merchant processor must be used.

Response: Accounts Receivable requirements are as stated in Detailed Specifications Section 3.4. Revenue functions not listed there are not specified in this solicitation. Integration capability is required under Section 8.4. With that, the only applicable receivable listed is relative to sanitation billing. Card transactions will not be an acceptable form of online payment at this time; therefore no specific merchant processor is mandated. ACH is the preferred method of online payment.

Question 6: Section 11.H requires proposers to describe "all interfaces and integrations to be developed, including interfaces with the City's other applications, financial institutions, benefit providers, and State and Federal reporting systems," but no interface inventory is provided. Please issue, by addendum, a complete list of required interfaces identifying for each: the third-party system and vendor, direction (inbound/outbound/bidirectional), frequency, data volume, whether an API exists, and whether the ERP vendor or the City is responsible for building and maintaining the interface. Please confirm whether NEOGOV (referenced in Section 8.4) will be retained.

Response: Section 8.4 names NEOGOV as an example. Proposers shall identify the recruiting and onboarding solution proposed, whether native or by integration.
Although not exhaustive, additional interfaces include:

- **Active Directory; Daily; One-way export from ERP**
- **bswift; Daily (new hires) and Yearly (enrollment);**
- **PensionGold (LRS); 6 times Monthly;**
- **Medcom; Every payday; One-way export from ERP.**
- **Valic; Every payday; Bi-directional import to & export from ERP**
- **Aflac; Monthly; One-Way export from ERP**
- **Empower for DCP**
- **Life Insurance Provider**

- **+ other for basic file / data transfers.**
- **NEOGOV; Daily**
- **Treeno**
- **DocDepot**
- **ShopFax; Weekly; One-way import to ERP**
- **Sanitation/Landfill; Weekly; One-way import to ERP**
- **Cannon; Monthly; One-way import to ERP**
- **Verizon; Monthly; One-way import to ERP**
- **Synovus (EFTs, Positive Pay);Daily ; One-way export from ERP**
- **VSS Alerts; Daily; One-way export from ERP**

Question 7: Please provide the City's target go-live date(s) and preferred implementation approach. Specifically:

a. is a phased or single-event ("big bang") go-live expected, and if phased, what is the required module sequencing;

b. when does the City's current CGI Advantage 4.0 subscription/support agreement expire, and is there an extension option; and

c. must payroll go live at a calendar year boundary and financials at a fiscal year (July 1) boundary?

Response: **The RFP does not mandate a phased or single-event go-live. Proposers shall recommend an approach and state their assumptions. The City's fiscal year is July 1 - June 30. The City does not disclose the terms, expiration or extension options of its contract with the incumbent.**

Question 8: Section 11 leaves the volume of historical data conversion to the proposer ("the number of years of historical data proposed for conversion"), which will make cost proposals non-comparable. Please state the City's required minimum: how many years of history must be converted for General Ledger, AP/AR, procurement, fixed assets, HR/personnel, payroll/earnings history, and leave balances, and whether full transactional detail or summary balances are required. In addition, will the City obtain the required extracts from CGI Technologies and Solutions, Inc., and which party bears any CGI extract, de-conversion, or archive-access fees?

Response: **Section 11.G leaves the number of years of historical data to the proposer. Proposers shall state the years proposed and may price additional years as an option.**

Question 9: The RFP does not state a contract term, although the Cost Proposal requests "maintenance fees for up to five (5) years." Please confirm:

a. the intended initial contract term and the number/length of renewal options;

b. whether cost will be evaluated on total five-year cost of ownership (implementation plus subscription/maintenance) or on some other basis;

c. whether an annual escalation cap on subscription/maintenance is acceptable and, if so, the maximum acceptable percentage; and

d. whether the City has an established budget or not-to-exceed amount for this procurement.

Response: The RFP does not state a contract term. However, Section 13 requires pricing through five (5) years of maintenance. While the City prefers a fixed pricing model, annual price escalations may be submitted for negotiation in accordance with industry standards but capped at a maximum of 5%. The City does not disclose budget or cost estimate information for this solicitation.

Question 10: General Provisions Item Z states the City's standard payment term is "net 30 days, after successful receipt of goods or services." For a multi-year ERP implementation and SaaS subscription, will the City accept:

a. milestone- and deliverable-based invoicing for implementation services tied to City-approved acceptance criteria, and

b. annual subscription/hosting fees invoiced in advance of each subscription year? Please also confirm whether any retainage or holdback will be applied to implementation fees and, if so, the percentage and release conditions.

Response: Yes, milestone and deliverable based invoicing is acceptable. A retainage of 10% may or may not be applied; however, if applied said retainage will not be released until successful completion of the project.

Question 11: General Provisions Item E states that all submitted materials become City property and that "the proposal submission, in its entirety, will be included as part of the contract documents and filed, as public record." Please describe the process by which a proposer may designate trade secret or confidential material (for example, detailed pricing build-ups, SOC 2 Type II reports, penetration test results, and security architecture documentation) for protection under O.C.G.A. § 50-18-72, and whether the City will notify the proposer before releasing any such designated material in response to an Open Records request.

Response: All submissions are subject to the Georgia Open Records Act. A proposer claiming trade secret protection must mark the specific portions and attach the affidavit required by O.C.G.A. Sec. 50-18-72(a)(34). The statute requires the City to notify the submitting entity before producing records so designated. The City does not guarantee the confidentiality of any material submitted.

Question 12: The evaluation criteria table assigns 100% of the weighting across five written-proposal criteria, but General Specifications Section III states that short-listed vendors "may be required to perform a virtual demonstration." Please clarify:

a. how the short list will be determined and how many vendors will be short-listed;

b. whether demonstrations, references, or site visits will be separately scored and, if so, at what weight;

c. whether initial written scores will be retained, re-set, or adjusted following demonstrations; and

d. whether the City will provide scripted demonstration scenarios in advance.

Response: The RFP evaluation committee will determine the short list based on the evaluated proposals. Initial written determinations may not change; however, revised evaluations may be submitted based upon said demonstrations. Questions or inquiries relating to the vendor's proposal will be provided to the offeror in advance of the demonstration.

Question 13: The Detailed Specifications do not address pension or OPEB administration. The City administers four single-employer defined benefit plans (General, Public Safety, Death Benefit, Major Disability), a DROP program, and a retiree healthcare (OPEB) plan. Please confirm whether the ERP must provide:

a. retiree/pension payroll disbursement,

b. DROP account administration and interest calculation,

c. retiree benefit and premium billing, and actuarial data extracts, or whether these functions remain in separate systems

Response: Pension and OPEB administrative functions remain in separate systems with interfaces from the ERP system to those other systems. Proposers may identify and price such functionality as an option. However, Retiree/pension payroll disbursement is the only requirement relative to this RFP.

Question 14: Section 5.3 (Time and Attendance) lists "Scheduling" as a single line item. Please clarify whether the requirement includes public safety shift/roster scheduling for Police, Fire/EMS, Sheriff, and Muscogee County Prison, including FLSA 7(k) work-period calculations, shift differentials, court/callback pay, holiday and retention/enhanced pay rules, and overtime distribution. Please also confirm whether physical time clocks or badge readers are in scope, and if so, the approximate quantity and whether existing hardware must be reused.

Response: Yes, public safety shift/roster scheduling for Police, Fire/EMS, Sheriff, and Muscogee County Prison, including FLSA 7(k) work-period calculations, shift differentials, court/callback pay, holiday and retention/enhanced pay rules, and overtime distribution are within scope. Physical time clocks or badge readers pricing may be provided as an option. The exact quantity needed would be TBD at this time.

Question 15: Section 9 requires "Compliance with security frameworks such as SOC 2, ISO 27001, or NIST." Please confirm which of these is mandatory versus preferred, and whether any of the following are required: StateRAMP or FedRAMP authorization, CJIS Security Policy compliance (given Police, Sheriff, and court data), IRS Publication 1075 compliance, PCI DSS (if online payments are in scope), and HIPAA safeguards (given the self-funded employee health plan). Please also confirm whether a current SOC 2 Type II report and third-party penetration test summary must be submitted with the proposal or may be provided under NDA post-short list.

Response: **Section 9 requires compliance with a security framework such as SOC 2, ISO 27001, or NIST. StateRAMP, FedRAMP, CJIS, IRS Publication 1075 and PCI DSS are not required by the RFP as written. Proposers shall state which frameworks they hold.**

Question 16: Section 11.N and Section 13 require proposers to describe service level agreements "and associated remedies or credits," and Section 14 requires "defined recovery time objectives (RTO)" and "recovery point objectives (RPO)," but the RFP does not state the City's required targets. Please specify the City's minimum required system availability percentage, maintenance window, RTO, RPO, and severity-level response and resolution times, and confirm whether service credits will be the sole and exclusive remedy for SLA failures or whether repeated failures will constitute grounds for termination.

Response: **The RFP does not state required availability, RTO or RPO targets. Section 11.N requires proposers to describe the commitments they propose. However, the City would like for proposals to consider the following:**

Required Availability: 99% uptime
Maintenance Window: 1100 PM – 0600 AM ET
RTO: 1 Hour
RPO: Short (1-4 hours)
SLA: Non-Critical (5 business days), Low (3 business days), Medium (1 business day), High (4 business hours), Critical (1 business hour)
Service credits will be the first remedy for SLA failures. Repeated failures may constitute grounds for termination.

Question 17: The Insurance Checklist (Form 8) requires Miscellaneous Errors and Omissions coverage at $1,000,000 per occurrence but does not require Cyber/Network Security and Privacy Liability, notwithstanding that the vendor will host all of the City's financial, payroll, and employee personally identifiable information. Will the City add a cyber liability requirement, and if so, at what limit? In addition, Item 24 requires that "The City shall be named Additional Insured on all policies" — will the City confirm that additional insured status is required only where legally and customarily available (i.e., General Liability and Automobile Liability), and not on Workers' Compensation or Errors and Omissions policies?

Response: **Insurance requirements are as stated on Form 8.**

Question 18: Detailed Specifications Section 2 states the solution "may be provided as a cloud-hosted Software as a Service (SaaS) platform," while Section 8.1 lists "Cloud deployment" as a system architecture requirement and Section 8.2 requires "Microsoft Windows

compatibility." Please confirm whether multi-tenant public-cloud SaaS is mandatory, or whether a single-tenant private cloud, government cloud, or on-premises/City-hosted deployment would also be considered responsive. Please also confirm whether the City requires SSO via Entra ID with SCIM provisioning and whether MFA must be enforced through the City's identity provider.

Response: **Section 1 states the solution may be cloud-hosted SaaS and Section 8.1 lists cloud deployment. Section 8.2 requires Entra ID authentication and Section 9 requires multifactor authentication. Section 2 requires hosted data to reside in the United States. Section 8.2 addresses client-side Microsoft compatibility, not hosting architecture. Both multi-tenant public-cloud SaaS and single-tenant private cloud, government cloud, or on-premises are considered responsive. Also, SSO via Entra ID is required and MFA is currently enforced through DUO.**

Question 19: Section 3.2 requires "GFOA standard budget book preparation and publishing" and Section 7 requires "Support for annual financial reporting" and "Any mandatory state and/or federal reports." Please confirm the specific deliverables expected from the system, including whether it must produce:

a. the GFOA Distinguished Budget Presentation Award document itself or only supporting data;

b. GASB 34 government-wide conversion entries and full ACFR statements and note disclosures;

c. the Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards for the Single Audit; and

d. the Schedules of Expenditures of Special Purpose Local Option Sales Tax Proceeds required by O.C.G.A. § 48-8-121.

Response: **The system shall produce the data, schedules and reports supporting the City's budget document and annual financial reporting. The RFP does not require the system to generate finished publications.**

Question 20: The Detailed Specifications do not reference risk management or self-insured claims functionality. Please confirm whether the ERP must support:

a. self-funded employee and retiree health claims administration, ACA 1095-C/1094-C reporting, and COBRA administration, and

b. workers' compensation and general liability claims tracking, or whether these will remain with the City's third-party administrators with interfaces only. If interfaces are required, please identify the applicable administrators and file formats.

Response: **Risk management and self-insured claims administration are not specified in the Detailed Specifications and are expected to remain with third party administrators. However, proposers may identify and price such functionality as an option.**

Question 21: The detailed specifications are presented as high-level functional bullets rather than a numbered requirements matrix. Does the City intend to issue a detailed functional and technical requirements matrix (for example, in Excel) for vendors to respond to on a

Standard/Configuration/Modification/Not Available basis? If so, please issue it by addendum. If a matrix is issued, please confirm whether it may be submitted as a separate Excel attachment notwithstanding the instruction to submit "one PDF file" and that "Zip files with multiple files are not acceptable," and please state the maximum file size and any page limit applicable to the OpenBids submission.

Response: **The RFP does not include a requirements matrix. The Electronic Submittal Checklist requires one PDF file; zip files and multiple files are not accepted.**

Question 22: General Provisions Item S.1 (Default) provides a ten (10) day cure period before the City may terminate the contractor's right to proceed. For a multi-year ERP implementation, will the City extend the cure period for non-monetary defaults, and will the City confirm whether a termination for convenience provision will be included in the final agreement? If a termination for convenience right is included, please confirm the treatment of:

a. implementation work performed but not yet invoiced,

b. prepaid subscription fees, and

c. the vendor's obligation and pricing for transition-out and data return services described in Section 11.Q/DD.

Response: **General Provisions Item S.1 permits the Purchasing Division Manager to specify a longer cure period in writing. In addition, a termination for convenience provision may be in the final agreement subject to agreed upon terms from both the City and the successful offeror as part of the City's standard contract form.**

Question 23: Form 4 (Federal Compliance) requires acknowledgment of federal flow-down provisions including 2 CFR 200 Appendix II, the Davis-Bacon Act, the Build America, Buy America Act, and Section 3, applicable "in the event a procurement under this contract is federally funded." Please confirm whether any portion of this ERP procurement is anticipated to be funded with federal awards. If so, please identify the funding source and confirm how the Build America, Buy America domestic sourcing requirements and Davis-Bacon prevailing wage provisions are intended to apply to a software and professional services contract.

Response: **Form 4 (Federal Compliance) is a standard form in all Columbus Consolidated Government solicitations. Clauses may or may not be applicable to every solicitation.**

Question 24: Form 6 (Client Work History) requires "at least three (3) public entity clients," while Service Plan Section 11.R requires "at least two (2) comparable public sector ERP implementations of similar size and scope completed by the proposed team." Please confirm the governing minimum number of references and whether the Section 11.R references must be the same clients listed on Form 6. Please also confirm the City's definition of "similar size and scope" (for example, population, annual operating budget, employee count, or modules implemented).

Response: **Form 6 requires three (3) public entity clients. Section 11.R requires two (2) comparable implementations completed by the proposed team. They need not be the same engagements. Proposers shall state the basis of comparability i.e.**

population, operating budget, employee count, or modules implemented.

Question 25: The RFP was issued August 7, 2026, with proposals due September 9, 2026, and questions due five business days prior. Given the breadth of the scope (financials, procurement, budgeting, HR, payroll, time and attendance, benefits, self-service, workflow, reporting), the requirement for a detailed service and transition plan, and the likelihood that responses to these clarification questions will materially affect scope assumptions, will the City consider extending the proposal due date by 21 to 30 days following issuance of the final addendum?

Response: The RFP deadline has been extended per previous addenda. Proposal submissions are due Friday, November 13, 2026, no later than 5:00 PM.

Question 26: Section 3.1 requires a "Configurable chart of accounts." Is a chart of accounts redesign in scope for this engagement, or will the City map its existing CGI Advantage chart of accounts to the new system substantially as-is? If a redesign is expected, please confirm whether the vendor is responsible for facilitating and documenting the new structure, and whether historical data must be restated to the new structure.

Response: Section 3.1 requires a configurable chart of accounts. The RFP does not require a chart of accounts redesign.

Question 27: There is an internal inconsistency regarding post-award hard copies: General Provisions Item X states the awarded vendor will provide "one identical hard copy of submitted proposal with original signatures," the Proposal Preparation instructions at Section 14 state "two (2) identical hard copies," and Appendix A again states "one identical hard copy." Please confirm the correct number of hard copies required after award.

Response: The awarded vendor will be notified to provide one (1) identical hard copy of submitted bid. The awarded vendor will receive an electronic copy of the executed contract.

Question 28: Would the City accept a phased go-live (Financials/Procurement first, HR/Payroll second), or does the evaluation committee expect a single cutover event? This one number changes our whole Service Plan section.

Response: See response to Question 7.

Question 29: Section 5.3 asks for “Scheduling” alongside electronic time entry. Is that shift-based scheduling for Police/Fire/Sheriff, or standard administrative scheduling? Those are two very different builds.

Response: See response to Question 14.

Question 30: Do Police, Fire, or Sheriff operate under any union contracts or civil service pay rules that affect Time & Labor configuration? Not in the RFP, and it's the kind of thing that shows up in month 14 if we don't ask now.

Response: The RFP does not address collective bargaining agreements. Please see response to Question 14 for time and labor information.

Question 31: How many years of historical financial, HR, and payroll data does the City want converted from CGI Advantage? Section 11.G asks us to describe our approach but doesn't give us the volume to size it against.

Response: See response to Question 8.

Question 32: How many active vendor and employee records currently exist in CGI Advantage? Drives both migration effort and license count.

Response: Please see response to Question 4.

Question 33: Section 8.4 asks vendors to identify third-party recruiting/onboarding integration (naming NEOGOV as an example). Is NEOGOV the City's current system, and is keeping it a requirement, a preference, or fully open?

Response: See response to Question 6.

Question 34: Does the City have an existing e-signature platform (DocuSign, Adobe Sign, or other), or is that a clean-sheet decision for the winning vendor?

Response: The City does not have a current standard e-signature platform. Section 6.2 requires signatures compliant with ESIGN and UETA and integration with platforms such as DocuSign or Adobe Sign. Proposers shall state which platforms are supported.

Question 35: Section 4.2 asks for vendor-performance KPI tracking with automated threshold alerts. Does the City have specific KPIs and thresholds in mind already, or is defining that framework part of the scope?

Response: Section 4.2 requires configurable KPI definition, threshold tracking and automated alerts. Specific measures are configured during implementation.
KPIs to include:

- **Timeline adherence (implementation and maintenance)**
- **On-time and on-budget delivery (actual timeline & cost compared to forecast)**
- **On-time delivery rate (percentage of on-time deliverables)**
- **System Uptime & Availability (% time functional & accessible by users)**
- **Data Migration Accuracy**
- **System Response Time & API Latency (page load times, web response times)**
- **Adherence to SLA for support requests:**
  - **Non-Critical: 5 business days**
  - **Low: 3 business days**
  - **Medium: 1 business day**
  - **High: 4 business hours**
  - **Critical: 1 business hour**

- **Alerting for (at minimum):**
  - **System availability**
  - **System hotfixes, updates, upgrades, and side-grades**
  - **System job warnings**

- **System job failures**
- **Extended maintenance**
- **Emergency maintenance**
- **Cyber incident discovery**
- **Cyber incident response**

Question 36: Is there any existing Oracle footprint anywhere in the City's technology environment, database, middleware, or otherwise? Not required knowledge, but it changes the integration story.

Response: The City does not disclose its internal technology inventory in this solicitation.

Question 37: Section 7 says exceptions to General Provisions will not be considered. Is that truly absolute, including for a vendor's own standard cloud services agreement layered on top of the City's contract, or is there room to negotiate license/subscription terms post-award during the BAFO process?

Response: Yes.

Question 38: The RFP doesn't spell out a termination-for-convenience clause with payment for work-in-progress, only default/cure language. Does one exist elsewhere in the City's standard contract terms not included in this package?

Response: Please see response to Question 22.

Question 39: Is there a stated or approximate project budget? Not required to answer, but worth asking, since "no comment" is itself useful information.

Response: The City does not disclose budget or cost estimate information for this solicitation.

Question 40: Will the demonstration (if requested post-shortlist) be scored, or purely confirmatory of the written proposal?

Response: Vendor demonstrations will be considered as part of the submitted proposals.

Question 41: How many vendors does the City expect to shortlist for demonstrations?

Response: This will be determined by the evaluation committee.

Question 42: What is your anticipated timeline for award?

Response: Section IX.A states the evaluation process normally takes approximately three (3) months before a recommendation is provided to Columbus Council. Award is subject to Council approval.

Question 43: Does the project have an anticipated Go-Live target date(s)? If a phased approach is preferred is there a tentative go-live schedule based on module or department?

Response: See response to Question 7.

Question 44: Please provide a breakdown of the City's workforce by employment type (FTE, PTE,

seasonal) and indicate the number of unionized and non-union employees.

Response: **There are approximately 3,000 FT and 450 PT non-union employees.**

Question 45: How is Time & Attendance (including schedules) managed? What solution(s) are used? Are there different collection methods based on employee role?

Response: **Time and attendance is managed based on employee work cycles within the current HRM software system.**

Question 46: Please provide the number of Financial users, categorized as follows:

a. Full Users: have access to all the features and functionalities of the system and can perform any task within their role.

b. Team Users: Have limited access to view data and complete tasks like entering time, requisitions, or expenses. Some managers may also be team users if they only approve expenses or run reports, without performing accounting entries.

Response: **Due to current system security settings, this information is not available.**

Question 47: Has a budget range been identified for the current project? If so, is it possible to share a breakdown of estimated implementation cost, annual cost, and number of years?

Response: **The City does not disclose budget or cost estimate information for this solicitation.**

Question 48: Has the City seen any product demonstrations in the last 12 months leading up to the release of this RFP? If so, which products have you seen?

Response: **No.**

Question 49: Would the City consider granting a one-week extension following the holidays to allow vendors the opportunity to submit their best responses?

Response: **The RFP deadline has been extended per previous addenda. Proposal submissions are due Friday, November 13, 2026, no later than 5:00 PM.**

Question 50: Re: Questions/due date; page 7: Please confirm the final question deadline, including whether the Labor Day holiday affects the five-business-day calculation before September 9, 2026.

Response: **The final question deadline has passed.**

Question 51: Re: Post-award hard copies; pages 11, 19 and 38: The RFP states one identical hard copy in some places and two identical hard copies in Section 14. Which count governs after award?

Response: **The awarded vendor will be notified to provide one (1) identical hard copy of submitted bid. The awarded vendor will receive an electronic copy of the executed contract.**

Question 52: Re: Submission format; page 38: Should the itemized cost proposal be included in the

single required PDF file, or uploaded separately in OpenBids if the portal provides a pricing field?

Response: The cost proposal is to be included with submission file. As stated on page 38 "In the event OpenBids requires a dollar value for your submittal, enter "0"."

Question 53: Re: Detailed Specifications/Section 2; page 21: The data ownership requirement references County data. Please confirm this should be interpreted as City data for Columbus Consolidated Government.

Response: Confirmed. References to County data in Detailed Specifications Section 2 are intended to mean Columbus Consolidated Government data.

Question 54: Re: Mandatory Forms; pages 14-15, 38: The checklist marks some forms with an asterisk but the proposal preparation section lists all required documents. Please confirm all Section 1-15 documents are required with the single PDF submission.

Response: As stated on page 14, VIII. Proposal Preparation and Submission, A.: "Firms shall include the information listed below with submission. Submissions will be deemed incomplete/non-responsive if the following required documents are not included, as prescribed with the specifications: E-Verify Affidavit, Conflict of Interest Affidavit, and Communication Concerning This Solicitation form. However, the City reserves the right to request any other omitted information."

Question 55: Re: E, Public Information; page 8: How should we treat proprietary and confidential information in the RFP? Can we provide a redacted document?

Response: A complete proposal must be submitted; a redacted proposal is not accepted in its place. See response to Question 11 for the trade secret designation process.

Question 56: Re: VIII. Proposal Preparation and Submission: pages, 16-18: The following requirements appear similar in section 11: Service Plan. Can we respond to the first one and provide that requirement number in the subsequent requirement? (E.g., for S. - Please see response to question E.)

E and S
F and T
G and U
H and V
I and W
K and X
L and Y
N and AA
O and BB
P and CC

Response: See ADDENUM NO. 2 for section VIII. Proposal Preparation and Submission – *REVISED*.

Question 57: Re: General: Could you please provide a sample Contract/Terms and conditions document for review and providing exceptions?

Response: **The General Provisions and General Specifications are the City's terms for this solicitation. A separate contract template is not issued before proposals are due.**

Question 58: Can comment as to whether Financials or HR/Payroll functionality as it currently existing in CGI has the greater business need for modernization?

Response: **The City's objectives are stated in General Specifications Section I and Detailed Specifications Section 1.**

Question 59: What is the total employee count at CCG presently?

Response: **Approximately 3,450 FT & PT employees.**

Question 60: Approximately how many users of the system exists under the following rough categories:

a. Financials power users (GL/accounting/AP/AR/Fixed Assets - heavy users running transactions as part of their job

b. Budgeting power users (entering and managing budgets/doing forecasts and planning)

c. Heavy Purchasing users - issuing POs/Contracts, managing vendor details, running solicitations/bids

d. Medium Financials users – primarily approving workflows, light data entry, read only access

e. Light Financials users – light data entry, read only access

Response: **Due to current system security settings, this information is not available.**

Question 61: How many collective bargaining agreements are in place?

Response: **None.**

Question 62: Scope & Organizational Boundary

- Does "Columbus Consolidated Government" for this RFP include all component units and agencies, or only core city/county departments? Columbus Water Works and any independent authorities appear to operate separately;
- Is a separate school system, library system, or other quasi-independent entity in scope for financials, HR, or payroll?
- How many separate legal entities or reporting funds will operate within a single instance versus segregated environments?

Response: **The RFP does not enumerate the entities included. See response to Question 3.**

Question 63: Workforce & Payroll Complexity

- What is the City's current total headcount, broken out by full-time, part-time, seasonal, and temporary? I gather roughly 2,500 from the RFP.

- How many collective bargaining units or union contracts exist, and do they carry distinct pay rules, differentials, or leave accrual schedules?

- How many pay groups and pay frequencies does the City run today (biweekly, monthly, separate cycles for sworn public safety, etc.)?

- Does the City process payroll for any employees working or residing outside Georgia, triggering multi-state tax reporting?

Response: **Please see response to Question 4.**

Question 64: Scheduling, Time & Public Safety

- Do Police and Fire operate on rotating or 24/7 shift schedules that require complex scheduling rules (shift bidding, minimum staffing, FLSA overtime averaging)?

- Is Kronos, Telestaff, or another third-party scheduling tool in use today that needs to be retained or retired?

Response: **See response to Question 14.**

Question 65: Budgeting & Financial Reporting

- Can we please have an overview of the City's current annual budget development process and the tool used today (spreadsheet-based, CGI Advantage budget module, something else).

- How many active grants and federal awards does the City manage in a typical year, and is Uniform Guidance (2 CFR 200) compliance reporting required?

- Does the City require multi-fund consolidated reporting across governmental, proprietary, and fiduciary fund types beyond what's described in the RFP?

Response: **Please refer to the Finance Department website for budget development and reporting information. https://columbusga.gov/finance/**

Question 66: HR Depth

- Is NEOGOV the City's recruiting and onboarding system of record today, and if so, is the intent to replace it natively or retain it via integration?

- Does the City run a formal annual performance review cycle today? Is 360-degree or continuous feedback a requirement, or is a simpler annual evaluation sufficient?

- Is a native Learning Management System required, or does the City have an existing LMS (e.g., a public-sector-specific platform) that only needs content interoperability?

- Is Benefits Administration self-insured or fully insured, how many carriers, and roughly what open enrollment volume should we plan for?

Response: See response to Question 6 regarding recruiting and onboarding. Section 5.5 requires performance evaluation management. A learning management system is not specified in the Detailed Specifications although NEOGOV currently functions as such. Benefits administration is handled by a third party.

Question 67: Security & Compliance

- Does the City process credit card payments directly within the ERP's Accounts Receivable or online bill pay function, or through a separate third-party payment gateway? This determines whether PCI Compliance Cloud Service is required or out of scope.

- Does the Workforce Health & Safety Incidents function store any protected health information that would trigger HIPAA obligations, or is it limited to OSHA-style incident logging?

- Beyond SOC 2, ISO 27001, or NIST, does the City have a specific compliance framework mandated by state statute or existing IT policy?

Response: See responses to Questions 5, 15 and 20.

Question 68: Data, Interfaces & Transition

- How many years of historical data does the City want converted for Financials, HR, and Payroll, respectively? The RFP asks vendors to propose this, but a stated preference narrows our estimate meaningfully.

- What is the full list of third-party systems requiring interfaces: banking partners, benefit carriers, State of Georgia reporting systems, federal reporting systems, and any point solutions not named in the RFP?

- What is the current contract end date and any termination or transition notice provisions with CGI Technologies, and is there flexibility to extend if implementation timing requires it?

Response: See responses to Questions 6, 7 and 8.

Question 69: Commercial & Contract Structure

- The RFP asks for pricing through five years of maintenance, but doesn't state a preferred subscription term length. Does the City have a preference for a 3-year, 5-year, or longer initial term, given pricing typically improves with longer commitments?

- Is there a City-estimated budget range for this initiative that vendors should be aware of, even directionally?

Response: **See response to Question 9.**

Question 70: Re: Section 11H: Will the City provide an inventory of existing third-party applications and interfaces that are expected to be part of this implementation?

Response: **See response to Question 6.**

Question 71: On page 22, section 3.5, the RFP identifies Cash Receipt management as a requirement. Please specify where the receipts will originate. Are they to be brought in through an interface from your point of sales solutions? If so, please provide a list of the external applications.

Response: **Section 3.5 requires cash receipt management. A file transfer upload is currently used to import cash receipts from the system of origin.**

Question 72: The scope around workflow automation, integrations, migration, testing, reporting, and implementation support is relevant to our work. Before investing time in a full response, could you confirm whether a [foreign]-based technology supplier may submit directly, or whether the prime contractor must be a U.S.-registered entity?

I also noted the requirement that City data reside within the United States; we can architect around U.S.-hosted infrastructure if international delivery participation is otherwise permitted.

Response: **The City does not restrict participation based on a proposer's location. The prime contractor must meet all requirements, including the notarized E-Verify affidavit under O.C.G.A. Sec. 13-10-91, Form W-9, and a business license. Section 2 requires hosted data to reside in the United States, and Section 11.F requires disclosure of offshore or subcontracted work.**

Question 73: The RFP identifies Payroll as part of the HCM functional scope and notes that certain functionality may be provided through integrated third-party systems. Is a proposed payroll solution required for a responsive proposal, or would the City consider a proposal that addresses the Finance, Procurement, and other HCM requirements but excludes payroll, with payroll to be provided separately by the City or another solution/provider?

Response: **Payroll is required. Section 5 requires each HR and Payroll function to be delivered natively or through an identified third-party system with which the proposed solution natively integrates.**

Question 74: Please confirm that, notwithstanding Section C on page 8 of the RFP, which states that the successful offeror's proposal will become a public record upon award, information properly identified and marked as confidential or exempt from disclosure in accordance with Georgia public records law will be protected from disclosure to the extent permitted by law.

Response: **See response to Question 11.**

Question 75: Has the City established a budgeted amount or funding range for this ERP replacement project (system, implementation, and multi-year maintenance combined)?

Response: **The City does not disclose budget or cost estimate information for this solicitation.**

Question 76: Can we have an extension to the deadline?

Response: **The RFP deadline has been extended per previous addenda. Proposal submissions are due Friday, November 13, 2026, no later than 5:00 PM.**

Question 77: How many total system users are anticipated (broken out by Finance, HR/Payroll, Procurement, casual/self-service, and read-only reporting users)?

Response: **Due to current system security settings, this information is not available.**

Question 78: What is the current annual cost (license, hosting, and support) of the incumbent CGI Advantage 4.0 system?

Response: **The City does not provide incumbent contract or pricing information in this solicitation.**

Question 79: Does the City have a specific RTO/RPO requirement?

Response: **See response to Question 16.**

Question 80: Is management of contingent workforce a requirement in scope for this RFP?

Response: **Contingent workforce management is not specified in the Detailed Specifications.**

Question 81: Are there existing City IT security policies, standards, or a security assessment/questionnaire proposers should reference their response?

Response: **Security requirements are stated in Detailed Specifications Section 9. See response to Question 15.**

Question 82: What is the exact level of security required?

Response: **See responses to Questions 15 and 16.**

Question 83: Does the City have a specific need for change management outside of the implementation partner, once services are completed?

Response: **Section 11.P requires change management during implementation. Ongoing post-implementation change management is not specified in the RFP.**

Question 84: Does the City require budget development at the position/FTE Level, or is position budgeting handled separately from HR today?

Response: **Section 3.2 requires employee and position integration from the HR module.**

Question 85: What is the Cities expectation for API/integration volume?

Response: **The City prefers API. See question 6 response regarding integration volume.**

Question 86: Does the City's chart of accounts follow GASB fund accounting structure with a specific number of funds, cost centers, and grant/project combinations we should plan configuration around?

Response: Fund accounting requirements are stated in Detailed Specifications Section 3.1. See also response to Question 87.

Question 87: Will the proposed ERP system be required to support fund accounting on a modified accrual basis in compliance with GASB (Governmental Accounting Standards Board) standards?

Response: The system must support fund accounting under applicable GASB standards, including the modified accrual basis for governmental funds and full accrual for proprietary and fiduciary funds.

Question 88: What is the current chart of accounts structure in CGI Advantage — specifically, how many segments are in the account string (e.g., fund, department, object, project), and what is the total number of active account codes?

Response: Please see response to Question 4.

Question 89: What is the approximate monthly volume of vendor invoices processed (PO-backed and non-PO), and what is the current split between paper/manual invoices and electronic invoices? Is the City interested in an electronic invoicing or supplier portal capability to reduce manual entry?

Response: Section 3.3 requires invoice processing with approval workflows, vendor self-service and electronic payments. See response to Question 4.

Question 90: How many active vendors are in the current system, and does the City currently operate a Vendor Self-Service portal? If so, what functions do vendors perform today (e.g., invoice submission, payment status inquiry, W-9 maintenance, banking updates)?

Response: Vendor self-service is required by Detailed Specifications Section 3.3. See response to Question 4.

Question 91: What electronic payment methods does the City currently use (ACH, virtual card, check), and does the City have a goal to increase ACH or virtual card adoption as part of this initiative? Are there any payment card programs (procurement cards or travel cards) that need to integrate with the new system?

Response: Section 3.3 requires electronic payments and ACH capability. Increasing ACH payments is an active goal for the City.

Question 92: Does the City have a specific need to validate data and business processes prior to migrating to a SaaS based ERP?

Response: Detailed Specifications Section 11 requires data validation and reconciliation tools prior to go-live. Proposers shall describe their approach under Sections 11.G and 11.I.

Question 93: Does the City require real-time, embedded analytics within the transactional system, or is a separate reporting/BI environment in use today?

Response: **Section 7 requires standard and ad hoc reporting, dashboards and analytics. Proposers shall identify any separate licensing required to meet it. A separate reporting environment is currently in use.**

Question 94: Can the City provide a current listing of all CGI Advantage modules in use, active customizations, and any modules NOT currently utilized?

Response: **Modules in use:**

- **ADM**
- **HRM**
- **FIN**
- **PB**
- **VSS**
- **ESS**

Question 95: How many years of historical financial, HR, and payroll data does the City expect to convert (RFP Sec. IV references historical data broadly)?

Response: **See response to Question 8.**

Question 96: What is the City's current employee headcount and payroll frequency/cycle (e.g., bi-weekly, multiple pay groups, union vs. non-union)?

Response: **See response to Question 4.**

Question 97: Can the City provide a complete list of current interfaces/integrations (banking, benefits providers, NEOGOV, State/Federal reporting systems) that must be preserved or rebuilt?

Response: **See response to Question 6.**

Question 98: Is NEOGOV expected to remain the system of record for recruiting/onboarding, or is the City open to a natively integrated recruiting module replacing it?

Response: **See response to Question 6.**

Question 99: Does the City have a preferred or required cloud hosting provider/region beyond the general 'data must reside within the United States' requirement (Sec. 2)?

Response: **No. Section 2 requires only that hosted data reside within the United States.**

Question 100: Will the virtual demonstration referenced in Sec. III be scored as part of the formal evaluation criteria, or is it a pass/fail gate for shortlisted vendors only?

Response: **Vendor demonstrations will be considered as part of the submitted proposals.**

Question 101: What is the anticipated Council award date, and what is the target go-live date or fiscal-year milestone (e.g., before a specific fiscal year-end close)?

Response: **See responses to Questions 7 and 42.**

Question 102: Is there a page limit or preferred format (e.g., font size, single- vs. double-sided) for the Service Plan response (Sec. 11, items A-DD), given its extensive scope?

Response: **The RFP does not state a page limit or format requirement for the Service Plan response.**

Question 103: For OpenBids submission, should Section 13 (Cost Proposal) be submitted as a separate line-item file/tab, or embedded within the single combined PDF required for the rest of the proposal?

Response: **The cost proposal is to be included within the vendor's submission file.**

Question 104: Has CGI Technologies and Solutions (the incumbent) received any information, access, or transition planning discussions beyond what is available to all other proposers?

Response: **This information is not available.**

Question 105: Is the City open to negotiating its standard contract terms (e.g., liability caps, indemnification scope) as referenced in Section 7 (Exceptions to RFP), given many SaaS vendors' standard terms differ materially from municipal boilerplate?

Response: **See responses to Questions 2 and 37.**

Question 106: Does the City's payroll include multiple bargaining units, special pay rules (e.g., Public Safety/Fire shift differentials, FLSA overtime rules), or pension integrations beyond standard municipal payroll?

Response: **See responses to Questions 14 and 30.**

Question 107: Does the City require the GFOA Distinguished Budget Presentation Award format specifically (Sec. 3.2), and if so, can a sample of the current budget book be provided as a format reference?

Response: **See response to Question 19 and Question 65.**

Question 108: The RFP references Finance, HR, Payroll, and Procurement as in-scope modules. Please confirm whether the following functional areas are also in scope for this procurement, or are planned for future phases:

- Grant Management
- Project Accounting / Cost Accounting
- Fleet Management
- Utility Billing
- Permits and Licensing

- Community Development
- Work Order / Asset Management (for infrastructure or facilities)
- Budget Preparation / Budget Development (as distinct from Budget Execution)

Response: **Grant management, project accounting and budget preparation are required by Detailed Specifications Sections 3.7 and 3.2. Fleet management, utility billing, permits and licensing, community development, and work order or asset management are not specified or required modules per the Detailed Specifications.**

Question 109: Does the City require the ERP to enforce **appropriation-based budget control** (i.e., prevent expenditures from exceeding appropriated amounts) with the ability to define budget control levels by fund, department, object code, or project?

Response: **Yes.**

Question 110: CGI Advantage currently supports position control. Please describe the City's current use of position control — specifically whether it is used for:

- Budgeted FTE tracking only
- Civil service / classification management
- Vacancy management and workflow approval for new hire requests

Response: **Position control is used for budgeting, civil service, and vacancy tracking.**

Question 111: Does the City prefer or require a **phased implementation** approach (e.g., Finance first, then HR/Payroll), or is a **single go-live** across all modules expected? Is there flexibility for vendors to propose the approach they consider most appropriate?

Response: **See response to Question 7.**

Question 112: The RFP indicates short-listed vendors may be required to perform a demonstration via Microsoft Teams. What is the timeline to determine the short-list of vendors and will this be the one and only opportunity to showcase capabilities?

Response: **This decision will be determined by the evaluation committee.**

Question 113: Does the City currently use or plan to adopt a vendor catalog or marketplace for routine, low-value commodity purchases? If so, are there existing supplier catalog relationships or punch-out integrations with distributors that should be preserved?

Response: **Section 4.1 requires vendor catalog support.**

Question 114: Do you track assets by location, department, and fund, and do you perform periodic physical inventories with barcode or RFID scanning?

Response: **Section 3.6 requires asset tracking, depreciation and lifecycle management.**

Barcode or RFID inventory is not specified.

Question 115: How many active grants do you currently manage, and who are your primary grantors (federal, state, foundation)?

Response: Please see response to Question 65.

Question 116: Do you require compliance with the Uniform Guidance (2 CFR 200), and do you currently track cost sharing or matching requirements?

Response: Please see response to Question 65.

Question 117: What is your current project/WBS structure, and do you need to track costs at a task level below the grant?

Response: Section 3.7 requires project cost tracking.

Question 118: Do you require automated drawdown requests or reimbursement invoicing to grantors from the system?

Response: Automated grantor drawdown and reimbursement invoicing are not specified in the Detailed Specifications. Proposers shall state whether the capability is available.

Question 119: How does time data flow into payroll today, automated or manual?

Response: The process is manual.

Question 120: How does the city handle exceptions such as missed punches and overtime requests?

Response: Missed punches are currently handled thru a special check request process.

Question 121: How do employees currently record their time? (paper timesheets, a system, mobile app)

Response: Timekeeping records are maintained in multiple forms depending on the department.

Question 122: How do seasonal and temporary employees record time? Is that process separate from your permanent workforce?

Response: Timekeeping records are maintained in multiple forms depending on the department. The process would be the same as the regular workforce.

Question 123: What time clocks are you currently using for your employees?

Response: The RFP does not identify time clock hardware.

Question 124: Does CCG currently track employee time against specific cost centers, departments, or government programs and if so, how is that allocation captured and validated today?

Response: Time and attendance requirements are stated in Detailed Specifications Section 5.3 and project cost tracking in Section 3.7.

Question 125: How many years of historical financial, procurement, HR, and payroll data does the City require to be migrated from the CGI Advantage environment, and what is the approximate volume of records (e.g., number of journal entries, purchase orders, employee records, payroll transactions) for each functional area?

Response: See responses to Question 4 and Question 8.

Question 126: Does the City require all historical data to be available and fully searchable in the new system at go-live, or will historical data be available in a read-only archive or data warehouse?

Response: The RFP does not state whether converted history must be searchable in the new system or held in an archive. This is subject to discuss.

Question 127: Can the City provide a data dictionary or export specification for the CGI Advantage data structures in each module to assist vendors in scoping the migration effort?

Response: Available documentation will be provided to the successful offeror following award. The City does not warrant documentation produced by a third party.

Question 128: Will CGI Technologies be contractually required to cooperate with data extraction, and is there a known fee or timeline associated with obtaining data extracts from the current system?

Response: See response to Question 8. The City will coordinate with the incumbent regarding data extraction. The City does not disclose the terms, expiration or extension options of its contract with the incumbent.

Section B — Scope and Scale

Question 129: What is the approximate total number of employees on the City's payroll (full-time, part-time, and seasonal), and how many active positions are currently managed in the system?

Response: See the response to Question 44.

Question 130: What is the approximate total number of named or concurrent ERP users across all functional areas (Finance, HR, Procurement, Payroll, etc.)?

Response: See the response to Question 4.

Question 131: How many active vendors are currently in the vendor master file, and how many purchase orders and invoices does the City process annually?

Response: See the response to Question 4.

Question 132: How many active grants does the City currently manage, and which federal or state agencies are the primary grantors? Are there specific federal reporting requirements (e.g., SEFA, FFATA, Uniform Guidance) that the ERP must support?

Response: Section 7 requires support for mandatory state and federal reports. See response to Question 65.

Section C — Integrations and Third-Party Systems

Question 133: Can the City provide a complete inventory of all current third-party systems and interfaces that must be replicated or replaced in the new ERP environment (e.g., banking institutions, benefit carriers, time-and-attendance hardware, state reporting portals)?

Response: The RFP does not include an interface inventory. See response to Question 6.

Question 134: Does the City currently use NEOGOV or another specific recruiting and onboarding platform? If so, will the City continue using that platform, and is a native integration to that specific system required?

Response: See response to Question 6.

Question 135: Which benefit providers and carriers require electronic data interchange (EDI) or other automated file exchange, and what are the current file formats and transmission methods in use?

Response: The RFP does not identify benefit carrier interfaces as there are active RFP's that may change this information.

Question 136: Is the City currently using Microsoft Azure Active Directory / Entra ID as its identity provider? If so, what is the current directory structure (single tenant, federated)?

Response: Section 8.2 requires Entra ID authentication. The City does not disclose further detail regarding its directory architecture in this solicitation.

Section D — Technical and Security Requirements

Question 137: Does the City require FedRAMP or StateRAMP authorization for the cloud-hosted ERP environment, or is SOC 2 Type II, ISO 27001, or NIST compliance sufficient?

Response: See response to Question 15.

Question 138: Are there specific data residency requirements beyond the United States (e.g., data must reside within a specific state or region)?

Response: No. Section 2 requires United States data residency only.

Question 139: Does the City have a defined Recovery Time Objective (RTO) and Recovery Point Objective (RPO) that the selected solution must meet, or is the City expecting vendors to propose these?

Response: See response to Question 16.

Section E — Timeline and Implementation

Question 140: Does the City have a target or required go-live date? Is there a hard deadline tied to a fiscal year-end close, payroll cycle, or budget cycle that must not be disrupted?

Response: **See response to Question 7.**

Question 141: What level of City staff availability is anticipated during implementation? Will the City designate a full-time internal project manager, and will functional subject matter experts be available on a part-time or full-time basis throughout the project?

Response: **City resource commitments will be established in the approved project plan. Proposers shall state the City staff effort their methodology requires, by phase.**

Question 142: Is there a preferred phasing approach — for example, Finance and Procurement first, followed by HR/Payroll — or does the City require a single go-live for all modules simultaneously?

Response: **See response to Question 7.**

Section F — Contract and Commercial

Question 143: What is the anticipated initial contract term, and how many optional renewal years does the City anticipate?

Response: **See response to Question 9.**

Question 144: Is there an approved budget or budget range the City can share to assist vendors in scoping their proposals appropriately?

Response: **The City does not disclose budget or cost estimate information for this solicitation.**

Question 145: Are travel and per diem expenses subject to the U.S. General Services Administration (GSA) per diem rates, or does the City apply its own travel reimbursement policy?

Response: **Travel and per diem are not specified in the RFP. Section 13 requires travel and per diem expenses, if any, to be itemized in the cost proposal.**

Section G — Evaluation Process and Demonstrations

Question 146: Will all responsive vendors be invited to provide a demonstration, or only a short-listed subset? If short-listed, approximately how many vendors are expected to be invited?

Response: **Per General Specifications Section III, demonstrations are limited to short-listed vendors.**

Question 147: Are oral presentations or interviews with the evaluation committee anticipated in addition to the virtual demonstration?

Response: **The RFP contemplates a virtual demonstration. The City reserves the right to conduct discussions with responsible offerors as provided in Procurement Ordinance Section 3-110.**

Question 148: In Section 11, items S through DD appear to duplicate items G through R of the same section. Should the response address these as separate sections with additional detail, or should the vendor reference the earlier responses?

Response: **See response to Question 56.**

Question 149: Will the City provide a scripted demonstration scenario or use-case guide to short-listed vendors prior to the demonstration, or will vendors structure the demonstration at their own discretion?

Response: **Questions or inquiries from the evaluation committee relating to the vendor's proposal will be provided to the offeror in advance of the demonstration.**

Question 150: What is the expected duration of each vendor demonstration session?

Response: **The vendor is expected to respond to any questions from the evaluation committee.**

Section H — Benefits Administration

Question 151: Does the City self-administer employee benefits, or does it use a third-party benefits administrator or broker platform? Is the ERP expected to serve as the system of record for benefits enrollment, or will it interface with a separate benefits administration system?

Response: **See response to Question 20.**

Question 152: Is the City responsible for ACA compliance reporting (Forms 1094-C and 1095-C), COBRA administration, or other statutory HR compliance requirements, and must these be supported natively by the new ERP or via a specific third-party integration?

Response: **See response to Question 20.**

Section I — Financial Structure and Reporting

Question 153: What is the City's fiscal year — specifically, what are the start and end months?

Response: **The City's fiscal year is July 1 – June 30. We are currently in Fiscal Year 2027.**

Question 154: How many active funds are in the current chart of accounts, and what is the fund structure (e.g., how many governmental funds, proprietary funds, fiduciary funds, and component units)?

Response: **See response to Question 4.**

Question 155: How many active departments and cost centers are currently maintained in the system?

Response: **See response to Question 4.**

Question 156: Is the City a current GFOA Award for Distinguished Budget Presentation recipient? What toolset or format is currently used to prepare the budget book, and is the expectation that the new ERP will produce the budget book directly or export source data to a separate publishing tool?

Response: **See response to Question 19.**

Question 157: Does the City prepare an Annual Comprehensive Financial Report (ACFR)? If so, what tool is currently used for ACFR compilation and is integration with or replacement of that tool in scope for this procurement?

Response: ACFR compilation tooling is not specified in the Detailed Specifications.

Question 158: What state-level financial reporting obligations apply — for example, submissions to the Georgia Department of Audits and Accounts — and must the new ERP support specific report formats or submission portals for those obligations?

Response: Section 7 requires support for mandatory state and federal reports.

Section J — Accounts Receivable and Cash Management

Question 159: What revenue types does the Accounts Receivable module need to support (e.g., permit fees, court fines, intergovernmental receivables, rental income)? Are utility billing or business license fee collection currently managed in CGI Advantage, and are they in scope for this procurement?

Response: See responses to Questions 5 and 108.

Question 160: How many bank accounts does the City maintain that will require reconciliation in the new system, and what is the approximate monthly volume of check and ACH transactions?

Response: There are two bank accounts that require reconciliation. Further, please see the response to Question 4.

Section K — Fixed Assets and Procurement

Question 161: Approximately how many fixed asset records (capital assets) are currently tracked, and does the City capitalize infrastructure assets under GASB 34?

Response: Section 3.6 requires capital asset reporting consistent with applicable GASB standards.

Question 162: Does the City operate a procurement card (p-card) program? If so, must the new ERP integrate with the p-card platform and reconcile p-card transaction data against the general ledger and budget?

Response: The City operates a p-card program. However, purchasing card functionality is not specified in the Detailed Specifications. Proposers may identify and price such capability as an option.

Question 163: Approximately how many active contracts does the City manage at any given time across all contract types (construction, professional services, goods and services)?

Response: The list of annual contracts can be found on the Finance Department website. https://columbusga.gov/finance/

Section L — HR, Payroll, and Benefits

Question 164: What is the City's current payroll processing frequency — weekly, bi-weekly, semi-monthly, or monthly — and does the City run a single payroll or multiple separate payrolls (e.g., salaried vs. hourly, or by department)?

Response: See response to Question 4.

Question 165: Does the City have collective bargaining agreements with recognized unions? If so, how many bargaining units are there, and how are union-specific pay rules, step progressions, or benefit structures currently managed?

Response: See response to Question 30.

Question 166: Does the City participate in the Georgia Municipal Employees Benefit System (GMEBS), the Employees' Retirement System of Georgia (ERS), or any other defined-benefit pension or retirement plan that requires electronic file submission, contribution reporting, or integration with the new ERP?

Response: See response to Question 13.

Question 167: Does the City use physical time clocks or badge-based time capture hardware? If so, what make and model, and is the expectation that the new system will interface with the existing hardware or replace it?

Response: See response to Question 14.

Question 168: What system does the City currently use for employee performance evaluations? Is the intent to replace it with the ERP's Manager Self-Service module, or will it remain a separate system?

Response: Section 5.5 requires performance evaluation management.

Section M — Scope Boundaries

Question 169: Are any constitutional officers — such as the Sheriff, Tax Commissioner, Clerk of Superior Court, or Probate Court — currently using CGI Advantage? Are they in scope for the new ERP, or will they be addressed separately?

Response: See response to Question 3.

Question 170: Are utility billing, permitting, code enforcement, or business licensing currently managed within CGI Advantage or in separate systems? Are any of these functions within scope for this procurement?

Response: See responses to Questions 5 and 108.

Section N — Transition and Timing

Question 171: What is the current contractual expiration or next renewal date with CGI Technologies? Is there a hard deadline by which the City must be live on the new system in order to avoid a gap in contract coverage or an unwanted contract extension with the incumbent?

Response: **See response to Question 7. The City does not disclose the terms, expiration or extension options of its contract with the incumbent.**

Section O — Proposal Format and Submission

Question 172: Is there a maximum page count for the overall proposal or for any individual section? The RFP references file size and page limitations on OpenBids but does not specify a page cap for the response itself.

Response: **See response to Question 102.**

Question 173: Section 13 (Cost Proposal) contains what appears to be a duplicate list of line items. Should vendors provide one consolidated itemized pricing table, or two separate tables corresponding to each occurrence as written in the RFP?

Response: **Proposers shall submit one (1) consolidated itemized cost proposal addressing each cost category listed in Section 13.**

Question 174: May the client references provided in Form 6 be for implementations of the same ERP software product conducted by a different implementation partner or team than the one being proposed?

Response: **Yes. Section 11.R requires two (2) engagements completed by the proposed team; proposers shall identify which engagements those are.**

Section P — DBE / Local Preference

Question 175: Does the City have an established Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) or Minority/Women-owned Business Enterprise (M/WBE) subcontracting participation goal for this procurement? If so, what is the target percentage and how is compliance documented in the proposal?

Response: **The RFP does not establish a numeric DBE or M/WBE participation goal. General Provisions Item J states the City's policy.**

Question 176: What is the approximate total number of employees on the City's payroll (full-time, part-time, and seasonal), and how many active positions are currently managed in the system?

Response: **The RFP does not provide headcount or position counts. See response to Question 129.**

Question 177: What is the approximate total number of named or concurrent ERP users across all functional areas (Finance, HR, Procurement, Payroll, etc.)?

Response: **The RFP does not provide user counts. See response to Question 130.**

Question 178: How many active vendors are currently in the vendor master file, and how many purchase orders and invoices does the City process annually?

Response: **The RFP does not provide vendor or transaction counts. See response to Question 131.**

Question 179: How many active grants does the City currently manage, and which federal or state agencies are the primary grantors? Are there specific federal reporting requirements (e.g., SEFA, FFATA, Uniform Guidance) that the ERP must support?

Response: Section 7 requires support for mandatory state and federal reports. See response to Question 132.

Question 180: Please confirm whether the City will accept an integrated SaaS solution in which certain HR, payroll, benefits, timekeeping, or procurement functions are provided by identified partner products through supported native integrations and explain how such an architecture will be evaluated relative to a single-vendor suite.

Response: No, the HR, Payroll, Benefits, Timekeeping, and Procurement functions should be provided by the integrated SaaS solution. These functions should accept input from an integration solution, if deemed necessary by CCG.

Question 181: Please provide the current number of employees, retirees, contingent workers, ERP users, self-service users, concurrent users, payroll groups, bargaining units, pay cycles, annual payroll runs, and approximate annual transaction volumes relevant to licensing and infrastructure sizing.

Response: See response to Question 4.

Question 182: Please identify the number of years and approximate volume of financial, procurement, HR, payroll, fixed-asset, attachment, audit-history, and configuration data expected to be converted, and confirm whether CGI will provide complete documented extracts without additional vendor-paid access or extraction charges.

Response: See response to Question 8.

Question 183: Please provide the current interface inventory, including each banking platform, payment processor, benefit provider, recruiting/onboarding system, timekeeping system, state or federal reporting interface, identity provider, document repository, and other application that must exchange data with the ERP.

Response: See response to Question 6.

Question 184: Please identify the City's target go-live date, whether phased module deployment is acceptable, and the minimum acceptance criteria required before financial and payroll production cutover, including the expected number of parallel payroll cycles.

Response: See response to Question 7. Phased module deployment is acceptable during initial implementation only, and only before go-live. All modules must be available on go-live.

Question 185: What is the breakdown of your employee count (Full-time, Part-time, and seasonal employees)?

Response: See response to Question 59.

Question 186: Do you require physical time clocks? If so, how many (Time & Attendance)

Response: See response to Question 14.

User Counts & Licensing

Question 187: Please provide the total number of ERP system users, broken out by tier: admin/power users, standard ERP users, self-service ERP users, HCM self-service users, and budget users (preparers/approvers, data-entry-only, and view-only), consistent with a named-user licensing model.

Response: Previously answered in the responses to Additional Questions 180 – 212.

Question 188: How many total City employees (full-time and part-time) will require system access in some form (payroll, self-service, or otherwise)?

Response: All city employees, former, current, and future, will need access to the system in some form.

HR, Payroll & Bargaining Units

Question 189: How many payroll employees does the City currently process (full-time, part-time, seasonal/temporary)?

Response: See response to Question 4.

Question 190: How many collective bargaining units/union agreements does the City maintain, and how many distinct payroll areas or pay groups result from them?

Response: See response to Question 30.

Question 191: How many payroll periods per year does the City run, and are they consistent across all employee groups?

Response: See response to Question 4.

Question 192: Is benefits administration (enrollment, eligibility, carrier feeds) currently handled directly within CGI Advantage, through a separate benefits administration platform or broker/TPA, or a combination? If a separate platform is used, please identify it.

Response: See responses to Question 20 and Question 66.

Question 193: Please confirm whether NEOGOV is the City's current recruiting/onboarding system, and whether the City intends to retain it (requiring integration) or would consider a replacement as part of this project.

Response: See response to Question 6.

Transaction Volumes

Question 194: Approximately how many expense reports are processed per month, and how many employees regularly file them?

Response: This information is not readily available.

Question 195: Approximately how many A/P invoices are processed per month (average and maximum line counts), and how many A/R invoices per month?

Response: See response to Question 4.

Question 196: Approximately how many purchase requisitions and purchase orders are processed monthly, including average line counts?

Response: See response to Question 4.

Question 197: Approximately how many cash receipts are processed per month, and how many P-Cards are issued (and are they used to pay against POs)?

Response: See response to Question 4.

Vendor/Supplier Portal

Question 198: Beyond the Vendor Self-Service capability referenced in Section 3.3 (Accounts Payable), does the City require a broader supplier-facing portal for sourcing, bidding, or contract management, or is vendor self-service limited to invoice/payment status and 1099 information?

Response: The City has an existing system for bidding and contract management.

Banking

Question 199: How many banking relationships does the City maintain, and does the City use lockbox and/or positive pay services? If positive pay is used, for how many accounts?

Response: This information is not available at this time.

Master Data & Scope

Question 200: Approximately how many active grants and funds does the City currently track?

Response: See response to Question 65.

Question 201: Approximately how many active capital/operating projects are tracked, and is project cost tracking tied to procurement (procure-to-project)?

Response: Approximately 100+ projects and procurement is not currently tied to project costs.

Question 202: Approximately how many fixed assets and asset classes does the City currently maintain in CGI Advantage?

Response: See response to Question 4.

Question 203: Approximately how many active suppliers/vendors and purchase contracts does the City maintain?

Response: **See response to Question 4.**

Interfaces vs. Integrations

Question 204: Section 8.4 references both "integrations" and "interfaces." Can the City clarify whether these terms are used interchangeably, and if not, provide the distinction intended? Separately, how many unique external interfaces (banks, state/federal reporting systems, benefit providers, etc.) does the City currently maintain with CGI Advantage?

Response: **See response to Question 6.**

Project Goals, Approach & Organizational Change Management

Question 205: What are the City's top five goals for this project, and how will success be measured?

Response: **The project scope is provided in general specifications for the RFP.**

Question 206: What are the top limitations of the current CGI Advantage environment that this project is intended to resolve?

Response: **See response to Question 35.**

Question 207: What is the City's target go-live date?

Response: **See response to Question 7.**

Question 208: Does the City have a dedicated internal project manager and project team allocated to this effort, and approximately what percentage of their time will be dedicated?

Response: **HR/Finance/IT will dedicate personnel towards project management and the project team for this effort. The level of effort from each functional area will depend upon each phase of project.**

Question 209: Does the City prefer a Fit-to-Standard implementation approach (adapting business processes to standard software functionality) or a Fit-to-Gap approach (customizing the software to existing processes)?

Response: **We are interested in a Fit-to-Standard approach but may consider Fit-to-Gap in certain instances.**

Question 210: Does the City have an organizational change management (OCM) team or plan in place, and will OCM be budgeted as part of this project or handled separately?

Response: **See response to Question 83.**

Question 211: Can we have clarification on 11S – 11DD as it appears to be same as 11E – 11Q.

Response: **See ADDENUM NO. 2 for section VIII. Proposal Preparation and Submission - *REVISED***

Question 212: Does the addendum to extend the RFP deadline directly correlate with CCG's anticipated timeline for the proposal process and project execution?

Response: No.

Question 213: We are reviewing RFP 27-0008 – Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) System and would appreciate clarification regarding the permitted vendor structure.

Would the City accept a proposal submitted jointly by SAP and an authorized SAP partner, where SAP provides/contracts the SAP cloud software subscription and the SAP partner serves as the prime implementation and services provider?

Alternatively, would the City permit SAP and its authorized implementation partner to participate under another prime/subcontractor structure, provided that one party is clearly designated as the prime contractor responsible for the overall proposal and contractual obligations?

We have seen similar public-sector ERP procurements structured to allow SAP and its implementation partner to jointly respond while clearly identifying the respective software and implementation responsibilities.

Please confirm whether either structure would be acceptable under RFP 27-0008.

Response: General Provisions Item B requires that, when a team of firms responds, one firm be named the prime contractor and the proposal be submitted in that firm's name; all correspondence is between the City and the prime contractor. General Provisions Item C requires subcontractors to be named in the proposal, makes the offeror responsible for their compliance, and provides that payments will be made only to the offeror. A structure in which either SAP or the implementation partner is designated prime, with the other identified as its subcontractor, is consistent with Items B and C. The RFP does not provide for two separate contracting parties. Under Section 7.B, any agreement the offeror or a subcontractor will require the City to execute, including a software subscription agreement, is an exception and must be listed in Section 7.

Question 214: Is Columbus Consolidated Government still considering additional implementation or development capacity for RFP 27-0008?

Response: The RFP solicits one proposal per offeror for an ERP system and related implementation services (General Provisions Item B; Detailed Specifications Section 10). It does not solicit separate proposals for additional implementation or development capacity. See response to Question 249.

Question 215: We are an India-based ERP implementation company interested in responding to RFP No. 27-0008 – Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) System. We are unable to complete vendor registration on OpenBids due to international vendor restrictions.
Kindly confirm:

1. Whether international vendors are eligible to submit proposals.
2. Whether an alternative submission method is available (email/upload/manual submission).
3. How foreign vendors should comply with the E-Verify Affidavit, W-9, insurance, and business license requirements.

Response: **1. See response to Question 72.**

2. As stated in Appendix A, responses must be submitted via OpenBids, and failure to do so will result in rejection of the response. The RFP provides no alternative submission method.

3. The RFP provides no alternative compliance method for firms located outside the United States. General Specifications Section VII requires a notarized E-Verify affidavit under O.C.G.A. Sec. 13-10-91 for any services contract of $2,500 or more, even if the services are performed outside Georgia, and omitting it renders the proposal non-responsive. Section 15 requires page 1 of IRS Form W-9, the Insurance Checklist (Form 8) or a Certificate of Insurance, and a current business license for the vendor's location. The successful vendor must also obtain a Columbus business license.

Question 216: Before preparing a response, I would appreciate clarification on one eligibility point. Can a small independently owned software development company propose a custom or highly customized ERP solution directly, or is the City seeking only vendors with an already established commercial ERP platform and prior large municipal ERP implementations?

Response: **The RFP does not restrict participation by firm size. Detailed Specifications Section 2 requires that the system allow configuration without modification of core code. Section 15 requires proposers to demonstrate experience implementing ERP systems for public sector organizations, provide references from similar municipalities, and demonstrate ongoing product development and support capabilities. Form 6 requires at least three (3) public entity clients for whom the firm has provided the same or a similar ERP system, and Section 11.R requires two (2) comparable public sector ERP implementations completed by the proposed team.**

Question 217: What is the intended scope of Section 3.4's Online Bill Payment requirement, in terms of which department(s) or payment types it covers?

Response: **See response to Question 5.**

Question 218: Which existing third-party payment platforms currently in use will the awarded vendor would need to integrate with and/or replace?

Response: **The RFP does not identify existing payment platforms. See responses to Questions 5 and 6.**

Question 219: What payment types and channels (card, ACH, online, in-person, kiosk) are in scope for this requirement?

Response: **See response to Question 5.**

Question 220: What is the approximate annual transaction volume and dollar amount for the in-scope payment types broken out by each system/payment type?

Response: **This information is not available.**

Question 221: Does the City currently pass processing fees on to the payer (flat fee or percentage), and does it intend to continue that model under the new solution?

Response: Yes.

Question 222: With the cutoff to submit questions five days before the proposal due date, does the City anticipate extending the response deadline to allow adequate time for the City to respond to questions and for offerors to review responses and revise their proposals accordingly?

Response: The RFP deadline has been extended per previous addenda. Proposal submissions are due Friday, November 13, 2026, no later than 5:00 PM.

Question 223: Form 1 [E-Verify Affidavit] refers to the "firm or corporation which is engaged in the physical performance of services on behalf of Columbus Consolidated Government." If the prime offeror intends to subcontract the services, does the E-Verify requirement apply to the subcontractor, the prime offeror, or both?

Response: Both, in different ways. Under General Specifications Section VII and Form 1, the prime offeror must be registered with and use E-Verify and must submit the notarized Form 1 affidavit with its proposal. As stated in Section VII(D) and Form 1, under O.C.G.A. Sec. 13-10-91(b) the prime may contract for the physical performance of services only with subcontractors who present the prime an affidavit containing the same information. The RFP does not require subcontractor affidavits to be submitted with the proposal.

Question 224: General Specs I (p.13); Detailed Specs 1 (p.21) - Please identify the departments, elected and constitutional offices (e.g., Sheriff, Tax Commissioner, Clerks of Court, Probate, and Municipal/State/Superior Courts), boards, authorities, and component units whose financial, procurement, human resources, and/or payroll transactions are processed in CGI Advantage today and are in scope for the new ERP. Please also identify any entities that currently use separate systems and whether they are expected to move onto the new ERP.

Response: See responses to Questions 3 and 169.

Question 225: General Specs II History (p.13); Section 11.H (p.17) – Plese list the CGI Advantage modules currently in production use. Please also list the other systems that support in-scope functions today (e.g., budget development, timekeeping, scheduling, cashiering, recruiting/onboarding, performance evaluation, document management, contract management, licensing) and indicate whether the City expects each to be replaced by the ERP, retained and integrated, or is undecided. In addition to the City's systems are there any outside organizations the City exchanges data with (banks, benefit providers, state and federal agencies)?

Response: General Specifications Section II states that Advantage supports general ledger, budgeting, purchasing, accounts payable, accounts receivable and fixed assets, and human resource and payroll functions including position control, personnel administration and time entry. See responses to Questions 6 and 94 regarding the interface inventory and module list.

Question 226: Detailed Specs 1 General Overview (p.21) – The RFP refers to modernizing "administrative

operations" in addition to finance, HR and Budgeting. Are any functional areas beyond Detailed Specifications Sections 3 -7 intended to be in scope (e.g., inventory/warehouse, fleet, work orders/asset maintenance)? Are there any areas the City would like priced as optional rather than base scope?

Response: **Functional requirements are as stated in Detailed Specifications Sections 2 through 15. Inventory/warehouse, fleet, and work order or asset maintenance are not specified. See response to Question 108. Section 13 permits proposers to price additional or optional modules not included in the base proposal.**

Question 227: Section 13 Cost Proposal (p.18 – 19) – To size subscription pricing accurately, please provide the approximate number of named users in each category below (current Advantage users counts by role are acceptable if exact counts are not available):

a) Finance full-function users – staff who process or maintain GL, AP, AR/billing, cash management, fixed assets, grants, projects, budget, or close activities, or who maintain financial setups, security, or approval rules.

b) Finance self-service users – staff who only run inquiries/reports, approve financial transactions, enter or approve expenses, or enter/approve project time (e.g., department managers, budget owners, grant managers).

c) Procurement full-function users – buyers, purchasing agents, solicitation/sourcing staff, contract administrators, and supplier-management staff.

d) Procurement self-service users – department requestors, approvers, receivers, and contract stakeholders who need view or deliverable-tracking access.

e) HR, benefits, payroll, and time/attendance administrative users.

f) Budget development users (preparers, reviewers, and analysts).

Response: **See responses to Questions 60 and 65.**

Question 228: Detailed Specs 5 (p.23); Section 13 (p.18) – Please provide the current workforce count by category: full-time, part-time, and seasonal/temporary (including peak seasonal headcount), sworn public safety, and elected/appointed officials paid through payroll. Please also indicate whether or pension recipients are paid through the City's payroll, and provide the number of W-2s issued for the most recent calendar year.

Response: **See responses to Questions 4 and 44.**

Question 229: Detailed Specs 3 – 4 (p. 21 – 23) – Please provide the approximate annual volumes for AP invoices, active vendors, AR invoices and active customer accounts, and active contracts. Please also indicate approximately how many outside vendors and customers would use the self-service portals.

Response: **See responses to Questions 4, 131, 163 and 195.**

Question 230: Detailed Specs 3.5 (p. 22) – Is the City expecting the new ERP to include a cashiering function, where City staff take payments in person at a counter and print receipts? Or does

the City only need the ERP to record payments collected by other City systems? If cashiering is in scope, about how many locations take payments today?

Response: **Section 3.5 requires cash receipt management and Section 3.4 requires online bill payment. Counter cashiering and receipt printing are not specified in the Detailed Specifications. See responses to Questions 5 and 71.**

Question 231: Detailed Specs .5 (p. 22) – Please clarify what "Multiple check reconciliations" refers to. Please also identify the banks the City has banking relationships with and the approximate number of accounts at each.

Response: **See responses to Questions 160 and 199 regarding bank accounts and banking relationships.**

Question 232: Detailed Specs 3.2 (p. 22) – Please describe the scope of grants and project accounting, including whether capital projects are tracked in Advantage today, whether labor costs are distributed to grants/projects from payroll, and whether the City uses an indirect cost allocation plan to be supported in the ERP.

Response: **Section 3.7 requires project cost tracking, grant management and budget tracking by project, and Section 3.2 requires budget control and encumbrance tracking. Payroll labor distribution and indirect cost allocation are not separately specified. See responses to Questions 116, 124 and 201.**

Question 233: Detailed Specs 5.2 (p. 23) – Please describe payroll complexity, including pay frequencies, number of pay groups, number of distinct pay plans/salary schedules, any collective bargaining or meet-and-confer agreements, and public safety work periods (e.g., FLSA 7(k) cycles for police, fire, and sheriff personnel).

Response: **See responses to Questions 4, 14, 30, 63 and 164.**

Question 234: Section 11.G (p. 17); Detailed Specs 11 (p. 26) – Section 11.G asks vendors to propose the number of years of historical data to convert. Does the City have minimum retention requirements or preferences by data type (financial, procurement, HR, payroll), and approximately how many years of data currently reside in Advantage?

Response: **See response to Question 8. The RFP does not state retention requirements by data type or the number of years of data held in Advantage.**

Question 235: General Specs IV Transition (p. 13); Section 12 (p. 18) – When does the City's current Advantage agreement expire? Does the City have a target go-live date, and would it consider a phased go-live (for example, Financials and HR/Payroll going live at different times)?

Response: **See response to Question 7.**

Question 236: Section 11.D (p. 16) – Has the City identified internal staff to support this project, such as a project lead and people from the finance, HR, payroll and IT areas?

Response: **See response to Question 141. Section 11.D asks proposers to identify the responsibilities and tasks the City will be required to perform.**

Question 237: Section 11.F (p. 16 – 17) – Section 11.F asks vendors to state where project team members are located. Apart from the Section 2 requirement that the City data be stored in the United States, does the City have any policies or requirements about where project staff are based or where project work is done?

Response: Section 11.F requires proposers to state whether each team member is located in the United States and whether any work will be performed offshore or by subcontractors. Section 2 requires hosted data to reside in the United States. The RFP contains no other restriction on where project staff are based or where project work is performed.

Question 238: Detailed Specs 1 (p. 21) – Apart from replacing the current system, what business goals or improvements does the City hope to achieve with this program? Are there any limitations or challenges the City expects the new solution to remediate?

Response: See responses to Questions 205 and 206.

Question 239: Section 11.L-M (p. 17); Section 13 (p. 18) – Section 13 requests maintenance fees for up to five years. Beyond the software provider's standard support, is the City requesting pricing for ongoing post-implementation application support or managed services (functional and technical support)?

Response: Section 11.M and Detailed Specifications Section 13 require ongoing maintenance and support, and Section 13 requires hourly rates by labor category for additional services requested by the City. Ongoing functional or technical managed services are not specified. Proposers may price them as an option under Section 13.

Question 240: General Provisions C (p. 8); Section 10B (p. 16) – May the software subscription be contracted directly between the City and the software (or through an authorized reseller), with implementation services contracted with the prime offeror? General Provisions Item C states that payments will only be made to the offeror submitting the proposal; please confirm how this applies to software subscriptions.

Response: General Provisions Item C provides that payments will be made only to the offeror submitting the proposal, and Item B requires one firm to be named prime contractor. The RFP does not provide for subscription fees to be paid directly to a software publisher or reseller. Section 10.B requires a copy of the software license agreement the City would be required to sign, and under Section 7.B the terms of that agreement are an exception that must be listed in Section 7.

Question 241: Section 7.B (p. 16); Section 10.B (p. 16) – Section 10.B asks vendors to provide the software license agreement the City would be required to sign. Please confirm that vendors may include their standard software and services agreements and list any conflicting terms as exceptions under 7.B, without the proposal being considered non-responsive.

Response: See responses to Questions 1 and 37.

Question 242: General Provisions I and R (p. 9 – 10) – Will the City consider a mutually agreed limitation or liability in the final contract, for example a cap tied to the contract value?

Response: **See response to Question 2.**

Question 243: Section 13 (p. 18 – 19) – Does the City prefer fixed-fee payments tied to deliverables or milestones, or time-and-materials pricing with a not-to-exceed amount?

Response: **Section 13 requires an itemized cost proposal and hourly rates by labor category for additional services. It does not specify fixed-fee or time-and-materials pricing. See response to Question 10 regarding payment terms.**

Question 244: Section 13 (p. 18) – Has the City established a budget or identified a funding source for the software subscription and implementation services?

Response: **The City does not disclose budget, funding or cost estimate information for this solicitation.**

Question 245: Section 11 Items S – DD (p. 18) Section 11 Items S – DD appear to repeat items E through Q (e.g., S/E, U/G, W/I, X/K, Y/L, Z/M, AA/N, BB/O, CC/P, DD/Q). May vendors cross-reference their earlier responses for these items, or should each item be answered separately?

Response: **See response to Question 211.**

Question 246: General Provisions E (p. 8) – Please confirm that, not withstanding General Provisions Item E (page 8), which states that the successful offeror's proposal will become a public record upon award, information properly identified as trade secret or otherwise exempt under the Georgia Open Records Act (including O.C.G.A. § 50-18-72(a)(34), with the required supporting affidavit) will be protected from disclosure to the extent permitted by law. Please also advise how marked confidential material should be presented within the single-PDF submission (e.g., a separate redacted version).

Response: **See responses to Questions 11 and 55. The Electronic Submittal Checklist requires one PDF file.**

Question 247: I am reviewing RFP No. 27-0008 for the City's Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) System directly against the City's published requirements. Before evaluating a delivery structure, could you please clarify by [addendum]:

247-1 Whether the prime respondent must be the ERP software publisher/OEM, or whether an independent systems-integration / transformation firm may serve as prime with a named ERP platform partner;

247-1 Response: The RFP does not require the prime to be the software publisher. General Provisions Item B requires one firm to be named prime contractor when a team responds, and Item C requires subcontractors to be named. See responses to Questions 180 and 213.

247-2 Whether disclosed subcontractors or implementation partners may be used for configuration, data migration, integrations, training, cybersecurity, and post-go-live support while the prime remains fully responsible;

247-2 Response: Yes. General Provisions Item C permits subcontracting of all or

any part of the work, provided subcontractors are named in the proposal; the offeror is responsible for their full compliance. Section 11.F requires disclosure of any work performed offshore or by subcontractors.

247-3 Whether prior public-sector ERP implementation references are mandatory and, if so, the minimum number and similarity required;

247-3 Response: Form 6 requires at least three (3) public entity clients for whom the firm has provided the same or a similar ERP system. Section 11.R requires two (2) comparable public sector ERP implementations of similar size and scope completed by the proposed team. See response to Question 24.

247-4 Whether Georgia business registration, E-Verify, insurance, bonding, data-residency, SOC 2 / ISO 27001 / NIST, or other compliance items must be in place at proposal submission versus prior to contract execution;

247-4 Response: With the proposal: the notarized E-Verify Affidavit (Form 1), which is mandatory; the Insurance Checklist (Form 8) or a Certificate of Insurance; page 1 of Form W-9; and a current business license (Section 15). Certificates of insurance naming the City as additional insured are due within ten (10) business days after award notification (General Specifications Section VI), and the successful vendor must obtain a Columbus business license. The RFP does not require Georgia business registration or bonding. United States data residency (Section 2) and security framework compliance (Section 9) are requirements of the proposed solution; proposers shall state the frameworks they hold. See response to Question 15.

247-5 Whether any mandatory pre-proposal conference, demonstration, or site visit applies;

247-5 Response: No pre-proposal conference or site visit is scheduled. Under General Specifications Section III, short-listed vendors may be required to perform a virtual demonstration via Microsoft Teams after proposals are evaluated.

247-6 Whether proposals or qualification materials may be submitted entirely by email, or whether a separate procurement portal is mandatory for the final proposal.

247-6 Response: As stated on page 37, Appendix A, "*Responses must be submitted via OpenBids.*" Further, "*Failure to submit electronic responses, via OpenBids, will result in the rejection of your response*."

Question 248: We have exceptions to the insurance requirements. The RFP states that exceptions to Insurance Requirements will deem us as non-responsive. Will any exceptions make our response non-responsive?

Clarification from Vendor:
As a provider of predeveloped off-the-shelf SaaS NEOGOV's insurance requirements are not customer-specific. Request to delete in its entirety as this is not applicable to NEOGOV's off the shelf predeveloped subscriptions and refer to the following coverages below to align with NEOGOV's certificate of insurance:

"At all times during the Term NEOGOV shall procure and maintain, at its sole cost and expense, all insurance coverage required by applicable law, and in any event insurance coverage in the following types and amounts: (i) Commercial General Liability including bodily injury and tangible or real property $1,000,000 each occurrence, $3,000,000 general aggregate; (ii) Errors and Omissions Including Cyber Liability Insurance $3,000,000 each occurrence $3,000,000 general aggregate; (iii) Worker's Compensation and employers' liability insurance with limits no less than the minimum amount required by applicable Law for each accident and occupational illness claim; and (iv) Umbrella Liability $1,000,000 each occurrence and $1,000,000 general aggregate. Customer will be added as an additional insured on the General Liability policy and provided a waiver of subrogation on the General Liability and Workers Compensation policies."

Response: **Section 7.A states that exceptions to the RFP General Provisions will not be considered and will render the response non-responsive. Other exceptions to the RFP specifications must be listed in Section 7 and are considered by the Evaluation Committee; a proposal may be rejected if they are found unacceptable. General Provisions Item Q requires respondents to maintain insurance applicable to the services. The required coverages and limits are in General Specifications Section VI and Form 8, where proposers state the limits they will provide. Exceptions are not accepted or rejected through the question process. A proposer that cannot meet a Form 8 requirement, or that proposes its standard coverages in place of Form 8, should list that as an exception in Section 7 and enter the limits it will provide in the Bidders Limits/Response column of Form 8.**

Question 249: Are we able to bid on a portion of the RFP to provide project management services for the chosen vendor providing the software implementation?

Response: **The RFP solicits an ERP system with full implementation services, which include project management (Detailed Specifications Section 10). It does not solicit separate proposals for project management services or for oversight of the selected implementation vendor.**

Question 250: Can CCG provide a current inventory of all interfaces to and from CGI Advantage 4.0? Ideally it would include system name, direction, data objects, frequency, volume, protocol/format, and owner.

Response: **See responses to Questions 6 and 183.**

Question 251: Are any interfaces currently manual, such as spreadsheet uploads, re-keying or emailed files, that CCG expects to automate in the new solution?

Response: **The RFP does not identify current manual data exchanges. Section 11.H requires proposers to describe all interfaces and integrations to be developed, and Detailed Specifications Section 10 includes integration development.**

Question 252: Are any existing interfaces expected to be retired or consolidated because the new ERP will cover that function natively?

Response: **See responses to Questions 6 and 225.**

Question 253: Questions 11(H) and V (Page no 17, 18) both request a description of interfaces and integrations to be developed. Can CCG clarify the intended distinction between these two questions and whether separate responses are required?

Response: See response to Question 56.

Question 254: Testing. Please confirm if there is any existing test management tool (e.g., Azure DevOps, Jira/Zephyr, qTest) with CCG or should the vendor propose one?

Response: The RFP does not specify a test management tool. Section 11.I requires proposers to describe the testing approach, including the test scripts and test environments to be provided. Proposers may include a test management tool in their proposed approach.

III. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Indicate that your company has received this Addendum in the appropriate areas and include with electronic response. **Failure to acknowledge receipt of this addendum may render your Bid "Incomplete".**

Andrea J. McCorvey
Purchasing Manager

COLUMBUS GEORGIA
We do amazing.