



STATE OF DELAWARE
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

March 5, 2026

TO: ALL OFFERORS

FROM: WALT GORMAN
STATE CONTRACT PROCUREMENT SUPERVISOR

SUBJECT: ADDENDUM TO REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL NO.: GSS26936-ERP_SI

ADDENDUM # 2

The purpose of this addendum is to respond to questions that were received during the question period, include Bond requirement in the RFP, revise Appendix B2, and provide Professional Services Agreement Draft in Word format.

Performance Bond requirement

Contractors awarded contracts are required to furnish a 100% Performance Bond in accordance with Delaware Code Title 29, Section 6927, to the State of Delaware for the benefit of Government Support Services with surety in the amount of 100% of the specific award. Said bonds shall be conditioned upon the faithful performance of the contract. This guarantee shall be submitted using the Attachment in the form of a good and sufficient bond drawn upon an Insurance or Bonding Company authorized to do business in the State of Delaware.

Question and Answer

- 1) Given that the State requests multiple third party solutions be included in the scope of this procurement, would the State consider the following extensions: 1) Extending the question due date by two weeks, and 2) Extending the response due date by one month This will give respondents and third parties time to engage, review State requirements, ask questions, and develop thorough responses.
 - a) The state does not intend to extend the timelines associated with this solicitation.
- 2) Will the State allow offshore resourcing, assuming all State data remains within the continental United States?



GOVERNMENT SUPPORT SERVICES – CONTRACTING

600A SOUTH BAY ROAD – DOVER, DE 19901
PHONE: (302) 857-4550 – FAX: (302) 739-3779 – GSS.OMB.DELAWARE.GOV

- a) Vendors wishing to propose offshore resourcing should identify as an exception on Appendix R – Vendor Forms. The State will not accept any contract modifications that contravene the requirements of **IRS Publication 1075**.
- 3) Section 9.4 – Project Change Control (Page 55): This section references approval or rejection within “three (7) business days” and alternates between “three” and “seven” business days. Could the State please clarify the applicable timeframe?
 - a) The correct and appropriate timeframe shall be Three (3) business days for approval/rejection.
 - 4) Section 3.1 – Milestone Cost Proposals (Page 61): Could the State please provide a definition of “operational requirements” as used for determining penalties
 - a) The RFP states under Section 9.1 “Specific requirements for deliverables are outlined in incorporated Appendices and proposal requirements included in Section V Vendor Proposal Content, Proposal Response for Responding Vendors response.” Vendors awarded under the premise of meeting these requirements, via their offering of products/services, and are found to not meet these requirements may be assessed a penalty as defined.
 - 5) Section 2, Proposal Response – Section 2.8.2 requires three (3) business references for ERP implementations of a similar size and scope, while Section 2, RFP Submission – Section 2.10 requires at least five (5) business references consisting of current or previous customers of similar scope and value. Could the State please clarify how many business references are required?
 - a) Section 2.10 of the RFP Submission section requires five (5) references consisting of current or previous customers of *similar scope and value*, while section 2.8.2 of the Proposal Response section is a subsection of the question *How many times have you implemented Workday in the past five years?* This section requires three (3) references specific to the implementation of Workday. While these three (3) references may be included on the Reference Form contained within Appendix R – Vendor Information Forms, they should also be included within the proposal in response to the previously identified question.
 - 6) Section 1.2 (Page 28): To ensure alignment on the commercial and contracting approach for third party solutions referenced in Section 1.2 of the RFP, we would appreciate clarification on the following: Does the Client expect the Service Provider to act as the prime contracting party for all third party solutions, bundling those solutions into a single, all inclusive contract with the Client (i.e., a resale or sublicensing model)? Alternatively, is the Client open to a model in which certain third party solutions are licensed directly to the Client, with the Service Provider coordinating procurement and integration but not acting as the licensor?
 - a) We are requesting that vendors propose third party solutions for features that are documented in our requirements but cannot be met within Workday. Vendors proposals should identify their ability to procure those recommended solutions. The State is requesting proposal pricing reflect all third party solutions under one contract. Should a vendor believe it to be in the best interest of the State to alter this approach, it should be defined in their proposal how.
 - 7) Section 9.1 – Implementation and Post Implementation Support (Page 52): Could the required duration of the stabilization or post implementation support period be defined?

- a) Proposals, including pricing proposals submitted through Appendix P, should be structured to cover a period of 10 years.
- 8) This section indicates that contractors awarded contracts are required to furnish a 100% Performance Bond or that there is no Performance Bond requirement. Additionally, Attachment 1 of the Appendix indicates it should be removed if a waiver has been identified in Section 24. Section 24 refers to Performance Requirements. Could the State please clarify whether a waiver has already been provided in Section 25?
- a) This contract will require a performance bond. Please refer to the information provided at the beginning of this Addendum #2 and in Appendix T – Professional Services Agreement Draft; attachment #1 to that document is the State of Delaware Performance Bond form.
- 9) Section: Section III.8; Page: 47; Text of Passage Being Questioned: The Regulatory and Legal Compliance Acceptance Criteria in the table on p. 47 references FedRamp as a something the SI must ensure compliance with. Question: Has the state procured Workday's FedRamp SKUs? If not, do they intend to remove the requirement for FedRamp?
- a) Delaware will not be hosted on Workday's FedRamp GovCloud Offering. After an in-depth security trust session with the DTI team, FedRamp was not deemed necessary, as Workday meets and surpasses DTI's Security requirements on the commercial offering. At this time, the State does not intend to remove the requirement for FedRamp, as applicable to proposed third party solution offerings.
- 10) Section: Section IV; Page: 50; Text of Passage Being Questioned: Item #8 includes: "Create and implement the help ticket management process using a ticketing management tool."; Question: Does the state have an existing ticketing management tool that the SI is expected to leverage, or do you expect SIs to include a helpdesk ticketing solution in our proposal?
- a) The State of Delaware currently uses ServiceNow for ticketing. SI Vendors should propose in their response help desk functionality.
- 11) Section: Section IV 9.1 Implementation and Post-Implementation Support; Page: 53; Text of Passage Being Questioned: "Post-implementation support must include a stabilization period with on-site and remote assistance, resolution of defects, performance optimization, and knowledge transfer to internal teams. Ongoing support services should include system monitoring, incident management, update coordination, and user support aligned with agreed SLAs"; Question: To ensure consistency among responses, would the state consider indicating their required duration for both Post-implementation and Ongoing support services?
- a) Vendors should identify their proposed durations for post-implementation and ongoing support services.
- 12) Section: RFP Section V 2.8.2 Proposal Response, RFP Section VI 2.10 Business References; Page: 60; Text of Passage Being Questioned: There appears to be conflicting requirements related to the number of references that responders must provide. In Section V, it states: "Please provide at least three client references for ERP implementations of a similar size and scope. Include company name, contact person, project scope, go-live date, and any post-implementation support provided." In Section VI, it states: "Provide at least five (5) business references consisting of current or previous customers of similar scope and value using the Business References Form found in Appendix R. Include business name, mailing address, contact name and phone number, number of years doing business with, and type of work

performed. Personal references cannot be considered.”; Question: Please confirm that at least 5 references will be required for the response.

- a) Section 2.10 of the RFP Submission section requires five (5) references consisting of current or previous customers of similar scope and value, while section 2.8.2 of the Proposal Response section is a subsection of the question How many times have you implemented Workday in the past five years? This section requires three (3) references specific to the implementation of Workday. While these three (3) references may be included on the Reference Form contained within Appendix R – Vendor Information Forms, they should also be included within the proposal in response to the previously identified question.

13) Section: V.1; Page: 59; Text of Passage Being Questioned: RFP V.1 says “The proposal should be organized in the exact order in which the requirements and/or desirable performance criteria are presented in the RFP. Each page should be numbered. The proposal should contain a table of contents, which cross-references the RFP requirement and the specific page of the response in the Responding Vendor’s proposal.”; Question: Please confirm the RFP requirements to cross-reference are only those in the Word narrative responding to V.2.5 Discussion Topics.

- a) Correct, cross reference is only required in the Word narrative responding to discussion topics.

14) Section: Appendix N1; Text of Passage Being Questioned: Central System users and organization system users; Question: Can the state provide a more detailed breakdown of the number of FMS central system users and organization system users by functional area (asset management, AP, AR, etc.)?

- a) No, FMS users have multiple roles even within a specific module like AP, AR, etc. This will be determined during the implementation phase.

15) Section: Appendix N2; Page/ Text of Passage Being Questioned: System users; Question: Can the state provide a more detailed breakdown of PHCM system users by functional area (i.e., payroll, recruitment, benefits, MSS/ESS, onboarding/offboarding, etc.) for both PHCM staff and agencies?

- a) In 2025 DHR Systems:
 - Learning Users: 51,000 internal & external
 - Learning Administrators: 120
 - Learning System Administrators: 4
 - Onboarding/Offboarding End Users: 16,000
 - Onboarding/Offboarding System Administrators: 3
 - Onboarding/Offboarding HR Admins: 85
 - Labor Relations System Users: 11
 - Recruitment System Administrators: 7
 - Recruitment Hiring Managers: 1,100
 - Digital Content Management System Users: 150
- b) PHRST System Users
 - a) Human Resources: 827
 - b) Benefits Administration: 635
 - c) Time and Attendance: 1,170
 - d) Payroll: 788
 - e) Statewide Access: 220
 - f) PHRST Central Staff: 47

- g) ERP Technical Staff: 61
- h) Employee Self Service/Manager Self Service: 90,591

- 16) Section: Appendix B1; Page: FMS R-24-1.24; Text of Passage Being Questioned: Ability to store historic static reports in a repository with role security access. Reports must be able to be downloaded to Excel, CSV, and PDF. For historic reports and legacy data - roles and responsibility for who governs the data in a data lake must be established. Question: Does the State have an existing data warehouse that the SI is expected to leverage, or do you expect SIs to include a data warehousing solution in our proposal?
- a) Data Warehousing solution is outside the scope of this RFP. The State currently uses Mobius as a report repository. The vendor is expected to provide a recommendation for using Workday solution or alternative in their proposal.
- 17) Section: Appendix Q & T; Page: All Question: Can procurement please provide a Word version of the Appendices to redline?
- a) As the source document owner of Appendix T – Professional Services Agreement Draft, Government Support Services is posting *Professional Services Agreement Draft-WORD* will all other solicitation documents, both on <https://bids.delaware.gov> and <https://gss.bonfirehub.com/>. All redlines/exceptions should be identified in Appendix R – Vendor Forms exception tab.
 - b) Appendix Q – DTI Policies are source documents belonging to DTI. Those documents can only be obtained through the portals in PDF format. Should a vendor elect to convert these documents, redlines/exceptions should be identified in Appendix R – Vendor Forms exception tab.
- 18) Section: Appendix B2; Page: All Question: Appendix B2 does not contain a Comments column; can we add or can procurement provide an updated file containing such column?
- a) A revised version of Appendix B2 has been provided to include a comment/explanation column. All responding vendors should download and use the revised Appendix B2.
- 19) Section: Main RFP; Page: 2; Text of Passage Being Questioned: The following dates apply to this RFP and subsequent contract award. Vendors are advised that these dates and milestones are not absolute and may change due to unplanned events during the proposal solicitation, evaluation, and award process. Question: Will there be a second round of questions and answers given the published timeline?
- a) No, only a single question and answer period has been scheduled for this solicitation.
- 20) Is there an RFP number associated with this solicitation? Does the department also have an estimated contract value for this solicitation? Is there an anticipated contract start date?
- a) The solicitation number is GSS26936-ERP_SI. There is no contract value assigned. The anticipated contract start date is within 4th quarter 2026.
- 21) Empryrean is interested in responding to your RFP but we want to ask a point of clarification prior to responding as such: Is the State looking for vendors to provide Benefit Administration Services that integrate with Workday ERP? Empryrean provides the best in class enrollment/eligibility/and ongoing administration “Benefits Administration” services which can be fully integrated with Workday. We also lead our implementation for our services which may provide some additional cost savings. I am not sure from the RFP if you are looking for this service distinctly or open to

bids for this service at this time. When you have a moment, can you please let us know as soon as you can as your response will determine whether or not we proceed with your RFP.

- a) PHCM plans to implement only Workday for Benefit Administration.
- 22) Euna currently maintains an active contract with the State. In the interest of simplifying this procurement, is there an opportunity for the State to leverage the existing contract to procure Euna products and services directly, rather than through an SI reseller arrangement?
- a) Vendors responding to this SI solicitation should propose integration solutions to best meet the identified requirements within this solicitation.
- 23) Document: Request for Proposal; Section II. Important Events; page 2: Is the State targeting a specific date to start this project?
- a) Anticipated target date to start this project is 4th quarter 2026.
- 24) Document: Request for Proposal; Section I. Proposal Overview; Page 1: The RFP states you are seeking an SI to provide procurement, implementation and ongoing vendor support for both software and implementation services. Does this mean you expect to contract with the SI to supply third party software? Is the State open to using a reseller for all software and implementation services, or are you willing to award separate contracts for software and/or services that the prime SI does not resell (software) or provide (third party software implementation services)?
- a) We are requesting that vendors propose third party solutions for features that are documented in our requirements but cannot be met within Workday. Vendors proposals should identify their ability to procure those recommended solutions. The State is requesting proposal pricing reflect all third party solutions under one contract. Should a vendor believe it to be in the best interest of the State to alter this approach, it should be defined in their proposal how.
- 25) Document: Request for Proposal; Section V. Vendor Proposal Content; Page 62: Re: "Workday and 3rd party applications are expected to be implemented from 2026 through 2030 funded by the State Office of Management and Budget. Responding Vendors must submit a corresponding pricing table." Can the State please specify if this is fiscal or calendar year?
- a) FMS must go-live at the beginning of a fiscal year, which is July 1st.
 - b) PHCM can go-live at either beginning of a fiscal year (July 1st) or calendar year (January 1st)
- 26) Document: Request for Proposal; Section 1.2.7 Learning Management; Page 3: Beyond Workday Learning, are there other Workday modules where assessments or testing may play a role (e.g. recruiting, certifications, compliance, promotions, performance)?
- a) Yes, assessments are used in the recruitment and promotion for some positions.
- 27) Document: Request for Proposal; Section 1.2.7 Learning Management; Page 3: Can you share an approximate annual assessment volume: number of employees, candidates or participants expected to test annually?
- a) Learning Assessments: 13,000
 - b) Recruitment Tests: 300
 - c) Promotion Tests: 500

- 28) Document: Request for Proposal; Section 1.2.7 Learning Management; Page 3: Is the goal to standardize assessment delivery across agencies or will agencies operate independently?
- a) No, it is not our goal to centralize the creation and delivery of learning assessments. Organizations will continue to operate independently in the creation and delivery of their assessments.
- 29) Document: Request for Proposal; Section 1.2.7 Learning Management; Page 3: Will there be centralized administration or distributed ownership?
- a) PHCM – There will be centralized administration
- 30) Document: Request for Proposal; Section 1.2.7 Learning Management; Page 3: Is the vision for assessments to be a transactional tool within Learning, or a statewide strategic capability across workforce development and hiring?
- a) Both
- 31) Document: Request for Proposal; Section III. Implementation Requirements; Page 42: If the State is considering an expansion of software already used by the state, such as Euna Budget, how will the software contract resulting from this solicitation interact with any current software contracts already established?
- a) We are requesting that vendors propose third party solutions for features that are documented in our requirements but cannot be met within Workday. Vendors proposals should identify their ability to procure those recommended solutions. The State is requesting proposal pricing reflect all third party solutions under one contract. Should a vendor believe it to be in the best interest of the State to alter this approach, it should be defined in their proposal how.
- 32) Cost worksheet appendix P requires a detailed breakout of software pricing or other licensed products needed to meet the RFP requirements. The scope of work requires the vendor to be "responsible for advising on, validating, and coordinating the procurement of all third-party applications that meet the State's functional and technical requirements" (1.1) and presumably working with the state as strategic partner on identifying and procuring third party software that meets user needs. Does the License tab of Appendix P refer only to mandatory third-party software mentioned in the RFP? Is it intended to include potential third-party software that has not yet been identified in partnership with the state?
- a) Yes, this tab within appendix P is open to proposals of any and all third party software/solutions identified within a vendors proposal response.
- 33) Does the License tab of Appendix P refer only to mandatory third party software mentioned in the RFP ("RedRover, QuestionMark, Euna, Training Orchestra, or other suitable alternatives to be determined by the vendor")?
- a) No, this tab within appendix P is open to proposals of any and all third party software/solutions identified within a vendors proposal response.
- 34) How should the vendor account for or submit licensing details or costs for third party software that are not yet known due to lack of discovery?

- a) Vendors are expected to propose their best solutions to meet the requirements identified by the State. Final terms and conditions, to include pricing may be negotiated with the vendor that is offered award.
- 35) Please confirm the authoritative legacy systems and HCM data domains to be migrated into Workday, along with record counts and required history retention for each domain?
- a) Yes, both PHCM and FMS data will be migrated into Workday. Further discussion will take place with the State Functional project team after the SI vendor is selected regarding historical record retention.
- 36) Who owns data cleansing versus transformation-time cleansing, and what canonical code sets/crosswalks (org, department, job/class, locations, combo codes) will be provided?
- a) Data cleansing is State's responsibility and data mapping / transformation is joint efforts between State and SI vendor.
- 37) Please list all HCM integrations to be built/replaced with directionality, frequency, real-time vs batch needs, and preferred Workday mechanism
- a) Please refer to Functional requirements. This will be discussed in greater detail during implementation discovery and design phase.
- 38) Please confirm Okta SSO, provisioning/de-provisioning flows, attribute sources, and audit requirements, and specify which third-party HCM capabilities must be surfaced in Workday via certified integrations.
- a) Okta would be used as the identity solution for Functional End Users and Self-Service Users. We have two Okta tenants (Employee tenant and Citizen tenant). Self Service users will be logging in through the Citizen tenant and Employee users will be logging in through the Employee tenant. We will be using Workday recruitment and Supplier Management which will be behind Citizen Okta tenant. There will be auto provisioning and de-provision to different degrees across both tenants for Self Service users and for Employee users. Okta and Workday will log user and access logs. We are requesting that the SI propose third party solutions for features that are documented in our requirements but cannot be met within Workday.
- 39) How many years Historic data have to bring over? Data Cleanup:- Who is responsible for Data cleanup (Dirty data) in PeopleSoft before the first load into the Workday? Mapping: Effective Date
- a) Historic data is not expected to exceed three (3) years. Vendors should provide recommendations on this subject. Vendors should also identify recommendations on storing historical data over three (3) years in Prism for reporting purposes.
 - b) FMS and PHCM teams will be working on data clean up.
 - c) The SI vendor will be expected to do data mapping. Effective date is to be determined.
- 40) 1) List of Third Party 2) Middle Ware 3) Active Directory (i.e. Server Path where files transmission involved)
- a) We have provided all interfaces in the two attachments Appendix E1 FMS Interfaces and Appendix E2 PHCM Interfaces. For file exchanges the state uses an SFTP solution. The State uses OKTA as identity solution. The State does use Active Directory but NOT as an identity solution.

41) 1) Configuration and Customization details (Foundational Data Model - Setup configurations details) 2) Security Matrix (Roles and Permission list)

a) If necessary, this will be provided during Implementation.

42) Given the complexity of the RFP requirements and time required to coordinate and negotiate with 3rd parties for a comprehensive response, would the State provide an extension to the due date?

a) No extension of the due date will be considered.

43) Hello, what is the total value of this contract?

a) No value has been assigned to this contract.

All other terms and conditions remain the same.

S:\ Addendum to RFP