



THE UNIVERSITY OF  
**SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI**

---

02 October 2025

**Addendum 3 for RFP 26-06**

This addendum answers questions submitted by potential respondents. The University's answers are shown in **RED**.



Amber Floyd

Buyer, Procurement, and Contract Services

1. We kindly request an extension of the RFP submission deadline to Tuesday, October 7th at 2:00 PM. The current deadline of September 29th at 5:00 PM for question responses leaves our team with a very limited window to incorporate your feedback, finalize our response, and meet the mandatory printing and shipping requirements for a September 30th 2:00 PM submission deadline. An extension would ensure we can provide a comprehensive and high-quality submission. Thank you for your consideration.
  - a. The RFP has been extended to Tuesday, October 7th at 2:00 PM
2. Which software vendors have you attended product demos for in the last 18 months for this initiative?
  - a. This is a competitive bid available to anyone who meets posted specifications. USM stakeholders may be aware of similar systems in the market, but no specific vendors will be named. All potential bidders shall remain anonymous to preserve the integrity of the sealed bid process.
3. What is the budgeted amount of ongoing subscription and one-time setup fees that you have allocated for this project?
  - a. This is a competitive bid and the budget will not be shared

4. What is your total population of workers in in each of the below 3 categories regardless of if they would use the application or not? (Definitions are listed below) --Full Time Employees --Part-Time Employees --Associates
  - a. Full Time Employees: 2107
  - b. Part-Time Employees: 778
  - c. Associates: 184
5. How many users would need to actively write to the application?
  - a. There should be no restrictions on this number (Requirement #16). Please specify any user number restrictions in your response.
6. How many users would need view only access to the application?
  - a. There should be no restrictions on this number (Requirement #16). Please specify any user number restrictions in your response.
7. Regarding question 21 "Vendor's client success team must be able to directly configure and adapt models (not just provide guidance or escalate to a consulting partner):" To our knowledge, there is one very niche Software vendor who has a model where a Software vendor's Client Success team performs heavy duty model maintenance and configuration. Would you be open to empowering the USM Finance team to be capable of configuring and adaptive models?
  - a. Vendor must be able to configure and adapt models
8. Requirement 8 - Please confirm integration requirements - Requirement 8 specifies the desired data ingestion approach is through flat file (excel, csv) upload of actuals. Can vendors assume ingestion of COA and other metadata from your source ERP systems can follow a similar upload process, or is a direct connection/API expected?
  - a. The import of actuals is expected to occur via flat file upload (Excel, CSV). For COA and other metadata, we are open to a similar flat file upload approach, provided it meets our data security requirements. However, if your solution offers a direct connection or API integration with PeopleSoft that can streamline processes, we are open to evaluating that option as well. Please outline both approaches in your proposal, including any implications for setup, maintenance, and security.
9. We understand that the university is using Peoplesoft for Financials and HR data. Is your goal to be able to load information from these core systems?
  - a. There must be no limit to the number of users (Requirement #16). Please specify user number restrictions in your response.

10. Requirement 21 & 23 - These requirements somewhat conflict with one another. Is USM requiring an Application Managed Services (“AMS”) approach (\*As Req 21 seems to indicate) or a solution which does not require the need for ongoing AMS support to maintain configurations within the USM implementation (As noted in Req 23)

a. These two requirements are complementary, not conflicting. USM is seeking a solution where the vendor’s own client success team is capable of directly configuring and adapting models — without relying on third-party implementation partners or external consultants. Requirement 23 reinforces 21

11. Please confirm the scope of the “financial modeling” use cases, and what is expected to be delivered in the 90-day timeline envisioned in Req 9, vs what is expected to be a Phase 2 → X. Examples are:

- Annual Budget development:
  - i. Labor Operating expense (current faculty/staff inclusive of contingent and adjuncts + open requisitions or vacancies)
  - ii. Non-Labor Operating Expense (e.g. Incremental, zero-base, RCM, etc.)
  - iii. Revenue (including but not limited to tuition, housing/room & board, grants, appropriations, gifts & endowments, athletics, or other auxiliaries)
  - iv. Enrollment modeling
    - Capital Planning:
    - Cash Flow & Balance Sheet Forecasting:
    - Long Range / Strategic Forecasting
  - v. Multi-year operating plans (extending annual plan out over X years)
  - vi. Strategic What-if Scenario modeling (discrete driver based models showing financial performance based on macro economic drivers along with strategic University level decisions)

a. All pieces are expected to be implemented within the 90-day period.

12. General Terms, Section 12, Page 4 - Requires compliance with all applicable local, State, and Federal laws. Could you confirm that the intent of this clause is for each party to be responsible for the laws applicable to its own business and operations, and not to transfer the University's compliance obligations to its vendors?

a. Yes, confirmed that it is not intended to transfer the University’s compliance obligations to its vendors. It ensures that vendors operate in accordance with applicable legal requirements relevant to their services.

13. General Terms, Section 10, Page 3 - "Unless written exception is provided in the bid response, the winning Vendor agrees to be bound by the USM Terms and Conditions, which are incorporated herein..." To ensure a fair evaluation process for all vendors offering established SaaS solutions, we suggest reconsidering the clause stating that proposal submission implies agreement to all terms. We believe a collaborative negotiation process with the awarded vendor would ensure the final agreement accurately reflects the chosen solution, benefiting both parties.

- a. Proposal submission implies agreement to the USM Terms and Conditions, vendors are encouraged to submit written exceptions within their bid response for any terms that may conflict with their standard practices. These exceptions will be reviewed during the evaluation process.

14. Section J. Cloud Hosted Services, Page 11 - "The winning Vendor...must allow the University to comply with the 'Mississippi Department of Information Technology Services, Security Services Division, State of Mississippi Enterprise Cloud Offsite Internet Hosting Security Policy.'" Section J on page 11 references "clauses included in Appendix A of this RFP as it relates to Non-Public Data." However, Appendix A appears to be the specifications spreadsheet. Could you please clarify where these specific data-related clauses can be found via hyperlink or provide them via attachment so we can review?

- a. <https://www.its.ms.gov/services/security/ESP-Cloud>