

Q&A Grants Management System RFP

1. Does IHCD A have a range / budget identified for this project and can it be shared?
 - a. We don't have a specific budget prepared for this project. The goal to move awards over to the new system will be incremental and not all at once.
2. Is there a business cycle or funding component that would drive an expected/desired delivery/install timeline?
 - a. IHCD A expects to work with the selected Respondent to determine the anticipated go-live date, adjusting based on SOW finalization and contract execution. IHCD A does not want a program award to straddle two systems, so it will be done at the startup of new program years.
3. Which e-signature technology does IHCD A currently utilize and is that the preferred technology for the Grants Management System?
 - a. IHCD A currently utilizes adobe sign however we are able to consider alternatives.
4. Will IHCD A be looking to migrate away from Great Plains ? If yes, to what targeted platform?
 - a. At this time the integration piece will need to be to Great Plains
5. What technology is IHCD A currently using for Single Sign-On ?
 - a. We don't have an agency wide standard for single sign on
6. What technology is IHCD A currently using for external user authentication ?
 - a. We do not have an agency wide technology for external user authentication. We do have one system using a Microsoft account authentication.
7. How many IHCD A users will be utilizing the system?
 - a. Depending on scope it would most likely be somewhere around 120 internal users
8. How many external authenticated users will be utilizing the system? These are not public users.
 - a. About 400 users
9. Will IHCD A consider a two week extension as the answers are due back just 9 working days before the submission is due ?
 - a. No
10. Will the Portal serve as the exclusive interface for all external users?
 - a. Yes
11. Which user groups are expected to use the portal?
 - a. Applicants, partner organizations, local units of government, contractors
12. Will different grant programs require different portal experiences?
 - a. The portal in general can be similar in nature however some programs have different application processes and key/relevant data points, so some configuration will be needed to achieve results needed within competitive vs non competitive rounds
13. Is multilingual support required?
 - a. Yes

14. What identity provider will external users authenticate against? Microsoft Entra or is another provider already selected?
 - a. No provider is selected at this point
15. Will external users self-register or will invites be required?
 - a. Self-register with approval from their organization's admin
16. Can organizations create their own users?
 - a. Yes
17. Who approves new user registrations?
 - a. IHCD staff and designated individuals in their own organization
18. Can one user belong to multiple organizations?
 - a. Yes
19. Who approves organization registration?
 - a. IHCD
20. Can organizations maintain addresses?
 - a. Yes
21. Can organizations manage banking information?
 - a. Yes
22. Can multiple users edit organization information?
 - a. Yes – if they have necessary permissions
23. Should organization changes require approval?
 - a. No, unless it is a key identifier such as the TIN
24. Will application forms vary by funding opportunity?
 - a. Yes, applications can vary by funding opportunity
25. Can applicants save drafts?
 - a. Yes
26. Can applications be copied?
 - a. Yes
27. Can applications be withdrawn?
 - a. Yes
28. Can submitted applications be amended?
 - a. Not once submitted, the system would need to have IHCD staff put it back in some editable status.
29. What document types are accepted?
 - a. I don't believe we have any types we would not accept.
30. Electronic document signing required?
 - a. Yes
31. Can applicants replace documents?
 - a. No
32. Should documents be stored in SharePoint or Dataverse?
 - a. We would prefer these documents be stored within the system
33. Is metadata on documents required?
 - a. It is not required however if there is any metadata that would make searching/filter documents that would be helpful
34. Will claims be submitted entirely through the portal?

- a. Yes
- 35. Can claims be edited after submission?
 - a. No
- 36. Can denied claims be corrected?
 - a. Yes
- 37. Can users track reimbursement status?
 - a. Yes
- 38. Should payment information be visible?
 - a. IHCDCA should be able to see payment info depending on permissions and it should be isolated to only be visible to authorized individuals in their own organization
- 39. Can claims be withdrawn?
 - a. No, they would need to reach out to IHCDCA to stop the claim
- 40. Is two-way messaging required?
 - a. Not required but would be advantageous if it was part of it
- 41. Is messaging threaded?
 - a. Useful but not required
- 42. Can attachments be included?
 - a. Yes
- 43. Are notifications emailed?
 - a. Yes
- 44. Are Email or SMS notifications required?
 - a. Email is the minimum notification required, but additional options can be included.
- 45. What dashboards should applicants see?
 - a. Aside from maybe a list of applications submitted not sure dashboards would be to useful at the applicant stage
- 46. What dashboards should grantees see?
 - a. It would be ideal if we could build dashboards and make them externally viewable but if not possible dashboards pertaining to disbursements and utilizations would be ideal
- 47. Can users customize dashboards?
 - a. Yes
- 48. Can external users export reports?
 - a. Yes, but limited to their own specific data
- 49. Does the portal participate in approvals?
 - a. The portal should display where a reimbursement or application is in the approval process
- 50. Which approvals occur inside CRM or can external reviewers work through the portal?
 - a. That would depend on if the portal is separate from the application IHCDCA is using. If its all the same system and just driven by permission based viewing its all in the portal however if they are two different applications the approvals past submission approval would need to happen in the CRM where IHCDCA would most likely be the approving authority in most process instances

51. Required penetration testing, or is this State provided?
 - a. If stored on state servers we would need to plan for the penetration testing but if cloud based we are not required to do it. That testing would be provided by the vendor.
52. Annual security assessments?
 - a. IHCDAs schedule software risk assessments for gaps in security and process.
53. Required compliance certifications?
 - a. No
54. What level of accessibility is required?
 - a. WCAP 2.1
55. Accessibility testing required, or provided by the State?
 - a. Accessibility testing will be required
56. Is there any help functionality required for external users? FAQs, videos, chat?
 - a. IHCDAs have a wide variety of internal and external users pursuing different activities. Respondents are to include their training plan for the system users.
57. Expected external users?
 - a. 400
58. Peak concurrent users?
 - a. We would estimate this to be around 300 for both external and internal users
59. Peak application submission periods?
 - a. There is no peak application submission period. We have programs regularly starting at all times of the year
60. Expected annual applications?
 - a. Once all expected programs are in the system maybe 1000 – not all will be approved
61. Expected annual claim submissions?
 - a. Once all expected programs are in the system about 5000 claims
62. Will the portal be deployed in phases?
 - a. Yes
63. Is train-the-trainer expected?
 - a. Yes
64. Is hypercare required?
 - a. Yes
65. Can samples of applications, any relevant forms, communication templates, dashboards and reports be provided (e.g. Bidders Library) ?
 - a. Not at this time
66. What federal reporting systems should the new system be capable of integrating with?
 - a. The Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (FFATA) with SAM.gov would be a nice integration. It is not required. Exporting to an SF425 (Federal Financial Report) would also be of note, but it is not required.
67. When archiving documents, should the archive date correlate to the program year, the calendar date, or both?

- a. Program year would be primary but if there are other keyword options that would fall more in line with how we currently archive documents. Archival based on time from closeout date may also be a useful option.
- 68. When documents are archived, should they remain available for State users to view as needed until finally expired and removed permanently?
 - a. Yes
- 69. When defining document upload types, which document types should be available for States users to select from within the system?
 - a. That can be discussed once its identified what document types the new application will allow.
- 70. In addition to the claims, what other areas of the system should allow users to upload documents?
 - a. Supporting documentation to go with agreements or applications, organizational info would also be needed.
- 71. Ideally when would you want the new Grants Management up and running to replace the existing legacy system?
 - a. IHCDCA expects to work with the selected Respondent to determine the anticipated go-live date, adjusting based on SOW finalization and contract execution. IHCDCA does not want a program award to straddle two systems, so it will be done at the startup of new program years.
- 72. Are you considering running a pilot implementation with the new Grants Management System ? If so for how long and what would that entail ?
 - a. We would target smaller scale programs first and get to a point where agreements are setup and claim reimbursement has begun and is working with integration to our accounting software before moving on to the next program. Once the first is worked out we would then stair step the remaining programs based on program start dates
- 73. To support accurate scoping of integration requirements, please identify any federal reporting systems with which the proposed solution is expected to interface. Additionally, please indicate whether these integrations are expected to support direct data exchange, file-based submissions, or reporting exports.
 - a. The Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (FFATA) with SAM.gov would be a nice integration. It is not required. Exporting to an SF425 (Federal Financial Report) would also be of note, but it is not required.
- 74. Please confirm whether the public-facing portal is expected to support multiple languages. If so, please identify the required languages and whether multilingual support is expected at go-live or as part of a future implementation phase.
 - a. Multiple languages although not required would be beneficial at time of roll out.
- 75. Could IHCDCA provide additional detail regarding the expected business processes for the recovery or recoupment of funds associated with negative claims? Specifically, are there existing workflows, approval requirements, financial offsets, or repayment tracking processes that the solution will be expected to support?
 - a. This new system would need to support the ability for IHCDCA to request funds back from a partner and for those funds when integrated to offset money that

went out the door in previous claims. It would need to adjust the line item budgets in the system to show funds came back in.

76. Please identify any existing or preferred electronic signature platforms, such as DocuSign or Adobe Acrobat Sign, that the solution should integrate with. If no preferred platform exists, please clarify whether the expectation is for the proposed solution to provide e-signature capabilities natively or through a third-party integration.
 - a. We would prefer the esignature piece be natively in the system and not be an integration to a third party system.
77. To support sizing and configuration efforts, please provide an estimate of the number and type of standard reports, dashboards, and data exports expected to be available at initial deployment. Additionally, please indicate whether reporting requirements vary materially across program areas.
 - a. Standard reports would probably number around 10 and probably half as many as dashboards, depending on available filtering and grouping options. The reporting requirements do not really differ between programs
78. Please clarify whether any reports, dashboards, or analytical data are expected to be accessible through the public-facing portal. If so, please describe the anticipated audience, security considerations, and level of data visibility required
 - a. We would like to see general disbursement info of claims visible to the organization. The audience would be the respective organization. A dashboard of all their claims in the various stages of review would be needed as well
79. Please confirm whether the use of offshore resources is permissible under this engagement. If permitted, are there any restrictions regarding activities, data access, security requirements, or work products that may be performed by offshore personnel.
 - a. Offshore resources are not permissible with this software application. All implementation and support staff must be US based
80. To ensure alignment with IHCD's grant administration processes, please clarify the distinction between competitive and non-competitive funding opportunities as referenced in the RFP. Specifically, are there functional or workflow differences that the system must support between these funding mechanisms?
 - a. Competitive funding or application process means that IHCD can receive more applications than we can fund and we will score them and select winners. Non competitive programs are mostly guaranteed amounts to guaranteed partners each year and we are largely just changing the funding amounts based on federal allocations. The workflows differ slightly in that competitive applications have a scoring process whereas non competitive do not
81. Please identify the current grants management system or systems that will be replaced by the proposed solution. Additionally, any information regarding pain points, limitations, or primary drivers for replacement would be helpful in informing our proposed approach.
 - a. The current system is legacy intellectual property of IHCD, developed and maintained by a third-party vendor. IHCD would not like to focus on the pain points of the prior system, but the three biggest hopes of the implemented solution are:

- i. Comprehensive and modern system for the full grants management lifecycle;
 - ii. Streamlined, yet adaptable, workflows and handoffs;
 - iii. And robust and/or dynamic reporting.
- 82. Please provide additional detail regarding training expectations, including preferred delivery methods, such as onsite, remote, or hybrid delivery, anticipated numbers of administrative and end users requiring training, and whether a train-the-trainer model is preferred.
 - a. IHCDCA has a wide variety of internal and external users pursuing different activities. Respondents are to include their training plan for the system users.
- 83. The RFP references approximately 45 programs to be managed within the system. Please clarify the anticipated timeline and deployment strategy for onboarding these programs. Additionally, are all programs expected to be configured by the implementation vendor, or will IHCDCA require self-service program configuration capabilities to support future program setup and maintenance?
 - a. We would like to begin in the 2nd half of 2027 and we would stair step the programs as the new program year for each program comes up would start in the new system with each programs new year so no program ever straddles both systems. We would like to be able to do some level of configuration on the IHCDCA side for future new program setup
- 84. Please confirm whether data migration is within the scope of this engagement. If so, please provide estimated data volumes, the systems serving as migration sources, and whether document attachments and historical records are expected to be included as part of the migration effort.
 - a. IHCDCA will not be migrating data. IHCDCA may request the Vendor import organization and contact data cleaned by IHCDCA staff.
- 85. Please clarify IHCDCA's expectations regarding post-implementation support. Specifically, is 24x7 production support required, or would support be limited to standard business hours with defined service-level agreements for issue response and resolution?
 - a. Support could be limited to normal business hours with defined service level agreements for issue response and resolution. Its possible we might need after hours support in extreme cases like full system downtime
- 86. The RFP references External Partners. For purposes of solution design and implementation planning, please clarify whether this term refers solely to applicants and subrecipients or if it also includes partner agencies and other organizations involved in program administration. If multiple external organizations are expected to participate, please describe how stakeholder engagement, requirements gathering, training, and governance activities will be coordinated throughout the project.
 - a. For this purpose external partners are subrecipients. We do not work directly with program participants but other local state agencies or local units of governments that participate in our program. This development will be handled solely by IHCDCA

87. Please indicate whether IHCDCA has a preferred cloud hosting provider or technology platform. If preferences exist, please identify any hosting, compliance, security, or architectural requirements that should be considered in the proposed solution.
 - a. No preferences exist at this time. Any security requirements should conform to the states RAMP policy
88. To support licensing, performance planning, and capacity sizing, please provide estimated numbers of internal users, including IHCDCA personnel, and external users, including applicants, subrecipients, and other portal users, expected to access the system.
 - a. Internal users would number about 120 and external users will number around 400
89. Please clarify whether IHCDCA prefers a vendor-hosted Software-as-a-Service solution or if there is an expectation that the solution be hosted within infrastructure managed by IHCDCA. If IHCDCA-hosted deployment is a consideration, please provide any relevant infrastructure or technology standards.
 - a. IHCDCA would prefer a vendor hosted software as a service solution
90. Please confirm whether any onsite activities are expected as part of the implementation and ongoing support phases of the engagement. If onsite participation is anticipated, please identify the types of activities, expected frequency, and locations where vendor personnel would be expected to perform services.
 - a. The majority of the activities can be remote however some potential meetings like kick off and some large scale initial trainings can be in person but most everything else can be remote
91. Across the 45+ programs in scope, are the application forms and claim/review workflows generally unique to each program, or do groups of programs share a common application form and workflow? Approximately how many distinct application and workflow types exist across the portfolio?
 - a. The applications will differ across the programs to a certain degree, the workflow for competitive vs non competitive deal with one scoring and the other not scoring. Claim review process is largely the same.
92. How does IHCDCA prefer respondents format any proposed exceptions to the Contract Boilerplate? Redlines? Proposed modifications in a separate attachment?
 - a. Redlines should be sufficient
93. Can IHCDCA provide the RFP in Microsoft Word format?
 - a. No
94. How many internal users are there?
 - a. There are about 120 internal users
95. What integrations will be required vs desired?
 - a. Required will be an integration to Microsoft Great Plains.
96. What is the estimated annual funding allocation for each of the programs within scope?
 - a. The funding for individual programs fluctuates each year but the total funding allocation for all IHCDCA programs that will eventually transition to the new application would be about \$130 million.

97. What is the estimated applicant volume/external users for each of the programs within scope?
- a. We estimate about 400 external users
98. For any required integrations, will IHCDa be able to provide API documentation, test endpoints, and a technical point of contact at the Agency during implementation?
- a. We can provide a technical point of contact for the software.
99. The RFP references 45+ programs. Can IHCDa provide a list of the programs in scope for the GMS, and indicate how they are grouped or categorized by type? Does IHCDa expect the number of programs to change?
- a. They are grouped into two categories – competitive and non competitive. During the rollout we do not expect the number to change but the number of programs does change periodically based on new funding streams from federal or state sources
100. Across the 45+ programs in scope, are the application forms and claim/review workflows generally unique to each program, or do groups of programs share a common application form and workflow? Approximately how many distinct application and workflow types exist across the portfolio?
- a. The workflows are fairly standard and the applications do share similar features from each but they do differ in the types of questions and data requested. The claims process is standard regardless if it's a competitive program or not.
101. Can IHCDa provide an approximate breakdown of claim volume by program or program category?
- a. In a typical year the agency will process about 5000 claims across all programs
102. The RFP timeline concludes with vendor selection on September 14, 2026. Does IHCDa have a target date or timeframe for contract execution and for the first program to go live in the new system? Are there any fixed deadlines — such as a program-year start, funding deadline, or legacy-system sunset date — that the implementation schedule must accommodate?
- a. We would prefer to begin rolling out new program years in the new system beginning in the 2nd half of 2027. There is no sunset date of the old software.
103. The RFP states each program migrates as its new program year begins so no program straddles two systems. Can IHCDa share the anticipated program-year start dates, or the expected rollout order and cadence, across the in-scope programs?
- a. Yes, IHCDa will share the programs, estimated program total dollar amounts, program start dates, and program durations with the selected vendor
104. Can IHCDa provide the approximate number of internal (staff) users and external users (applicants, grantees, subrecipients, lenders) across the portfolio, in total and, if available, by program category?
- a. Internal staff are about 120. External users number about 400
105. What are IHCDa's expectations for data conversion/migration from the legacy system, including source system(s), formats, data volumes, historical lookback period, and any known data-quality issues? Will migration scope be finalized during implementation?

- a. Migration scope can be finalized during implementation. Most data will not migrate however some data such as user contact info or organization info might migrate and would most likely be exported as excel or CSV files
- 106. What is IHCD's expectation for "integration" with Microsoft Great Plains — for example, real-time API exchange, scheduled/batch file transfer, or another method? Which GP version and hosting model (on-premise vs. cloud/Dynamics 365 Business Central) is currently in use?
 - a. We currently use real time API exchange. We have an on premise hosted model and the version is 18.5.1661
- 107. Which specific federal reporting systems are in scope for integration, what is the objective of each?
 - a. The Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (FFATA) with SAM.gov would be a nice integration. It is not required. Exporting to an SF425 (Federal Financial Report) would also be of note, but it is not required.
- 108. Which identity provider does IHCD use for single sign-on (e.g., Microsoft Entra ID / Azure AD, Okta, or another)?
 - a. We currently do not use single sign on features agency wide.
- 109. Appendix B states "dynamic mapping connections between the various line items and our accounting software accounts without altering historic information." Can IHCD clarify "without altering historic information"?
 - a. This refers to any changes in mapping for data flowing between the two systems does not go back and rewrite anything that was already done and moved to Great Plains in the past.
- 110. The RFP does not specify whether there is any legacy data that needs to be converted to the new grant management system. Please specify whether or not Respondents should plan for any data conversion activities in the scope of services, timeline, and budget. If so, please provide as much detail as possible about the legacy data to be converted, including where this data is currently housed, number of records, types of records, accuracy/cleanliness of data, etc.
 - a. IHCD will not be migrating data. IHCD may request the Vendor import organization and contact data cleaned by IHCD staff.
- 111. There does not seem to be a way to provide information about our software implementation processes as part of our response to the RFP. Can we add this information to our response? If so, where should we include this information? In an appendix or in a new (main) response section, maybe before or after the Key Personnel Identification section or before the Timelines section?
 - a. You can add it as an appendix.
- 112. What system or software is currently being used to manage the IHCD's grant portfolio or other aspects of the work of the agency?
 - a. The current system is legacy intellectual property of IHCD, developed and maintained by a third-party vendor.
- 113. The RFP has identified that an integration with Great Plains is required. Since Dynamics GP is in the process of being sunsetted with no support after September 2029, is it the

plan of IHCD to move to Business Central or some other enterprise accounting package?

- a. IHCD does not have current plans for new accounting software at this time and will be reviewed at a later date. For this current RFP the system will need to integrate with Great Plains

114. APPENDIX B. Data System Features, page 18 – “System has integration to federal reporting systems.” Please describe in detail any federal reporting requirements for the solution and define any systems integrations and the type(s) of integration(s) that are being requested.

- a. The Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (FFATA) with SAM.gov would be a nice integration. It is not required. Exporting to an SF425 (Federal Financial Report) would also be of note, but it is not required.

115. Our system currently supports the entire lifecycle of housing projects. This includes applications, evaluations and underwriting, closing, disbursements, compliance and monitoring, reporting, and portal access for partners and recipients. Are any of these areas outside of the scope of this RFP? If so, please explain anything that would be handled outside of the new system.

- a. Those are all in this scope in terms of the grant lifecycle. Ongoing owner compliance for development projects is outside of the scope but may be noted in response materials.

116. With the Governor’s Office’s recent announcement of the termination of the Minority and Women’s Business Enterprises Office, will you be removing M/WBE participation requirements from this procurement?

- a. There are no requirements in the RFP for M/WBE participation. If there is a part you are concerned about please let us know which part that is.

117. Please provide any budget information that might be available for this project.

- a. There is space provided in the RFP response packet to include your budgets for implementation as well as annual costs.

118. We kindly request at least a two-week extension of the response deadline. Would the agency please consider moving the due date?

- a. IHCD is not providing any extensions at this time

119. Can IHCD provide the overall amount of the Grants managed in the current system in terms of dollar value and number of Grant applications they receive for the 45 separate programs mentioned in the RFP?

- a. Calendar year 2025 grants by dollar amount were \$130 million

120. Is there a timeline that the system has to go live by?

- a. We are looking for a go-live in the 2nd half of 2027 with an incremental stair step roll out for programs as their new program year begins

121. RFP says each program will be enabled in the new system as the program year begins. Can IHCD confirm that the vendor doesn't have to migrate the legacy data from the existing application to the new solution?

- a. IHCD will not be migrating data. IHCD may request the Vendor import organization and contact data cleaned by IHCD staff.

122. How many internal and external users does IHCD expects on the new solution?

- a. Internal users would be about 120 and external users would be about 400
- 123. Please clarify the extent of the ERP/accounting capabilities required. Is the proposed solution expected to provide full ERP financial management functionality, or only grant-related financial tracking and accounting integrated with the Agency's existing financial system?
 - a. The system will need to have budget by award and line item tracking and contain a claim module to allow external users to draw funds down from applicable budgets and to have that draw data integrate to Microsoft Great Plains accounting software.
- 124. What is the current system that IHCDCA is using? Any incumbent vendor?
 - a. The current system is legacy intellectual property of IHCDCA, developed and maintained by a third-party vendor
- 125. For electronic PDF-only submissions, how should respondents designate proprietary or confidential materials, given the RFP language requiring confidential documents to be placed in a sealed envelope?
 - a. This is if a public records request is submitted and IHCDCA has any physical documentation. For all electronic documentation it is up to IHCDCA's discretion on what is considered public documentation
- 126. How should the "Recorded Reimbursement Claim Demonstration Video" be marked as confidential?
 - a. It cannot be marked as confidential. These are not shared with anyone outside of IHCDCA unless a public records request is initiated. It must then be reviewed by IHCDCA general counsel to determine what is/can be shared
- 127. The RFP submission list includes a required Recorded Reimbursement Claim Demonstration Video, but the later application checklist does not list that video item. Is the video mandatory for submission and if so, where should it be placed in the combined PDF.
 - a. Yes, the video is required. The video link can be included on the organization cover page.
- 128. The submission checklist says key personnel should be those working on "Indiana's EAP data system," while the RFP is for grants management software. Is this a typo?
 - a. This is a typo
- 129. The checklist says the budget chart is located in Appendix D, but the budget charts are in Appendix A. Can you confirm Appendix A has the correct budget charts?
 - a. It is appendix A
- 130. Appendix A says the first budget chart should include start-up costs associated with configuring and customizing the Great Plains integration, even though the project is broader than the accounting integration. Should the first budget include all implementation/start-up costs or only Great Plains integration costs?
 - a. All costs but you will need to include any additional costs needed to setup an integration into our accounting software
- 131. Appendix C says separate attachments are required for technical considerations, while the proposal must be one single/combined PDF. Does "separate attachments" means separate labeled sections within the combined PDF.

- a. Please make them separate attachments but part of the combined PDF
- 132. Does IHCDCA expect the selected vendor to migrate data from the existing legacy system into the new grants management system? If yes, please identify the source system(s), expected data types, approximate volume, historical years to be migrated, file/database formats available, and whether document attachments must be migrated?
 - a. IHCDCA will not be migrating data. IHCDCA may request the Vendor import organization and contact data cleaned by IHCDCA staff.
- 133. What version of Microsoft Great Plains (Dynamics GP) is IHCDCA currently running, and is it hosted on-premises or in the cloud?
 - a. We are running version 18.5.1661 and it is hosted on premises
- 134. What data is expected to flow between the GMS and Great Plains — specifically, which direction(s) are required (GMS → GP, GP → GMS, or bidirectional), and what entities are in scope (e.g., vendor/payee records, chart of accounts, budget lines, disbursement/payment batches, GL journal entries)?
 - a. GMS to GP. Vendor info, chart of accounts, budget lines, disbursement amounts, batching of payments, GL journal entries. Ideally, GP to GMS to confirm payments and any other updates.
- 135. Does IHCDCA have an internal IT team that manages the Great Plains environment, or is it supported by a third-party partner? Will that team be available to support integration testing?
 - a. It is supported by a third party partner and they will be available for testing and support on the GP side
- 136. Is a working GP integration required at go-live for Phase 1, or is it acceptable to complete integration in a subsequent phase?
 - a. Working GP integration will be required for go live phase 1
- 137. Appendix B includes features for tracking "incoming federal funds" and "sub-awards." Is the GMS expected to manage grants IHCDCA receives from federal agencies (e.g., HUD, Treasury) in addition to grants IHCDCA issues to grantees and subrecipients, or is the scope limited to outgoing administration?
 - a. It is not a requirement to tracking incoming federal funds however if a system where to provide some functionality around that it would be beneficial to IHCDCA to have that functionality in the new application.
- 138. Which specific federal programs are in scope (e.g., HOME, CDBG, LIHTC, Section 8, CDBG-DR)? Are there programs with unique federal reporting obligations the system must support?
 - a. Continuum of Care, CSBG, Emergency Solutions Grant, Housing First, HOME, HOPWA, Housing Trust Fund, LIHEAP, PSHPD
- 139. Which specific federal reporting systems must the GMS integrate with or export data to (e.g., HUD IDIS, Treasury ASAP, SAM.gov, Grants.gov, FFATA/USASpending)?
 - a. The Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (FFATA) with SAM.gov would be a nice integration. It is not required. Exporting to an SF425 (Federal Financial Report) would also be of note, but it is not required.

140. Can IHCD provide a list of the 45+ programs, or at minimum a breakdown by type (competitive vs. formula/non-competitive, federal vs. state-funded)? This will help vendors accurately scope configuration and timeline.
- a. Continuum of Care, CSBG, Emergency Solutions Grant, Housing First, HOME, HOPWA, Housing Trust Fund, LIHEAP, PSHPD are the programs we have but each has several derivatives that do slightly different functions
141. For the phased rollout — where each program transitions at the start of its new program year — what is the anticipated timeline for Phase 1? Which programs are expected to go live first, and when does the first program year begin after contract execution?
- a. IHCD is looking at the 2nd half of 2027 so the exact program would be driven by when a vendor can get a system up and running with all necessary integrations and requirements.
142. During the phased rollout, will staff need to access historical data from the legacy system and the new GMS simultaneously? If so, what are the requirements for legacy data access or migration during the transition period?
- a. Staff will need data from both systems however no data will be migrated to the new system
143. What system is currently being replaced, and in what format(s) is existing grant data stored (e.g., database exports, spreadsheets, a legacy SaaS platform)?
- a. The current system is legacy intellectual property of IHCD, developed and maintained by a third-party vendor. IHCD will not be migrating data. IHCD may request the Vendor import organization and contact data cleaned by IHCD staff.
144. How far back does IHCD require historical grant data to be migrated? Is read-only access to historical records sufficient, or must data be fully functional in the new GMS?
- a. No migration is needed
145. What is the approximate volume of active grant records, organization records, and historical claims currently in the system? This will help vendors accurately scope migration effort and budget.
- a. No migration is needed
146. How many internal IHCD staff users are expected, and what is the approximate breakdown by role (e.g., program officers, finance/accounting, administrators, executives)?
- a. Internal staff will number about 120 users
147. How many external partner organizations and external users (grantees, applicants, subrecipients) are expected to access the portal?
- a. We estimate around 400 external users
148. The RFP references both a public-facing portal for "applicants" and a portal for "grantees" submitting claims. Are these the same portal with role-based differentiation, or are separate portals expected for pre-award applications vs. post-award claims?
- a. It will or can be one portal that both applicants and grantees (applicants that were awarded funds) use
149. Is the online application portal required at initial go-live, or is the post-award claims and monitoring workflow the priority for Phase 1?

- a. Claims and monitoring workflow would be the priority for phase 1 but a working online application would be a close second.
150. Indiana's IOT RAMP policy allows vendors to achieve GovRAMP authorization after contract award — specifically within 18 months of contract start or half the initial term, whichever is shorter. Can IHCDCA confirm this interpretation applies to this procurement? Additionally, what is the anticipated initial contract term, so vendors can assess the applicable compliance window?
- a. The initial contract term will be as long as IHCDCA and the selected vendor need to get the new system up and running. There will also need to be an ongoing maintenance contract to help the agency keep the system up and running
151. Is multi-factor authentication (MFA) required for all user types — both internal staff and external grantees/applicants — or only for internal IHCDCA users? Does IHCDCA plan to integrate the GMS with its own Identity Provider (IdP, e.g., Azure AD/Entra ID) for either internal or external user authentication? If so, please confirm whether IdP-level MFA enforcement would satisfy this requirement.
- a. MFA is not a requirement but if the chosen system has it IHCDCA can review with the vendor to see how it fits within IOT security requirements
152. Will all vendors who submit a responsive, compliant proposal be invited to the virtual presentation phase, or will presentations be limited to a shortlisted subset based on written proposal scores?
- a. Presentations will be limited to those shortlisted based on written proposal scores
153. What is the scoring rubric and point allocation for the virtual presentations? How much of the total final score do presentations represent relative to the written proposal?
- a. The presentations will be factored into the scoring in the technical considerations and data system features at the end of section 3 in the RFP
154. For the required recorded claims demonstration video, should this use a generic/sandbox environment or reflect IHCDCA-specific program configurations? Are there specific program types or claim scenarios IHCDCA wants to see?
- a. A generic/sandbox environment can be used for this purpose.
155. The written proposal scoring totals 231 points. Can IHCDCA provide the scoring breakdown for the presentation phase as well?
- a. Not at this time.
156. Is there a published budget ceiling or estimated contract value for this procurement?
- a. There is not
157. The RFP states the Contract Boilerplate is non-negotiable but that exceptions may be submitted for consideration. What is IHCDCA's timeline for reviewing and responding to exception requests?
- a. That would be determined by our legal team and how many exceptions are submitted
158. Will the contract be structured as a fixed-price implementation plus recurring SaaS subscription, or is IHCDCA open to alternative pricing structures?
- a. IHCDCA is open to alternative pricing structures

159. What does the monitoring module need to support — on-site visits, remote desk reviews, progress reporting, financial audits, or a combination? Are monitoring workflows expected to be configurable by program?
- a. Monitoring workflows would need to have some level of configuration and would include onsite visits, remote desk reviews, and financial audits
160. Are there specific record retention periods IHCDCA must comply with for grant documentation (e.g., federal 7-year requirements)? Should the system enforce retention schedules automatically?
- a. There are different retention periods for different document types. Automatic enforcement of those retention schedules would be a highly requested.
161. Is the Power BI integration listed in Appendix B a required feature for award, or a desired/bonus capability?
- a. If there is no robust reporting/dashboard features built in then Power BI integration would be required however if the system has a strong built in reporting/dashboard feature than Power BI integration may not be necessary
162. How many letter templates does IHCDCA anticipate needing at launch (e.g., award letters, denial letters, compliance notices), and should these be fully configurable by IHCDCA staff without vendor involvement?
- a. At launch the number of templates would probably be about 10 and partial configuration would be required.
163. Section 2(K) of Part 3 states that IHCDCA reserves the right to split the award "on a category by category basis." Will IHCDCA consider awarding the project management/PMO function of this engagement separately from the core software licensing and technical implementation? If so, what submission requirements would apply to a respondent proposing only PMO services, given that several required items (e.g., Appendix B Data System Features, Appendix C Technical Considerations, the claims demonstration video) are software-specific?
- a. While IHCDCA reserves the right to split the award on a category-by-category basis, this RFP is for the all-encompassing solution. As such, if certain services cannot be provided by a selected respondent, as outlined in their response, we will address procurement of those categories at that time.
164. Would IHCDCA accept a proposal from a respondent offering only project management office (PMO) services as part of a teaming arrangement with a separate software vendor, or must all respondents propose as the prime for the full scope of services described in Part 1, Section 3?
- a. IHCDCA will review and score all responses submitted in accordance with the Public Notice RFP and publicly available supplemental information (including the responses to these questions). All responses will be fully scored across all categories. Respondents are allowed to utilize third-party entities, if identified in the Response with the intended scope of services the other entity (or entities) will provide. While there is not a required format to submit this, an explanation of all roles and functions should accompany the response.
165. Have they taken any demonstrations of grants management software? If so, who did they demo with?

- a. Any demos done in the past were not part of this RFP process.
- 166. How many active grants are they currently managing?
 - a. We have 3,000 grants active in the current system.
- 167. Do they have multiyear grants?
 - a. Some programs, but not all, receive and/or subgrant multiyear awards.
- 168. What federal reporting systems would need to be integrated?
 - a. The Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (FFATA) with SAM.gov would be a nice integration. It is not required. Exporting to an SF425 (Federal Financial Report) would also be of note, but it is not required.
- 169. What type of PII information is collected?
 - a. In the Grants Management System, EIN/TIN/SSN and banking information are the primary PII data points.
- 170. The RFP states IHCD administers over 45 programs. Could you provide a breakdown of those programs by funding source or business area (e.g., HOME, HTF, LIHTC, HOME-ARP, ESG, CDBG, DPA, Rental Assistance, etc.)?
 - a. US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) administers HOME, HTF, LIHTC, CDBG, a variety of voucher programs, etc. Most of these programs are administered by IHCD's Real Estate Division. HUD also has CoC, ESG, and HOPWA, among others, that are administered by our Community Services Division. US Health and Human Services (HHS) administers LIHEAP and CSBG; US Department of Energy (DOE) administers Weatherization. The HHS and DOE programs, as well as two small state funded programs (Individual Development Accounts, or IDA, and Neighborhood Assistance Program, or NAP), are largely administered by our Community Programs Division.
- 171. Can you drill down into which of these are true grants as opposed to other funding instruments such as, Loans, Tax credits, Rental assistance, Other housing finance programs
 - a. Without understanding what is meant by a true grant, our rental assistance programs are true grants. Both HOME and HTF are typically grants but based on several factors may be loans. LIHTC, a tax credit, will not utilize the Grants Management System. Our down-payment assistance/first-time homebuyer programs will not utilize the Respondent Solution.
- 172. Approximately how many of those programs require materially different application forms, workflows, claims processes, and reporting versus sharing a common configuration?
 - a. There is much that could be common configuration. Each program has its own application form, workflow, claims requirements, and reporting, but for the grants management aspects, it is largely the data points and/or user assignment that are adjusted. Most programs that utilize an application have a copy of their form on the IHCD website even when not open. The claims processes all largely follow the same flow, however, there are distinctions for whether our Financial Operations team would review the claim or the program staff team would based on a variety of nuances.

173. Approximately how many funding opportunities (NOFOs/RFPs) are opened annually across all programs?
- IHCDA has not determined, nor committed, that RFPs will be performed in the solution. NOFOs vary based on a variety of factors, but there are typically at least two NOFOs per year, both for Continuum of Care (CoC). There are a variety of Requests for Awards and Requests for Project Applications. These can be found on the IHCDA Public Notice website from 2021 to current.
174. Approximately how many applications are received annually?
- Due to the variety of systems used for applications, we are unsure the total quantity. The best estimate is that we have around 1000 applications per year.
175. Approximately how much grant and housing assistance funding does IHCDA award annually across all programs?
- The current system processed approximately \$130m in the 2025 calendar year.
176. The RFP references processing over 5,000 claims annually. Could you clarify what constitutes a "claim," and approximately how those claims are distributed across your programs?
- A claim is a specific request to reimburse funds for a particular program. Many, but not all, IHCDA program agreements have a requirement that at least one and no more than one claim be submitted in a month to cover the administration and provision of services in the prior month (where the prior month is in the appropriate award period).
177. Would IHCDA be willing to share representative examples of its current or desired application forms, claims forms, budget templates, award agreements, review forms, reports, dashboards, correspondence templates, workflow diagrams, or screenshots of the existing system? These materials would help respondents better understand the desired configuration and provide more accurate implementation estimates.
- No
178. Can you share an anticipated budget or 'not to exceed' amount for this project?
- We don't have a specific budget prepared for this project. The goal to move awards over to the new system will be incremental and not all at once.
179. Do you have a designated internal system administrator for this new grants system who will act as a product owner and long-term point of contact after initial go-live of the MVP?
- Adam Lawson, Director of Operations, will be the product owner. He and Katryna Rice-Krause, Manager of Business Processes, will be the long-term points of contact for configuration, implementation, and ongoing maintenance.
180. Could IHCDA provide the anticipated annual program calendar, including the typical start dates for each major program, to help respondents develop an appropriate phased implementation schedule?
- Please see below based on the program umbrellas.

Program	Start
CSBG	January
Housing First	January
COC-DV	February

WX DOE	April
ESG	July
HOPWA	July
IDA	July
HMIS	October
WX LIHEAP	October
WX Rebates	October
COC-CE	December
Development Fund	Revolving
HOME	Revolving
HTF	Revolving
Lead	Revolving
PSHPD	Revolving
COC-RRH	Revolving

181. The RFP indicates IHCD intends to implement the system using a phased approach where each program transitions at the start of its next program year. Could you clarify what programs are expected to be included in the initial MVP, what constitutes MVP success, and what the anticipated rollout schedule is for the remaining programs?
- The programs included in initial MVP are determined based on the timeline for finalizing SOW and executing contract with the selected Respondent. IHCD anticipates rolling out to the remaining programs as their next grant year begins. Once initial MVP is live, IHCD does not anticipate new program years starting in the legacy system; the change in program year will be when the program moves to the new solution.
182. Approximately how many internal users will require access?
- 120 internal users
183. Approximately how many external users (applicants, grantees, developers, nonprofit partners, local governments, etc.) will access the system annually?
- 400 external users.
184. Will you rely on external reviewers for application scoring?
- Not with current processes.
185. Which identity provider will IHCD use for Single Sign-On (e.g., Microsoft Entra ID, Okta, Ping)? Will SSO be required only for internal users, or for external users as well?
- IHCD does not currently have an agency-wide standard. Native SSO functionality will be considered in conjunction with IOT SSO policies.
186. Which existing systems will serve as the sources for data migration?
- IHCD will not be migrating data. IHCD may request the Vendor import organization and contact data cleaned by IHCD staff.

187. Approximately how many historical applications, awards, claims, organizations, contacts, documents, payment records, monitoring records, and attachments are expected to be migrated?
- a. IHCD A will not be migrating data. IHCD A may request the Vendor import organization and contact data cleaned by IHCD A staff.
188. Will historical claims and payment history be migrated, or only active programs?
- a. IHCD A will not be migrating data. IHCD A may request the Vendor import organization and contact data cleaned by IHCD A staff.
189. What role will IHCD A's team play in data migration vs the vendor? Is vendor expected to do data prep or data clearing of IHCD's historical data?
- a. IHCD A will not be migrating data. IHCD A may request the Vendor import organization and contact data cleaned by IHCD A staff.
190. Beyond Microsoft Great Plains and Power BI, what other systems are expected to integrate with the MVP (document management, e-signature, GIS, identity management, federal reporting systems, etc.)? Are their APIs for these?
- a. There aren't further expectations. IHCD A would like you to provide any integrations available.
191. Has IHCD A engaged with any vendors or seen any demos prior to this RFP?
- a. Any demos done in the past were not part of this RFP process.
192. What is the current legacy system in use? What are the 3 biggest pain points that are bringing you to market now?
- a. The current system is legacy intellectual property of IHCD A, developed and maintained by a third-party vendor. IHCD A would not like to focus on the pain points of the prior system, but the three biggest hopes of the implemented solution are:
 - i. Comprehensive and modern system for the full grants management lifecycle;
 - ii. Streamlined, yet adaptable, workflows and handoffs;
 - iii. And robust and/or dynamic reporting.
193. In section 4. Responsible Respondent Requirements state that vendors have a satisfactory performance record with IHCD A. If a vendor hasn't worked with IHCD A, would this disqualify the vendor? If it doesn't disqualify the vendor, is it weighed during the evaluation?
- a. A vendor that hasn't worked with IHCD A would not be disqualified. Prior performance, in and of itself, with IHCD A is not scored, though may be used in conjunction with "4. Strength of client references" in Part 2, Section 3.
194. For the registration with the Secretary of State, can this be done during contracting or does this need to be completed prior to submitting the proposal?
- a. To be determined a responsible Respondent, the Respondent, if an entity subject to IC Title 23, must be properly registered with the Indiana Secretary of State and owe no outstanding reports to the Indiana Secretary of State.
195. What, if any, federal reporting systems does the vendor need to provide direct API integrations to? Is IHCD A anticipating API integrations or would an import/export suffice for this requirement?

- a. The Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (FFATA) with SAM.gov would be a nice integration. It is not required. Exporting to an SF425 (Federal Financial Report) would also be of note, but it is not required.
- 196. Who is IHCDCA anticipating would need to go through training? If so, how many would be in attendance for that training? Would a customized user guide and navigation video for specific users be considered as a cost-savings?
 - a. IHCDCA has a wide variety of internal and external users pursuing different activities. Respondents are to include their training plan for the system users. A user guide and navigation video could be considered cost-saving, depending on content, formulation, and a wide variety of other factors.
- 197. Is IHCDCA anticipating a help desk? If so, what type of support? If so, how many estimated help desk tickets come in currently?
 - a. IHCDCA does expect ongoing support from the selected Respondent. How that support is administered should be addressed in the proposal. The quantity of tickets will depend on what functionality can be handled by the internal product owner and system administrator (or any other users of lower permissions), versus what has been handled by the selected Respondent.
- 198. Would references from government grantmaking entities such as state agencies, state commissions, municipal departments, or other public-sector organizations operating within a state satisfy the state and federal reference requirement?
 - a. Yes
- 199. Part 2, Section 5, Items 9 and 10 require three client references — two from state or federal agencies currently using the respondent's data system — and a recorded demonstration of that system processing a claim end to end. If a respondent proposes a solution built and operated by a technology partner or subcontractor, with the respondent serving as prime and responsible party, may the partner's client references and existing system be used to satisfy Items 9 and 10? Is a prime/subcontractor teaming structure permitted under this RFP, and if so, is there a required disclosure format (teaming agreement, defined roles and responsibilities)?
 - a. IHCDCA will review and score all responses submitted in accordance with the Public Notice RFP and publicly available supplemental information (including the responses to these questions). All responses will be fully scored across all categories. Respondents are allowed to utilize third-party entities, if identified in the Response with the intended scope of services the other entity (or entities) will provide. While there is not a required format to submit this, an explanation of all roles and functions should accompany the response. That said, IHCDCA, and security policies in place with IOT, make it advantageous for vendors working with IHCDCA to be based in the US.
- 200. How does Indiana Housing and Community Development Authority (IHCDCA) plan to fund this project? Is it part of the operating budget or capital budget?
 - a. IHCDCA has an approved annual budget that includes the start-up costs for this endeavor.
- 201. Does IHCDCA have an approved budget for this new Grants Management System (GMS)?

- a. IHCDCA has an approved annual budget that includes the start-up costs for this endeavor.
- 202. Has IHCDCA previously entertained any system demonstrations and/or presentations from vendors? If so, which systems were seen and when?
 - a. Any demos done in the past were not part of this RFP process.
- 203. Did IHCDCA utilize any vendor / SME consultants in defining the sought-after functionality and/or scope of work enumerated in the RFP? If yes, please provide the name of the vendor/consultant.
 - a. No
- 204. How does IHCDCA currently manage grants, including the name of any existing vendor-provided GMS or related systems? What are the primary pain points with the current solution and processes?
 - a. The current system is legacy intellectual property of IHCDCA, developed and maintained by a third-party vendor. IHCDCA would not like to focus on the pain points of the prior system, but the three biggest hopes of the implemented solution are:
 - i. Comprehensive and modern system for the full grants management lifecycle;
 - ii. Streamlined, yet adaptable, workflows and handoffs;
 - iii. And robust and/or dynamic reporting.
- 205. Given the requirement to manage federal funds, does IHCDCA require vendors who have experience deploying GMS at the federal level?
 - a. Experience deploying GMS at the federal level is not required but may be included for relevant organizational experience and/or client references.
- 206. Can you provide the annual dollar amount of grant funding you receive for the current fiscal year?
 - a. Approximately \$130m flowed through the existing system in the 2025 calendar year.
- 207. What dollar volume of these grants are pass-through grants to sub-grantees?
 - a. Generally, there is at most 10% held back for IHCDCA Administration (including for sub-contracts).
- 208. What is the total dollar amount of grants distributed?
 - a. Approximately \$130m flowed through the existing system in the 2025 calendar year.
- 209. Does IHCDCA have a timeline / anticipated go-live date for the new system?
 - a. IHCDCA expects to work with the selected Respondent to determine the anticipated go-live date, adjusting based on SOW finalization and contract execution. IHCDCA does not want a program award to straddle two systems, so it will be done at the startup of new program years.
- 210. How many separate grant programs does IHCDCA manage? Please provide a list, if available. For these programs, do business processes and associated forms vary by program, or are they standardized? Please also provide the anticipated application period start dates for each program, if available.

- a. Continuum of Care, CSBG, Emergency Solutions Grant, Housing First, HOME, HOPWA, Housing Trust Fund, LIHEAP, PSHPD are the programs we have but each has several derivatives that do slightly different functions. The applications will differ across the programs to a certain degree, the workflow for competitive vs non-competitive deal with one scoring and the other not scoring. Claim review process is largely the same.

Program	Start
CSBG	January
Housing First	January
COC-DV	February
WX DOE	April
ESG	July
HOPWA	July
IDA	July
HMIS	October
WX LIHEAP	October
WX Rebates	October
COC-CE	December
Development Fund	Revolving
HOME	Revolving
HTF	Revolving
Lead	Revolving
PSHPD	Revolving
COC-RRH	Revolving

211. What systems, both internal and external, does IHCD need the new GMS to integrate with? Can you provide details for the integration (capability, data, etc.)?
- a. IHCD's accounting system is Microsoft Great Plains and we would need a direct integration to Great Plains.
212. What version of your financial management system is currently being used?
- a. IHCD's accounting system is Microsoft Great Plains and is version 18.5.1661.
213. Please provide the current modules that are implemented within the financial management system?
- a. We utilize the Financial Management module (general ledger, accounts payable, accounts receivable)
214. Also, can you provide the expectation for the type of integration required, e.g., web services, file-based, one-way, or bi-directional data flow?
- a. Integration would at least need to be data out of the system. The key integration is the accounting integration, which ideally is two-way. PowerBI would only need to be one-way out of the system.
215. Can you provide an estimate of the volume of data to be converted and migrated into the new GMS?

- a. IHCD A will not be migrating data. IHCD A may request the Vendor import organization and contact data cleaned by IHCD A staff.
216. What is the current format of this grant data? Please provide an example row of data and/or database schema.
- a. IHCD A will not be migrating data. IHCD A may request the Vendor import organization and contact data cleaned by IHCD A staff.
217. Please provide the following breakdown:
- a. How many IHCD A staff will access/log into the GMS more than 20 hours a month?
 - i. IHCD A will have about 120 internal users. IHCD A does not have the ability to estimate the proportion less/over 20 hours.
 - b. How many IHCD A staff will access/log into the GMS less than 20 hours a month?
 - i. IHCD A will have about 120 internal users. IHCD A does not have the ability to estimate the proportion less/over 20 hours.
 - c. How many Grantee/Recipient users will need access to the GMS ?
 - i. IHCD A estimates 400 external users.
 - d. How many internal staff only review applications?
 - i. Let's assume none.
218. Are there any file size limits for email submissions?
- a. IOT restricts file uploads to 10MB.
219. Could IHCD A provide more detail on the evaluation criteria and the subcriteria? Specifically, what factors will be assessed and what weighting will be assigned to each?
- a. No
220. The checklist references submitting the budget chart located in Appendix D, while the RFP identifies the budget as Appendix A. Please confirm the correct appendix reference and required budget forms.
- a. Please use the Appendix A Budget sheets
221. Could the agency share the IHCD A's boilerplate agreement?
- a. This can be found at: <https://www.in.gov/ihcda/files/Professional-Services-Contract-2025-Boilerplate-FORMATTED-1-002.pdf>.
222. Please confirm whether the proposal submission order should follow Part 2, Section 5 or the Application Checklist, since the checklist places Budget and Budget Narrative after Timelines while Part 2 lists Budget before Data System Features and Technical Considerations.
- a. Follow Part 2, Section 5.
223. Please confirm whether the Recorded Reimbursement Claim Demonstration Video is required, since it appears in Part 2, Section 5 but does not appear in the Application Checklist.
- a. It is required.
224. Please confirm whether Appendix C responses require separate attachments, as stated in Appendix C, while the RFP also requires one single/combined PDF document.
- a. Please make them separate attachments but part of the combined PDF.

225. Please confirm whether respondents should submit a "Document Noting IOT Exceptions" only if exceptions exist, as stated in the checklist, or whether a statement of no exceptions should be included for completeness.
- a. Please submit only if exceptions exist.
226. Please confirm whether the Times New Roman, 12-point, single-spaced formatting requirement applies only to narrative responses, or to all proposal content, including forms, tables, charts, Appendix B, Appendix C attachments/textboxes, headers/footers, graphics, and captions.
- a. Narrative responses only.
227. Could IHCDa please confirm the 45 programs that this Grant Management System is intended to support?
- a. Continuum of Care, CSBG, Emergency Solutions Grant, Housing First, HOME, HOPWA, Housing Trust Fund, LIHEAP, PSHPD are the programs we have but each has several derivatives that do slightly different functions.
228. Is this system intended to replace IHCDa's current program database, or will it operate alongside/in addition to the existing database?
- a. IHCDa intends to replace the current database with the selected solution. IHCDa intends to use a phased approach where new program year awards are started in the new system, based on the mutually agreed upon initial go-live date. Once the initial programs go-live, IHCDa envisions rolling out each program's next executed awards to be in the selected solution, to avoid a program year being split across two systems.
229. What is the existing grants management system?
- a. The current system is legacy intellectual property of IHCDa, developed and maintained by a third-party vendor.
230. Which records require migration (e.g. awards, award budgets, payments, etc.)? and how many records of each type are there approximately?
- a. IHCDa will not be migrating data. IHCDa may request the Vendor import organization and contact data cleaned by IHCDa staff.
231. What data formats currently exist (SQL database, Excel, etc.)? Any data quality issues?
- a. IHCDa will not be migrating data. IHCDa may request the Vendor import organization and contact data cleaned by IHCDa staff.
232. How many years of historical data must migrate?
- a. IHCDa will not be migrating data. IHCDa may request the Vendor import organization and contact data cleaned by IHCDa staff.
233. Are there legacy systems beyond the primary one feeding data?
- a. No.
234. What is the total annual grant dollars managed across 45 programs?
- a. The current system processed approximately \$130m in the 2025 calendar year.
235. Can you provide a breakdown of competitive vs. non-competitive applications annually?
- a. Mostly non-competitive, but a smattering of competitive.
236. How many active sub-recipients/grantees are there?
- a. IHCDa estimates approximately 400 external users

237. The RFP includes 'Integration to Microsoft Great Plains' as a budget line item (Appendix A) and evaluates API capabilities for accounting software integration (Appendix B & C), but Great Plains integration is not listed in the Required System Components (Scope section). Is Microsoft Great Plains integration mandatory, optional, or phased by program? Can you define the use case for the Microsoft Great Plains integration
- a. The integration does not have to predate this RFP or exist at time of contract execution. It will, however, be a required component of initial MVP.
238. Aside from Microsoft Great Plains, are there any other systems you want to integrate with? If so, what is the use case per system?
- a. PowerBI – One-way for reporting purposes.
239. Does IHCDCA have a RAMP compliance checklist or validation process that vendors should reference during proposal development?
- a. IHCDCA does not have independent RAMP resources. Please see the IOT policies.
240. What is your preferred implementation approach? For example, do you anticipate foundational standard processes across all 45 programs? Do you want each program to be implemented separately?
- a. Each program will have distinctions but will have a lot of replicated functionality and logic. The key data points and users change, but they are foundationally standard processes.
241. Please clarify the specific GovRAMP requirements applicable to the proposed solution. What GovRAMP impact level—Low, Moderate, or High—is required, and what authorization status will IHCDCA accept, such as Ready, Provisionally Authorized, or Authorized? Please also confirm whether the required status must be held at the time of proposal submission, contract award, or production go-live.
- a. Impact level is High. Authorization will be reviewed in conjunction with IOT's GovRAMP policy.
242. Which legacy grants management system(s) will be replaced, and what data volumes/structures (tables, file sizes, years of history) must be migrated into the new platform?
- a. IHCDCA will not be migrating data. IHCDCA may request the Vendor import organization and contact data cleaned by IHCDCA staff.
243. Beyond Microsoft Great Plains, are there other required external systems or federal reporting portals (e.g., IDIS, DRGR, Sage, HUD systems) that must exchange data with the GMS, and what integration methods are acceptable (REST API, SFTP, etc.)?
- a. Other integrations are not required but may be of note, particularly for Federal reporting portals including those mentioned and/or integration with SAM for FFATA.
244. Please provide estimated numbers of internal IHCDCA staff, external sub-grantees, and reviewer users expected at go-live and over the 3-year term for sizing and pricing purposes.
- a. Users expected at go-live depends upon the agreed upon go-live time (and therefore program). IHCDCA estimates at go-live 25 internal staff and up to 100

external staff will be necessary. IHCD estimates, at full implementation, needing 120 internal users and 400 external users.

245. The RFP references Indiana IOT RAMP. What target RAMP impact level and timeline for authorization should vendors plan for, and are there existing ATO packages that can be leveraged?

- a. Impact level is high. Authorization timeline is the responsibility of the vendor and will be reviewed in conjunction with IOT's GovRAMP policy.

246. Will point scoring for the 108-item "Data System Features" checklist be binary, or will partial fulfillment earn proportional points? Understanding this affects configuration vs. development planning.

- a. Partial fulfillment earns partial points.