RFP #061726
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
for
Enterprise Artificial Intelligence: Platforms, Services, and Integrated Delivery
Proposal Due Date: June 17, 2026, 3:30 p.m., Central Time

Sourcewell, a State of Minnesota local government unit and service cooperative, is requesting proposals for Enterprise Artificial Intelligence: Platforms, Services, and Integrated Delivery to result in a procurement solution for use by its Participating Entities. Sourcewell Participating Entities include thousands of governmental, higher education, K-12 education, nonprofit, tribal government, and other public agencies located in the United States and Canada. Sourcewell encourages the use of Small, Minority-owned, Women's Business Enterprise, Veteran-owned Business Enterprise (S/M/WBE/VBE) suppliers both as prime and subcontractors and encourages the participation of these suppliers in the solicitation process. A full copy of the Request for Proposals can be found on the Sourcewell Procurement Portal [https://proportal.sourcewell-mn.gov]. Only proposals submitted through the Sourcewell Procurement Portal will be considered. Proposals are due no later than June 17, 2026, at 3:30 p.m. Central Time, and late proposals will not be considered.

SOLICITATION SCHEDULE

Public Notice of RFP Published:	April 29, 2026
Pre-proposal Conference:	May 12, 2026, 10:00 a.m., Central Time
Question Submission Deadline:	June 09, 2026, 4:30 p.m., Central Time
Proposal Due Date:	**June 17, 2026, 3:30 p.m., Central Time** Late responses will not be considered.
Opening:	June 17, 2026, 3:30 p.m., Central Time See RFP Section V.G. "Opening"

I. ABOUT SOURCEWELL

A. SOURCEWELL

Sourcewell is a State of Minnesota local government unit and service cooperative created under the laws of the State of Minnesota (Minnesota Statutes Section 123A.21) that facilitates a competitive public solicitation and master agreement award process for the benefit of its 50,000+ participating entities across the United States and Canada. Sourcewell's solicitation process complies with State of Minnesota law and policies, conforms to Canadian trade agreements (including Canadian Free Trade Agreement, Ontario-Quebec Trade and Cooperation Agreement, and Canada-European Union Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement, as applicable), and results in cooperative purchasing solutions from which Sourcewell's Participating Entities procure equipment, products, and services.

Cooperative purchasing provides participating entities and suppliers increased administrative efficiencies and the power of combined purchasing volume that result in overall cost savings. At times, Sourcewell also partners with other purchasing cooperatives to combine the purchasing volume of their membership into a single solicitation and master agreement expanding the reach of awarded suppliers' potential pool of end users.

Sourcewell uses a website-based platform, the Sourcewell Procurement Portal, through which all proposals to this RFP must be submitted.

B. USE OF RESULTING MASTER AGREEMENTS

In the United States, Sourcewell's master agreements are available for use by:

- Federal and state government entities[1];
- Cities, towns, and counties/parishes;
- Education service cooperatives;
- K-12 and higher education entities;
- Tribal government entities;
- Some nonprofit entities; and
- Other public entities.

The following entities are listed in this solicitation to satisfy the procurement requirements of Oregon, Utah, and Virginia [Political Subdivision List - Oregon, Utah, and Virginia].

In Canada, Sourcewell's master agreements are available for use by current and future members including:

[1] Pursuant to HAR §3-128-2, the State of Hawaii, Department of Accounting and General Services, State Procurement Office, on behalf of the State of Hawaii and participating jurisdictions, has provided notice of its Intent to Participate in the solicitation as a participating entity.

- Federal, provincial, and territorial government departments, ministries, agencies, boards, councils, committees, commissions, and similar agencies;
- Indigenous self-governing bodies;
- Regional, local, district, and other forms of municipal government, municipal organizations, school boards, and publicly funded academic, health, and social service entities referred to as MASH sector (this should be construed to include but not be limited to the cities of Calgary, Edmonton, Toronto, Ottawa, and Winnipeg), as well as any corporation or entity owned or controlled by one or more of the preceding entities;
- Crown corporations, government enterprises, and other entities that are owned or controlled by these entities through ownership interest; and
- Canoe procurement group of Canada's current and future members. Canoe members include:
    - Federal, provincial and territorial government departments, ministries, agencies, boards, councils, committees, commissions, and similar agencies;
    - Crown corporations, government enterprises, and other entities that are owned or controlled by these entities through ownership interest;
    - Indigenous self-governing bodies;
    - Airport authorities;
    - Regional, local, district, and other forms of municipal government, municipal organizations, school boards, and publicly funded academic, health, and social service entities referred to as MASH sector (this should be construed to include but not be limited to the cities of Calgary, Edmonton, Toronto, Ottawa, and Winnipeg), as well as any corporation or entity owned or controlled by one or more of the preceding entities; and
    - Canoe procurement group of Canada's current and future partner associations, including Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities, Association of Manitoba Municipalities, Local Authorities Services/Association of Municipalities Ontario, Nova Scotia Federation of Municipalities, Federation of Prince Edward Island Municipalities, Municipalities Newfoundland Labrador, Union of New Brunswick Municipalities, Northwest Territories Association of Communities, Association of Yukon Communities, CivicInfo BC, Association and their current and future members.

For a listing of current United States and Canadian Participating Entities visit Sourcewell's website (note: there is a tab for each country): https://www.sourcewell-mn.gov/sourcewell-for-vendors/agency-locator.

Participating Entities typically access master agreements for equipment, products, or services through a purchase order issued directly to the awarded supplier. A Participating Entity may request additional terms or conditions related to a purchase. Use of Sourcewell master agreements is voluntary and Participating Entities retain the right to obtain similar equipment, products, or services from other sources.

To meet Participating Entities' needs, Sourcewell broadly publishes public notice of all solicitation opportunities, including this RFP. In addition, where applicable, other purchasing cooperatives and procurement officials receive notice and are encouraged to re-post the solicitation opportunity.

Proof of publication will be available at the conclusion of the solicitation process.

Sourcewell encourages the use of Small, Minority-owned, Women's Business Enterprise, Veteran-owned Business Enterprise (S/M/WBE/VBE) suppliers both as prime and subcontractors and encourages the participation of these suppliers in the solicitation process.

C. INTERGOVERNMENTAL SUPPORT AGREEMENTS

Pursuant to 10 U.S.C. § 2679, United States Department of Defense authorized installations may access Sourcewell's awarded cooperative purchasing master agreements through an Intergovernmental Support Agreement with Sourcewell. All transactions completed through this Intergovernmental Support program are directly facilitated by Sourcewell and may be subject to additional terms and conditions.

II. SOLICITATION DETAILS

A. SOLUTIONS-BASED SOLICITATION

This RFP and master agreement award process is a solutions-based solicitation; meaning that Sourcewell is seeking equipment, products, or services that meet the general requirements of the scope of this RFP and are commonly desired or are required by law or industry standards. Participating Entities are responsible for conducting due diligence and ensuring compliance with state, federal, local laws, and specific funding requirements in consultation with legal counsel.

B. REQUESTED EQUIPMENT, PRODUCTS, OR SERVICES

Proposers are expected to offer a wide array of equipment, products, or services at lower prices and with better value than what they would ordinarily offer to a single government entity, school district, or regional cooperative.

Sourcewell is seeking proposals for Enterprise Artificial Intelligence: Platforms, Services, and Integrated Delivery as described below.

Sourcewell recognizes that enterprise artificial intelligence solutions often rely on related capabilities such as data infrastructure, cybersecurity, and compliance. Proposers may include directly related products and services to the extent that they are complementary to the Primary Lot being proposed, even where those offerings are not exclusively AI specific, provided they align with the scope of the Solicitation.

This RFP is organized into three (3) response Lots. Proposers must select ONE (1) Primary Lot under which to submit a response.

- For purposes of this RFP, **"Primary Lot"** means the single Lot that best represents the proposer's principal line of business and the primary value the proposer provides to Participating Entities under this solicitation.

The Proposer's Lot selection will determine the response pool in which the proposal is evaluated. **Proposers will not be penalized for complementary offerings or capabilities that may also align with other Lots; the Lot structure serves only as an organizational and evaluation mechanism and does not limit the scope of a proposer's broader capabilities.**

Proposals submitted in response to this Solicitation will be evaluated on a Lot-by-Lot basis. The issuance of awards may occur at different times for each Lot, and Sourcewell reserves the right to evaluate, negotiate, and award contracts for any Lot independently of the others.

Notwithstanding the timing of any individual contract award, all master agreements awarded under this Solicitation shall share a common expiration date and shall be coterminous.

Lot Selection Guidance

The following guidance is provided to assist proposers in selecting the most appropriate, single, *Primary* Lot for their response. This section is intended for clarification purposes only and does not modify or replace the requirements of this Solicitation.

Primary Deliverable Determination

Based on the definition above, proposers should consider the nature of their offering:

1. If the proposer's Primary deliverable is a technology product, such as an AI platform, infrastructure system, or software solution that Participating Entities procure and operate, the proposer should respond under Lot 1: AI Products and Platforms.
2. If the proposer's Primary deliverable is human expertise, including advisory, consulting, implementation, or managed services, the proposer should respond under Lot 2: AI Professional Services.
3. If (a) the proposer delivers **both** AI technology and AI professional services as a unified commercial offering, and (b) can serve as the single accountable party **for both** under one contract, and (c) maintains primary responsibility for the design, integration, performance, and delivery of the integrated AI solution, and remains fully accountable for outcomes, even when third-party components are used, the proposer should respond under Lot 3: Integrated AI Delivery.

Lot 1: AI Products and Platforms

Included Solutions may consist of, but are not limited to:

a. AI Platforms and Infrastructure

i. Enterprise AI platforms with built-in automation, orchestration, and governance capabilities;
ii. Platforms supporting AI model development, deployment, and lifecycle management for enterprise and public sector use cases;
iii. On-premise, hybrid, and cloud AI infrastructure design, deployment, and management;
iv. AI-optimized compute infrastructure;
v. Enterprise knowledge management systems and data infrastructure that enable AI capabilities; and
vi. AI solutions designed for sensitive or restricted government environments, including air-gapped and privacy-preserving deployments.

b. Intelligent Automation Platforms and Agentic AI

i. Agentic AI platforms that build, deploy, and manage AI-driven automation that operate across enterprise systems independent of any single software application — including agent development frameworks, orchestration infrastructure, and lifecycle management tools;
ii. Workflow automation platforms that connect AI capabilities to systems, data sources, and processes across organizational boundaries;
iii. Enterprise automation platforms enhanced with AI reasoning and natural language capabilities that operate across multiple systems; and
iv. Platforms for document intelligence, multimodal processing, and unstructured data extraction at enterprise scale.

*For purposes of this solicitation, an **AI platform** is a technology system that provides foundational infrastructure, tooling, or services enabling the development, deployment, operation, or management of artificial intelligence capabilities at enterprise scale. An AI platform is defined by the functions it performs, not by specific technologies or terminology, and is characterized by one or more of the following:*

- ***Model Infrastructure***
  The platform hosts, serves, or provides access to artificial intelligence models and provides mechanisms for model versioning, performance management, and lifecycle management.
- ***Development and Deployment Tooling***
  The platform provides tools for building, configuring, evaluating, deploying, and maintaining AI-enabled systems or applications, including data pipeline management and integration capabilities.
- ***Orchestration and Automation***
  The platform coordinates AI capabilities, intelligent automation, or automated workflows across enterprise systems, data sources, and operational processes.
- ***Purpose-Built AI Platforms***
  The platform delivers AI-enabled functionality designed for a specific industry,

government function, or operational domain, operating as a distinct, separately-procured technology independent of any single enterprise software application.

Lot 1 includes both horizontal AI platforms applicable across multiple industries and purpose-built AI platforms designed for specific government functions, industries, or operational domains, provided the platform is enterprise-scale.

Artificial intelligence should constitute a primary, standalone component of the proposer's offering or proposed solution. A standalone AI platform is an independent, purpose-built system that delivers artificial intelligence capabilities as a primary function, rather than a feature embedded within existing software applications. It operates as a modular solution that can integrate with multiple systems and data sources across an organization.

Lot 2: AI Professional Services

Included Solutions may consist of, but are not limited to:

a. AI Strategy, Governance, and Enterprise Transformation

i. Enterprise AI maturity assessment — structured evaluation of an organization's AI readiness across technology, data, talent, governance, and culture dimensions;
ii. Responsible AI policy development — documented frameworks, policies, and standards governing AI use, accountability, and risk management;
iii. AI governance architecture — design and implementation of oversight structures, audit mechanisms, bias controls, and human-in-the-loop requirements;
iv. Operating model redesign — restructuring of organizational workflows, roles, and accountabilities around AI-enabled capabilities;
v. AI investment prioritization and business case development — structured approaches to identifying, evaluating, and sequencing AI opportunities;
vi. Workforce transformation strategy — design of AI literacy programs, role transition planning, and organizational change management at scale; and
vii. Cross-sector AI policy advisory — guidance on compliance with applicable federal, state, and local AI governance requirements and emerging regulatory frameworks.

b. AI-Enabled Managed Services

i. AI operations management, including deployment oversight, incident response, and service level management;
ii. Model monitoring — ongoing tracking of AI system performance, accuracy, and output quality in production environments;
iii. Model drift management — detection and remediation of accuracy degradation as real-world data diverges from training data over time;
iv. Continuous improvement programs — structured processes for model retraining, capability expansion, and performance optimization;
v. Managed AI services for specific government functions, including citizen services automation, benefits processing, case management, and permitting; and

vi. AI security operations — monitoring for adversarial inputs, data poisoning, and unauthorized model access.

c. AI Software Development and Engineering

Custom development of AI-enabled applications, integrations, and automated workflows designed for specific government functions, operational domains, or agency use cases, including model fine-tuning and adaptation.

For purposes of this Solicitation, custom development, software engineering, and client-specific solution design are considered professional services, even when resulting in a deployed AI-enabled application or system.

Lot 3: Integrated AI Delivery

Included Solutions may include, but are not limited to:

a. Systems integrators delivering end-to-end AI solutions, including platform implementation, integration, and ongoing managed services;
b. Technology companies with established professional service arms that deploy and support their own AI platforms;
c. Managed service providers delivering AI platforms and ongoing operations as a unified service offering; and
d. Providers delivering turnkey AI solutions for specific government functions, including both the underlying technology and ongoing service delivery.

A proposer would respond in Lot 3 **only** if they are a single organization capable of:

i. Delivering both AI technology products and AI professional services under one contract;
ii. Serving as the primary accountable party for both; and
iii. Maintaining primary responsibility for the design, integration, performance, and delivery of the integrated AI solution, remaining fully accountable for outcomes, even when third-party components are used.

The ability to deliver both technology and services does not, by itself, qualify a proposer for Lot 3; the integration of these components must be a standard, unified offering for which the proposer assumes end-to-end accountability.

Unlike Lot 1 proposers, who primarily deliver technology, or Lot 2 proposers who primarily deliver services, Lot 3 proposers deliver both as a unified, integrated offering in which the technology and services components are core to the proposer's business model and are commercially established.

Lot 3 proposers should demonstrate that:

i. Both the AI technology and professional services components are core offerings of the organization (not incidental or ad hoc);
ii. The proposer can deliver these as integrated components; and
iii. The proposer assumes primary responsibility for the performance, implementation, and outcomes of the combined solution.

Offerings that rely primarily on reselling or distributing third-party AI products without providing integrated implementation and accountability for outcomes do not meet the intent of this Lot.

C. ROLLING SUPPLIER ONBOARDING

Consistent with Sourcewell's commitment to providing Participating Entities with access to the best available AI solutions throughout the master agreement term, Sourcewell may conduct supplemental supplier onboarding evaluations during the **ten-year term** of the resulting master agreements.

- Future supplemental supplier onboarding evaluations will be subject to the same evaluation factors and terms as this RFP, including the **ten-year maximum** Master Agreement term and **coterminous termination date** applicable to all master agreements awarded under this RFP.
- Future supplemental supplier onboarding evaluations will be evaluated only against other suppliers responding in the same Lot, not against prior submissions or previously awarded suppliers.
- Existing awardees are not required to reapply through a supplemental evaluation window, and their master agreements remain in effect. Suppliers who previously responded to a Lot but were not awarded must resubmit during future supplemental onboarding to be considered.
- Sourcewell may re-open any Lot every six months to consider additional responses. Sourcewell reserves the right, in its sole discretion, to suspend, delay, or discontinue further rolling supplier onboarding for any Lot as Sourcewell deems appropriate, including based on the best interests of Participating Entities, administrative capacity, or other operational considerations. Sourcewell reserves the right to open any, all, or no Lots at the time of any rolling supplier onboarding.

D. SINGLE PRIMARY LOT

Proposers must select ONE Primary Lot (1, 2, or 3) in which to submit their proposal. For purposes of this RFP, "**Primary"** means the single Lot that best represents the proposer's principal line of business and the primary value the proposer provides to Participating Entities under this solicitation. Lot selection is the proposer's determination and reflects how they primarily create value for Participating Entities. If a proposer submits a response that does not clearly fit the selected Primary Lot, Sourcewell reserves the right to seek clarification from a

proposer and reassign the submission to the most appropriate Lot, or deem it non-responsive, based on such clarification.

Sourcewell prefers suppliers that provide a sole source of responsibility for the equipment, products, and services provided under a resulting master agreement. If proposer includes the equipment, products, and services of its subsidiary entities, the proposer must also identify all subsidiaries included in its proposal. If proposer requires the use of distributors, dealers, resellers, or subcontractors to provide the equipment, products, or services, the proposal must address how the equipment, products or services will be provided to Participating Entities, and describe the network of distributors, dealers, resellers, and/or subcontractors that will be available to serve Participating Entities under a resulting master agreement.

Sourcewell encourages suppliers to offer the broadest possible selection of equipment, products, and services being proposed over the largest possible geographic area and to the largest possible cross-section of Sourcewell current and future Participating Entities.

E. REQUIREMENTS

It is expected that proposers have knowledge of all applicable industry standards, laws, and regulations and possess an ability to market and distribute the equipment, products, or services to Participating Entities.

1. Safety Requirements. All items proposed must comply with current applicable safety or regulatory standards or codes.
2. Deviation from Industry Standard. Deviations from industry standards must be identified with an explanation of how the equipment, products, and services will provide equivalent function, coverage, performance, and/or related services.
3. New Equipment and Products. Proposed equipment and products must be for new, current model; however, proposer may offer certain close-out equipment or products if it is specifically noted in the Pricing proposal.
4. Delivered and operational. Unless clearly noted in the proposal, equipment and products must be delivered to the Participating Entity as operational.
5. Warranty. All equipment, products, supplies, and services must be covered by a warranty that is the industry standard or better.

F. PROSPECTIVE MASTER AGREEMENT TERM

The term of the Master Agreement will be **ten (10) years** with no extensions. Sourcewell reserves the right to consider additional extensions beyond the ten-year term as required under exceptional circumstances and mutual agreement. Notwithstanding the timing of any individual master agreement award, all master agreements awarded under this Solicitation shall share a common expiration date and shall be coterminous.

G. ESTIMATED MASTER AGREEMENT VALUE AND USAGE

Based on past volume of similar contracts, the estimated annual value of all transactions from master agreements resulting from this RFP is anticipated to be USD $150 Million for Lot 1, $150 Million for Lot 2, and $300 Million for Lot 3. Therefore, proposers are expected to propose volume pricing. Sourcewell anticipates considerable activity under the master agreement(s) awarded from this RFP; however, sales and sales volume from any resulting master agreement are not guaranteed.

H. MARKETING PLAN

Proposer's sales force will be the primary source of communication with Participating Entities. The proposer's Marketing Plan should demonstrate proposer's ability to deploy a sales force or dealer network to Participating Entities, as well as proposer's sales and service capabilities. It is expected that proposer will promote and market any master agreement award.

I. ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

1. Master agreements will be awarded to proposers able to best meet the needs of Participating Entities. Proposers should submit their complete line of equipment, products, or services that are applicable to the scope of this RFP.
2. A proposer may submit only one proposal. If related, affiliated, or subsidiary entities elect to submit separate proposals, rather than a single parent-entity proposal, each such proposal must be prepared independently and without cooperation, collaboration, or collusion.
3. If a proposer works with a consultant on its proposal, the consultant (an individual or company) may not assist any other entity with a proposal for this solicitation.
4. Proposers should include all relevant information in its proposal, since Sourcewell cannot consider information that is not included in the proposal. Sourcewell reserves the right to verify proposer's information and may request clarification from a proposer, including samples of the proposed equipment or products.
5. Depending upon the responses received in a given category, Sourcewell may need to organize responses into subcategories in order to provide the broadest coverage of the requested equipment, products, or services to Participating Entities. Awards may be based on a subcategory.
6. A proposer's documented negative past performance with Sourcewell or its Participating Entities occurring under a previously awarded Sourcewell master agreement may be considered in the evaluation of a proposal.

III. PRICING AND DELIVERY SCHEDULES

A. REQUIREMENTS

Sourcewell recognizes that enterprise AI solutions are delivered through fundamentally different commercial models. Proposers are expected to propose pricing structures appropriate to their Primary Lot and the nature of their offering **and upload a corresponding detailed price sheet.**

All proposed pricing must be:

1. Submitted using one or more of the following pricing structures, as appropriate to the proposer's Primary Lot and commercial model*:

    a. **Line-Item Pricing** — Pricing based on each individual product, platform, or service. Each line must indicate the proposer's published list price and the Master Agreement Price. Applicable where discrete, individually priced products or services are offered.
    b. **Percentage Discount from Catalog or Published Rate Card** — A percentage discount applied to a published rate card, MSRP, or catalog price. Proposers are responsible for providing and maintaining current published rates with Sourcewell throughout the term of any resulting master agreement. This pricing must be included in the proposal and updated as rate cards change.
    c. **Subscription and Consumption-Based Pricing** — For AI platforms, models, and infrastructure delivered on a recurring or usage-based basis. Proposals must identify the pricing unit (e.g., per user/month, per API call, per compute unit, per model inference, per transaction) and the not-to-exceed rate for each unit. Where consumption pricing is tiered, all tiers must be disclosed.
    d. **Managed Services and Recurring Fees** — For ongoing AI operations, model monitoring, and managed services delivered under a recurring engagement. Proposals must fully describe the pricing model, billing basis, scope of included services, and any assumptions, limitations, tiers, minimums, or other conditions affecting the proposed pricing (for example, pricing per month, per environment, per model, per user, by service tier, or under a fixed recurring fee arrangement).
    e. **Time-and-Materials Rates** — For professional services, implementation, advisory, and custom development. Proposals must provide not-to-exceed hourly or daily rates by role, labor category, or service type.
    f. **Outcome- or Transaction-Based Pricing** — For solutions priced per task completed, case resolved, or decision processed. Proposals must identify the unit of outcome, the not-to-exceed rate per unit, and any volume thresholds that affect per-unit pricing.
    g. **Other** – does not fit within the models above. Proposer must fully describe their pricing model.

    **Note on Pricing Model Selection: Proposers are not required to only use a single pricing model.*

2. Selected Bid Pricing Line Items - In addition to 1(a) through 1(g) above, Sourcewell is requesting selected bid pricing items to assist in preparation of the independent estimate and cost/price analysis.

3. The proposer's not to exceed price. A not to exceed price is the highest price for which equipment, products, or services may be billed to a Participating Entity. However, it is permissible for suppliers to sell at a price that is lower than the agreed-upon price.

4. Stated in U.S. and Canadian dollars (as applicable).

5. Clearly understandable, complete, and fully describe the total cost of acquisition (e.g., the cost of the proposed equipment, products, and services delivered and operational for its intended purpose in the Participating Entity's location).

Proposers should clearly identify any costs that are NOT included in the proposed product or service pricing. This may include items such as installation, set up, mandatory training, or initial inspection. Include identification of any parties that impose such costs and their relationship to the proposer. Additionally, proposers should clearly describe any unique distribution and/or delivery methods or options offered in the proposal.

B. PRICING TRANSPARENCY REQUIREMENTS

Given the complexity and variability of AI pricing, all proposals **must** also include a Pricing Narrative – a plain-language explanation of:

- How costs scale over time as usage, users, or data volumes grow;
- What events or conditions may trigger pricing changes during the contract term (e.g., model updates, infrastructure changes, licensing tier adjustments); and
- How a Participating Entity can reasonably estimate total cost of ownership over a multi-year engagement.

The Pricing Narrative is not a substitute for the structured price sheet required above — it is a supplement that allows evaluators and Participating Entities to assess the full economic picture.

C. ADMINISTRATIVE FEES

Proposers awarded a master agreement are expected to pay Sourcewell an administrative fee in exchange for Sourcewell facilitating the resulting master agreements. The administrative fee is normally calculated as a percentage of the total sales to Participating Entities for all equipment, products, or services made during a calendar quarter, and is typically one percent (1%) to two percent (2%). In some categories, a flat fee may be an acceptable alternative.

D. DELIVERY SCHEDULES

Participating Entities are encouraged to establish flexible delivery schedules whenever feasible with the awarded supplier.

IV. MASTER AGREEMENT

Proposers awarded a master agreement will be required to execute a master agreement with Sourcewell (see attached template). Only those modifications the proposer indicates in its proposal will be available for discussion. Much of the language in the master agreement reflects Minnesota legal requirements and cannot be altered. Numerous and/or onerous exceptions that contradict Minnesota law may result in the proposal being disqualified from further review and evaluation. Additionally, if a Participating Entities use an awarded master agreement for FEMA or other federal grant purchases, terms and conditions required by 2 C.F.R.§200.327 and Appendix II to 2 C.F.R §200 are incorporated into the master agreement. These terms and conditions cannot be altered.

To identify any exception, or to request any modification, to Sourcewell's standard master agreement terms, conditions, or specifications, a proposer must submit the proposed exception(s) or requested modification(s) via redline in the Master Agreement Template provided in the "Documents" section of the "Bid Details" page on the Sourcewell Procurement Portal and uploaded as part of its response. Only those exceptions noted at the time of the proposal submission will be considered.
Exceptions must:

1. Clearly identify the affected article and section.
2. Clearly note the requested modification; and as applicable, provide requested alternative language.

Unclear requests will be automatically denied.

Only those exceptions that have been accepted by Sourcewell will be included in the master agreement document provided to the awarded supplier for signature.

If a proposer receives a master agreement award resulting from this solicitation it will have up to 30 days to sign and return the master agreement. After that time, at Sourcewell's sole discretion, the master agreement award may be revoked.

V. RFP PROCESS

A. PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE

Sourcewell will hold an optional, non-mandatory pre-proposal conference via webcast on the date and time noted in the Solicitation Schedule for this RFP and on the Sourcewell Procurement Portal. The purpose of this conference is to allow potential proposers to ask questions regarding this RFP and Sourcewell's competitive procurement process. Information about the webcast will be sent to all entities that have registered for this solicitation opportunity through their Sourcewell Procurement Portal Vendor Account. Pre-proposal conference attendance is optional.

B. QUESTIONS REGARDING THIS RFP AND ORAL COMMUNICATION

All questions regarding this RFP must be submitted through the Sourcewell Procurement Portal. The deadline for submission of questions is found in the Solicitation Schedule and on the Sourcewell Procurement Portal. Answers to questions will be issued through an addendum to this RFP. Repetitive questions will be summarized into a single answer and identifying information will be removed from the submitted questions.

All questions, whether specific to a proposer or generally related to the RFP, must be submitted using this process. Do not contact individual Sourcewell staff to ask questions or request information as this may disqualify the proposer from responding to this RFP. Sourcewell will not respond to questions submitted after the deadline.

C. ADDENDA

Sourcewell may modify this RFP at any time prior to the proposal due date by issuing an addendum. Addenda issued by Sourcewell become a part of the RFP and will be delivered to potential proposers through the Sourcewell Procurement Portal. Sourcewell accepts no liability in connection with the delivery of any addenda.

Before a proposal will be accepted through the Sourcewell Procurement Portal, all addenda, if any, must be acknowledged by the proposer by checking the box for each addendum. It is the responsibility of the proposer to check for any addenda that may have been issued up to the solicitation due date and time.

If an addendum is issued after a proposer submitted its proposal, the Sourcewell Procurement Portal will WITHDRAW the submission and change the proposer's proposal status to INCOMPLETE. The proposer can view this status change in the "MY BIDS" section of the Sourcewell Procurement Portal Vendor Account. The proposer is solely responsible to check the "MY BIDS" section of the Sourcewell Procurement Portal Vendor Account periodically after submitting its proposal (and up to the Proposal Due Date). If the proposer's proposal status has changed to INCOMPLETE, the proposer is solely responsible to:

1. make any required adjustments to its proposal;
2. acknowledge the addenda; and
3. ensure the re-submitted proposal is received through the Sourcewell Procurement Portal no later than the Proposal Due Date and time shown in the Solicitation Schedule above.

D. PROPOSAL SUBMISSION

Proposer's complete proposal must be submitted through the Sourcewell Procurement Portal no later than the date and time specified in the Solicitation Schedule. Any other form of proposal submission, whether electronic, paper, or otherwise, will not be considered by Sourcewell. **Late proposals will not be considered.** It is the proposer's sole responsibility to ensure that the proposal is received on time.

It is recommended that proposers allow sufficient time to upload the proposal and to resolve any issues that may arise. The time and date that a proposal is received by Sourcewell is solely determined by the Sourcewell Procurement Portal web clock.

In the event of problems with the Sourcewell Procurement Portal, follow the instructions for technical support posted in the portal. It may take up to 24 hours to respond to certain issues.

Upon successful submission of a proposal, the Sourcewell Procurement Portal will automatically generate a confirmation email to the proposer. If the proposer does not receive a confirmation email, contact Sourcewell's support provider at support@bidsandtenders.ca.

To ensure receipt of the latest information and updates via email regarding this solicitation, or if the proposer has obtained this solicitation document from a third party, the onus is on the proposer to create a Sourcewell Procurement Portal Vendor Account and register for this solicitation opportunity.

Within the Sourcewell Procurement Portal, all proposals must be digitally acknowledged by an authorized representative of the proposer attesting that the information contained in the proposal is true and accurate. By submitting a proposal, proposer warrants that the information provided is true, correct, and reliable for purposes of evaluation for potential master agreement award. The submission of inaccurate, misleading, or false information is grounds for disqualification from a master agreement award and may subject the proposer to remedies available by law.

E. GENERAL PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

Proposals must be:

1. In substantial compliance with the requirements of this RFP or it will be considered nonresponsive and be rejected.
2. Complete. A proposal will be rejected if it is conditional or incomplete.
3. Submitted in English.
4. Valid and irrevocable for 150 days following the Proposal Due Date.

Any and all costs incurred in responding to this RFP will be borne by the proposer.

F. PROPOSAL WITHDRAWAL

Prior to the proposal deadline, a proposer may withdraw its proposal.

G. OPENING

The Opening of proposals will be conducted in the Sourcewell Procurement Portal immediately following the proposal due date and time. To view the list of proposers resulting from the

opening, verify that the Sourcewell Procurement Portal opportunities list search is set to "All" or "Closed."

Members of the public may attend the Opening at Sourcewell's office located at 202 12th Street NE, Staples, MN to hear the results.

VI. EVALUATION AND AWARD

A. EVALUATION

It is the intent of Sourcewell to award one or more master agreements to responsive and responsible proposers offering the best overall quality, selection of equipment, products, and services, and price that meet the commonly requested specifications of Sourcewell and its Participating Entities. The award(s) will be limited to the number of proposers that Sourcewell determines is necessary to meet the needs of its Participating Entities.

Proposals submitted in response to this Solicitation will be evaluated on a Lot-by-Lot basis. The issuance of awards may occur at different times for each Lot, and Sourcewell reserves the right to evaluate, negotiate, and award contracts for any Lot independently of the others.

Factors to be considered in determining the number of master agreements to be awarded in any category may include the following:

1. Total evaluation scores (considering natural breaks in the scoring of responsive proposals);
2. The number and geographic location of highest-scoring proposers that offer:
    a. A comprehensive selection of the requested equipment, products, or services;
    b. A sales and service network ensuring availability and coverage for Participating Entities' use; and
    c. Other attributes of the proposer or contents of its proposal that assist Participating Entities in achieving environmental and social requirements, and goals.

Information submitted as part of a proposal should be as specific as possible when responding to the RFP. Do not assume Sourcewell has any knowledge about a specific supplier or product.

Responsiveness Criteria

To qualify as responsive under this RFP, a Proposer must demonstrate experience delivering artificial intelligence solutions in a highly regulated industry at a scale appropriate to the selected Lot. The required thresholds are identified and explained at the beginning of the RFP Questionnaire in the Sourcewell Procurement Portal, and will be evaluated during a responsiveness review, which constitutes the first step of the evaluation process.

- Highly regulated industries are sectors subject to strict government oversight, compliance standards, and legal requirements to ensure safety, security, and ethical practices.
- Qualifying highly regulated industries include, but are not limited to: banking and financial services, insurance, healthcare and public health, federal, state, local, or tribal government, K–12 or higher education, public safety and criminal justice, public transportation and transit authorities, utilities and energy (where government-operated or regulated), and defense and national security. *Whether an industry qualifies as highly regulated for the purposes of this RFP will be determined at the sole discretion of the evaluation team*

B. AWARD(S)

Award(s) will be made to the highest-scoring proposer(s) whose proposal conforms to all conditions and requirements of the RFP, and consistent with the award criteria defined in this RFP.

Proposals submitted in response to this Solicitation will be evaluated on a Lot-by-Lot basis. The issuance of awards may occur at different times for each Lot, and Sourcewell reserves the right to evaluate, negotiate, and award contracts for any Lot independently of the others.

Sourcewell may request written clarification of a proposal at any time during the evaluation process.

Proposal evaluation will be based on the following scoring criteria and the Sourcewell Evaluator Scoring Guide (a copy is available in the Sourcewell Procurement Portal):

Conformance to RFP Requirements	Pass/Fail
Financial Viability and Marketplace Success	50
Ability to Sell and Deliver Solutions	175
Responsible AI & Governance	175
Marketing Plan	100
Value Added Attributes	100
Depth and Breadth of Offered Solutions	200
Pricing	200
TOTAL POINTS	**1000**

Sourcewell reserves the right to reduce or recalibrate the numerical evaluation scale to align with Sourcewell's then-current procurement practices. Any such adjustment will apply prospectively and uniformly to future evaluation cycles. Notwithstanding any modification to the evaluation scale, all substantive evaluation criteria and the weights assigned to those criteria will remain unchanged and will be applied consistently across all future rolling solicitations.

C. PROTESTS OF AWARDS

Any protest made under this RFP by a proposer must be in writing, in English, addressed to Sourcewell's Chief Executive Officer, and delivered to the Sourcewell office located at 202 12th Street NE, Staples, MN 56479. All documents that comprise the complete protest package must be received, and time stamped at the Sourcewell office by 3:30 p.m., Central Time, no later than 10 business days following Sourcewell's notice of master agreement non-award. A protest must allege a procedural, technical, or legal defect, with supporting documentation. A protest that merely requests a re-evaluation of a proposal's content will not be entertained.

A protest must include the following items:

- The name, address, and telephone number of the protester;
- Identification of the solicitation by RFP number;
- A precise statement of the relevant facts;
- Identification of the alleged procedural, technical, or legal defect;
- Analysis of the basis for the protest;
- Any additional supporting documentation;
- The original signature of the protester or its representative; and
- Protest bond in the amount of $20,000 (except where prohibited by law or treaty).

Protests that do not address these elements and include all required documents will not be reviewed.

D. RIGHTS RESERVED

This RFP does not commit Sourcewell to award any master agreement, and a proposal may be rejected if it is nonresponsive, conditional, incomplete, conflicting, or misleading. Proposals that contain false statements or do not support an attribute or condition stated by the proposer may be rejected.

In addition to any other rights reserved herein, Sourcewell reserves the right to:

- Modify or cancel this RFP at any time;
- Reject any and all proposals received;
- Reject proposals that do not comply with the provisions of this RFP;
- Select, for master agreements or for discussion, a proposal other than that with the lowest cost;
- Independently verify any information provided in a proposal;
- Disqualify any proposer that does not meet the requirements of this RFP, is debarred or suspended by the United States or Canada, State of Minnesota, Participating Entity's state or province; has an officer, or other key personnel, who have been charged with a serious crime; or is bankrupt, insolvent, or where bankruptcy or insolvency are a reasonable prospect;

- Waive or modify any informalities, irregularities, or inconsistencies in the proposals received;
- Clarify any part of a proposal and discuss any aspect of the proposal with any proposer; and negotiate with more than one proposer;
- Award a master agreement if only one responsive proposal is received if it is in the best interest of Participating Entities; and
- Award a master agreement to one or more proposers if it is in the best interest of Participating Entities.

E. DISPOSITION OF PROPOSALS

All materials submitted in response to this RFP will become property of Sourcewell and will become public record in accordance with Minnesota Statutes Chapter 13, after negotiations are complete, including pricing and financial data. Sourcewell considers negotiations complete upon execution of a resulting master agreement.

Proposers are explicitly cautioned not to submit any data that they consider to be confidential, proprietary, or trade secret, as such data will not be treated as confidential and will be subject to public disclosure in accordance with Minnesota law.

F. ADDITIONAL FEDERAL FUNDING NOTICES

NOTICE TO ALL PROPOSERS

Non-Discrimination on the Basis of Faith

- Faith-based organizations may propose to this Request for Proposals on the same basis as any other organization, as set forth at, and subject to the protections and requirements of, this part and any applicable constitutional and statutory requirements, including 42 U.S.C. 2000bb et seq. Neither Sourcewell, nor any federal funding agency will discriminate for or against an organization on the basis of the organization's religious character, motives, or affiliation, or lack thereof, or on the basis of conduct that would not be considered grounds to favor or disfavor a similarly situated secular organization.
- A faith-based organization that participates in this program will retain its independence from the government and may continue to carry out its mission consistent with religious freedom and conscience protections in Federal law. Religious accommodations may also be sought under many of these religious freedom, nondiscrimination, and conscience protections in Federal law.
- A faith-based organization may not use direct Federal financial assistance from any federal funding agency to support or engage in any explicitly religious activities except when consistent with the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment and any other applicable requirements. An organization receiving Federal financial assistance also may not, in providing services funded by any Federal agency, or in their outreach activities related to such services, discriminate against a program beneficiary on the basis of

religion, a religious belief, a refusal to hold a religious belief, or a refusal to attend or participate in a religious service.

Non-Discrimination of Disadvantaged Businesses

In accordance with the provisions of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 252, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000d to 2000d-4), Sourcewell hereby notifies all proposers that it will affirmatively ensure that disadvantaged business enterprises will be afforded full and fair opportunity to submit proposals in response to this Request for Proposals and will not be discriminated against on the grounds of race, color, or national origin in consideration for an award.

04/30/2026
Addendum No.1
Solicitation Number: RFP 061726
Solicitation Name: Enterprise Artificial Intelligence: Platforms, Services, and Integrated Delivery

Consider the following Question(s) and Answer(s) to be part of the above-titled solicitation documents. The remainder of the documents remain unchanged.

Question 1:

What forms of evidence (e.g., past performance references, certifications, compliance attestations) are preferred to demonstrate experience?

Answer 1:

It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine the information or documentation necessary to best demonstrate their ability to serve Sourcewell Participating Entities and satisfy all the requirements included in the questionnaire tables.

Question 2:

Can respondents provide Commercial references rather than public sector references?

Answer 2:
For the purposes of this RFP, Proposers may provide references who operate in “highly regulated industries” as defined in RFP Section IV.A. Responsiveness Criteria. This may potentially include commercial or public sector references.

End of Addendum

Acknowledgement of this Addendum to RFP 061726, posted to the Sourcewell Procurement Portal on 04/30/2026, is required at the time of proposal submittal.

05/01/2026
Addendum No.2
Solicitation Number: RFP 061726
Solicitation Name: Enterprise Artificial Intelligence: Platforms, Services, and Integrated Delivery

Consider the following Question(s) and Answer(s) to be part of the above-titled solicitation documents. The remainder of the documents remain unchanged.

Question 1:

I can't seem to find the actual RFP questionnaire anywhere in these bid documents, am I simply missing something obvious or has this not been posted yet?

Answer 1:

The Questionnaire is embedded within the portal and becomes accessible after selecting "Start Submission" on the Bid Details page. For additional guidance on responding to the RFP, including completing the Questionnaire, please refer to the Submit Response Guide available on the Procurement Portal main page.

Question 2:

Please clarify the relationship between this RFP and RFP 110724 (Artificial Intelligence Readiness, Implementation, and Support Services) awarded in April 2025? Specifically, should respondents view this as a continuation, expansion, or separate procurement, and how will any overlap in scope or services be managed?

Answer 2:

This RFP is a separate procurement from RFP 110724 awarded in April 2025 and should not be viewed as a continuation or extension. AI needs have expanded significantly since that award, and this solicitation reflects a broader, more advanced scope of solutions.

Participation in or award under RFP 110724 does not guarantee or influence selection for this RFP. While there may be a partial overlap in scope, all responses will be evaluated independently based on the requirements of *this* solicitation.

End of Addendum

Acknowledgement of this Addendum to RFP 061726, posted to the Sourcewell Procurement Portal on 05/01/2026, is required at the time of proposal submittal.

05/06/2026
Addendum No. 3
Solicitation Number: RFP 061726
Solicitation Name: Enterprise Artificial Intelligence: Platforms, Services, and Integrated Delivery

Consider the following Question(s) and Answer(s) to be part of the above-titled solicitation documents. The remainder of the documents remain unchanged.

Question 1:

I get a little intimated when I see these large gov't contracts and I am always unsure if a small woman own company such as mine should even consider reaching out in pursuit of even a drop of this contract. So here it goes, [redacted] even though a small enterprise is talented in providing enterprise level AI delivery capabilities with flexibility, transparency and accountability. We have over 30 years of experience in providing Integration with existing systems, platform flexibility, Scalable, secure AI architectures. We align with AI platform-agnostic approach such as Azure AI, OpenAI-based services, custom ML, rule-based automation. We design AI solutions that integrate seamlessly into existing enterprise environments. If you see a fit anywhere in this project, please let me know and I will continue this process.

Answer 1:

Sourcewell will not pre-qualify any products or services. It is left to the discretion of each Proposer to determine if its products or services meet the scope of RFP II. B. Requested Equipment, Products, or Services. Only those products within the scope of the RFP will be included in any contract awarded by Sourcewell as a result of the solicitation.

Also refer to the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) guide posted to the Sourcewell Procurement portal homepage and included in the Bid Documents section.

Question 2:

For Lot 1: AI Products and Platforms, can Sourcewell confirm whether a purpose-built AI SaaS platform focused on a specific enterprise workflow would be eligible, even if it is not a broad, general-purpose AI platform? For example, would a platform that supports procurement, grant, or proposal evaluation through document intelligence, rubric-based scoring, evidence extraction, reviewer workflow management, and audit-ready evaluation summaries be considered within the intended scope of Lot 1?

Answer 2:

Refer to Answer 1.

Question 3:

For proposers offering specialized AI products under Lot 1, what types of documentation are acceptable to demonstrate experience and readiness? For example, will Sourcewell consider product demonstrations, pilot deployments, reference letters, founder/team experience in regulated or public-sector environments, implementation plans, security documentation, responsible AI policies, and sample outputs as part of the proposer's evidence?

Answer 3:

Refer to Addendum 1, Answer 1.

Question 4:

Can a proposer offer multiple deployment options under Lot 1, such as SaaS, private cloud, and offline/private deployment for sensitive or regulated environments, within a single proposal?

Answer 4:

In the competitive process, Sourcewell will not advise a proposer on the content of the proposal. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine how to best satisfy all requirements of the questionnaire tables.

Question 5:

Can Sourcewell provide the name of the current incumbent vendor(s) and a high-level summary of the existing solution and contract term?

Answer 5:

This is a new category with no existing incumbent information available.

Question 6:

Is there a way to export this event so I can share it with my team members who will be helping respond?

Answer 6:

For help downloading the Questionnaire tables for this RFP, please refer to Section I. General on the FAQ page within the Sourcewell Procurement portal.

Question 7:

If a potential bidder previously provided professional services to Sourcewell that contributed to the development of this solicitation, does that create an organizational conflict of interest that would disqualify the vendor from responding to RFP 061726. If so, would there be a disclosure or mitigation process available.

Answer 7:

Per the Code of Federal Regulations, "To ensure objective contractor performance, and eliminate unfair competitive advantage, contractors that develop or draft specifications, requirements, statements of work, or invitations for bids must be excluded from competing on those procurements" (2 C.F.R. § 200.319(b)).

Question 8:

Does Sourcewell permit a portion of the professional services (e.g., software engineering, configuration, managed services) to be delivered remotely from outside the United States/Canada?

If permitted, are there any specific constraints or disclosure requirements (for example: data access restrictions, data residency expectations, security requirements, or limitations by Participating Entity)?

Answer 8:

Sourcewell can contract with a foreign supplier. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to demonstrate how they will effectively deliver the requested goods and services offered in their proposal to participating entities. Each proposal will be evaluated based on the criteria stated in the RFP.

Question 9:

Can the Master Agreement be awarded to a Canadian prime (Supplier) that subcontracts defined delivery activities to a South African subcontractor? Are there any restrictions on the subcontractor's location, or any specific requirements we should address in our proposal regarding subcontractor oversight, compliance, or reporting?

If the above model is acceptable, please confirm what level of subcontractor detail should be provided at proposal stage (e.g., named subcontractor(s), roles/responsibilities, percentages of work, and any supporting documentation).

Answer 9:

Refer to RFP Section II. D. Single Primary Lot, "… If proposer includes the equipment, products, and services of its subsidiary entities, the proposer must also identify all subsidiaries included in its proposal. If proposer requires the use of distributors, dealers, resellers, or subcontractors to provide the equipment, products, or services, the proposal must address how the equipment, products or services will be provided to Participating Entities, and describe the network of distributors, dealers, resellers, and/or subcontractors that will be available to serve Participating Entities under a resulting master agreement."

It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine the information or documentation necessary to best demonstrate their ability to serve Sourcewell Participating Entities and satisfy all the requirements of the RFP and the questionnaire tables. Proposals are evaluated based on the criteria stated in the RFP.

Question 10:

I would like to make sure I have the Login instructions for the Online Pre-Proposal Conference. As well as get this added to our calendars. It notes this information will be in the documents section. Will there be another document added with these instructions and login information?

Answer 10:

Pre-Proposal Conference information will be posted in the documents section two (2) business days prior to the conference date. Refer to the Solicitation Schedule in the RFP for Pre-Proposal date and time.

Question 11:

When will we be getting the link for Pre-Bid Conference? Unable to see in Document section yet.

Answer 11:

Refer to Answer 10.

End of Addendum

Acknowledgement of this Addendum to RFP 061726, posted to the Sourcewell Procurement Portal on 05/06/2026, is required at the time of proposal submittal.

05/14/2026
Addendum No. 4
Solicitation Number: RFP 061726
Solicitation Name: Enterprise Artificial Intelligence: Platforms, Services, and Integrated Delivery

Consider the following Question(s) and Answer(s) to be part of the above-titled solicitation documents. The remainder of the documents remain unchanged.

Question 1:

Can a Lot 1 proposer include standardized enablement, adoption, training, governance, and deployment support services as complementary services packaged with an enterprise AI platform subscription, provided that the AI platform remains the proposer's primary deliverable and primary source of value?

Answer 1:

Refer to Section II.B. Primary Deliverable Determination and Lot 1: AI Products and Platforms.

In the competitive process, Sourcewell will not advise a proposer on the content of the proposal. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine how to best satisfy all requirements of the questionnaire tables.

Question 2:

The RFP states that the proposer will be responsible for the development, deployment, operation, and maintenance of the solution. Could you please clarify whether this scope also includes knowledge transfer and/or transition activities to the client?

Answer 2:

Refer to Addendum 3, Answer 4.

Question 3:

Does the organization have a preferred cloud platform or hosting environment, or is the proposer expected to recommend the most suitable cloud solution as part of the proposal?

Answer 3:

Sourcewell is requesting proposals to meet the various needs of its 50,000+ Participating Entities as a whole, across the United States and Canada. In this competitive solicitation process, Sourcewell will not advise a proposer on the contents of its proposal. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to articulate and propose the solutions that align with its business methods and satisfies the requirements of the RFP. A Participating Entities' unique needs will be determined if and when the Participating Entities choose to utilize a contract resulting from this solicitation.

Question 4:

Could you please outline the evaluation process for the proposals, including the anticipated timeline for commencement of evaluations?

Answer 4:

Refer to RFP, Section VI. Evaluation and Award, Subsection A.

Question 5:

With reference to Section H, Page 11, could you please clarify the proposer's expected role in marketing or promoting the Master Agreement award?

Answer 5:

Refer to RFP Section II. H. Marketing Plan, "Proposer's sales force will be the primary source of communication with Participating Entities. The Proposer's Marketing Plan should demonstrate Proposer's ability to deploy a sales force or dealer network to Participating Entities, as well as Proposer's sales and service capabilities. It is expected that Proposer will promote and market any master agreement award."

The Sourcewell Supplier Development team will also provide support and resources to expand and enhance awarded supplier marketing efforts. In the competitive process,

Sourcewell does not advise on the content of proposer marketing plans. Each proposal will be evaluated based on the criteria stated in the RFP.

Question 6:

Can Sourcewell provide examples of the types of AI use cases participating agencies are most interested in (healthcare, education, public safety, operations, bare-metal etc.)?"

Answer 6:

Refer to Section II. B. Requested Equipment, Products, or Services for examples within each Lot, and Section VI. A. Responsiveness Criteria for a definition and examples of qualifying highly regulated industries.

Question 7:

Can Sourcewell confirm the required compliance frameworks for this contract (HIPAA, SOC 2, ISO 27001, CJIS, etc.) for vendors providing AI compute or hosting services?

Answer 7:

Refer to Answer 3.

Question 8:

Are there any data residency requirements for agencies using AI compute or hosting services under this contract?"

Answer 8:

Sourcewell is requesting proposals to meet the various needs of its 50,000+ Participating Entities as a whole, across the United States and Canada. In this competitive solicitation process, Sourcewell will not advise a proposer on the contents of its proposal. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to articulate and propose the solutions that aligns with its business methods and satisfies the requirements of the RFP. A Participating Entities' unique needs will be determined if and when the Participating Entities choose to utilize a contract resulting from this solicitation.

Question 9:

Does Sourcewell have any minimum performance expectations for AI compute (e.g., memory bandwidth, GPU memory size, or throughput) that vendors should meet or exceed?" We utilize the Nvidia H200s for maximum compute.

Answer 9:

Refer to Answer 8.

Question 10:

Regarding potential evaluation points, Table headings for 7A and 7B read as follows:
• Table 7A: Depth and Breadth of Offered Solutions (200 Points, applies to Table 7A and 7B)
• Table 7B: Responsible AI & Governance (175 Points)

Evaluation scoring criteria lists:
• Responsible AI & Governance – 175 pts
• Depth and Breadth of Offered Solutions – 200 pts

Following the logic, are we correct in our analysis that this creates a possible 375 points for Tables 7A and 7B? Is Table 7B essentially evaluated under two categories?

Answer 10:

Refer to Amendment 2.

Question 11:

Historically, Sourcewell has specifically excluded products, solutions, and services available through currently active Master Agreements. With no exclusions identified in 061726, Enterprise AI: Platform, Services, and Integrated Delivery we respectfully submit the following questions:

a) Will Sourcewell issue an Amendment to RFP 061726 to exclude existing contracts such as 121923 Technology Products and Services and 110724 AI Readiness, Implementation, and Support Services?
b) If there is no Amendment detailing existing contract exclusion, how will Sourcewell address the addition of suppliers offering similar solutions to previously solicited, evaluated, and competitively awarded contracts?

Answer 11:

Sourcewell does not currently plan to issue an amendment or addendum to RFP 061726 regarding contract exclusions. While Sourcewell acknowledges there may be slight overlap with previously released RFPs, Sourcewell believes the AI engagement-focused response criteria and current lot structure included in this RFP provide sufficient guardrails to prevent the solicitation from overlapping too closely with existing contracts.

Question 12:

Will Sourcewell please delineate the primary differences between Enterprise AI Products, Services, and Solutions offered in the forthcoming 061726 contract against 121923 Technology Products and Services and 110724 AI Readiness, Implementation, and Support Services?

Answer 12:

Refer to Addendum 2, Answer 2.

Question 13:

Response Template, Table 4, Question 47. Does Sourcewell prefer that the example of how governmental and educational customers have successfully utilized e-Procurement or e-Commerce ordering processes be included in the response narrative or included as detailed attachment?

Answer 13:

It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine the information or documentation necessary to best demonstrate their ability to serve Sourcewell Participating Entities and satisfy all the requirements included in the questionnaire tables.

Question 14:

What is the minimum and maximum service providers that Sourcewell will select for each lot?

Answer 14:

Refer to the Evaluation and Award section of the RFP VI. It is the intent of Sourcewell to award one or more suppliers offering the best overall quality, selection of equipment, products, and services, and prices that meet the commonly requested specifications of

Sourcewell and its Participating Entities. The award(s) will be limited to the number of proposers that Sourcewell determines is necessary to meet the needs of its Participating Entities.

Question 15:

For Lot 2, may proposers submit multiple pricing models, such as time-and-materials rates, fixed-fee service packages, managed services tiers, and optional transaction-based pricing?

Answer 15:

All proposed pricing must be submitted using *one or more* of the pricing structures, as appropriate to the proposer's Primary Lot and commercial model, listed in RFP Section III. A. 1.

Question 16:

For professional services pricing, does Sourcewell prefer hourly rates, daily rates, or will either be acceptable if not-to-exceed rates are clearly provided by labor category?

Answer 16:

It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine and propose the pricing approach that aligns with their business methods and satisfies all the requirements of RFP Section III – Pricing and Delivery Schedules. Proposals are evaluated based on the criteria stated in the RFP.

Also refer to Answer 15.

Question 17:

The RFP requires a Pricing Narrative explaining cost scaling, price-change triggers, and total cost of ownership. Is Sourcewell expecting this narrative as a separate uploaded document, a portal response, or part of the pricing attachment?

Answer 17:

A specific format is not required for submission, but Excel is preferred. Each supplier will propose pricing in the format that makes sense for their industry. Each proposer, in its discretion, will determine and articulate the pricing approach that aligns with its business methods and satisfies all the requirements of the III. Pricing section of the RFP. Proposals are evaluated based on the criteria stated in the RFP.

Question 18:

For third-party costs such as cloud hosting, model/API consumption, software licensing, OCR tools, or other pass-through costs, should proposers include not-to-exceed rates where available or identify them as excluded/pass-through costs to be priced at the Participating Entity task-order level?

Answer 18:

Refer to Answers 15 and 16 above.

Question 19:

Can Sourcewell clarify whether the administrative fee should be embedded into proposed pricing or treated separately in the proposer's internal commercial model?

Answer 19:

Refer to RFP III. B. and Master Agreement Article II. G. Administrative Fees. The administrative fee is paid by the awarded supplier to Sourcewell and is not to be separately assessed to a participating entity.

Question 20:

Under "Depth and Breadth of Offered Solutions," should Lot 2 proposers emphasize the breadth of professional services only, or should they also describe related tools, frameworks, accelerators, and partner technologies used to deliver those services?

Answer 20:

In the competitive process, Sourcewell will not advise a proposer on the content of the proposal. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine how to best satisfy all requirements of the questionnaire tables.

Question 21:

Under “Ability to Sell and Deliver Solutions,” what evidence is most useful: national delivery footprint, sales coverage, customer support model, delivery staffing, implementation methodology, or public-sector contract adoption strategy?

Answer 21:

Refer to Addendum 1, Answer 1

Question 22:

Under “Responsible AI & Governance,” is Sourcewell looking primarily for proposer internal AI governance policies, client-facing governance services, implementation controls, or all of these?

Answer 22:

It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine the information or documentation necessary to best demonstrate their ability to serve Sourcewell Participating Entities and satisfy all the requirements included in the questionnaire tables. Sourcewell will not advise a proposer on the contents of its proposal.

Question 23:

If a Lot 2 proposer uses third-party AI platforms, cloud services, LLMs, OCR tools,automation tools, or model APIs as part of delivering professional services, should those be described as enabling tools under Lot 2 rather than as separate Lot 1 products?

Answer 23:

Per RFP Section II. D. Single Primary Lot, “Sourcewell prefers suppliers that provide a sole source of responsibility for the equipment, products, and services provided under a resulting master agreement. If proposer includes the equipment, products, and services of its subsidiary entities, the proposer must also identify all subsidiaries included in its proposal. If proposer requires the use of distributors, dealers, resellers, or subcontractors to provide the equipment, products, or services, the proposal must address how the equipment, products or services will be provided to Participating Entities, and describe the network of distributors, dealers, resellers, and/or subcontractors that will be available to serve Participating Entities under a resulting master agreement.”

Primary Lot selection is the proposer’s determination and reflects how they primarily create value for Participating Entities.

Question 24:

If a proposer provides both AI professional services and access to third-party technology components, but does not commercialize its own AI platform as the primary offering, is Lot 2 still the appropriate Lot?

Answer 24:

Refer to Answer 23.

Question 25:

The RFP states that proposers must demonstrate experience delivering AI solutions in a highly regulated industry at a scale appropriate to the selected Lot. For Lot 2, what type of evidence will Sourcewell consider sufficient to demonstrate this requirement?

Answer 25:

Refer to Addendum 1, Answer 1.

Question 26:

For Lot 2, how does Sourcewell define "scale appropriate to the selected Lot"? Is Sourcewell looking for number of engagements, size of client, dollar value, number of users supported, number of workflows implemented, geographic reach, or a combination?

Answer 26:

Responsiveness Criteria thresholds and requirements are listed in the RFP Specifications Questionnaire under the section titled Responsiveness Criteria. The Questionnaire can be found in the Sourcewell Procurement Portal.

Question 27:

Will Sourcewell allow proposers to include confidential client examples in summarized or anonymized form if the work is covered by confidentiality obligations?

Answer 27:

Refer to RFP Section VI. E. Disposition of Proposals, which states, "Proposers are explicitly cautioned not to submit any data that they consider to be confidential,

proprietary, or trade secret, as such data will not be treated as confidential and will be subject to public disclosure in accordance with Minnesota law."

Question 28:

Under Section II.D "Single Primary Lot," the RFP states a preference for a single source of responsibility and allows the use of subcontractors, distributors, and related entities where appropriately described. However, the RFP does not explicitly address whether Joint Venture (JV), consortium, or team-based prime submissions (i.e., two or more entities jointly submitting as a single prime contractor) are permitted. Please clarify whether Joint Venture or consortium bids are allowed under this solicitation.

Answer 28:

A proposer may submit only one proposal. If related, affiliated, or subsidiary entities elect to submit separate proposals, rather than a single parent-entity proposal, each such proposal must be prepared independently and without cooperation, collaboration, or collusion. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine the information or documentation necessary to best demonstrate their ability to serve Sourcewell Participating Entities and satisfy all the requirements of the RFP.

Question 29:

After watching the video and hearing the references to 'highly regulated industries' I revisited the RFP and noted in a number of places that 'highly regulated industries' is mentioned. On the first web page reference is made to 'governmental, higher education, K-12 education, nonprofit, tribal government, and other public agencies located in the United States and Canada' - I am having trouble reconciling highly regulated industries with some of the types of organisations mentioned, which makes responding confusing (when I think of highly regulated I think of Banking, Air Transportation, Nuclear Energy, Medical and other regulated professions). Is experience in 'highly regulated industries a requirement?

Answer 29:

Refer to RFP Section VI. A. Responsiveness Criteria, as well as the thresholds and requirements listed in the RFP Questionnaire under the section titled, Responsiveness Criteria. Both areas provide a definition of highly regulated industries and examples of qualifying highly regulated industries.

Question 30:

In the list of organisations - 'governmental, higher education, K-12 education, nonprofit, tribal government, and other public agencies located in the United States and Canada' - which of those do you consider regulated?

Answer 30:

Refer to RFP Section VI. A. Responsiveness Criteria, as well as the thresholds and requirements listed in the RFP Questionnaire under the section titled, Responsiveness Criteria. Both areas provide a definition of highly regulated industries and examples of qualifying highly regulated industries.

Question 31:

RFP Section II.B Primary Delivery Determination #3, pg. 5
Relating to Primary Lot selection as stated in RFP II.B Primary Delivery Determination #3, if a Bidder wishes to be considered for Lots 1 and 2, the direction is that the bidder should select Lot 3, correct?

Answer 31:

Sourcewell will not pre-qualify any products or services. It is left to the discretion of each Proposer to determine if its products or services meet the scope of RFP II. B. Requested Equipment, Products, or Services. Only those products within the scope of the RFP will be included in any contract awarded by Sourcewell as a result of the solicitation.

Question 32:

RFP Section II.B Primary Delivery Determination #3, pg. 5
If a bidder is bidding Primary Lot 3, should the Bidder provide responses to Demonstrated Experience requirements for Lots 1, 2, and 3; or just Lot 3?

Answer 32:

For the Responsiveness Criteria Demonstrated Experience tables (pages 2–5 of the RFP Questionnaire), proposers must identify the single, Primary Lot for which they are submitting a response and complete only the corresponding Demonstrated Experience table.

Question 33:

For purposes of the Lot 1 responsiveness criteria regarding "production deployments," would Sourcewell consider multiple operational deployments of the same AI platform across distinct enterprise customer environments or facilities as separate deployments, provided each deployment: supports ongoing operational use, includes defined users/workflows and measurable outputs, and operates within separate production environments?

Answer 33:

In the competitive process, Sourcewell will not advise a proposer on the content of the proposal. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine how to best satisfy all requirements of the questionnaire tables.

Question 34:

As presented on the Pre Proposal Conference, Sourcewell described a process to evaluate and award Lots consecutively, starting with Lot 1 and moving on to Lot 2 and finally Lot 3. Adding to the degree of complexity, Section I. Additional Consideration, Question 5 of the RFP reads that Sourcewell may need to organize responses into subcategories and awards may be based on those subcategories which may create an even more extended timeline per Lot.

With an unknown, and likely large, number of responses submitted this strategy, while thorough, creates the potential for an extended timeline between submission and potential award. Upon solicitation close, and based on the number of responses received, is Sourcewell considering alternate evaluation and award practices (i.e., concurrent evaluation and award across Lots 1, 2, and 3) to minimize time from submission to award and maximize potential impact to Sourcewell Members?

Answer 34:

The duration of the evaluation process will depend on the number and complexity of responses received. Following the solicitation close, Sourcewell may reevaluate the evaluation and award approach, as needed, provided any adjustments remain consistent with the process and requirements outlined in the RFP.

End of Addendum

Acknowledgement of this Addendum to RFP 061726, posted to the Sourcewell Procurement Portal on 05/14/2026, is required at the time of proposal submittal.

05/15/2026
Addendum No. 5
Solicitation Number: RFP 061726
Solicitation Name: Enterprise Artificial Intelligence: Platforms, Services, and Integrated Delivery

Consider the following Question(s) and Answer(s) to be part of the above-titled solicitation documents. The remainder of the documents remain unchanged.

Question 1:

For Lot 1, if a platform supports multiple operational deployments through a shared enterprise platform architecture, should each operational customer environment be treated as a separate production deployment?

Answer 1:

Refer to Addendum 4, Answer 33.

Question 2:

Will the selected vendor be permitted to perform any project activities from offshore/global delivery centers (e.g., India or the UK), or is all work required to be performed within the United States?

Answer 2:

Sourcewell can contract with a foreign supplier. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to demonstrate how they will effectively deliver the requested goods and services offered in their proposal to participating entities. Each proposal will be evaluated based on the criteria stated in the RFP.

Question 3:

Are there any specific supporting documents, certifications, policies, references, or proof points that Sourcewell expects proposers to provide for each evaluation criterion to strengthen scoring?

Answer 3:

It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine the information or documentation necessary to best demonstrate their ability to serve Sourcewell Participating Entities and satisfy all the requirements included in the questionnaire tables.

Question 4:

For Canada-serving suppliers, should Canadian-dollar pricing, Canadian privacy considerations, and provincial coverage be included in the proposal.

Answer 4:

Per RFP Section III. 4., "All proposed pricing must be stated in U.S. and Canadian dollars (as applicable)."

In the competitive process, Sourcewell will not advise a proposer on the content of the proposal. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine how to best satisfy all requirements of the RFP and questionnaire tables.

Question 5:

One of our partners in Canada, they are tied with us in States, Can they come as a package with us from States?

Answer 5:

Refer to Addendum 4, Answer 23 and 28.

Question 6:

I see there was a release of the Artificial Intelligence (AI) Readiness, Implementation, and Support Services in 2024. Is this RFP different then the one awarded a few years ago?

Answer 6:

Refer to Addendum 2, Answer 2.

Question 7:

For Canadian-based vendors serving Canadian participating entities, are there any regional preferences or geographic considerations applied within the evaluation or scoring process?

Answer 7:

It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine the information and documentation necessary to best demonstrate their ability to serve Sourcewell participating entities and satisfy all the requirements included in the questionnaire tables. Proposals are evaluated based on the criteria stated in the RFP.

Question 8:

Are agencies national in the US, or Minnesota only?

Answer 8:

Sourcewell is a State of Minnesota local government unit and service cooperative created under the laws of the State of Minnesota (Minnesota Statutes Section 123A.21) that facilitates a competitive public solicitation and master agreement award process for the benefit of its 50,000+ participating entities across the United States and Canada.

Question 9:

Once awarded, do gov't agencies just connect with the supplier directly? Or do they send out RFPs to the suppliers on the list?

Answer 9:

Participating Entities typically access master agreements for equipment, products, or services through a purchase order issued directly to the awarded supplier. A Participating Entity may request additional terms or conditions related to a purchase. Use of Sourcewell master agreements is voluntary and Participating Entities retain the right to obtain similar equipment, products, or services from other sources.

Question 10:

Are offshore/nearshore resources acceptable?

Answer 10:

Refer to Answer 2.

Question 11:

Can you advise the $ value of the contracts that are awarded to successful suppliers with the end buyer entities from the previous RFP Artificial Intelligence (AI) Readiness, Implementation, and Support Services RFP #110724.

Answer 11:

For Public Data Requests, please reach out to rfp@sourcewell-mn.gov

Question 12:

Is this a new contract? If not, can we access incumbent contract details, prior responses, and pricing?

Answer 12:

This is a new category with no existing incumbent information available.

Question 13:

If you are not awarded in this first iteration, do you have to resubmit the entire packet or just re-validate/edit and add extra details for the potential 6-month re-evaluations for the different lots?

Answer 13:

To maintain a continuously competitive process, respondents who were not previously awarded but wish to be considered during a subsequent rolling onboarding period must submit a complete RFP response for each open enrollment period.

Per RFP Section II.C., "Existing awardees are not required to reapply through a supplemental evaluation window, and their master agreements remain in effect. Suppliers who previously responded to a Lot but were not awarded must resubmit during future supplemental onboarding to be considered."

Question 14:

Can we apply as as Sub or Prime with other vendors ?

Answer 14:

Refer to Addendum 4, Answer 23 and 28.

Question 15:

Are there any MBE goals ?

Answer 15:

Sourcewell is requesting proposals to meet the various needs of its 50,000+ Participating Entities as a whole, across the United States and Canada. Though it is possible those specific entities have MBE goals, it is left to the discretion of each proposer to articulate and propose the solutions that align with its business methods and satisfies the requirements of the RFP. A Participating Entities' unique needs will be determined if and when the Participating Entities choose to utilize a contract resulting from this solicitation.

Question 16:

Can services be delivered utilizing offshore resources?

Answer 16:

Refer to Answer 2.

Question 17:

For Lot 2, may a proposer submit multiple qualifying client engagements (each meeting the $200K / 12-month / qualifying-industry bar) to demonstrate depth and breadth - trying to determine if multiple reference strengthen response?

Answer 17:

In the competitive process, Sourcewell will not advise a proposer on the content of the proposal. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine how to best satisfy all requirements of the questionnaire tables.

Question 18:

Do we need to be registered to do business in any particular state in the USA?

Answer 18:

Sourcewell is requesting proposals to meet the various needs of its 50,000+ Participating Entities as a whole, across the United States and Canada. A Participating Entities' unique needs will be determined if and when the Participating Entities choose to utilize a contract resulting from this solicitation. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to articulate and propose the solutions that align with its business methods and satisfies the requirements of the RFP.

Question 19:

Can we bid on more than one lot? If so, will additional lots be treated as secondary?

Answer 19:

Per RFP Section II. B., " Proposers must select ONE (1) Primary Lot under which to submit a response . . . Proposers will not be penalized for complementary offerings or capabilities that may also align with other Lots; the Lot structure serves only as an organizational and evaluation mechanism and does not limit the scope of a proposer's broader capabilities."

Question 20:

Can you confirm whether fixed-price, time-and-materials, or hybrid pricing structures are acceptable for the services outlined in Lot 1 and Lot 2 respectively, and whether the $150M figure represents a not-to-exceed /target contract value?

Answer 20:

It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine and propose the pricing approach that aligns with their business methods and satisfies all the requirements of RFP Section III – Pricing and Delivery Schedules. Proposals are evaluated based on the criteria stated in the RFP.

The USD $150 million estimates for both Lot 1 and Lot 2 represent the anticipated annual value of all transactions generated through the master agreements awarded under each respective Lot.

Question 21:

Please confirm the required timeframe for past performance references. Should respondents provide projects completed within a specific look-back period, such as the past three, five, or seven years?

Answer 21:

Per the RFP Questionnaire section titled, "Responsiveness Criteria," the demonstrated experience timeframe requirements are as follows: Lot 1, 24-months preceding the proposal submission deadline; Lot 2, 12-months preceding the proposal submission deadline; and Lot 3, 12-months preceding the proposal submission deadline.

Question 22:

Can the references be more than 1 year old?

Answer 22:

Refer to Answer 21.

Question 23:

How many awardees are there per lot ?

Answer 23:

Refer to Addendum 4, Answer 14.

Question 24:

Should Sourcewell's administrative fee be built into the published rate card for professional services, or shown separately in the pricing narrative?

Answer 24:

Proposers are asked to list their administrative fee within line 73 of the RFP Questionnaire. Beyond that, it is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine and propose the pricing approach that aligns with their business methods and satisfies all the requirements of RFP Section III – Pricing and Delivery Schedules. Proposals are evaluated based on the criteria stated in the RFP.

Also refer to Addendum 4, Answer 19

Question 25:

When a new RFP is rolled out by an agency - How will the lot categorization happen? If it is services - will it be open for Lot 2 and Lot 3

Answer 25:

Refer to RFP Section II.C. Rolling Supplier Onboarding.

Question 26:

Can Sourcewell clarify whether deployments through consortiums, partner organizations, educational institutions, or federally funded programs qualify as external client organizations?

Answer 26:

External client organizations refer to any client outside of the supplier itself.

Question 27:

How would two partners partnering on a given lot respond to the bid?

Answer 27:

Refer to Addendum 4, Answer 28.

Question 28:

Are you looking for a ready made solution or a custom one. We are a type of company who will build it from the scratch.

Answer 28:

Refer to RFP Section II. Solicitation Details.

Question 29:

Can we bid on the proposal with another AI company? As partners?

Answer 29:

Refer to Addendum 4, Answer 28.

Question 30:

For Lot 2, can a proposer use third-party AI tools, cloud services, automation platforms, or model providers as part of implementation services without being considered a Lot 1 platform proposer?

Answer 30:

Refer to Addendum 4, Answer 23.

Question 31:

You mentioned Canoe Procurement Group participate on Sourcewell RFPs? What does that mean for proposers? Are they competitors?

Answer 31:

Sourcewell collaborates with Canoe to incorporate Canada-specific language into the Sourcewell RFP, and Canoe advertises Sourcewell's solicitation documents across multiple provinces. Sourcewell agreements are made available for use by members of the Canoe procurement group of Canada. Refer to RFP Section I. B. Use of Resulting Agreements.

Question 32:

Will you even evaluate the proposals if it does not meet the initial experience criteria?

Answer 32:

Refer to RFP Section VI. Evaluation and Award.

At this time, Sourcewell does not intend to evaluate proposals that fail to meet the minimum Responsiveness Criteria requirements and thresholds.

Question 33:

How many projects were used against the previous rfp?

Answer 33:

This is a new category with no existing incumbent or project information available.

Question 34:

Sorry it is unclear if Canadian entities have to bid with Canoe Procurement RFP if they float a similar RFP on their portal OR bid directly with Sourcwell. Please elaborate.

Answer 34:

Refer to Answer 31.

Question 35:

For Lot 1, would a purpose-built AI platform focused on intelligent document processing, transcript normalization, academic data extraction, and workflow automation for higher education institutions qualify?

Answer 35:

Sourcewell will not pre-qualify any products or services. It is left to the discretion of each Proposer to determine if its products or services meet the scope of RFP II. B. Requested Equipment, Products, or Services. Only those products within the scope of the RFP will be included in any contract awarded by Sourcewell as a result of the solicitation.

Question 36:

IS THERE A PULISHED LIST OF GENIES AND PARTNERS SOURCEWELL CURRENTLY SELLS / PROVICVES SERVICES TOO?

Answer 36:

Refer to RFP Section I. A and B.

Question 37:

Can you also touch payment side? Who pays to whom? Customer to Proponent?

Answer 37:

Refer to RFP III. B. and Master Agreement Article II. G. Administrative Fees. The administrative fee is paid by the awarded supplier to Sourcewell and is not to be separately assessed to a participating entity.

Question 38:

The RFP references enterprise-scale AI platforms. Can Sourcewell provide additional guidance regarding how “enterprise-scale” will be evaluated for education-focused AI platforms serving higher education systems and state-level institutions.

Answer 38:

Sourcewell will not provide further definitions for "enterprise-scale" at this time, though suppliers can find an in-depth description of scope requirements and expectations for Lot 1 in RFP Section II. B. Lot 1: AI Products and Platforms.

Proposals are evaluated based on the criteria stated in the RFP.

Question 39:

For Lot 1 respondents, is custom implementation, onboarding, integration, and configuration support permissible as complementary services when bundled with the AI platform offering?

Answer 39:

Per RFP Section II. B., " Proposers must select ONE (1) Primary Lot under which to submit a response . . . Proposers will not be penalized for complementary offerings or capabilities that may also align with other Lots; the Lot structure serves only as an organizational and evaluation mechanism and does not limit the scope of a proposer’s broader capabilities."

Question 40:

Hello, Can you confirm to whom the bid is for? It shows up as being from Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada but the RFP documents all refer to Minnesota. We ask for clarification on this. Thank you.

Answer 40:

Sourcewell is requesting proposals to meet the various needs of its 50,000+ Participating Entities as a whole, across the United States and Canada, NOT individual entities' needs. The use of Sourcewell contracts is voluntary for Participating Entities. In this competitive solicitation process, Sourcewell will not advise a proposer on the way it should submit a proposal. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to articulate and propose the approach that aligns with its business methods and satisfies the requirements of the RFP. Participating Entities' unique needs, and Solutions from awarded supplier(s), will be determined if and when Participating Entities choose to utilize a contract resulting from this solicitation.

Question 41:

RFP Section III notes proposers are expected to upload a corresponding detailed price sheet. Section 3, Part B notes The pricing narrative is not a substitute for the structured price sheet required above... Does Sourcewell intend to provide a structure price sheet/s or shall proposers create their own in alignment with the proposed pricing structure?

Answer 41:

Refer to Addendum 4, Answer 17.

Question 42:

Can Sourcewell clarify whether there are any minimum hardware or infrastructure requirements associated with Lot 1 AI platform solutions, including whether bidders are expected to provide or supply any required hardware? Additionally, for SaaS-based offerings, please confirm where the solutions are expected to be hosted

Answer 42:

Addendum 4, Answer 8.

Question 43:

Can Sourcewell provide any guidance on typical or expected usage levels for Lot 1 AI platform solutions - such as approximate user counts, scale of deployments,

or representative consumption assumptions across Participating Entities - to help bidders develop realistic and competitive pricing models?

Answer 43:

Per RFP Section II. G. “Based on past volume of similar contracts, the estimated annual value of all transactions from master agreements resulting from this RFP is anticipated to be USD $150 Million for Lot 1, $150 Million for Lot 2, and $300 Million for Lot 3. Therefore, proposers are expected to propose volume pricing. Sourcewell anticipates considerable activity under the master agreement(s) awarded from this RFP; however, sales and sales volume from any resulting master agreement are not guaranteed.”

Question 44:

Given the breadth of this RFP and the volume of response requirements, would Sourcewell consider extending the submission deadline by two weeks from June 17 to July 1 to allow vendors sufficient time to provide comprehensive, accurate, and competitive responses in accordance with the RFP’s objectives?

Answer 44:

No extension of the due date is being considered by Sourcewell at this time.

End of Addendum

Acknowledgement of this Addendum to RFP 061726, posted to the Sourcewell Procurement Portal on 05/15/2026, is required at the time of proposal submittal.

05/19/2026
Addendum No.6
Solicitation Number: RFP 061726
Solicitation Name: Enterprise Artificial Intelligence: Platforms, Services, and Integrated Delivery

Consider the following Question(s) and Answer(s) to be part of the above-titled solicitation documents. The remainder of the documents remain unchanged.

Question 1:

If a proposer selects Lot 3 as its Primary Lot and is awarded a master agreement, will Participating Entities be able to procure AI technology products (consistent with Lot 1 scope) or AI professional services (consistent with Lot 2 scope) individually from the Lot 3 awardee—without requiring the full integrated delivery offering—or is the Lot 3 master agreement restricted solely to engagements where both technology and services are delivered together as a unified solution? Additionally, does the Lot 3 award preclude the proposer from bidding or being considered for Lot 1 or Lot 2, or are there circumstances under which a Lot 3 awardee may also be eligible for separate contracts under Lot 1 or Lot 2?

Answer 1:

Per RFP Section II. B., " Proposers must select ONE (1) Primary Lot under which to submit a response . . . Proposers will not be penalized for complementary offerings or capabilities that may also align with other Lots; the Lot structure serves only as an organizational and evaluation mechanism and does not limit the scope of a proposer’s broader capabilities."

Question 2:

we understand there is an option to download the various tables to a word document to prepare our responses which would then be copied into the table within the site. can you please explain how to access this option?

Answer 2:

Refer to Section I. General of the FAQ document located on the home page of the Procurement Portal.

After selecting "Start Submission," a proposer may navigate to Step 4 – "Preview Bid" and select "Preview My Bid in PDF," if a downloadable PDF of the questionnaire tables is desired. PDF is the only format available during export.

Question 3:

Can Sourcewell clarify the intended boundary between:
a. AI professional services under Lot 2; and
b. Integrated AI delivery under Lot 3,
particularly where a proposer provides implementation, engineering, and managed services associated with third-party AI platforms?

Answer 3:

Sourcewell will provide no further clarifications on Lot boundaries at this time. Refer to RFP Section II. Solicitation Details.

Question 4:

Under Lot 2, are proposers permitted to include implementation and operational support services for commercial AI/cloud platforms (e.g., Azure AI, AWS AI/ML, Databricks, OpenAI, Anthropic, Google AI, Snowflake AI)?

Answer 4:

In the competitive process, Sourcewell will not advise a proposer on the content of the proposal. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine how to best satisfy all requirements of the questionnaire tables.

Question 5:

Would enterprise data engineering, data governance, data modernization, knowledge management, and intelligent automation services be considered in-scope under Lot 2 when directly supporting AI adoption initiatives?

Answer 5:

Refer to Answer 4.

Question 6:

Can Sourcewell confirm whether AI readiness assessments, AI roadmap development, governance strategy, and AI operating model transformation are considered core Lot 2 services?

Answer 6:

Refer to Answer 4.

Question 7:

Does Sourcewell consider AI-enabled software engineering and custom application development under Lot 2 to include:
a. RAG applications,
b. AI copilots,
c. conversational AI,
d. workflow automation,
e. AI-assisted case management,
f. and enterprise search solutions?

Answer 7:

Refer to Answer 4.

Question 8:

Can proposers include offshore or global delivery support models for managed services and engineering activities, provided security and service-level requirements are met?

Answer 8:

Refer to Answer 4.

Question 9:

Is there an incumbent currently performing this work/similar work? If so, could you please provide the incumbent's name, current contract number, duration, historical level of effort, and contract value?

Answer 9:

This is a new category with no existing incumbent or project information available.

Question 10:

Is the incumbent eligible to submit a proposal under this RFP?

Answer 10:

Refer to Answer 9.

Question 11:

What is the place of performance for this work?

Answer 11:

Sourcewell is requesting proposals to meet the various needs of its 50,000+ Participating Entities as a whole, across the United States and Canada, NOT individual entities' needs. The use of Sourcewell contracts is voluntary for Participating Entities. In this competitive solicitation process, Sourcewell will not advise a proposer on the way it should submit a proposal. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to articulate and propose the approach that aligns with its business methods and satisfies the requirements of the RFP. Participating Entities' unique needs, and Solutions from awarded supplier(s), will be determined if and when Participating Entities choose to utilize a contract resulting from this solicitation.

Question 12:

Will remote work be permitted under this contract?

Answer 12:

Refer to Answer 11.

Question 13:

Is the contractor permitted to perform part of the work from offshore or nearshore locations (e.g., India, Canada), or must all work be performed strictly within the United States?

Answer 13:

Sourcewell can contract with a foreign supplier. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to demonstrate how they will effectively deliver the requested goods and services offered in their proposal to participating entities. Each proposal will be evaluated based on the criteria stated in the RFP.

Question 14:

Would the Sourcewell consider extending the submission deadline by two weeks to allow for a more robust and comprehensive response?

Answer 14:

No extension of the due date is being considered by Sourcewell at this time.

Question 15:

For a proposer responding under Lot 2: AI Professional Services, can the proposer also include and offer complementary AI-related technology platforms, software subscriptions, cloud services, intelligent automation platforms, and integrated delivery capabilities as part of broader implementation or managed service engagements?

More specifically, if the proposer's primary value proposition and principal line of business align with Lot 2 professional services, would Sourcewell still permit the proposer to:
Resell or provide access to third-party AI or cloud platforms as part of a services engagement;
Deliver integrated implementation and managed services associated with those platforms;
Include platform licensing/subscription pricing where directly tied to the proposed professional services engagement; and
Market broader end-to-end AI transformation capabilities under the resulting agreement, provided the proposer is not positioning itself primarily as a standalone AI platform provider under Lot 1 or a turnkey integrated AI product provider under Lot 3?

We are seeking clarification regarding how broadly complementary technology, software, and integrated delivery capabilities may be included within a Lot 2 response and resulting Master Agreement.

Answer 15:

Refer to RFP Section II. B. Primary Deliverable Determination and Lot 1: AI Products and Platforms.

Sourcewell will be providing no further clarifications regarding complementary technology or Lot inclusions at this time. In the competitive process, Sourcewell will not advise a proposer on the content of the proposal. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine how to best satisfy all requirements of the questionnaire tables.

Question 16:

Is the Certificate of Insurance required with the response or once the vendor is awarded?

Answer 16:

An awarded supplier will be expected to carry the insurance coverage as stated in the Master Agreement, Article 2, 22. upon execution. To identify any exception, or to request any modification, to Sourcewell's standard terms, conditions, or specifications, a proposer must submit the proposed exception(s) or requested modification(s) via redline in the Master Agreement provided in the "Documents" section of the "Bid Details" page on the Sourcewell Procurement Portal and uploaded as part of its response. Only those exceptions noted at the time of the proposal submission will be considered.

End of Addendum

Acknowledgement of this Addendum to RFP 061726, posted to the Sourcewell Procurement Portal on 05/19/2026, is required at the time of proposal submittal.

05/22/2026
Addendum No. 7
Solicitation Number: RFP 061726
Solicitation Name: Enterprise Artificial Intelligence: Platforms, Services, and Integrated Delivery

Consider the following Question(s) and Answer(s) to be part of the above-titled solicitation documents. The remainder of the documents remain unchanged.

Question 1:

Can Sourcewell clarify whether the responsiveness criteria and minimum qualification requirements for RFP #061726 may be satisfied solely through the demonstrated AI experience, past performance, and references of identified subcontractors or teaming partners within the proposed delivery team?

Answer 1:

Within the Questionnaire, each proposer is required to answer the following question, regardless of the Lot selected: “Describe your organization’s specific role and confirm that your organization **held primary accountability** for the overall solution. If subcontractors were used, describe their roles and explain how accountability was structured and governed.” Proposers should have held primary responsibility for the Demonstrated Experience examples they provide.

Question 2:

Can you please publish the pre-bid meeting attendee list with contact information? This will help facilitate networking and MBE outreach.

Answer 2:

Sourcewell will not disclose the list of pre-proposal conference attendees at this time. That data is classified as non-public until all contracts have been awarded and executed.

Question 3:

Can we use a subcontractor's past experience/AI work to show responsiveness at the start of the questionnaire?

Answer 3:

Refer to Answer 1.

End of Addendum

Acknowledgement of this Addendum to RFP 061726, posted to the Sourcewell Procurement Portal on 05/22/2026, is required at the time of proposal submittal.

05/26/2026
Addendum No. 8
Solicitation Number: RFP 061726
Solicitation Name: Enterprise Artificial Intelligence: Platforms, Services, and Integrated Delivery

Consider the following Question(s) and Answer(s) to be part of the above-titled solicitation documents. The remainder of the documents remain unchanged.

Question 1:

To demonstrate our relevant experience, will Sourcewell consider and evaluate our work for a Telecom company like Verizon as a highly regulated industry? In other words, can we submit a past experience where we have similar work with a Telecom company (Verizon) and will be considered a highly regulated industry?

Answer 1:

Refer to Addendum 1, Answer 1.

Question 2:

Could Sourcewell please confirm whether the Small/Minority/Veteran goal is a mandatory requirement? If so, does Sourcewell accept Small/Minority/Veteran certification from any U.S. state, or is certification by the State of Minnesota required?

Answer 2:

Refer to Addendum 5, Answer 15.

Question 3:

We are an MBE-certified company by the State of Maryland and intend to submit a bid as a prime contractor. Could Sourcewell please confirm whether our certification alone satisfies the Minority goal, or if we are required to partner with another Small/Minority/Veteran-certified firm to meet the goal?

Answer 3:

Refer to Addendum 5, Answer 15.

Question 4:

Could you please clarify whether there is an opportunity to submit supplemental materials, such as a company overview deck or capabilities presentation, in addition to the required questionnaire responses and pricing tables? If so, please advise where these materials should be uploaded within the submission process.

Answer 4:

Proposers may upload additional supporting documentation during "Step 2, Documents" of the proposal submission process.

Question 5:

Could you please clarify the number of references required for LOT 2: AI Professional Services Category?

The RFP document indicates that one (1) reference is required; however, the response table appears to request three (3) references.

Could you please confirm the correct requirement for this category?

Thank you for your assistance, and we look forward to your clarification.

Answer 5:

Lot 2 Demonstrated Experience - AI Professional Services is asking for experience details related to Responsiveness Criteria. Table 2B: References/Testimonials is asking for reference information to be used by the Evaluation Committee and/or the Participating Entities.

End of Addendum

Acknowledgement of this Addendum to RFP 061726 posted to the Sourcewell Procurement Portal on 05/26/2026, is required at the time of proposal submittal.

05/27/2026
Addendum No.9
Solicitation Number: RFP 061726
Solicitation Name: Enterprise Artificial Intelligence: Platforms, Services, and Integrated Delivery

Consider the following Question(s) and Answer(s) to be part of the above-titled solicitation documents. The remainder of the documents remain unchanged.

Question 1:

Could you please clarify whether the references provided are required to demonstrate experience with a similar scope of work?

Answer 1:

For the purposes of this RFP, Proposers may provide references who operate in “highly regulated industries” as defined in RFP Section IV.A. Responsiveness Criteria.

Question 2:

The RFP focuses on enterprise-level AI. If a proposer offers a purpose-built AI platform for a specific government function, but it is typically deployed to the department, office, branch, or unit with that need rather than entity-wide, is it still in scope?

Answer 2:

Sourcewell will not pre-qualify any products or services. It is left to the discretion of each Proposer to determine if its products or services meet the scope of RFP II. B. Requested Equipment, Products, or Services. Only those products within the scope of

the RFP will be included in any contract awarded by Sourcewell as a result of the solicitation.

Question 3:

Section II.D SINGLE PRIMARY LOT seems to address software developing companies as respondents to this RFP having a sole source of responsibility for the equipment, products, and services provided under a resulting master agreement. It further requests to describe a network of resellers/distributors, etc. for their products. Our company is a software reseller. Please clarify if resellers can respond to this RFP under Lot 1.

Answer 3:

Refer to RFP Section II. D. Single Primary Lot, "… If proposer includes the equipment, products, and services of its subsidiary entities, the proposer must also identify all subsidiaries included in its proposal. If proposer requires the use of distributors, dealers, resellers, or subcontractors to provide the equipment, products, or services, the proposal must address how the equipment, products or services will be provided to Participating Entities, and describe the network of distributors, dealers, resellers, and/or subcontractors that will be available to serve Participating Entities under a resulting master agreement."

It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine the information or documentation necessary to best demonstrate their ability to serve Sourcewell Participating Entities and satisfy all the requirements of the RFP and the questionnaire tables. Proposals are evaluated based on the criteria stated in the RFP.

End of Addendum

Acknowledgement of this Addendum to RFP 061726 posted to the Sourcewell Procurement Portal on 05/27/2026, is required at the time of proposal submittal.

6/1/2026
Addendum No.10
Solicitation Number: RFP 061726
Solicitation Name: Enterprise Artificial Intelligence: Platforms, Services, and Integrated Delivery

Consider the following Question(s) and Answer(s) to be part of the above-titled solicitation documents. The remainder of the documents remain unchanged.

Question 1:

We have extensive experience in FinTech (e.g., BBVA, Santander) and Logistics (e.g., FedEx). Does Sourcewell definitively classify the Logistics and Retail/E-commerce (e.g., Cencosud) sectors as highly regulated for the purposes of the responsiveness review?

Answer 1:

Refer to RFP Section VI. A. Responsiveness Criteria, as well as the thresholds and requirements listed in the RFP Questionnaire under the section titled, Responsiveness Criteria. Both areas provide a definition of highly regulated industries and examples of qualifying highly regulated industries.

Question 2:

What are the five most requested AI platform use cases among Sourcewell participating entities today? Are there 'must-have' capabilities evaluators expect to see addressed?

Answer 2:

In the competitive process, Sourcewell will not advise a proposer on the content of the proposal. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine how to best satisfy all requirements of the questionnaire tables.

Question 3:

What proportion of participating entities have deployed AI in production vs. those still in exploratory/pilot phases?

Answer 3:

Sourcewell is requesting proposals to meet the various needs of its 50,000+ Participating Entities as a whole, across the United States and Canada. In this competitive solicitation process, Sourcewell will not advise a proposer on the contents of its proposal. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to articulate and propose the solutions that aligns with its business methods and satisfies the requirements of the RFP. A Participating Entities' unique needs will be determined if and when the Participating Entities choose to utilize a contract resulting from this solicitation.

Question 4:

Is there a supplier marketplace or discovery portal where participating entities can browse and compare offerings from different MA awardees?

Answer 4:

Refer to Answer 3 above.

Question 5:

To ensure our proposal is as accurate and consistent as possible, we would greatly appreciate clarification on a few terminology. Specifically, could you please provide the definitions or the definitions exhibit for capitalized terms such as 'Program' or 'Delivery', which seem to hold specific meaning for this scope of engagement?

Answer 5:

Refer to Answer 2 above.

Question 6:

As per our understanding from the Master Agreement, Suppliers can propose redlines to identify any exception or request any modifications. Please confirm if it is acceptable to Sourcewell if we redline the Master Agreement document or the expectation would be to share these modifications in tabular format, we will accordingly prepare the list.

Answer 6:

Proposed exception requests or modifications are to be redlined in the Word version of the Master Agreement.

Question 7:

Our organization provides utility-focused consulting, system integration, managed services, modernization programs, and AI-enabled solutions for customer service, workforce productivity, workflow automation, knowledge management, and operational support across North America.

Given the broad nature of Lot 3 and the rolling supplier onboarding model described in the RFP, would Sourcewell encourage organizations with strong alignment to the integrated delivery model to submit a response in the current cycle if their primary objective is to establish participation and visibility within the contract vehicle while continuing to mature and expand their AI offerings and commercialization approach?

Alternatively, would Sourcewell recommend waiting for a future supplier onboarding opportunity once those offerings are more fully developed?

Any guidance on how Sourcewell views organizations in this position would be appreciated as we evaluate the most appropriate participation strategy.

Answer 7:

In the competitive process, Sourcewell will not advise a proposer on the content of the proposal. Sourcewell will not pre-qualify any products or services. It is left to the discretion of each Proposer to determine if its products or services meet the scope of RFP II. B. Requested Equipment, Products, or Services. Only those products within the scope of the RFP will be included in any contract awarded by Sourcewell as a result of the solicitation.

Question 8:

The RFP Questionnaire requests the Proposer's CAGE code or Unique Entity Identifier (SAM), which are typically required for entities doing business with the U.S. federal government. Can Sourcewell clarify how Canadian suppliers (or other non-U.S. entities) that do not have a CAGE code or SAM registration should respond to this requirement, and whether an alternative identifier or "N/A" response is acceptable?

Answer 8:

A CAGE or Unique Entity Identifier (SAM) code is not required to be considered for or awarded a Sourcewell contract. Proposals are evaluated based on the criteria as stated in the RFP.

Question 9:

Since Pricing now represents 25% of the total score, will Sourcewell prioritize high-volume not-to-exceed hourly rates for professional services, or is there a preference for Outcome-based pricing models for AI implementations?

Answer 9:

Each supplier will propose pricing in the format that makes sense for their industry. Each proposer, in its discretion, will determine and articulate the pricing approach that aligns with its business methods and satisfies all the requirements of the III. Pricing section of the RFP. Proposals are evaluated based on the criteria stated in the RFP.

Question 10:

Regarding the Depth and Breadth of Offered Solutions, does Sourcewell value the number of different AI technologies mastered more than the number of specific AI products offered?

Answer 10:

Refer to Answer 2 above.

Question 11:

Does the definition of 'standalone AI platform' exclude platforms that also include BI reporting, process automation, or non-AI modules? Where is the boundary between a qualifying AI platform and an ERP/CRM with AI features?

Answer 11:

Sourcewell will not pre-qualify any products or services. It is left to the discretion of each Proposer to determine if its products or services meet the scope of RFP II. B. Requested Equipment, Products, or Services. Only those products within the scope of the RFP will be included in any contract awarded by Sourcewell as a result of the solicitation.

Question 12:

For the AI Maturity Assessment requirement in Lot 2, would Sourcewell accept a proprietary tool like our Modernization Health Check Scorecard as a valid methodology for evaluating a Participating Entity’s readiness?

Answer 12:

See Answer 11 above.

Question 13:

Since the Master Agreement term is a non-extendable 10 years, how frequently can proposers update their Rate Card or Line-Item Pricing to account for the rapid evolution and potential cost changes of AI technologies over a decade?

Answer 13:

Refer to the Sourcewell Master Agreement, Article II: Sourcewell and Supplier Obligations, B. Product and Price Changes.

Question 14:

Will Sourcewell provide a specific template for the Pricing Narrative to ensure all proposers explain their total cost of ownership (TCO) calculations in a consistent format?

Answer 14:

A specific format is not required for submission, but Excel is preferred. Each supplier will propose pricing in the format that makes sense for their industry. Each proposer, in its discretion, will determine and articulate the pricing approach that aligns with its business methods and satisfies all the requirements of the **III. Pricing section of the RFP**. Proposals are evaluated based on the criteria stated in the RFP.

Question 15:

Does Sourcewell provide awarded suppliers with contact information for participating entities, curated lead lists, or direct introductions?

Answer 15:

Awarded suppliers will work with their Supplier Development Executive to best market the contract post-award.

Question 16:

What level of Explainable AI (XAI) do participating entities typically expect — required for all use cases, or only for high-stakes decisions such as benefits eligibility or criminal justice?

Answer 16:

Sourcewell utilizes a competitive, solutions-based solicitation approach that is NOT based on detailed specifications or specific opportunities. A proposer can propose its entire offering that falls within the requested equipment, products, or services as described in II. Solicitation Details. B. Requested Equipment, Products, or Services within the RFP.

Question 17:

Are the 175 points for Responsible AI evaluated on corporate AI ethics policies, or on specific technical features of the offered solution (explainability, bias detection, auditability)?

Answer 17:

See Answer 2 above.

Question 18:

Is there a specific Responsible AI framework that Sourcewell or its participating entities expect awarded suppliers to adopt (NIST AI RMF, ISO 42001, a federal Executive Order requirement)?

Answer 18:

See Answer 11 above.

Question 19:

Does the evaluation process include oral presentations, product demonstrations, or proof-of-concept evaluations, or is the award decision based solely on the written proposal?

Answer 19:

Refer to Answer 2 above.

Sourcewell does not intend to allow proposer presentations at this time.

Question 20:

What is the profile of the proposal evaluators — Sourcewell procurement professionals, external AI SMEs, or participating entity representatives?

Answer 20:

In regard to this RFP, the proposal evaluation committee will be comprised of Sourcewell procurement professionals.

Question 21:

For 'Depth and Breadth of Offered Solutions' (200 pts — highest single evaluable weight after Pricing), does Sourcewell favor breadth across many use cases or depth in fewer specialized areas?

Answer 21:

Refer to Answer 2 above.

Question 22:

What are the contract termination provisions for services engagements? Can a participating entity terminate a SOW for convenience, and what is the minimum notice period?

Answer 22:

Refer to RFP Section I. B. – Use of Resulting Contracts, “Participating Entities typically access master agreements for equipment, products, or services through a purchase order issued directly to the awarded supplier. A Participating Entity may request additional terms or conditions related to a purchase.”

Question 23:

Do K-12 and higher education entities have materially different AI professional services needs vs. government agencies? Should the proposal address segments with differentiated service lines?

Answer 23:

Refer to Answer 2 above.

Question 24:

What proportion of participating entities have deployed AI in production vs. those still in exploratory/pilot phases?

Answer 24:

Refer to Answer 3 above.

Question 25:

Are there currently active Responsible AI governance initiatives within Sourcewell or its participating entities that awarded service providers would be expected to align with?

Answer 25:

Refer to Answer 3 above.

Question 26:

Does the definition of 'standalone AI platform' exclude platforms that also include BI reporting, process automation, or non-AI modules? Where is the boundary between a qualifying AI platform and an ERP/CRM with AI features?

Answer 26:

Refer to Answer 11 above.

Question 27:

What AI Professional Services are most in demand among participating entities today — strategy/governance, platform implementation, or managed services? Where is current supply insufficient?

Answer 27:

Refer to Answer 3 above.

Question 28:

Do AI Security Operations services under Lot 2 need to include adversarial red-teaming against clients' deployed models, or is the scope limited to ongoing production monitoring?

Answer 28:

Refer to Answer 11 above.

Question 29:

Does 'AI Software Development & Engineering' under Lot 2 include foundational model fine-tuning and custom model training, or only applications consuming existing third-party models via API?

Answer 29:

Refer to Answer 11 above.

Question 30:

How does Sourcewell handle product updates and new offerings during the MA term? Can we add new platform versions without a new solicitation?

Answer 30:

Refer to Answer 13 above.

Question 31:

Does the Master Agreement require fixed not-to-exceed prices for the full 10-year term, or are annual adjustments permitted (e.g., tied to CPI or a technology price index)?

Answer 31:

Refer to Answer 13 above.

Question 32:

Lot 2 Demonstrated Experience qualification — value, timing, and AI scope. For the Lot 2 Demonstrated Experience requirement of approximately $200,000 with a qualifying highly regulated industry client, active within the 12 months preceding the proposal submission deadline, (a) where the qualifying engagement spans a duration longer than the 12-month lookback window, is the ~$200,000 minimum measured against total engagement contract value, value of work performed or invoiced within the 12-month lookback window, or remaining contract value as of the submission date; (b) does "active within the 12 months preceding the proposal submission deadline" require the engagement to be active at any point within that 12-month window, active at the submission date itself, or both signed and performed entirely within the 12-month window; and (c) must AI services constitute the primary deliverable of the engagement, or does the engagement qualify if AI services represent a meaningful and discretely identifiable component of a broader services engagement (e.g., a cloud modernization or data engineering engagement that included AI-enabled deliverables)?

Responsible AI scoring for third-party foundation models. For the Responsible AI and Governance evaluation category, how will Sourcewell weigh a proposer's reliance on a third-party foundation model provider (e.g., a commercial LLM provider with a published Responsible Scaling Policy and Usage Policy) versus a proposer's own internally documented governance practices? Are documented operationalizations of an underlying model provider's published policies (such as the provider's Responsible Scaling Policy, Usage Policy, or safety evaluations) treated as supplier-controlled evidence, third-party evidence, or both, and does that affect scoring?

Answer 32:

Refer to Answer 11 above.

Question 33:

Pricing mechanics over the 10-year Master Agreement term. (a) Across the 10-year Master Agreement term, does Sourcewell express a preference for a

particular price scaling methodology (e.g., CPI-linked adjustment, fixed annual cap, vendor-elected escalator schedule), or is the choice of scaling mechanism left entirely to the proposer to articulate in the Pricing Narrative? (b) For Lot 2 engagements that include consumption-based third-party costs (e.g., foundation model API usage, cloud hosting, vector database, observability tooling), may these costs be disclosed in the Pricing Sheet as cost-plus-fixed-markup line items or pass-through line items with a defined administrative fee, or must they be embedded inside a single composite services rate; and if pass-through is permitted, what disclosure format does Sourcewell expect (e.g., named third-party vendor, current published rate, markup percentage)?

Answer 33:

Refer to Answer 14 above.

Question 34:

Subcontractor handling for primary submissions and demonstrated experience. (a) May a proposer submit its own primary proposal under one Lot and also be identified as a subcontractor in another proposer's submission under the same Lot or a different Lot, and if permitted, are there any disclosure or coordination requirements that apply to either proposal? (b) Where a Lot 2 qualifying engagement cited for Demonstrated Experience was delivered with limited subcontractor support (for example, less than 25% of total engagement value), is the proposer required to itemize that subcontractor relationship in the experience narrative, or is disclosure only required where the subcontractor delivered a material or accountable portion of the work; if a threshold applies, what percentage or scope-based test does Sourcewell use?

Answer 34:

Per RFP Section II. D. Single Primary Lot, "Sourcewell prefers suppliers that provide a sole source of responsibility for the equipment, products, and services provided under a resulting master agreement. If proposer includes the equipment, products, and services of its subsidiary entities, the proposer must also identify all subsidiaries included in its proposal. If proposer requires the use of distributors, dealers, resellers, or subcontractors to provide the equipment, products, or services, the proposal must address how the equipment, products or services will be provided to Participating Entities, and describe the network of distributors, dealers, resellers, and/or subcontractors that will be available to serve Participating Entities under a resulting master agreement." Primary Lot selection is the proposer's determination and reflects how they primarily create value for Participating Entities.

A proposer may submit only one proposal. If related, affiliated, or subsidiary entities elect to submit separate proposals, rather than a single parent-entity proposal, each such proposal must be prepared independently and without cooperation, collaboration,

or collusion. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine the information or documentation necessary to best demonstrate their ability to serve Sourcewell Participating Entities and satisfy all the requirements of the RFP.

Question 35:

Reference confidentiality for Table 2B. Per Addendum 8 Q5, proposers must provide three references in Table 2B for evaluator and Participating Entity contact. Where a willing reference client cannot consent to public disclosure in the Sourcewell record due to internal confidentiality requirements or contractual constraints, may the proposer (a) submit the reference under a confidentiality designation, (b) provide redacted client identifiers with a verifiable equivalent (e.g., third-party attestation), or (c) substitute a different reference type, without the response being treated as non-conforming?

Answer 35:

Refer to RFP Section VI. E. Disposition of Proposals, which states, “Proposers are explicitly cautioned not to submit any data that they consider to be confidential, proprietary, or trade secret, as such data will not be treated as confidential and will be subject to public disclosure in accordance with Minnesota law.”

Question 36:

Are there character or page limits per response cell, per table, or for the overall proposal? Are there limits on attachment file types and sizes?

Answer 36:

There is sufficient room to answer the question(s). The portal allows approximately 32,000 characters or 10-typed pages in each text field. Each answer should be clear and concise.

Question 37:

Is there a preferred level of quantified outcomes evaluators want to see (e.g., adoption rates, model accuracy, cost or cycle-time reduction)?

Answer 37:

Refer to Answer 2 above.

Question 38:

How many references are required, and may they be the same organizations cited in the Lot experience tab?

Answer 38:

Refer to Answer 2 above.

Question 39:

Will Sourcewell contact references during evaluation or only at award, and is there a preferred contact window?

Answer 39:

Refer to RFP Section VI. D. – Rights Reserved, “Sourcewell reserves the right to: Independently verify any information provided in a proposal.”

Question 40:

Must references be public-sector entities, or are regulated commercial references acceptable?

Answer 40:

Refer to instructions in Table 2B: References/Testimonials within the Questionnaire.

Question 41:

For the Authorized Sellers dealer-network questions, how should a services-led integrated provider that delivers directly (no reseller channel) respond to be scored fully? Will direct delivery be treated equivalently to a dealer network?

Answer 41:

Refer to Answer 2 above.

Question 42:

For the sales/service force questions, is there an expected minimum FTE threshold by sector (GOV/EDU), or are descriptive answers sufficient?

Answer 42:

Refer to Answer 2 above.

Question 43:

Are there common enterprise or government systems that Sourcewell entities most use (e.g., specific ERPs, ServiceNow, Workday, Microsoft 365) that we should explicitly address in the integration question?

Answer 43:

Refer to Answer 3 above.

Question 44:

What level of co-marketing support does Sourcewell provide, and are there brand/usage guidelines for referencing a Sourcewell-awarded agreement?

Answer 44:

The Sourcewell supplier development team provides support and resources to expand and enhance awarded supplier marketing efforts. In the competitive process, Sourcewell does not advise on the content of proposer marketing plans. Each proposal will be evaluated based on the criteria stated in the RFP.

Question 45:

Are marketing material samples scored, and is there a preferred format or quantity (e.g., one-pagers versus short slide decks)?

Answer 45:

Refer to RFP Section II. H. – Marketing Plan and Table 4: Marketing Plan within the Questionnaire for guidance on the marketing plan requirements. Each proposer, in its discretion, will determine the content of its marketing plan. The solicitation is a competitive process and proposals will be evaluated on the content submitted.

Question 46:

Is e-Procurement / e-Commerce punchout integration (with any specific platform) expected or scored for this category?

Answer 46:

Refer to Answer 2 above.

Question 47:

For Table 5B diversity, which certifications are recognized and weighted (e.g., MBE, WBE, SDVOSB, NMSDC, DBE), and are self-certifications accepted or must they be third-party issued?

Answer 47:

Proposers may describe any socioeconomic certifications their company or hub partners have attained in Table 5B, "Value-Added Attributes." Proposals are evaluated based on the criteria stated in the RFP.

Question 48:

For sustainability, are certifications expected to relate to AI/cloud operations (e.g., data-center energy efficiency or carbon), and how are they evaluated for a software- and services-based offering?

Answer 48:

Proposers may describe any sustainability certifications their company has attained in Table 5B, "Value-Added Attributes." Proposals are evaluated based on the criteria stated in the RFP.

Question 49:

What Administrative Fee percentage does Sourcewell typically expect for this category, is it negotiable, and does it apply uniformly across all transaction types (subscription, managed services, T&M, outcome-based)?

Answer 49:

Refer to RFP Section III. C. – Administrative Fees, for directions on proposing an administrative fee. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine and propose an administrative fee that is consistent with its business and its industry.

Question 50:

Can we propose multiple pricing models simultaneously for an integrated Lot 3 offering (e.g., T&M for services, subscription/consumption for the platform, outcome-based for specific deliverables), or must we select a single model?

Answer 50:

See Answer 9 above.

Question 51:

How should pass-through third-party and cloud consumption costs (e.g., hyperscaler usage, foundation-model API costs) be represented - at cost, with a fixed markup, or excluded - and do they count toward the Administrative Fee?

Answer 51:

Refer to Answer 2 above.

Question 52:

Is a published catalog or rate card required at submission, or are not-to-exceed (ceiling) rates by role/labor category sufficient for the services portion?

Answer 52:

Refer to Section III. Pricing and Delivery Schedules in the RFP.

Question 53:

Over the 10-year Master Agreement term, how frequently may pricing and rate cards be updated (e.g., annual CPI escalation), and what is the approval process?

Answer 53:

Refer to Answer 13 above.

Question 54:

Are firm-fixed price-hold periods required, and for how long must submitted pricing remain firm?

Answer 54:

It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine and propose the pricing approach that aligns with their business methods and satisfies all the requirements of RFP Section III – Pricing and Delivery Schedules. Proposals are evaluated based on the criteria stated in the RFP.

Question 55:

Are any subcategories considered mandatory versus optional for a Lot 3 award?

Answer 55:

Refer to Answer 11 above.

Question 56:

Which frameworks or standards does Sourcewell expect alignment to (e.g., NIST AI RMF, ISO/IEC 42001, ISO 27001, SOC 2, FedRAMP, StateRAMP, HIPAA, CJIS), and is certification required or is documented alignment sufficient?

Answer 56:

Refer to Answer 3 above.

Question 57:

For data sovereignty, do Participating Entities require U.S.-only (or Canada-only) data residency and no foreign-subprocessor access by default, or is this defined per entity?

Answer 57:

Sourcewell can contract with a US, Canada or foreign supplier. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to demonstrate how they will effectively deliver the requested goods and services offered in their proposal to participating entities. Each proposal will be evaluated based on the criteria stated in the RFP.

Question 58:

Are on-prem, private-cloud, or air-gapped deployment options expected to be available, or is public cloud acceptable for most Participating Entities?

Answer 58:

Refer to Answer 3 above.

Question 59:

Regarding model training, is an opt-out by default expected for Participating Entity data, and are there constraints on using foundation models that may train on inputs?

Answer 59:

Refer to Answer 3 above.

Question 60:

Will Sourcewell provide the Master Agreement template and Participating Entity terms in advance so we can prepare exceptions/redlines, and how are exceptions scored (neutral versus penalized)?

Answer 60:

Sourcewell's Master Agreement is available in the "Documents" section of the "Bid Details" page on the Sourcewell Procurement Portal. To identify any exception, or to request any modification, to Sourcewell's standard terms, conditions, or specifications, a proposer must submit the proposed exception(s) or requested modification(s) via redline in the Master Agreement uploaded as part of its response. Only those exceptions noted at the time of the proposal submission will be considered.

Question 61:

Are there mandatory federal flow-down clauses, security requirements (e.g., FAR/DFARS, CJIS, HIPAA BAA), or insurance, bonding, and cyber-liability thresholds we must commit to?

Answer 61:

Refer to the Master Agreement available on the Sourcewell Procurement Portal.

Question 62:

What data breach and AI-incident notification timelines do Sourcewell or Participating Entities require, and must these be reflected in our SLAs?

Answer 62:

Refer to Answer 3 above.

Question 62:

Is subcontracting subject to Sourcewell approval, and are there subcontracting or diversity-participation goals that are scored?

Answer 62:

Refer to RFP Section II. D. Single Primary Lot, "… If proposer includes the equipment, products, and services of its subsidiary entities, the proposer must also identify all subsidiaries included in its proposal. If proposer requires the use of distributors, dealers, resellers, or subcontractors to provide the equipment, products, or services, the proposal must address how the equipment, products or services will be provided to Participating Entities, and describe the network of distributors, dealers, resellers, and/or subcontractors that will be available to serve Participating Entities under a resulting master agreement."

It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine the information or documentation necessary to best demonstrate their ability to serve Sourcewell Participating Entities and satisfy all the requirements of the RFP and the questionnaire tables. Proposals are evaluated based on the criteria stated in the RFP.

Question 63:

Please confirm the Master Agreement term (10 years) and proposal validity (150 days), and whether termination-for-convenience or renewal provisions apply that we should plan pricing around.

Answer 63:

Refer to RFP Section II: C. Rolling Supplier Onboarding and F. Prospective Master Agreement Term.

Question 64:

Do participating entities have materially different platform requirements across segments (federal, local government, K-12, higher ed, healthcare)? Or is a horizontal platform expected to serve all equally?

Answer 65:

Refer to Answer 3 above.

End of Addendum

Acknowledgement of this Addendum to RFP 061726 posted to the Sourcewell Procurement Portal on 6/1/2026, is required at the time of proposal submittal.

06/4/2026
Addendum No.11
Solicitation Number: RFP 061726
Solicitation Name: Enterprise Artificial Intelligence: Platforms, Services, and Integrated Delivery

Consider the following Question(s) and Answer(s) to be part of the above-titled solicitation documents. The remainder of the documents remain unchanged.

Question 1:

If a proposer provides Delivery Squads that handle both custom AI software development (Lot 2) and the integration of AI platforms into existing architectures (Lot 3), should they respond under Lot 3: Integrated AI Delivery, provided they assume end-to-end accountability for the outcome?

Answer 1:

In the competitive process, Sourcewell will not advise a proposer on the content of the proposal. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine how to best satisfy all requirements of the questionnaire tables.

Question 2:

Are there currently active enterprise agreements between participating entities and major cloud AI providers (Microsoft, Google, AWS) that a Lot 1 platform would need to complement rather than replace?

Answer 2:
Sourcewell utilizes a competitive, solutions-based solicitation approach that is NOT based on detailed specifications or specific opportunities. A proposer can propose its entire offering that falls within the requested equipment, products, or services as

described in II. Solicitation Details. B. Requested Equipment, Products, or Services within the RFP.

Question 3:

How does the MA address liability when a third-party component integrated into the solution causes service disruption to a participating entity?

Answer 3:
Refer to the Sourcewell Master Agreement, Article II: Sourcewell and Supplier Obligations, Q. Indemnification.

Question 4:

In which government function areas does Sourcewell anticipate highest demand for integrated AI delivery (citizen services, public safety, benefits processing, infrastructure, permitting)?

Answer 4:
Sourcewell is requesting proposals to meet the various needs of its 50,000+ Participating Entities as a whole, across the United States and Canada. In this competitive solicitation process, Sourcewell will not advise a proposer on the contents of its proposal. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to articulate and propose the solutions that aligns with its business methods and satisfies the requirements of the RFP. A Participating Entities' unique needs will be determined if and when the Participating Entities choose to utilize a contract resulting from this solicitation.

Question 5:

Are participating entities seeking primarily AI-driven transformation (net-new processes) or AI-enabled modernization (AI on legacy systems)?

Answer 5:
See Answer 2 above.

Question 6:

For Lot 1 SaaS-based AI platforms, does Sourcewell prefer pricing to be organized by subscription tiers, user counts, transaction volumes, or platform modules when presenting volume-based pricing schedules?

Answer 6:
Each supplier will propose pricing in the format that makes sense for their industry. Each proposer, in its discretion, will determine and articulate the pricing approach that aligns with its business methods and satisfies all the requirements of the III. Pricing section of the RFP. Proposals are evaluated based on the criteria stated in the RFP.

Question 7:

For Lot 1, how many production deployments in a highly regulated industry does a proposer need to demonstrate to meet the Responsiveness Criteria? Is one deployment enough, or is there a minimum number required?

Answer 7:
Refer to Section II. B. Requested Equipment, Products, or Services for examples within each Lot, and Section VI. A. Responsiveness Criteria for a definition and examples of qualifying highly regulated industries.

Question 8

Can proposers submit multiple pricing models within the same proposal (e.g., subscription pricing plus T&M services pricing) if the offering spans multiple delivery methods?

Answer 8:
All proposed pricing must be submitted using one or more of the pricing structures, as appropriate to the proposer's Primary Lot and commercial model, listed in RFP Section III. A. 1.

Each supplier will propose pricing in the format that makes sense for their industry. Each proposer, in its discretion, will determine and articulate the pricing approach that aligns with its business methods and satisfies all the requirements of the III. Pricing section of the RFP. Proposals are evaluated based on the criteria stated in the RFP.

Question 9:

Is there a preferred pricing template or spreadsheet format that Sourcewell expects proposers to use for the detailed price sheet?

Answer 9:
A specific format is not required for submission, but Excel is preferred. Each supplier will propose pricing in the format that makes sense for their industry. Each proposer, in its discretion, will determine and articulate the pricing approach that aligns with its business methods and satisfies all the requirements of the **III. Pricing section of the RFP**. Proposals are evaluated based on the criteria stated in the RFP.

Question 10:

Are proposers expected to provide both U.S. and Canadian pricing for all offerings, or only where services/products are available in Canada?

Answer 10:

Refer to RFP Section III. A. 4., “All proposed pricing must be: Stated in U.S. and Canadian dollars (as applicable).” If a proposer intends to offer its solutions to Sourcewell’s Canadian participating entities it must identify its Canadian pricing.

Question 11:

Should pricing include all implementation, onboarding, training, and support costs, or may those be itemized separately?

Answer 11:
Refer to Answer 8 above.

Question 12:

Does Sourcewell expect “not-to-exceed” pricing to remain fixed for the entire 10-year contract term, subject to approved adjustments, or may pricing be periodically refreshed?

Answer 12:
Refer to the Sourcewell Master Agreement, Article II: Sourcewell and Supplier Obligations, B. Product and Price Changes.

Question 13:

Are annual inflationary increases permitted for subscription, managed services, or labor-based pricing? If yes, is there a maximum escalation percentage or required index?

Answer 13:
Refer to Answer 12 above.

Question 14:

For percentage discount pricing models, what constitutes an acceptable “published rate card” or “catalog” for enterprise AI services and software?

Answer 14:
Refer to Answer 1 above.

Question 15:

Are privately shared enterprise price books acceptable, or must rate cards be publicly accessible?

Answer 15:
Refer to Answer 1 above.

Question 16:

Is Sourcewell expecting standardized pricing units across vendors (e.g., per seat, per API call, per token), or may vendors use their native commercial metrics?

Answer 16:
Refer to Answer 8 above.

Question 17:

Is Sourcewell expecting pricing for both production and non-production environments (e.g., development, testing, sandbox)?

Answer 17:
Refer to Answer 8 above.

Question 18:

Are proposers expected to provide separate labor categories for implementation, strategy, governance, engineering, support, and training services?

Answer 18:
Refer to Answer 1 above.

Question 19:

Is there a preferred structure for managed services pricing (e.g., per environment, per user, fixed monthly fee, service tiers)?

Answer 19:
Refer to Answer 9 above.

Question 20:

Can hybrid pricing structures combine fixed subscription fees with transaction-based components?

Answer 20:
Refer to Answer 9 above.

Question 21:

Is there a recommended format or page limit for the required Pricing Narrative?

Answer 21:
Refer to Answer 9 above.

Question 22:

Can Proposers bid for Lot 3 through a subcontractor/joint venture, where we provide AI professional services and our partner/teaming entity provides AI platform services

Answer 22:
Per RFP Section II. D. Single Primary Lot, "Sourcewell prefers suppliers that provide a sole source of responsibility for the equipment, products, and services provided under a resulting master agreement. If proposer includes the equipment, products, and services of its subsidiary entities, the proposer must also identify all subsidiaries included in its proposal. If proposer requires the use of distributors, dealers, resellers, or subcontractors to provide the equipment, products, or services, the proposal must address how the equipment, products or services will be provided to Participating Entities, and describe the network of distributors, dealers, resellers, and/or subcontractors that will be available to serve Participating Entities under a resulting master agreement." Primary Lot selection is the proposer's determination and reflects how they primarily create value for Participating Entities.

A proposer may submit only one proposal. If related, affiliated, or subsidiary entities elect to submit separate proposals, rather than a single parent-entity proposal, each such proposal must be prepared independently and without cooperation, collaboration, or collusion. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine the information or documentation necessary to best demonstrate their ability to serve Sourcewell Participating Entities and satisfy all the requirements of the RFP.

Question 23:

Is there a penalty for not using a MBE/WBE?

Answer 23:
Proposals are evaluated based on the criteria stated in the RFP.

Question 24:

Are there any additional points for listing MBE/WBE?

Answer 24:
Refer to Answer 23 above.

Question 25:

We are an AI professional services provider and want to bid on Lot 3. For this, can we team up with a partner who can provide AI products and platforms, and we provide their end-to-end integration and support? Please confirm if this is acceptable.

Answer 25:
Refer to Answer 22 above.

Question 26:

To ensure we are able to submit a thorough and comprehensive proposal that aligns with your requirements and expectations, would the client consider granting a two-week extension to the proposal submission deadline?

Answer 26:
No extension of the due date is being considered by Sourcewell at this time.

Question 27:

Can you please confirm whether video files or links may be submitted as part of the Step 2 Documents section of the RFP?

Answer 27:
It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine the information or documentation necessary to best demonstrate their ability to serve Sourcewell Participating Entities and satisfy all the requirements of the RFP and the questionnaire tables. Proposals are evaluated based on the criteria stated in the RFP.

Question 28:

If video submissions are not permitted, would it be acceptable to include links within the submitted documents directing evaluators to video content for review?

Answer 28:
Refer to Answer 27 above.

Question 29:

Does Sourcewell confirm that its master agreement framework satisfies the procurement authorization requirements for Participating Entities located in US Territories, including Puerto Rico, Guam, the US Virgin Islands, American Samoa,

and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands? If not, what obligations does the awarded supplier have in that regard?

Answer 29:
Refer to Master Agreement Article I., Section C. Participating Entity Access.

Question 30:

Can you provide a detailed, prioritized list of functional and non-functional requirements that the Ventrika engineering team will be responsible for building, integrating, and deploying?

Answer 30:
Refer to Answer 2 above.

Question 31:

What are the exact success criteria / acceptance criteria for each major deliverable? Are there any third-party systems, APIs, data sources, or legacy platforms that must be integrated? If so, please share current documentation, authentication methods, rate limits, and any known constraints.

Answer 31:
Refer to Answer 1 above.

Question 32:

What is the expected data volume, user concurrency, and performance SLAs that the solution must meet post-deployment?

Answer 32:
Refer to Answer 2 above.

Question 33:

Are there any compliance, security, or regulatory requirements (e.g., SOC 2, GDPR, HIPAA, PCI-DSS, ISO 27001) that Ventrika's engineers must design into the solution from day [sic]

Answer 33:
Refer to the Master Agreement available on the Sourcewell Procurement Portal.

Refer to RFP Section I. B. – Use of Resulting Contracts, "Participating Entities typically access master agreements for equipment, products, or services through a purchase order issued directly to the awarded supplier. A Participating Entity may request additional terms or conditions related to a purchase."

Question 34:

What is the ideal team size, role breakdown (e.g., Lead Engineer, Backend, Frontend, DevOps, QA, Data Engineer, AI/ML Engineer, etc.), and seniority mix you expect from Ventrika? Should the engineers be 100% dedicated to this project, or is some level of shared allocation acceptable?

Answer 34:
Refer to Answer 1 above.

Question 35:

What is the anticipated duration of the initial implementation phase and any follow-on phases (e.g., 6 months, 12 months, ongoing)?

Answer 35:
Refer to Answer 4 above.

Question 36:

Do you have any preferences or must-have technical skills, certifications, or domain experience for the engineers (e.g., specific cloud platforms, frameworks, or industry knowledge)?

Answer 36:
Refer to Answer 1 above.

Question 37:

How will knowledge transfer and handover to your internal team (if any) be structured at the end of each phase or at project completion?

Answer 37:
Refer to Answer 4 above.

Question 38:

What is your expectation around engineer onboarding, security training, and access provisioning from your side?

Answer 38:
Refer to Answer 2 above.

Question 39:

What is the preferred development methodology (Agile/Scrum, Kanban, etc.) and cadence (sprint length, ceremonies) you expect Ventrika to follow?

Answer 39:
Refer to Answer 1 above.

Question 40:

Who will provide the product backlog / user stories, and how frequently will requirements be refined?

Answer 40:
Refer to Answer 4 above.

Question 41:

What are the target environments (dev, staging, production) and who owns provisioning and access to them?

Answer 41:
Refer to Answer 4 above.

Question 42:

What CI/CD, IaC, monitoring, and logging tools or standards must Ventrika adhere to?

Answer 42:
Sourcewell will not pre-qualify any products or services. It is left to the discretion of each Proposer to determine if its products or services meet the scope of RFP II. B. Requested Equipment, Products, or Services. Only those products within the scope of the RFP will be included in any contract awarded by Sourcewell as a result of the solicitation.

Question 43:

Are there any specific deployment windows, blackout periods, or change-management processes we must follow?

Answer 43:
Refer to Answer 4 above.

Question 44:

Who will perform User Acceptance Testing (UAT) and what is the expected turnaround time for feedback and sign-off?

Answer 44:
Refer to Answer 4 above.

Question 45:

What is the expected scope of post-implementation support (e.g., bug fixes, minor enhancements, major upgrades, 24/7 coverage)?

Answer 45:
Refer to Answer 4 above.

Question 46:

What SLAs do you require for response and resolution times (by severity level)?

Answer 46:
Refer to Answer 4 above.

Question 47:

How should the support model be structured (dedicated support engineers, shared rota, on-call, etc.)?

Answer 47:
Refer to Answer 1 above.

Question 48:

What are the anticipated monthly hours or effort for maintenance and ongoing optimization after go-live?

Answer 48:
Refer to Answer 4 above.

Question 49:

Who will own infrastructure costs, licensing, and third-party tool subscriptions after deployment?

Answer 49:
Refer to Answer 4 above.

Question 50:

How will change requests and new feature requests be prioritized and funded during the maintenance phase?

Answer 50:
Refer to Answer 1 above.

Question 51:

What reporting cadence, format, and KPIs would you like from the Ventrika engineering and delivery team (e.g., weekly velocity, burndown, quality metrics, deployment frequency)?

Answer 51:
Refer to Answer 4 above.

Question 52:

Who will be the primary point of contact on your side for day-to-day engineering decisions and escalations?

Answer 52:
Refer to Answer 4 above.

Question 53:

Are there any required tools for project management, time tracking, or collaboration that Ventrika must use?

Answer 53:
Refer to Answer 42 above.

Question 54:

What is the expected budget range or pricing model preference (fixed-price, time & materials, dedicated team, outcome-based, etc.) for the implementation phase and for ongoing maintenance?

Answer 54:
Refer to Answer 4 above.

Question 55:

Are there any payment milestones or invoicing preferences tied to deliverables or sprints?

Answer 55:
Refer to Answer 4 above.

Question 56:

What are your standard contract terms regarding IP ownership, data ownership, confidentiality, termination, and liability?

Answer 56:
Refer to Answer 4 above.

Question 57:

How do you handle scope changes and change-order process?

Answer 57:
Refer to Answer 4 above.

Question 58:

What risks or dependencies on your side could impact our ability to deliver on time (e.g., delayed requirements, access issues, stakeholder availability)?

Answer 58:
Refer to Answer 4 above.

Question 59:

Do you have any assumptions we should explicitly validate or document in the proposal?

Answer 59:
Refer to Answer 1 above.

Question 60:

What is your contingency plan if key stakeholders or decision-makers are unavailable during critical phases?

Answer 60:
Refer to Answer 4 above.

Question 61:

Are there any references or case studies from similar engagements you would like vendor to review to better understand your working style and expectations?

Answer 61:
Refer to Answer 1 above.

Question 62:

In section B. Contents of Proposal, the RFP indicates there are four separate exhibits: Scope of Services Proposal Exhibit A; Pricing Proposal Exhibit B; Statement of Qualifications Proposal Exhibit C; and Terms of Design Professional Services Agreement Proposal Exhibit D. In Section B.1. Cover Letter, the RFP instructs proposers to include 'incorporation by reference of the five exhibits identified in this Section B.' Please clarify the number of exhibits and name/title of each.

Answer 62:
We find no reference for this citation in our RFP.

Question 63:

In Table 4, question 47, we are asked to explain whether our solutions are available through an e-Procurement or e-Commerce ordering process and to provide one example of how governmental and educational customers have successfully utilized them. Could you please explain whether the example case should be from successful utilization by government and educational customers in United States and/or Canada or can we demonstrate this success through government and educational customers worldwide?

Answer 63:
Refer to Answer 1 above.

Question 64:

Will states encourage M/WBE certified from other states as well or should they be based out of Minnesota? If so, what is the percentage?

Answer 64:
Proposers may describe any socioeconomic certifications their company or hub partners have attained in Table 5B, "Value-Added Attributes." Proposals are evaluated based on the criteria stated in the RFP.

Question 65:

Please clarify the data migration requirements for Lot 1. Specifically, is data migration included, and if so, what is the expected volume and what types and formats of data (e.g., Excel, PDFs, etc.) will need to be migrated?

Answer 65:

Refer to Answer 4 above.

Question 66:

What are the mandatory and required compliance the state is looking for, as those are not specified in the RFP?

Answer 66:
Refer to Answer 4 above.

Question 67:

The RFP does not specify a fixed number of workflows or users; instead, it seeks enterprise-scale solutions and requires pricing narratives to explain how costs scale as usage, users, or data volumes grow?

Answer 67:
Refer to Answer 4 above.

Question 68:

What is the estimated number of users, workflows, permissions based RBAC are needed for Lot 1?

Answer 68:
Refer to Answer 4 above.

Question 69:

Can Sourcewell clarify the specific data localization and sovereign cloud infrastructure standards required for solutions targeting restricted government deployments?

Answer 69:
Refer to Answer 4 above.

Question 70:

What specific baseline cybersecurity certifications (such as FedRAMP, SOC 2 Type II, or CJIS) are considered mandatory pass/fail criteria during the Step 1 responsiveness evaluation?

Answer 70:
Responsiveness Criteria thresholds and requirements are listed in the RFP Specifications Questionnaire under the section titled Responsiveness Criteria. The Questionnaire can be found in the Sourcewell Procurement Portal.

Question 71:

Is the State interested in proposals that include advanced capabilities, such as Artificial Intelligence (AI), to further streamline processes like metadata extraction or permit review automation?

Answer 71:
Refer to Answer 1 above.

Question 72:

Is the State interested in the AI Integrated system for automation tasks, chatbot integration, automation workflow?

Answer 72:
Refer to Answer 1 above.

Question 73:

What is the estimated budget allocated to Lot 1?

Answer 73:
Refer to Answer 4 above. Sourcewell does not have information regarding participating entities' budgets.

Question 74:

Our company is interested in proposing Case management , application management and business processing, workflow automation along with intelligent document processing for Lot 1 that are automated through our AI models. If you are interested in this please specify the workflow and business processes what state is expecting?

Answer 74:
Refer to Answer 1 above.

Question 75:

And for the Cost proposal, can vendors come up with their own pricing structure with a fixed pricing?

Answer 75:
Refer to Answer 9 above.

Question 76:

For Lot 2, is there a minimum project size or contract value that qualifies as scale appropriate under the responsiveness criteria?

Answer 76:
Refer to Answer 70 above.

Question 77:

If we delivered a custom application that uses AI or ML for decision support, but the project wasn't sold or branded as an AI project, does it count toward the responsiveness criteria?

Answer 77:
Refer to Answer 70 above.

Question 78:

Does AI work delivered as a subcontractor count toward the responsiveness criteria? If yes, what documentation is needed to show scope of work?

Answer 78:
Refer to Answer 70 above.

Question 79:

Does certified minority-owned business status earn scoring points anywhere in the rubric, or is it only a general encouragement?

Answer 79:
Refer to Answer 42 above.

Question 80:

Can a single Lot 2 proposal include more than one pricing model for example, T&M rates for advisory work, fixed-fee SOWs for defined projects, and recurring monthly fees for managed services?

Answer 80:
All proposed pricing must be submitted using one or more of the pricing structures, as appropriate to the proposer's Primary Lot and commercial model, listed in RFP Section III. A. 1.

Question 81:

Roughly how many redline exceptions to the Master Agreement template would be considered too many? Are common professional-services terms like limitation of liability, IP ownership, and indemnification more flexible than others?

Answer 81:
Proposed exception requests or modifications are to be redlined in the Word version of the Master Agreement.

Question 82:

If a proposer is awarded in a future rolling onboarding window, does the master agreement run only for the remainder of the original 10-year term, or does a new 10-year term begin from the award date?

Answer 82:
Refer to RFP Section II "Notwithstanding the timing of any individual contract award, all master agreements awarded under this Solicitation shall share a common expiration date and shall be coterminous."

Question 83:

The responsiveness criteria for lot 2 lists a requirement for an engagement of $200,000 or more for a single client. When partnering with small and medium sized local governments, the engagements are rarely that large. Can multiple successful engagements with customers in a highly regulated industry that add up to $200,000 substitute for the single engagement?

Answer 83:
Refer to Answer 70 above.

End of Addendum

Acknowledgement of this Addendum to RFP 061726, posted to the Sourcewell Procurement Portal on 06/4/2026, is required at the time of proposal submittal.

06/5/2026
Addendum No.12
Solicitation Number: RFP 061726
Solicitation Name: Enterprise Artificial Intelligence: Platforms, Services, and Integrated Delivery

Consider the following Question(s) and Answer(s) to be part of the above-titled solicitation documents. The remainder of the documents remain unchanged.

Question 1:

What minimum contract or engagement value is considered qualifying for Lot 3 experience, and how is value measured for multi-year managed services contracts — total contract value (TCV) or annual contract value (ACV)?

Answer 1:

Refer to Section II. B. Requested Equipment, Products, or Services for examples within each Lot, and Section VI. A. Responsiveness Criteria for a definition and examples of qualifying highly regulated industries.

Question 2:

Is there an expected minimum scope of AI components for Lot 3 experience (e.g., must the reference include model training, or is inference/deployment with workflow integration sufficient)?

Answer 2:
Refer to Answer 1 above.

Question 3:

Table 3, Q13 asks about implementation timelines and phases — is there a benchmark timeline range Sourcewell uses (e.g., under 6 months for initial go-live) against which responses are evaluated?

Answer 3:
Sourcewell is requesting proposals to meet the various needs of its 50,000+ Participating Entities as a whole, across the United States and Canada. In this competitive solicitation process, Sourcewell will not advise a proposer on the contents of its proposal. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to articulate and propose the solutions that aligns with its business methods and satisfies the requirements of the RFP. A Participating Entities' unique needs will be determined if and when the Participating Entities choose to utilize a contract resulting from this solicitation.

Question 4:

For Table 3, Q14 (integration with existing systems), do most Participating Entities operate in Microsoft-centric environments (M365, Azure AD, SharePoint), or is the landscape heterogeneous enough that we should address multiple ERP and ITSM ecosystems explicitly?

Answer 4:
Refer to Answer 3 above.

Question 5:

Table 3, Q15 asks about highly regulated industry environments — are GOV/EDU entities considered 'highly regulated' in this context, or does Sourcewell expect examples from sectors such as healthcare, defence[sic], or financial services specifically?

Answer 5:
Refer to Section II. B. Requested Equipment, Products, or Services for examples within each Lot, and Section VI. A. Responsiveness Criteria for a definition and examples of qualifying highly regulated industries.

Question 6:

For Participating Entities with low AI maturity, does Sourcewell expect proposers to describe an AI readiness assessment service as part of the implementation approach, or is this considered out of scope for the integrated delivery model?

Answer 6:
Refer to Answer 3 above.

Question 7:

Considering we do not have input on anything like the end customer Sourcewell is going to work with, or the existing technology platforms of the end client or any details on whether it's a fresh development project or a migration project, what is the approach in pricing that Sourcewell suggests to adopt. Do we give an approach like – We divide the end customers into 3 buckets based on deal size and then in that with the help of assumptions, spilt the pricing. Is there any approach Sourcewell can suggest?

Answer 7:
It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine and propose the pricing approach that aligns with their business methods and satisfies all the requirements of RFP Section III – Pricing and Delivery Schedules. Proposals are evaluated based on the criteria stated in the RFP.

Question 8

For Options 3 (Subscription/Consumption) and 4 (Managed Services), must not-to-exceed rates be set as a single ceiling across all Participating Entities, or can rates vary by entity size, sector (GOV vs. EDU), or geography (US vs. Canada)?

Answer 8:
Refer to Answer 7 above.

Question 9:

Where a Participating Entity's AI solution involves third-party foundation model costs (e.g., per-token charges from model providers), are these required to be included in the Sourcewell Agreement pricing and subject to the Administrative Fee, or can they be billed as pass-through costs separately?

Answer 9:
Refer to RFP III. B. and Master Agreement Article II. G. Administrative Fees. The administrative fee is paid by the awarded supplier to Sourcewell and is not to be separately assessed to a participating entity.

Question 10:

Is there a minimum transaction value below which the Administrative Fee does not apply, or does it apply to all transactions without a floor?

Answer 10:
Refer to RFP III. B. and Master Agreement Article II. G. Administrative Fees.

Question 11:

For T&M pricing (Option 5), must labor roles follow a fixed taxonomy (e.g., specific NAICS or government labor categories), or may proposers define their own role and grade structure?

Answer 11:
It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine the information or documentation necessary to best demonstrate their ability to serve Sourcewell Participating Entities and satisfy all the requirements included in the questionnaire tables. Sourcewell will not advise a proposer on the contents of its proposal.

Question 12:

Table 7B, Q3 asks for a Responsible AI governance framework — is there a minimum expected maturity level (e.g., a formally documented policy, a dedicated AI ethics role, a review board), or will a described process without a formal board structure be scored equivalently?

Answer 12:
Refer to Answer 11 above.

Question 13:

For Table 7B, Q5 (transparency and explainability), does Sourcewell expect audit logs and explainability for all AI outputs, or is this required only for high-stakes decision-making use cases (e.g., benefits eligibility, hiring, predictive enforcement)?

Answer 13:
Refer to Answer 11 above.

Question 14:

Table 7B, Q9 asks about data portability and exit rights — is there a required export format (e.g., JSON, CSV, ONNX for model artifacts), and must export capability be guaranteed within a defined timeframe post-contract termination?

Answer 14:
Refer to Answer 11 above.

Question 15:

Based on the insurance requirements set forth in the Master Agreement, can you please confirm whether the following coverage limits would be considered sufficient and compliant?

- Professional Liability (Technology Errors & Omissions): USD 5,000,000 per claim and in the aggregate.
- Cyber / Network Security & Privacy Liability: USD 5,000,000 per claim and in the aggregate.
- Cyber Incident Response: USD 5,000,000 in the aggregate.
- Cyber Crime / Fraud: USD 250,000 per claim.
- Cyber Extortion: USD 5,000,000 in the aggregate.
- System Damage & Business Interruption: USD 5,000,000 in the aggregate.
- Commercial General Liability: USD 5,000,000 per claim and in the aggregate.
- Loss Mitigation: USD 5,000,000 per claim.
- Reputation & Brand Protection: USD 100,000 in the aggregate.
- Court Attendance Costs: USD 100,000 in the aggregate.

We note that our Commercial General Liability coverage provides limits that exceed those required under the Master Agreement. In these circumstances, would the procurement of a separate Umbrella/Excess Liability policy still be mandatory, or would the existing primary coverage be considered sufficient to satisfy the applicable insurance requirements?

Our current Cyber Crime / Fraud coverage provides a limit of USD 250,000 per claim.

Can you please confirm whether this level of coverage would be considered sufficient for purposes of the Master Agreement and participation in the Sourcewell program, or whether a higher limit is expected or required?

Based on the coverage limits outlined above, are there any additional insurance coverages, endorsements, or minimum limits that Sourcewell would expect a supplier responding to RFP #061726 to maintain beyond those expressly stated in the Master Agreement?

Answer 15:
An awarded supplier will be expected to carry the insurance coverage as stated in the Master Agreement, Article 2, 22. upon execution. To identify any exception, or to request any modification, to Sourcewell's standard terms, conditions, or specifications, a proposer must submit the proposed exception(s) or requested modification(s) via redline in the Master Agreement provided in the "Documents" section of the "Bid Details" page on the Sourcewell Procurement Portal and uploaded as part of its response. Only those exceptions noted at the time of the proposal submission will be considered.

Question 16:

We are interested in bidding for Lot 3. Do we have to respond to the Lot 1 and Lot 2 dedicated Demonstrated Experience questions or mention N/A?

Answer 16:
For the Responsiveness Criteria Demonstrated Experience tables (pages 2–5 of the RFP Questionnaire), proposers must identify the single, Primary Lot for which they are submitting a response and complete only the corresponding Demonstrated Experience table.

Question 17:

Can Sourcewell confirm whether proposers have the option to limit the scope of their offering under the resulting Master Agreement to Canadian Participating Entities only (including Canoe Procurement Group members), and exclude U.S. Participating Entities? If permitted, are there any specific requirements or implications associated with such a limitation in geographic scope?

Answer 17:
Refer to Answer 11 above.

Question 18:

We are working on proposing both products & professional services. For the products the discount off MSRP could be proposed, but for professional services the hours rate differ for each brand & product being implemented. Can the hourly rates be provided after the contract award or should the hourly rate NTE have to be part of the award for us to be able to provide professional services? Is there an option to negotiate the hourly rate after award? How the hourly rate can be update based on CPI. If so, how frequent is it allowed to update our hourly rate NTE (quarterly or yearly)?

Answer 18:
Refer to Answer 7 and Answer 11 above.

Refer to the Sourcewell Master Agreement, Article II: Sourcewell and Supplier Obligations, B. Product and Price Changes.

Question 19:

Is there a mandated annual escalation cap or index (e.g., CPI) when it comes to pricing? Are rates firm for the full 10 years or re-openable by period?

Answer 19:

Refer to the Sourcewell Master Agreement, Article II: Sourcewell and Supplier Obligations, B. Product and Price Changes.

Question 20:

Is alignment to a specific framework (NIST AI RMF, ISO/IEC 42001) required, or is supplier choice acceptable?

Answer 20:
Refer to Answer 3 above.

Question 21:

Travel/expense: reimbursed per a Sourcewell policy, a federal/GSA rate, or entity-specific terms?

Answer 21:
Refer to Answer 3 above.

Question 22:

Please confirm a Lot 2 services supplier may implement/operate platforms the entity licenses but not resell licenses.

Answer 22:
Refer to Answer 3 above.

Question 23:

Does the named subcontractor require specific disclosure/approval documentation at proposal stage? Any cap on subcontracted percentage?

Answer 23:
Refer to RFP Section II. D. Single Primary Lot, "… If proposer includes the equipment, products, and services of its subsidiary entities, the proposer must also identify all subsidiaries included in its proposal. If proposer requires the use of distributors, dealers, resellers, or subcontractors to provide the equipment, products, or services, the proposal must address how the equipment, products or services will be provided to Participating Entities, and describe the network of distributors, dealers, resellers, and/or subcontractors that will be available to serve Participating Entities under a resulting master agreement."

It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine the information or documentation necessary to best demonstrate their ability to serve Sourcewell Participating Entities and satisfy all the requirements of the RFP and the questionnaire tables. Proposals are evaluated based on the criteria stated in the RFP.

End of Addendum

Acknowledgement of this Addendum to RFP 061726, posted to the Sourcewell Procurement Portal on 06/5/2026, is required at the time of proposal submittal.

06/08/2026
Addendum No. 13
Solicitation Number: RFP 061726
Solicitation Name: Enterprise Artificial Intelligence: Platforms, Services, and Integrated Delivery

Consider the following Question(s) and Answer(s) to be part of the above-titled solicitation documents. The remainder of the documents remain unchanged.

Question 1:

If we compete in Lot 3 and since Lot 3 requirements are a super set of Lot 1 and Lot 2 at a high level, and if we don't make it in Lot 3 will we be automatically be considered for Lot 1 if we qualify for Lot 1 also?

Answer 1:

Per RFP Section II.B, “The Proposer’s Lot selection will determine the response pool in which the proposal is evaluated.” Therefore, proposals will be evaluated only within the Lot selected by the proposer. Sourcewell does not intend to automatically move or re-evaluate proposals in another Lot if they are not awarded in their selected Lot.

Question 2:

Based on Sourcewell’s interactions with Participating Entities, are most organizations currently in the exploratory, pilot, scaling, or enterprise-wide adoption phase of their AI journey?

Answer 2:

Sourcewell is requesting proposals to meet the various needs of its 50,000+ Participating Entities as a whole, across the United States and Canada. In this competitive solicitation process, Sourcewell will not advise a proposer on the contents

of its proposal. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to articulate and propose the solutions that aligns with its business methods and satisfies the requirements of the RFP. A Participating Entities' unique needs will be determined if and when the Participating Entities choose to utilize a contract resulting from this solicitation.

Question 3:

For organizations beginning their AI journey, what are the most common barriers to adoption that suppliers should be prepared to address (e.g., governance, workforce readiness, data quality, funding, security, compliance, or change management)?

Answer 3:

Refer to Answer 2 above.

Question 4:

As Participating Entities evaluate AI initiatives, are they more commonly seeking short-term operational improvements and quick wins, or longer-term enterprise transformation and modernization outcomes?

Answer 4:

Refer to Answer 2 above.

Question 5:

Is it correct that we have to upload all our responses to the portal in the boxes right next to the questions? Is there a place where we can upload a document illustrating our AI capabilities with graphics and images?

Answer 5:

All proposals must be submitted through the Sourcewell Procurement Portal. The Specification Tables within the portal afford each proposer the opportunity to provide narrative content that it determines, in its discretion, will best reflect the solutions it provides. Uploaded documents should support and supplement the narrative as described in the Specification Tables.

Question 6:

Is there any word limit to the responses we can add in the boxes?

Answer 6:
The Sourcewell Procurement Portal allows for 30,000+ character answers in each text box.

Question 7:

Per Addendum 4, Answer 32, Sourcewell confirmed that proposers must identify the single, Primary Lot for which they are submitting a response and complete only the corresponding Demonstrated Experience table. Additionally, per RFP Section II.B, Proposers will not be penalized for complementary offerings or capabilities that may also align with other Lots.

Can Sourcewell please confirm: (a) Proposers should mark the Demonstrated Experience tables for non-selected Lots as N/A; and (b) Proposers may still describe capabilities that align with non-selected Lots as complementary offerings within other sections of the proposal (e.g., Depth and Breadth of Offered Solutions, Marketing Plan, or Pricing) without adverse impact to responsiveness or scoring?

Answer 7:

Refer to RFP Section II. B. Requested Equipment, Products, or Services and the Responsiveness Criteria section of the Questionnaire in the Sourcewell Procurement Portal for further clarification.

Question 8:

Are vendors expected to provide product-specific Terms and Conditions as part of this submission package? Or would those be provided on a contract-by-contract basis?

Answer 8:

Refer to Article III.F. – "Additional Terms and Conditions Permitted" of the Sourcewell contract template. "Additional terms and conditions to a purchase order, or other required transaction documentation, may be negotiated between a Participating Entity and Supplier, such as job or industry-specific requirements, legal requirements (e.g., affirmative action or immigration status requirements), or specific local policy requirements."

End of Addendum

Acknowledgement of this Addendum to RFP 061726, posted to the Sourcewell Procurement Portal on 06/08/2026, is required at the time of proposal submittal.

06/11/2026
Addendum No. 14
Solicitation Number: RFP 061726
Solicitation Name: Enterprise Artificial Intelligence: Platforms, Services, and Integrated Delivery

Consider the following Question(s) and Answer(s) to be part of the above-titled solicitation documents. The remainder of the documents remain unchanged.

Question 1:

What was the annual spend for the previous year on this Project?

Answer 1:

This is a new category with no existing incumbent or project information available.

Question 2:

If this is a new Contract, What is the annual Budget for this?

Answer 2:

Per RFP Section II. G. “Based on past volume of similar contracts, the estimated annual value of all transactions from master agreements resulting from this RFP is anticipated to be USD $150 Million for Lot 1, $150 Million for Lot 2, and $300 Million for Lot 3. Therefore, proposers are expected to propose volume pricing. Sourcewell anticipates considerable activity under the master agreement(s) awarded from this RFP; however, sales and sales volume from any resulting master agreement are not guaranteed.”

Question 3:

Are you open to a hybrid delivery model with a mix of offshore and onshore resources?

Answer 3:

Sourcewell can contract with a foreign supplier. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to demonstrate how they will effectively deliver the requested goods and services offered in their proposal to participating entities. Each proposal will be evaluated based on the criteria stated in the RFP.

Question 4:

Work will be onsite or remote?

Answer 4:

Sourcewell is requesting proposals to meet the various needs of its 50,000+ Participating Entities as a whole, across the United States and Canada. In this competitive solicitation process, Sourcewell will not advise a proposer on the contents of its proposal. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to articulate and propose the solutions that align with its business methods and satisfies the requirements of the RFP. A Participating Entities' unique needs will be determined if and when the Participating Entities choose to utilize a contract resulting from this solicitation.

Question 5:

Can you please give us an extension of 1-2 weeks to submit our proposal?

Answer 5:

No extension of the due date is being considered by Sourcewell at this time.

Question 6:

Is this contract intended to be awarded to a single vendor or to multiple vendors?

Answer 6:

Refer to RFP Section VI.A. Evaluation "It is the intent of Sourcewell to award one or more master agreements to responsive and responsible proposers offering the best overall quality, selection of equipment, products, and services, and price that meet the commonly requested specifications of Sourcewell and its Participating Entities. The award(s) will be limited to the number of proposers that Sourcewell determines is necessary to meet the needs of its Participating Entities."

Question 7:

Who are previous incumbents on this project?

Answer 7:

Refer to Answer 1 above.

Question 8:

What are the challenges or pain points you are facing with the current contractor?

Answer 8:

Refer to Answer 1 above.

Question 9:

Is there a preference for local vendors?

Answer 9:

It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine the information and documentation necessary to best demonstrate their ability to serve Sourcewell participating entities and satisfy all the requirements included in the questionnaire tables. Proposals are evaluated based on the criteria stated in the RFP.

Question 10:

Can vendor provide entire services from offshore location (outside US geography)

Answer 10:

Refer to Answer 3 above.

Question 11:

Are there any mandatory subcontracting goals (e.g., small business, disadvantaged business, or similar requirements) associated with this contract?

Answer 11:

Sourcewell is requesting proposals to meet the various needs of its 50,000+ Participating Entities as a whole, across the United States and Canada. Though it is possible those specific entities have specific goals, it is left to the discretion of each proposer to articulate and propose the solutions that align with its business methods and satisfies the requirements of the RFP. A Participating Entities' unique needs will be determined if and when the Participating Entities choose to utilize a contract resulting from this solicitation.

Question 12:

permits proposers to include complementary products and services that are not exclusively AI-specific. Can Sourcewell clarify how evaluators will determine whether a complementary offering remains sufficiently aligned with the selected Primary Lot and within the intended scope of the solicitation?

Answer 12:

Sourcewell will not pre-qualify any products or services. It is left to the discretion of each Proposer to determine if its products or services meet the scope of RFP II. B. Requested Equipment, Products, or Services. Only those products within the scope of the RFP will be included in any contract awarded by Sourcewell as a result of the solicitation.

Question 13:

For solutions that contain significant capabilities spanning multiple Lots, what criteria should proposers use to determine the most appropriate Primary Lot when the proposed solution could reasonably align with more than one Lot?

Answer 13:

Refer to Answer 12 above.

Question 14:

Can Sourcewell provide additional clarification regarding the distinction between AI Professional Services (Lot 2) and Integrated AI Delivery (Lot 3) for solutions that include implementation, integration, engineering, operational support, and managed service components?

Answer 14:

Refer to Answer 9 above.

Question 15:

For reference projects involving subcontractors or teaming partners, is there a minimum level of direct responsibility that the proposer must have held for the project to qualify toward the demonstrated experience requirements?

Answer 15:

Refer to Answer 12 above.

Question 16:

Given that suppliers may propose different pricing methodologies based on their business models, how will Sourcewell ensure equitable evaluation across subscription-based, consumption-based, transaction-based, project-based, and professional services pricing structures?

Answer 16:

Each proposer's response is independently evaluated against the scoring criteria stated in the RFP and not against any other proposers' response.

Question 17:

Can a single proposer submit three separate proposals – one for Lot 1, one for Lot 2, and one for Lot 3 – in order to be considered for all three Lots?
Or must the proposer submit only one proposal under the single Lot that best fits its business (the Primary Lot)?

Answer 17:

Refer to RFP Section II. D. Single Primary Lot "Proposers must select ONE Primary Lot (1, 2, or 3) in which to submit their proposal. For purposes of this RFP, "Primary" means the single Lot that best represents the proposer's principal line of business…"

Question 18:

Table 7A Depth and Breadth of Offered Solutions

Lot Item #89 Lot 3 does not have any associated Lot Subcategories for bidders to select as offerings. For bidders who are bidding Lot 3, is it acceptable for Lot 3 bidders to select applicable Lot Subcategory offerings listed in Lots 1 and 2 for those offerings included in the Lot 3 bidders' proposal submission. If not, should Table 7A be revised to include Lot Subcategory offerings or is the assumption that, by virtue of bidding Lot 3, those Lot Subcategories are included in Lot 3 bidders' proposal submissions?

Answer 18:

Refer to Answer 12 above.

Question 19:

If a proposer has not yet made sales in Canada, and does not have prior sales to U.S. or Canadian government or education sector entities, will this result in a lower evaluation score?

Answer 19:

It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine the information necessary to best demonstrate their financial viability and marketplace success and that they are willing to include. The solicitation is a competitive process, and proposals are evaluated on the content submitted and the criteria stated in the RFP.

Question 20:

Are any security or compliance certifications – such as FedRAMP, StateRAMP, SOC 2, or ISO 27001 – mandatory in order to submit a responsive proposal? Or is documented alignment to these frameworks sufficient?

Answer 20:

Refer to the Master Agreement available on the Sourcewell Procurement Portal. Refer to RFP Section I. B. – Use of Resulting Contracts, "Participating Entities typically access master agreements for equipment, products, or services through a purchase order issued directly to the awarded supplier. A Participating Entity may request additional terms or conditions related to a purchase."

Question 21:

If a proposer selects Lot 2 as its Primary Lot, should it complete all of the other questionnaire tables (Table 1 through Table 9), or only certain tables?

Answer 21:

In the competitive process, Sourcewell will not advise a proposer on the content of the proposal. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine how to best satisfy all requirements of the questionnaire tables.

Question 22:

The financial-strength question lists several acceptable examples (annual revenue range, years in business, SEC filings, third-party credit scores/ratings such as D&B, and letters of credit/financial backing).

For a privately held company that does not have a third-party credit rating (e.g., D&B) or SEC filings, will providing only the annual revenue range and years in business be sufficient to fully respond to this question?

Answer 22:

The Sourcewell RFP is an open and competitive solicitation process. Each proposer, in its discretion, will determine the information necessary to best demonstrate its financial viability/success to Sourcewell. Examples of potential supporting material are identified in the text of the question on financial strength and stability in Table 2, "Company Information and Financial Strength," in Step 1 of the proposal preparation process. Proposals are evaluated based on the criteria stated in the RFP.

Question 23:

Does the RFP's definition of qualifying industries—including utilities and energy that are either government-operated or regulated—apply to a privately owned, investor-operated U.S. energy company that is subject to state energy and environmental regulatory oversight?
We interpret the requirement as "government-operated or regulated," meaning that satisfying either condition independently is sufficient. Please confirm if this understanding is correct.

Answer 23:

Refer to Answer 12 above.

Question 24:

For respondents pursuing Lot 3 Integrated AI Delivery, how will Sourcewell evaluate solutions where the AI platform, implementation services, governance design, managed operations, and continuous improvement are delivered under one accountable model versus responses that combine third-party AI tools with advisory or implementation services? Specifically, what evidence will Sourcewell consider most persuasive to demonstrate that the technology and services are commercially repeatable, operationally mature, and not merely assembled for this RFP?

Answer 24:

Refer to Answer 12 above.

Question 25:

For the Responsible AI and Governance evaluation area, will Sourcewell give greater weight to operational governance controls that are embedded directly into the platform, such as human approval gates, role-based permissions, source and assumption tracking, audit logs, run reports, red-team testing, and model or workflow change management, as opposed to governance that is primarily policy-based or advisory in nature?

Answer 25:

Refer to Answer 12 above.

Question 26:

Many participating entities will have fragmented, incomplete, or unstructured data across documents, emails, transcripts, case records, spreadsheets, and legacy systems. Should respondents include a formal data readiness and knowledge architecture approach as part of their proposed delivery model, including source ranking, data

quality scoring, remediation planning, provenance tracking, and controls to reduce hallucination or unsupported outputs

Answer 26:

Refer to Answer 12 above.

Question 27:

Because AI solutions can be priced through subscriptions, managed services, usage-based transactions, API calls, implementation fees, or hybrid models, how does Sourcewell intend to normalize pricing during evaluation so that participating entities can compare total cost of ownership across different vendors, usage volumes, data volumes, deployment models, and support obligations? Will Sourcewell value pricing structures that include transparent cost drivers, volume discounts, price protection, and cost-control mechanisms over the life of the contract?

Answer 27:

It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine and propose the pricing approach that aligns with their business methods and satisfies all the requirements of RFP Section III – Pricing and Delivery Schedules. Proposals are evaluated based on the criteria stated in the RFP.

Question 28:

For solutions intended to support public-sector and potentially sensitive government environments, what minimum evidence should respondents provide regarding deployment models, tenant isolation, encryption, retention and deletion controls, connector permissions, prompt-injection defenses, log redaction, incident response, and auditability? Should respondents clearly distinguish between capabilities that are production-ready today, available through professional services, or roadmap-only, particularly for hybrid, private cloud, on-premise, or air-gapped environments?

Answer 28:

Refer to Answer 12 above.

Question 29:

1. Can a proposer submit a response under both Lot 2 and Lot 3, or is a proposer limited to a single Lot submission?

Answer 29:

Refer to Answer 17 above.

Question 30:

2. For Lot 3, may a proposer utilize third-party AI platforms while serving as the prime contractor and maintaining end-to-end accountability for implementation, integration, operations, and outcomes?

Answer 30:

Per RFP Section II. D. Single Primary Lot, "Sourcewell prefers suppliers that provide a sole source of responsibility for the equipment, products, and services provided under a resulting master agreement. If proposer includes the equipment, products, and services of its subsidiary entities, the proposer must also identify all subsidiaries included in its proposal. If proposer requires the use of distributors, dealers, resellers, or subcontractors to provide the equipment, products, or services, the proposal must address how the equipment, products or services will be provided to Participating Entities, and describe the network of distributors, dealers, resellers, and/or subcontractors that will be available to serve Participating Entities under a resulting master agreement."

Primary Lot selection is the proposer's determination and reflects how they primarily create value for Participating Entities.

Question 31:

3. Would a systems integrator that combines commercial AI products with its own consulting, implementation, governance, and managed services qualify under Lot 3?

Answer 31:

Refer to Answer 12 above.

Question 32:

4. For Lot 3, does Sourcewell require ownership of the underlying AI platform, or is accountability for the integrated solution the primary consideration?

Answer 32:

Refer to Answer 12 above.

Question 33:

There are 12 amendments to the RFP can the agency extend the submission date to 2 weeks to properly go through each amendment

Answer 33:

Refer to Answer 5 above.

Question 34:

For Participating Entities that are early in their AI adoption journey, does Sourcewell view AI readiness assessments, governance framework development, data modernization, and workforce enablement as foundational activities that may precede enterprise AI implementation efforts?

Answer 34:

Refer to Answer 11 above.

Question 35:

When evaluating Lot 2 and Lot 3 responses, does Sourcewell place value on suppliers that provide a complete AI transformation lifecycle, including strategy, data engineering, implementation, governance, change management, training, and ongoing optimization, rather than focusing solely on technology deployment?

Answer 35:

Refer to Answer 12 above.

Question 36:

Many public sector organizations face challenges related to data quality, data silos, security, governance, and workforce readiness when adopting AI. Should proposers explicitly address these common adoption barriers within their implementation methodologies?

Answer 36:

Refer to Answer 12 above.

Question 37:

For AI implementation and managed services engagements, are Participating Entities generally receptive to hybrid delivery models that combine onshore leadership and governance with offshore or global technical delivery resources, provided accountability, security, and service levels remain under the awarded supplier's control?

Answer 37:

Refer to Answer 3 above.

Question 38:

As AI adoption continues to mature, does Sourcewell anticipate increasing demand for managed AI operations, model monitoring, prompt lifecycle management, governance oversight, and continuous improvement services after initial deployment?

Answer 38:

Refer to Answer 11 above.

Question 39:

Would Sourcewell consider enterprise data engineering, master data management, knowledge management, intelligent document processing, and workflow automation services to be valuable supporting capabilities when directly enabling AI outcomes for Participating Entities?

Answer 39:

Refer to Answer 12 above.

Question 40:

When evaluating experience examples, does Sourcewell place greater emphasis on measurable business outcomes achieved for clients than on the specific technology stack or AI platform utilized?

Answer 40:

Refer to Answer 12 above.

Question 41:

For organizations operating within highly regulated environments, does Sourcewell encourage suppliers to demonstrate experience delivering secure AI solutions involving governance, auditability, compliance controls, and responsible AI practices in addition to technical implementation capabilities?

Answer 41:

Refer to Answer 12 above.

Question 42:

As Participating Entities explore AI adoption, are suppliers encouraged to propose repeatable accelerators, frameworks, reference architectures, and implementation methodologies that help reduce deployment risk and accelerate time-to-value?

Answer 42:

Refer to Answer 12 above.

Question 43:

Does Sourcewell anticipate demand from Participating Entities for AI solutions that integrate with existing enterprise investments such as Microsoft 365, Azure, AWS, Google Cloud, ServiceNow, Salesforce, ERP platforms, and legacy business applications?

Answer 43:

Refer to Answer 11 above.

Question 44:

For Lot 2 and Lot 3 suppliers, would experience supporting multiple AI use cases across different functional areas such as citizen services, operations, customer support, workforce productivity, document intelligence, and knowledge management be viewed favorably during evaluation?

Answer 44:

Refer to Answer 12 above.

Question 45:

As AI technologies continue to evolve rapidly, does Sourcewell encourage suppliers to demonstrate innovation roadmaps and continuous improvement approaches that help Participating Entities adapt to emerging AI capabilities throughout the life of the resulting master agreement?

Answer 45:

Refer to Answer 12 above.

Question 46:

Many organizations are balancing both Generative AI initiatives and broader data modernization programs. Does Sourcewell see value in suppliers that can align AI adoption efforts with broader enterprise data and digital transformation strategies?

Answer 46:

Refer to Answer 12 above.

Question 47:

For suppliers proposing Responsible AI frameworks, are Participating Entities expected to place particular emphasis on governance, transparency, explainability, human oversight, security, privacy, and risk management capabilities when evaluating AI solutions?

Answer 47:

Refer to Answer 11 above.

Question 48:

Without disclosing specific Participating Entity information, can Sourcewell share whether the most common AI adoption challenges observed across its membership are related to governance, data readiness, workforce adoption, integration complexity, compliance requirements, funding constraints, or operational scalability?

Answer 48:

Refer to Answer 11 above.

Question 49:

We are firm specializing in offering services in Data Analytics domain from last 14 years to several US public sector agencies.
As of now we implemented some AI solutions, but they are not in production yet. Can you confirm if we can bid for Lot 2 – AI Professional Services.

Answer 49:

Refer to the Responsiveness Criteria in the Questionnaire located in the Sourcewell Procurement Portal for further information.

Question 50:

Can you confirm whether we can use subcontractor references

Answer 50:

Refer to the Responsiveness Criteria in the Questionnaire and the instructions for Table 2B: References/Testimonials located in the Sourcewell Procurement Portal for further information.

Question 51:

Can you specify the mandatory number of client references that have to be submitted in the proposal for Lot-2

Answer 51:

Refer to Answer 50 above.

Question 52:

Can you confirm if we can propose offshore resources (from India) for the bid.

Answer 52:

Refer to Answer 3 above.

Question 53:

Can you confirm whether we can include relevant subcontractor resources for the implementation of services for Lot -2

Answer 53:

Refer to Answer 30 above.

Question 54:

What is the average duration of assignments for allocated resources (weeks / months / multi-year)?

Answer 54:

Refer to Answer 11 above.

Question 55:

Can vendors propose solution accelerators or frameworks, or must work be limited to personnel supply only?

Answer 55:

Refer to Answer 12 above.

Question 56:

Since the contract duration is 10 years, should we propose separate rate cards for each year, or provide a single rate card applicable for the entire 10-year period?

Answer 56:

Refer to the Sourcewell Master Agreement, Article II: Sourcewell and Supplier Obligations, B. Product and Price Changes as well as RFP Section II, C. Rolling Supplier Onboarding.

Question 57:

Can you please share approximately how many vendors does the agency anticipate awarding?

Answer 57:

Refer to Answer 6 above.

Question 58:

Can you please confirm if it is mandatory to have WBME/SDVOB resources in the projects

Answer 58:

If applicable, a proposer should select any Women or Minority Business Entity (WMBE), Small Business Entity (SBE), or veteran owned business certifications that your company or hub partners have obtained. Proposers should upload documentation and a listing of dealerships, HUB partners or re-sellers, if available, to confirm certifications.

Question 59:

With respect to proposal submission, apart from the specifications mentioned in the portal, do we need to submit Cost and Technical proposal. If yes, Can you please share the proposal format and contents for Technical proposal and Cost proposal

Answer 59:

In the competitive process, Sourcewell will not advise a proposer on the content of the proposal. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine how to best satisfy all requirements of the questionnaire tables.

Question 60:

Addendum 5, Answer 21 states that the Lot 2 Responsiveness Criteria requires qualifying engagements within 12 months preceding June 17, 2026 and references a $200K / 12-month threshold — but states the full detail is in the portal Questionnaire. Can Sourcewell confirm:
a) Is $200K in total engagement value the SOLE financial threshold for Lot 2, or are there additional requirements such as a minimum number of qualifying engagements, a minimum number of distinct client organisations, or a minimum total portfolio value across all qualifying engagements?
b) Does the $200K threshold apply to: (i) a single qualifying engagement, (ii) the total value of all qualifying engagements combined, or (iii) each qualifying engagement individually?

c) For ongoing managed services engagements that span multiple years: is the qualifying value the total contract value, the annual recurring value, or the value of work actually delivered within the 12-month qualifying window?
d) For time-and-materials engagements, is the qualifying value based on invoiced/billed amounts or contracted not-to-exceed amounts?

Answer 60:

Responsiveness Criteria thresholds and requirements are listed in the RFP Specifications Questionnaire under the section titled Responsiveness Criteria. The Questionnaire can be found in the Sourcewell Procurement Portal.

Question 61:

The RFP states that custom development and software engineering are considered professional services (Lot 2) even when resulting in a deployed application. For Lot 2 qualifying engagements:
a) If a qualifying engagement includes both professional services delivery (e.g., AI implementation, model monitoring, governance design) AND resale or provision of third-party AI platform licenses as part of the engagement — does the total engagement value (services + technology) count toward the Lot 2 $200K threshold, or only the services component?
b) If a proposer's historical AI engagements have a technology component (platform licenses) representing more than 50% of total contract value, does this risk reclassifying the engagement as a Lot 1 or Lot 3 reference rather than a qualifying Lot 2 reference?
c) What minimum percentage of a qualifying engagement's value must come from professional services (vs. technology resale) for it to qualify as a Lot 2 reference?

Answer 61:

Refer to Answer 12 above.

Question 62:

RFP Section VI.A defines qualifying highly regulated industries. Please confirm whether the following client types qualify for the Responsiveness Criteria:
a) State university systems and public higher education institutions;
b) Large K-12 public school districts operating under state and federal oversight;
c) Nonprofit healthcare organisations that are HIPAA-covered entities (Medicaid/Medicare-certified);
d) Nonprofit social services organisations administering federally-funded programs;
e) Quasi-governmental authorities (e.g., transit authorities, port authorities, public utilities) that are government-regulated but not directly government-operated.

Answer 62:

Refer to Section II. B. Requested Equipment, Products, or Services for examples within each Lot, and Section VI. A. Responsiveness Criteria for a definition and examples of qualifying highly regulated industries.

Question 63:

Responsible AI & Governance (Table 7B, 175 pts) is one of the highest-scored criteria. For a Lot 2 professional services proposer, this criterion could apply to: (i) the proposer's own internal AI governance policies; (ii) AI governance advisory and design services delivered to clients; or (iii) governance controls embedded in implementation and managed services delivery.
a) Does Sourcewell expect Lot 2 proposers to address all three dimensions in Table 7B, or is the primary focus on one specific dimension?
b) For a Lot 2 proposer that primarily delivers AI governance advisory services to clients but does not develop or deploy its own AI models internally: should Table 7B responses focus on the proposer's internal governance of its own AI tools, its methodology for designing client governance frameworks, or both?
c) Are there specific governance frameworks or standards (e.g., NIST AI RMF, ISO 42001, OECD AI Principles) that Sourcewell's evaluation team specifically expects to see referenced in Table 7B responses?

Answer 63:

In the competitive process, Sourcewell will not advise a proposer on the content of the proposal. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine how to best satisfy all requirements of the questionnaire tables.

Question 64:

Regarding the Questionnaire and Evaluator Scoring Guide available in the portal:
a) Are ALL scored Questionnaire tables visible immediately upon selecting 'Start Submission' with no portions locked or revealed later?
b) Does the Evaluator Scoring Guide contain specific sub-criteria, scoring descriptors, or example responses showing how individual answers are scored within each category? Or does it only describe the evaluation process generally?
c) For Responsible AI & Governance (Table 7B, 175 pts): are evaluators scoring each questionnaire item on a defined scale, or using holistic judgment across the full table?

Answer 64:

Refer to the FAQ and Sourcewell Evaluator Scoring Guide documents located on the homepage of the Procurement Portal.

Question 65:

The Lot 3 Responsiveness Criteria require qualifying integrated delivery engagements within 12 months preceding June 17, 2026. The exact thresholds are only visible in the portal Questionnaire. Can Sourcewell confirm:
a) The minimum qualifying engagement value for Lot 3 responsiveness — and is this measured as total integrated contract value (technology + services combined) or as separate technology and services components each meeting individual minimums?
b) Is a single qualifying integrated engagement sufficient to meet the Lot 3 responsiveness gate, or is a minimum number of distinct engagements required?
c) Must the qualifying engagement involve the proposer acting as the PRIME accountable party (not a subcontractor) for both the technology and services components? Or can an engagement where the proposer was prime for services but subcontracted the technology component still qualify?
d) For the Lot 3 'commercially established' integrated offering requirement: must the qualifying reference involve the SAME integrated offering being proposed in this response, or can it involve a prior generation of the proposer's integrated solution?

Answer 65:

Per the RFP Questionnaire section titled, Responsiveness Criteria, Lot 3 Proposers must demonstrate:

- At least one (1) external client in a qualifying highly regulated industry;
- A total contract or engagement value for that client of approximately $400,000 or more; and
- The contract or engagement must have been active within the twelve (12) months preceding the proposal submission deadline.

Question 66:

The RFP requires that Lot 3 proposers demonstrate their integrated AI delivery offering is 'commercially established' — meaning the integration of technology and services is a standard, unified offering, not assembled ad hoc for this RFP.
a) What forms of evidence does Sourcewell consider acceptable to demonstrate commercial establishment? For example: published brochures or datasheets showing bundled offerings; existing client contracts showing technology + services under a single SOW; named references from clients who purchased the integrated solution; revenue data showing both technology and services components in prior years; or other evidence?
b) If a proposer's integrated offering has been commercially available for less than 12 months but the organisation has extensive separate track records in both technology delivery and services delivery: does this disqualify the proposer from Lot 3, or will Sourcewell consider the combined organisational track record?
c) What distinguishes a qualifying Lot 3 proposer from a Lot 2 proposer who also uses and resells third-party AI platforms as part of service engagements?

Answer 66:

Refer to Answer 12 above.

Question 67:

The boundary between Lot 2 (professional services using AI tools) and Lot 3 (integrated delivery of technology + services) is genuinely ambiguous. Addendum 6, Answer 3 declined to provide further clarification.
For proposers who deliver integrated AI solutions using third-party AI platforms (e.g., Azure AI, AWS Bedrock, Google Vertex AI, Anthropic API) as the technology component, while providing all implementation, integration, and managed services:
a) What is the PRIMARY distinguishing factor between a qualifying Lot 3 proposer using hyperscaler AI platforms and a Lot 2 proposer who also uses hyperscaler tools? Is the distinction: contractual accountability for platform performance and outcomes; existence of a technology subscription/license in the client contract; the proposer's commercial model (technology revenue recognised separately from services revenue); or another factor?
b) Must a Lot 3 proposer be contractually responsible for the third-party AI platform's service levels (availability, latency, accuracy) even when those are determined by the hyperscaler, not the proposer?
c) Can a Lot 3 proposer's 'technology component' be a proprietary implementation layer built on top of hyperscaler AI (e.g., a custom RAG pipeline, fine-tuned model, or enterprise agent framework) rather than a standalone commercial platform?

Answer 67:

Refer to Answer 12 above.

Question 68:

RFP Section III.A.2 references 'Selected Bid Pricing Line Items' for independent cost analysis. For Lot 3 Integrated AI Delivery:
a) Has Sourcewell pre-defined specific line items? If so, where in the portal are they published?
b) For integrated solutions combining technology and services, should proposers price line items separately for (i) platform/technology components and (ii) professional services components, even if the integrated offering is typically sold as a single bundled price?
c) For outcome-based or managed service pricing where technology and service costs are inseparable, how should proposers structure line items to satisfy the independent cost analysis requirement?
d) Must Lot 3 proposers provide both a bundled integrated price AND separately itemised technology-only and services-only rates?
e) Are hyperscaler pass-through costs (e.g., Azure, AWS, Google AI API costs) required to

be included in the not-to-exceed pricing, even if these costs are not controlled by the proposer?

Answer 68:

Refer to Answer 27 above.

Question 69:

Addendum 4, Answer 34 confirms Sourcewell may organise responses into subcategories and make awards based on subcategories. For Lot 3 with $300M estimated annual value:
a) Has Sourcewell pre-identified anticipated subcategories for Lot 3? For example: by industry vertical (healthcare AI, education AI, public safety AI, government operations AI); by delivery model (cloud-native, on-premise, air-gapped integrated delivery); or by solution type (agentic AI + services, analytics AI + services, document intelligence + services).
b) If subcategories will be used, will proposers be notified of the subcategory structure BEFORE submission to allow them to frame responses accordingly? Or will subcategories be determined after proposals are received?
c) Can a single Lot 3 proposal be considered for multiple subcategory awards, or will each proposer be limited to one subcategory?

Answer 69:

For this initial evaluation cycle, Sourcewell will evaluate each of the three Lots independently. During subsequent rolling supplier onboarding periods, Sourcewell reserves the right to open any combination of Lots, including all, some, or none.

Question 70:

For the 12-month lookback period on Lot 2, does active mean the contract was in active delivery, or is it sufficient that the contract was still in its performance period even if deliverables were substantially complete?

Answer 70:

Refer to Answer 12 above.

Question 71:

Can a single engagement satisfy the responsiveness requirement if it spans multiple regulated industry sectors (e.g., a state government client that also operates a public health function)?

Answer 71:

Refer to Answer 60 above.

Question 72:

For Lot 2 T&M pricing, should labor categories be defined by the proposer or does Sourcewell provide a standard labor category structure? If proposer-defined, is there a recommended level of granularity (e.g., broad bands vs. detailed role-by-role)?

Answer 72:

Refer to Answer 27 above.

Question 73:

Is there a preferred length or format for Table 7B responses, or does the portal character limit (~32,000 characters per field) govern?

Answer 73:

Refer to Answer 12 above.

Question 74:

Are Participating Entities expecting standardized governance frameworks (e.g., NIST AI RMF alignment), or should vendors tailor frameworks per jurisdiction?

Answer 74:

Refer to Answer 11 above.

Question 75:

Should Responsible AI deliverables include operational artifacts (e.g., model review boards, audit workflows), or remain at policy/framework level?

Answer 75:

Refer to Answer 11 above.

Question 76:

What level of bias testing, explainability, and auditability is expected within governance design versus implementation phases?

Answer 76:

Refer to Answer 11 above.

Question 77:

For K-12 and public sector clients, are there specific state-level AI regulations or student data protections that must be incorporated beyond federal guidance?

Answer 77:

Refer to Answer 11 above.

Question 78:

Should governance models assume centralized enterprise AI oversight or support federated/agency-specific governance structures?

Answer 78:

Refer to Answer 11 above.

Question 79:

Section 2A Financial Viability - Are there minimum financial thresholds (revenue, profitability, liquidity ratios) that vendors are expected to meet for responsiveness?

Answer 79:

Refer to Answer 22 above.

Question 80:

Section 6 Pricing - Is there a minimum or maximum hourly rate range that Sourcewell considers reasonable for senior AI consultants (e.g., Principal AI Architects, Data Scientists), or is the market expected to self-regulate pricing?

Answer 80:

Refer to Answer 27 above.

Question 81:

Section 6 Pricing - Can proposers offer volume-based discount tiers (e.g., 10% discount for engagements exceeding $500K) within their rate card, and would such tiering be viewed favorably in the pricing evaluation?

Answer 81:

Refer to Answer 27 above.

Question 82:

Section 6 Pricing - For time-and-materials and managed-services pricing under a ten-year term, may proposers include an annual escalation or cost-of-living adjustment mechanism?

Answer 82:

Refer to Answer 27 above.

Question 83:

Lot 2 Definition - Where a Lot 2 proposer both develops a custom AI application under 2(c) and subsequently operates it under managed services in 2(b) for the same entity, does the combined engagement remain Lot 2, or does the combination of build-plus-operate indicate the proposer should respond under Lot 3?

Answer 83:

In the competitive process, Sourcewell will not advise a proposer on the content of the proposal. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine how to best satisfy all requirements of the questionnaire tables.

Question 84:

Participation Model & Delivery Expectations
Context: Use is across thousands of agencies (government, K-12, etc.).
• Are vendors expected to provide nationwide delivery coverage, or can they define regional focus areas?
• What level of sales and partner ecosystem is expected for Lot 2 providers to support Participating Entities?
• How should vendors plan for varying procurement maturity levels across K-12 vs. state agencies?
• Are there expectations to support rapid onboarding / quick-start engagements for smaller entities?

Answer 84:

Refer to Answer 12 above.

Question 85:

AI Software Development & Engineering
Context: Custom AI solutions, integrations, and workflows fall under Lot 2.
• What level of technical deliverables is expected (e.g., prototypes, production-ready systems, or reference architectures)?
• Are vendors expected to provide full DevSecOps pipelines for AI, or only solution development?
• Should solutions be designed for portability across multiple agencies, or tailored to single-entity deployments?
• What are the expectations for integration with legacy systems, especially in government and K-12 environments?

• Are there requirements or preferences for open-source vs. proprietary AI components?

Answer 85:

Refer to Answer 11 and 12 above.

Question 86:

Workforce Transformation & Change Management
Context: Workforce strategy, AI literacy, and organizational redesign are included in Lot 2.
• What level of training deliverables is expected (executive briefings vs. full curriculum development)?
• Should vendors design role-based workforce models (e.g., AI product owners, data stewards), or focus only on training?
• Are Participating Entities expecting ongoing change management support or one-time transformation planning?
• How should vendors account for varying AI maturity levels across small municipalities vs. large state agencies?

Answer 86:

Refer to Answer 11 and 12 above.

Question 87:

Pricing & Commercial Model Clarifications
Context: Multiple pricing models are allowed, including time-and-materials, managed services, and outcome-based pricing.
• Can vendors propose blended pricing models (e.g., T&M for advisory + subscription for managed services)?
• How should vendors structure pricing for multi-year AI transformation programs with evolving scope?
• Are there expectations for benchmark pricing across Participating Entities, or can pricing vary significantly by client size/complexity?
• For outcome-based pricing, how should success metrics or “units of outcome” be defined for AI services?
• What level of detail is expected in the Pricing Narrative for TCO modeling, particularly for long-term AI initiatives?

Answer 87:

Refer to Answer 27 above.

Question 88:

Evaluation Criteria & Competitive Positioning
Context: Scoring includes Responsible AI (175 pts), delivery capability (175 pts), depth/breadth (200 pts), and pricing (200 pts).
• How will evaluators assess "Depth and Breadth of Offered Solutions" specifically for service-based vendors versus platform vendors?
• Within "Responsible AI & Governance" scoring, what weight is given to practical implementation capability vs. policy design?
• Are past performance examples required to demonstrate scale in highly regulated industries, and what qualifies as "scale"?
• How will Sourcewell differentiate between firms offering broad general consulting vs. specialized AI expertise?
• To what extent does the marketing plan scoring (100 pts) influence award decisions for professional services firms?

Answer 88:

It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine the information and documentation necessary to best demonstrate their ability to serve Sourcewell participating entities and satisfy all the requirements included in the questionnaire tables. Proposals are evaluated based on the criteria stated in the RFP.

Question 89:

How will Participating Entities procure Lot 2 services — direct task orders to a chosen awardee, or competitive mini-bids among multiple Lot 2 awardees?

Answer 89:

Refer to Answer 11 above.

Question 90:

Is there a maximum dollar value or term length for individual task orders issued under a Lot 2 master agreement, or any threshold above which separate competition is required?

Answer 90:

Refer to Article 1. F. Survival of Terms in the Master Agreement, "Notwithstanding the termination of this Agreement, the obligations of this Agreement will continue through the performance period of any transaction entered between Supplier and any Participating Entity before the termination date."

Also refer to Answer 11 above.

Question 91:

Over the ten-year term, who bears responsibility for compliance with new AI laws or regulations enacted after award, and are mid-contract scope or pricing adjustments permitted to address them?

Answer 91:

In the competitive process, Sourcewell will not advise a proposer on the content of the proposal. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine how to best satisfy all requirements of the questionnaire tables.

Please also refer to Answer 11 above.

Question 92:

For Lot 2 engagements producing AI-specific artifacts (fine-tuned models, prompt libraries, embeddings, retrieval indices) from Participating Entity data, what is Sourcewell's expected default position on ownership and portability of those artifacts at engagement end?

Answer 92:

Refer to Answer 91 above.

Question 93:

May subcontractors not named at proposal submission be added during the contract term, and are their rates subject to the proposer's not-to-exceed pricing?

Answer 93:

Per RFP Section II. D. Single Primary Lot, “Sourcewell prefers suppliers that provide a sole source of responsibility for the equipment, products, and services provided under a resulting master agreement. If proposer includes the equipment, products, and services of its subsidiary entities, the proposer must also identify all subsidiaries included in its proposal. If proposer requires the use of distributors, dealers, resellers, or subcontractors to provide the equipment, products, or services, the proposal must address how the equipment, products or services will be provided to Participating Entities, and describe the network of distributors, dealers, resellers, and/or subcontractors that will be available to serve Participating Entities under a resulting master agreement.”

Primary Lot selection is the proposer’s determination and reflects how they primarily create value for Participating Entities. A proposer may submit only one proposal. If related, affiliated, or subsidiary entities elect to submit separate proposals, rather than a single parent-entity proposal, each such proposal must be prepared independently

and without cooperation, collaboration, or collusion. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine the information or documentation necessary to best demonstrate their ability to serve Sourcewell Participating Entities and satisfy all the requirements of the RFP.

Question 94:

Are SLAs (e.g., staffing response time, time-to-deploy, managed-services remediation) expected to be committed at the master agreement level, or negotiated per task order? Is there a preferred SLA framework?

Answer 94:

Refer to Answer 12.

Question 95:

Does Sourcewell expect Lot 2 proposers to specifically address generative-AI risks (hallucination, prompt injection, output IP contamination), and is there a preferred reference framework (e.g., NIST AI RMF, OWASP LLM Top 10, ISO 42001)?

Answer 95:

Refer to Answer 12 above.

Question 96:

What is Sourcewell's expected default position on IP ownership across (a) proposer background IP, (b) client foreground IP, and (c) jointly developed IP from Lot 2 engagements?

Answer 96:

Refer to Answer 12 above.

Question 97:

For Lot 2 proposers delivering services into client environments rather than hosting systems, are security certifications (FedRAMP, SOC 2, etc.) expected for the proposer's own delivery environment, and should personnel-level clearances (CJIS, public trust) be disclosed in the response?

Answer 97:

Refer to Answer 12 above.

Question 98:

Should the Pricing Narrative quantify external TCO drivers (third-party platform consumption, scope evolution), or simply identify them? Are illustrative small/medium/large engagement TCO scenarios expected?

Answer 98:

Refer to Answer 27 above.

Question 99:

Compliance, Security & Public Sector Constraints
Context: Work spans highly regulated industries including government and education.
• Are there baseline requirements for data residency, FERPA/CJIS/HIPAA compliance, or should these be handled per entity?
• How should vendors address AI usage in sensitive environments (e.g., student data, criminal justice, benefits systems)?
• Are there minimum expectations for security certifications or controls in AI service delivery?

Answer 99:

In the competitive process, Sourcewell will not advise a proposer on the content of the proposal. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine how to best satisfy all requirements of the questionnaire tables.

Question 100:

Does Sourcewell anticipate strong demand for vertical or function-specific AI service offerings (e.g., tax, child welfare, utility customer service) under Lot 2, and should proposers emphasize specialized practice areas in Depth & Breadth even where full Lot 2 subcategory coverage is not provided?

Answer 100:

Refer to Answer 11 above.

Question 101:

For Canadian Participating Entities, should Lot 2 proposers specifically address Canada-specific AI regulatory considerations (PIPEDA, Quebec Law 25, AIDA) and bilingual English/French service delivery?

Answer 101:

Refer to Answer 99 above.

Question 102:

If a proposer qualifies for both Lot 2 and Lot 3, what criteria should be used to determine the most appropriate Primary Lot selection?

Answer 102:

Refer to Answer 30 above.

Question 103:

Are references required from specific industry sectors or geographic regions?

Answer 103:

Refer to Answer 50 above.

Question 104:

Is there a maximum page limit for proposal responses or supporting documentation?

Answer 104:

The Sourcewell Procurement Portal allows for 30,000+ character answers in each text box.

Question 105:

Are hyperlinks to supporting materials permitted within proposal responses?

Answer 105:

All relevant information should be included in the proposal (RFP Section II., G.). It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine the method it deems best suited to submit its relevant information in a timely fashion through the Sourcewell Procurement Portal.

Question 106:

Are appendices excluded from any page limitations?

Answer 106:

See Answer 105 above.

Question 107:

How will pricing updates be handled over the 10-year contract term?

Answer 107:

Refer to Answer 56 above.

Question 108:

How should cloud consumption and third-party licensing costs be priced and reported?

Answer 108:

Refer to Answer 27 above.

Question 109:

Is there a mandatory pricing template?

Answer 109:

Refer to Answer 27 above.

Question 110:

What are the expectations for marketing and contract utilization after award?

Answer 110:

Refer to RFP Section II. H. – Marketing Plan and Table 4: Marketing Plan within the Questionnaire for guidance on the marketing plan requirements. Each proposer, in its discretion, will determine the content of its marketing plan. The solicitation is a competitive process and proposals will be evaluated on the content submitted.

Question 111:

Given the ten-year contract term, how will technology refreshes and new AI offerings be added to the contract?

Answer 111:

Refer to Answer 56 above.

Question 112:

Can pricing and product catalogs be updated periodically during the contract term?

Answer 112:

Refer to Answer 56 above.

Question 113:

If an employee referenced in past performance has left the company, can they still serve as a valid reference for the vendor?

Answer 113:

In the competitive process, Sourcewell will not advise a proposer on the content of the proposal. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine how to best satisfy all requirements of the questionnaire tables.

Question 114:

Section II.B.a.iv lists 'AI-optimized compute infrastructure' as a Lot 1 scope item. Does Sourcewell expect proposers to offer physical GPU hardware/servers, or is a software-based AI platform that runs on customer-provided or cloud-managed infrastructure sufficient to qualify under this scope item?

Answer 114:

Refer to Answer 12 above.

Question 115:

Section III.A.2 references 'Selected Bid Pricing Line Items' to assist with the independent estimate and cost/price analysis for Lot 1. What are these specific line items? Is a standard pricing template provided in the portal, or should proposers define their own pricing line items?

Answer 115:

Sourcewell utilizes a competitive, solutions-based solicitation approach that is NOT based on detailed specifications or specific opportunities. A proposer can propose its entire offering that falls within the requested equipment, products, or services as described in II. Solicitation Details. B. Requested Equipment, Products, or Services within the RFP.

Question 116:

Section III.A.4 requires pricing stated in U.S. and Canadian dollars 'as applicable.' For software subscription pricing, is Canadian dollar pricing required at time of initial proposal submission, or may it be provided upon the first Canadian Participating Entity transaction?

Answer 116:

Per RFP Section III. 4., "All proposed pricing must be stated in U.S. and Canadian dollars (as applicable)."

In the competitive process, Sourcewell will not advise a proposer on the content of the proposal. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine how to best satisfy all requirements of the RFP and questionnaire tables.

Question 117:

The 'Financial Viability and Marketplace Success' evaluation criterion (50 points) is assessed through the portal questionnaire. What specific financial documentation is required? Does Sourcewell accept analyst recognition (Gartner, IDC), named customer references, D&B Report, and insurance documentation as alternatives to audited financial statements for small businesses?

Answer 117:

Refer to Answer 19 and 22 above.

Question 118:

The 'Responsible AI & Governance' criterion (175 pts) is the highest-weighted qualitative criterion. Does Sourcewell require third-party bias audits or independent AI governance certifications (e.g., ISO/IEC 42001), or is a documented internal Responsible AI Policy, NIST AI RMF alignment, and explainable AI capabilities sufficient?

Answer 118:

Refer to Answer 12 above.

Question 119:

If a proposer is already registered in SAM.gov, is a separate Sourcewell Procurement Portal registration required, or does SAM.gov registration provide equivalent access? What documents must be uploaded directly versus entered in questionnaire form fields?

Answer 119:

All proposals must be submitted through the Sourcewell Procurement Portal. The Specification Tables within the portal afford each proposer the opportunity to provide narrative content that it determines, in its discretion, will best reflect the solutions it provides. Uploaded documents should support and supplement the narrative as described in the Specification Tables.

Question 120:

Section II.H requires a Marketing Plan demonstrating ability to deploy a sales force or dealer network. For software-as-a-service platforms sold direct or through cloud marketplaces (e.g Azure Marketplace), does a vendor's distribution/partnership channels qualify as an acceptable mechanism for Participating Entities?

Answer 120:

Refer to Answer 12 above.

Question 121:

Section IV states that 'numerous and/or onerous exceptions that contradict Minnesota law may result in disqualification.' If we have no exceptions to propose to the Master Agreement template, is a clean (unredlined) document submission acceptable, or must we affirmatively state 'no exceptions'?

Answer 121:

Review the instructions available in the Sourcewell Procurement Portal Questionnaire, Table 8: Line 96.

Question 122:

As a vendor offering both AI software platforms (Lot 1) and implementation/professional services. If awarded under Lot 1 (AI Products and Platforms), can we include time-and-materials professional services rates (implementation, training, integration) within the Lot 1 master agreement as complementary offerings per the 'directly related products and services' provision in Section II.B?

Answer 122:

Refer to Answer 30 above.

Question 123:

Section II.C describes rolling supplier onboarding every 6 months. If a vendor is awarded in this cycle, is there a process to expand the list of Included Solutions mid-term (e.g., adding new AI platform features or new products) through a Product and Price Change Request, or does a new onboarding cycle apply?

Answer 123:

Refer to Answer 56 above.

Question 124:

What are the 'Selected Bid Pricing Line Items' in Section III.A.2 for Lot 1 AI platforms? Is a sample pricing spreadsheet template provided in the portal?

Answer 124:

Refer to Answer 27 above.

Question 125:

Is a flat fee acceptable as an alternative to percentage-based administrative fee for software subscriptions?

Answer 125:

Refer to Answer 27 above.

Question 126:

The RFP references AI-optimized compute, enterprise knowledge infrastructure, and AI deployment environments. Are complementary technologies such as servers, storage, networking, cybersecurity, backup/recovery, power, cooling, and data-center infrastructure considered within the scope when they directly support AI workloads?

Answer 126:

Refer to Answer 12 above.

Question 127:

For manufacturers whose products are supplied through authorized distribution channels, does Sourcewell have a preferred method for demonstrating authorization, such as Letter of Authorization (LOA). If so, can we provide LoA provided by our distributor proving our authorization?

Answer 127:

In the competitive process, Sourcewell will not advise a proposer on the content of the proposal. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine how to best satisfy all requirements of the questionnaire tables.

Question 128:

Addendum 4, Answer 23, Addendum 10, Answer 34, on subcontractors and delivery networks. If awarded, may a supplier add, replace, or remove subcontractors, OEM delivery partners, or authorized service providers during the contract term, provided the

supplier maintains overall accountability for contract performance? If so, what approval process and supporting documentation would Sourcewell require?

Answer 128:

Refer to Answer 93 above.
Refer to RFP Section II. B. – Requested Equipment, Products, or Services – "…If Proposer requires the use of dealers, resellers, or subcontractors to provide the products or services, the Proposal should address how the products or services will be provided to Participating Entities and describe the network of dealers, resellers, and/or subcontractors that will be available to serve Participating Entities under a resulting contract."

Question 129:

Is Sourcewell looking for platform-specific compliance documentation (FedRAMP, CJIS, HIPAA, NIST, etc.) for each proposed manufacturer, or would a consolidated governance framework be sufficient at the proposal stage?

Answer 129:

In the competitive process, Sourcewell will not advise a proposer on the content of the proposal. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine how to best satisfy all requirements of the questionnaire tables.

Question 130:

We reviewed Addendum 10, Answer 52 and Addendum 5, Answer 41 regarding pricing submissions. For manufacturers with large catalogs and frequently changing product portfolios, are proposers expected to submit complete catalog/list price files with the proposal, or may proposers submit representative pricing schedules, discount structures, and pricing methodologies with detailed catalog files provided upon request during evaluation?

Answer 130:

Refer to Section III. Pricing and Delivery Schedules in the RFP.

Question 131:

We reviewed Addendum 4, Answer 16 regarding professional services pricing. For Time-and-Materials services, may a proposer provide a standardized Not-To-Exceed rate structure across service categories, or does Sourcewell prefer role-based pricing (e.g., Project Manager, Solution Architect, AI Engineer, Consultant, Trainer, Support Specialist) with separate NTE rates by labor category?

Answer 131:

Refer to Answer 27 above.

Question 132:

Can Sourcewell provide guidance regarding:
• Typical frequency of catalog price updates;
• Typical frequency of labor-rate updates;
• Supporting documentation generally expected for update requests;
• Whether manufacturer/OEM published pricing changes are considered acceptable justification for price adjustments during the contract term.

Answer 132:

Refer to Answer 56 above.

Question 133:

We reviewed Addendum 7, Answer 1, which states that proposers must demonstrate primary accountability for the overall solution, even when subcontractors are involved. We also reviewed Addendum 6, Answer 3 and Addendum 10, Answer 34 regarding subcontractors, resellers, and sole-source responsibility.
If a proposer serves as the prime contractor, signs the contract and SOW directly with the Participating Entity, maintains overall governance, program management, escalation management, and delivery accountability, but utilizes OEM professional services organizations and/or subcontractors to perform portions of the implementation work, would this delivery model be considered responsive to the intent of Lot 3: Integrated AI Delivery?

Answer 133:

Refer to Answer 12 above.

Question 134:

For the three references requested in Table 2B, please confirm that references may be drawn from any industry, not only highly regulated industries.

Answer 134:

Refer to the instructions for Table 2B: References/Testimonials located in the Sourcewell Procurement Portal for further information.

Question 135:

Please confirm that a single client engagement may be cited both as the Lot 2 Demonstrated Experience example and as one of the Table 2B references without being treated as duplicative or non-conforming.

Answer 135:

In the competitive process, Sourcewell will not advise a proposer on the content of the proposal. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine how to best satisfy all requirements of the questionnaire tables.

Question 136:

Please confirm there is no page or file-count limit on supporting documents uploaded at Step 2, and that embedded links to live demonstrations or a short video are permissible for evaluator reference.

Answer 136:

Refer to Answer 105 above.

Question 137:

For the Lot 2 Demonstrated Experience threshold, where an engagement's total value exceeds the threshold but spans more than 12 months, may the proposer state in its narrative the basis it is using (total contract value versus value performed within the 12-month window)?

Answer 137:

In the competitive process, Sourcewell will not advise a proposer on the content of the proposal. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine how to best satisfy all requirements of the questionnaire tables.

Question 138:

Please confirm that a proposer-developed Excel pricing sheet is acceptable in lieu of any Sourcewell-provided template, and whether both U.S. and Canadian pricing columns are expected if the proposer intends to serve Participating Entities in both countries.

Answer 138:

Refer to Answer 27 above.

Question 139:

Is there a threshold at which the number of redline exceptions to the Master Agreement is viewed unfavorably, and are common professional-services terms such as limitation of liability, intellectual property ownership, and indemnification treated with greater flexibility than other provisions?

Answer 139:

Proposed exception requests or modifications are to be redlined in the Word version of the Master Agreement.

Question 140:

If an addendum is posted on June 16 or 17, what is the latest recommended time before the 3:30 p.m. Central Time deadline to re-acknowledge the addendum and re-submit so that the proposal is still considered timely?

Answer 140:

Proposer's complete proposal must be submitted through the Sourcewell Procurement Portal no later than the date and time specified.

Question 141:

Can Sourcewell confirm whether the use of offshore subcontractors is permitted under this RFP, provided the prime proposer clearly identifies the subcontractor delivery model in its proposal, remains fully accountable for all work performed

Answer 141:

Refer to Answer 3 above.

Question 142:

When evaluating experience and technical capability, will Sourcewell consider the experience of subcontractors independently, or will evaluation emphasis be placed primarily on the Prime Contractor's demonstrated accountability and management of subcontractor resources?

Answer 142:

Refer to Answer 93 above.

Question 143:

Can Sourcewell share examples of marketing activities or outreach approaches that have historically been most effective in driving participating entity engagement under similar awarded agreements?

Answer 143:

Refer to RFP Section II. H. – Marketing Plan and Table 4: Marketing Plan within the Questionnaire for guidance on the marketing plan requirements. Each proposer, in its discretion, will determine the content of its marketing plan. The solicitation is a competitive process and proposals will be evaluated on the content submitted.

Question 144:

How does Sourcewell envision the balance of responsibility between the awarded vendor and Sourcewell for promoting resulting agreements to participating entities?

Answer 144:

Awarded suppliers will work with their Supplier Development Executive to best market the contract post-award.

Question 145:

Are there preferred metrics or KPIs Sourcewell uses to evaluate the effectiveness of awarded vendors' marketing efforts over the term of the agreement?

Answer 145:

Refer to Answer 144 above.

Question 146:

To what extent are evaluators seeking evidence of measurable outcomes, quantitative benefits, or performance metrics within project examples and case studies?

Answer 146:

Refer to Answer 12 above.

Question 147:

For professional services engagements involving multiple pricing models (e.g., fixed fee, milestone-based, subscription, and time-and-materials), may proposers include multiple pricing approaches under a single awarded agreement?

Answer 147:

All proposed pricing must be submitted using one or more of the pricing structures, as appropriate to the proposer's Primary Lot and commercial model, listed in RFP Section III. A. 1.

Question 148:

For subscription and consumption-based pricing models, does Sourcewell have standard usage assumptions or estimated consumption scenarios that proposers should use to facilitate an equitable evaluation across submissio(sic)

Answer 148:

Refer to Answer 27 above.

Question 149:

Given the rapidly evolving nature of enterprise AI technologies, will suppliers be permitted to add newly developed services, models, or platform capabilities to the resulting Master Agreement under the same pricing methodology?

Answer 149:

Refer to Answer 56 above.

Question 150:

Should proposers assume that implementation services will primarily involve configuration and deployment, or should responses also address broader activities such as business process redesign, change management, training, governance, and adoption support?

Answer 150:

Refer to Answer 11 above.

Question 151:

For Lot 3 proposers who deliver integrated AI solutions using a combination of proprietary capabilities and strategic technology partners, does Sourcewell consider those partners subcontractors requiring a formal network description or does the requirement apply only to third parties involved in physical delivery and distribution?

Answer 151:

Refer to Answer 93 above.

Question 152:

What level of detail is expected in describing the partner/subcontractor network — for example, is a named list of partners with defined roles sufficient, or does Sourcewell require executed teaming agreements or letters of commitment at time of proposal submission?

Answer 152:

In the competitive process, Sourcewell will not advise a proposer on the content of the proposal. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine how to best satisfy all requirements of the questionnaire tables.

Question 153:

If we serve as the single accountable prime contractor under Lot 3 but leverages technology partners (e.g., hyperscalers, AI platform vendors) as part of the integrated solution, should those technology relationships be disclosed under this section, and if so, how does Sourcewell distinguish between a technology partnership and a subcontractor relationship for evaluation purposes?

Answer 153:

In the competitive process, Sourcewell will not advise a proposer on the content of the proposal. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine how to best satisfy all requirements of the questionnaire tables.

Refer also to Answer 93 above.

Question 154:

For AI-specific warranties, what does Sourcewell expect coverage to include model performance, output accuracy, or solely the underlying software and infrastructure?

Answer 154:

Refer to Answer 11 above.

Question 155:

How does Sourcewell differentiate evaluation of a Marketing Plan for AI solutions versus traditional product or service categories, and are there AI-specific elements proposers should emphasize?

Answer 155:

Refer to Answer 12 and 21 above.

Question 156:

For Lot 3 Integrated AI Delivery, may demonstrated experience include enterprise modernization, advanced analytics, intelligent automation, DevSecOps/MLOps enablement, and AI-enabled transformation programs where AI capabilities were delivered as part of a broader integrated solution under a single accountable contract, even if the contract was not procured exclusively as an AI project?

Answer 156:

Refer to Answer 12 above.

Question 157:

How should the Pricing Narrative address cost changes driven by factors outside the proposer's control such as foundation model price changes or compute supply constraints and does the master agreement allow temporary pricing adjustments in those cases?

Answer 157:

Refer to Answer 27 above.

Question 158:

For Lot 3 Integrated AI Delivery, does Sourcewell consider cloud-native AI services, AI accelerators, AI reference architectures, AI solution frameworks, and AI-enabled platforms built on technologies such as AWS, Microsoft Azure, Google Cloud, OpenAI, Anthropic, or similar providers to satisfy the AI technology component of an integrated solution, even when the proposer is not offering a standalone commercial software product?

Answer 158:

Refer to Answer 12 above.

Question 159:

Given that AI consumption based pricing is inherently variable, how should proposers structure not-to-exceed pricing for usage-based models (e.g., per inference, per API call, per compute unit) while still providing Participating Entities with predictable total cost of ownership estimates?

Answer 159:

Refer to Answer 27 above.

Question 160:

For Lot 3 Integrated AI Delivery, may proposers utilize third-party AI models, cloud AI services, and commercial AI technologies as components of an integrated solution, provided the proposer maintains primary responsibility and accountability for solution design, integration, governance, performance, security, and overall delivery outcomes?

Answer 160:

Refer to Answer 12 and 93 above.

Question 161:

Can Sourcewell please clarify the warranty requirement in Section II.E.5 for Lot 3 responses? Specifically, is a flow through warranty model acceptable where third-party product, platform, software, or component warranties are passed through to the Participating Entity, provided the proposer clearly identifies the applicable warranty terms, coverage, and support responsibilities?

Answer 161:

In the competitive process, Sourcewell will not advise a proposer on the content of the proposal. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine how to best satisfy all requirements of the questionnaire tables.

Question 162:

Can Sourcewell please clarify its expectations regarding indemnification under this solicitation and resulting master agreement? In particular, if a proposer's Lot 3 offering includes third-party products, platforms, software, or components, is a flow-through indemnification structure acceptable for those third-party elements, provided the proposer clearly identifies the allocation of responsibilities and any applicable limitations in its proposal and redlines to the master agreement?

Answer 162:

In the competitive process, Sourcewell will not advise a proposer on the content of the proposal. It is left to the discretion of each proposer to determine how to best satisfy all requirements of the questionnaire tables.

Question 163:

For Lot 3 pricing, may a proposer submit OEM/category discounting by product family with representative configurations instead of listing every SKU for multiple OEMs?

Answer 163:

Refer to Answer 12 and 27 above.

Question 164:

What minimum detail must be included for category-discount pricing: OEM name, product family, discount percentage?

Answer 164:

Refer to Answer 27 above.

Question 165:

Q6: Canadian Taxes — GST/HST Treatment
Should proposed pricing for Canadian Participating Entities be stated exclusive of GST/HST
(with applicable taxes added at time of invoice), or should pricing be stated inclusive of all
applicable Canadian taxes? Does the Sourcewell master agreement template address Canadian tax obligations, or will this need to be addressed via a redline exception at time of
submission?

Answer 165:

Refer to Answer 27 above.

Question 166:

Section 3: Canadian Participating Entity Experience & References

Q7: Canadian Highly Regulated Industry References
Per Addendum 1, Answer 2, references from "highly regulated industries" are acceptable
whether commercial or public sector. For a Canadian Lot 2 proposer, will Sourcewell consider
references from Canadian regulated industries such as: federal/provincial government departments, Canadian banking institutions regulated by OSFI, Canadian healthcare organizations under provincial oversight, or Canadian post-secondary institutions? Should the
proposal clarify the regulatory framework governing each Canadian reference?

Answer 166:

Refer to Answer 12 Above.

Question 167:

Q8: Canadian-Specific AI Governance Experience
For the Responsible AI & Governance criterion (175 points), will evaluators consider experience
with Canadian-specific AI governance frameworks — such as the Directive on Automated
Decision-Making (Government of Canada), provincial privacy legislation (PIPEDA, Quebec Law
25), or the proposed Artificial Intelligence and Data Act (AIDA) — as equally demonstrative of
responsible AI capability as U.S.-specific frameworks?

Answer 167:

Refer to Answer 12 above.

Question 168:

Q9: MASH Sector Experience as Qualifying References
The RFP identifies Canadian MASH sector entities (municipalities, academic institutions, schools, hospitals) as eligible Participating Entities. For Lot 2 responsiveness, will experience
delivering AI professional services to Canadian MASH sector organizations qualify under the
"highly regulated industry" definition, given that these entities operate under provincial regulatory frameworks?

Answer 168:

Refer to Answer 12 Above.

Question 169:

Section 4: Delivery Model & Scope

Q10: Bilingual Service Delivery Requirements
For Canadian Participating Entities — particularly federal government departments and entities
in Quebec — will Sourcewell or Participating Entities require that professional services be
delivered in both English and French? Should a Lot 2 proposer describe bilingual delivery capacity in its proposal, and will this be evaluated under any specific scoring criterion?

Answer 169:

Refer to RFP Section V. E. Proposals must be: 3. Submitted in English.

Question 170:

Given the potential ten-year term of the contract and the agreement's price change process, should proposers incorporate anticipated labor and market cost increases into their initial pricing, or submit current market pricing and request adjustments as needed throughout the contract term?

Answer 170:

Refer to Answer 27 above**.**

End of Addendum

Acknowledgement of this Addendum to RFP 061726, posted to the Sourcewell Procurement Portal on 06/11/2026, is required at the time of proposal submittal.