

## **Grant Management System (GMS) RFP**

### **Vendor Questions and Draft Responses**

#### **I. Procurement Timeline, Submission, and Evaluation Process**

##### **1. Proposal Submission Deadline**

The official proposal submission deadline is **April 15, 2026, at 11:59 PM CST**.

##### **2. Evaluation Methodology**

Yes, proposals will be evaluated using a scoring methodology aligned with the evaluation criteria outlined in the RFP.

##### **3. Disclosure of Evaluation Weights**

DRA anticipates sharing general information regarding evaluation weighting; however, full scoring methodology and internal evaluation details may not be disclosed in their entirety to preserve the integrity of the review process.

##### **4. Certifications and Disclosures**

Vendors will be required to submit standard certifications and disclosures consistent with federal procurement practices. Additional details will be clarified in the final response package.

##### **5. General Liability Insurance**

The Contractor must secure and maintain Commercial General Liability Insurance or Business Liability Insurance, including bodily injury, property damage, products, personal and advertising injury, and completed operations with the following minimum limits: General Aggregate - \$1,000,000. This insurance must provide coverage for all claims that may arise from performance of the Contract or completed operations, whether by the Contractor or anyone directly or indirectly employed by the Contractor. Such insurance must include the State of Mississippi and Delta Regional Authority as an additional insured for the entire length of the resulting contract.

#### **II. Operational Challenges and Modernization Priorities**

##### **1. Among the RFP's stated objectives what operational challenges or pain points are highest priority for DRA?**

Several key priorities that will shape the design and selection of the new system:

- Enhanced reporting capabilities to support real-time insights, federal compliance, and leadership decision-making
- Improved internal controls to ensure consistency, transparency, and audit readiness across all programs
- Standardization of data and workflows to reduce variability and improve operational efficiency across funding streams

## **2. Are there specific workflow inefficiencies or reporting limitations in the current system that the new GMS must address immediately?**

Despite progress in stabilizing the current platform, several systemic challenges remain. These limitations have informed the requirements outlined in this RFP and underscore the need for a more robust and flexible solution:

- Workflow reliability and automation issues, including inconsistent triggering of key process steps and notifications
- Limited reporting functionality, restricting the ability to generate timely, program-level and portfolio-wide insights
- Lack of real-time data visibility, making it difficult to monitor performance, track obligations, and support strategic decision-making

Desired improvements to help address these issues include:

- Automated workflow triggers and notifications
- Real-time dashboards
- Improved communication across internal and external stakeholders
- Greater system reliability and scalability

## **III. Current System Environment and Existing Tools**

### **1. Current Platform**

Yes, **CommunityForce** is the current grant management platform being replaced.

### **2. Scope of Replacement**

The new system will replace both:

- External applicant portal

- Internal grant management functionality

### **3. Existing Supplemental Tools**

DRA currently utilizes supplemental tools (e.g., spreadsheets, SharePoint, manual trackers). The new system should be capable of **integrating or replacing these tools** where appropriate.

### **4. Legacy Data Sources**

At minimum, **legacy data for awarded projects from the last five fiscal years** will be migrated. This will include both data from the current CommunityForce system as well as external data sources. Additional historical data may also be considered based on feasibility and value.

## **IV. System Users, Volume, and Usage Scale**

### **1. Internal Users**

Approximately **20–25 internal users**.

### **2. User Roles**

Roles will include:

- Administrators
- Program Managers
- Reviewers
- Finance Staff
- Other authorized personnel

### **3. External Users**

- Applicants and grantees: **1,000+ annually (and growing)**
  - Each application and grantee will likely have multiple collaborators. A proposed system will need the ability for each application/grant to have multiple collaborators.

### **4. Application Volume**

Approximately **350 applications annually** (based on recent program data), although this number may vary depending on funding availability.

## **5. Active Grants and System Load**

- Approximately **450 active projects** currently
- System should support **peak concurrent usage**, particularly during application cycles

## **6. Estimated Users by Role**

- Internal Staff: ~25
- Reviewers: ~10
- Applicants: 1,000+
  - Each applicant/application will likely have multiple users for each application.
  - Some users may have more than one application.
- Grantees: 1,000+
  - Each grant/grantee will likely have multiple users for each grant.
  - Many grantees will have more than one grant from DRA (including both active and inactive grants).
- Local Development Districts: 50+

## **V. Program Scope and Workflow Requirements**

### **1. Variability in Workflows**

Workflows vary across programs due to differences in:

- NOFAs/FOAs
- Funding structures
- Program requirements

While work is ongoing to streamline these processes as much as possible, DRA still requires a system that allows for customization based on the respective programmatic areas.

## **2. Additional Programmatic Areas**

In addition to traditional grants, DRA manages programmatic activities requiring workflow support (e.g., payment processing, reporting, and compliance tracking). DRA would require a system that includes both an application portal, as well as active grant/project management capabilities.

## **3. Inclusion of Non-Grant Programs**

Programs such as Delta Leadership Institute (DLI) and Delta Doctors may be included in the initial implementation, though final scope may depend on vendor approach and implementation timeline. DLI is a DRA's leadership development program. Housing application and project information for DLI would include applicant information, as well as potential outcome data. Delta Doctors is DRA's J1 visa waiver program. Housing application and project information for Delta Doctors would include application information, ongoing reporting as required by law, and evaluative data as needed.

## **4. Non-Grant Program Workflows**

These programs have similar lifecycle structures to grants but may require:

- Modified workflows
- Scholarship and microgrant tracking
- Enhanced applicant data management

## **5. Workflow Documentation**

DRA is continuing to refine internal workflows. Additional documentation may be provided during later stages of procurement.

## **6. Hybrid Operating Model**

DRA operates with characteristics of both a federal agency and a philanthropic organization, requiring:

- Flexibility in program design (funding programs change by year based on availability of funding)
- Strong compliance and audit controls
- Diverse reporting capabilities and ability to quickly pull reports

## **VI. Data Migration and Historical Records**

### **1. Historical Data Scope**

- Funded project data: **FY21–FY26**
- Unfunded applications: **FY24–FY26**
  - Application-level data from current GMS. This would only include applications that were submitted. DRA would prefer to include this information in a separate data file.

### **2. Data Volume (Estimates)**

- 750+ funded grants as of FY25.
- Potentially 2000+ total records (including historical and unfunded data) .

### **3. Data Formats**

- Current GMS (CommunityForce)
- Excel and other external files
- PDF applications and supporting documents currently housed within SharePoint

### **4. Data Preparation**

Formal data profiling and cleansing efforts are ongoing and may be further refined prior to migration.

## **VII. Financial System Integration**

### **1. Current Financial Systems**

DRA is transitioning from spreadsheet-based tracking toward a more formalized financial system (including MIP implementation), with continued coordination through federal systems (e.g., GSA processes).

### **2. Integration Expectations**

Preferred capabilities include:

- Real-time integration
- At minimum, daily or scheduled data synchronization to support up to date grant specific dashboards

### **3. Data Exchange Requirements**

Key integration points include:

- Obligation tracking
- Payment requests
- Financial reconciliation
- Budget modifications

### **4. Financial Tracking**

The system should support budget-to-actual tracking across multiple funding sources, with periodic reconciliation between systems that allows for the creation of necessary grant specific up to date budget dashboards, including drawdown requests and budget modifications.

## **VIII. Security, Compliance, and Technical Architecture**

### **1. Security Requirements**

FedRAMP is not required, but solutions must demonstrate compliance with recognized standards such as:

- NIST-aligned controls
- SOC 2 Type II and/or ISO 27001

### **3. Hosting Preference**

DRA is open either hosting preference:

- Multi-tenant (public cloud)
- Single-tenant (private cloud)

Solutions will be evaluated based on security, scalability, and cost.

### **4. Additional Compliance Requirements**

The system must support:

- Strong internal controls
- Audit trails
- Reporting capabilities
- Data retention requirements consistent with federal standards

## **X. AI and Innovation Capabilities**

### **1. AI Usage Requirements**

Any AI functionality must:

- Operate within a closed, secure environment
- Ensure DRA retains full ownership of all data
- Prohibit exposure to public AI models

### **2. Desired Capabilities**

While not required, the following are considered valuable:

- Automated reporting
- Data analytics
- Compliance monitoring tools