Request for Information (RFI)
The Department of Veterans (VA)
Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP)
VA-26-000769

1. Introduction:

This RFI is for planning purposes only and shall not be considered an Invitation for Bid, Request for Task Execution Plan, Request for Quotation or a Request for Proposal. Additionally, there is no obligation on the part of the Government to acquire any products or services described in this RFI. Your response to this RFI will be treated only as information for the Government to consider. You will not be entitled to payment for direct or indirect costs that you incur in responding to this RFI. This request does not constitute a solicitation for proposals or the authority to enter into negotiations to award a contract. No funds have been authorized, appropriated or received for this effort. Interested parties are responsible for adequately marking proprietary, restricted or competition sensitive information contained in their response. The Government does not intend to pay for the information submitted in response to this RFI.
The North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) for this requirement is 541519.
Please reference previous RFI 36C10B26Q0585.

2. Background:

The VA, Office of Information and Technology (OIT), Infrastructure Operations (IO) Enterprise Service Management (ESM) requires the acquisition of cloud-based ERP solution delivered via a multi-instance Platform-as-a-Service (PaaS) and Software-as-a-Service (SaaS) subscription model. The Government requires a fully integrated enterprise operating model in which the Contractor served as Enterprise System Integrator, is accountable for the service delivery, performance, reliability, maintainability, scalability, supportability, and continuous improvement of the enterprise platform and associated enterprise services.

VA seeks a next-generation solution with capabilities spanning ITSM, IT Asset Management (ITAM), IT Operations Management (ITOM), IT Business Management (ITBM), and other service domains, delivered by a single enterprise System Integrator accountable for the platform and all associated services.

VA is releasing draft Performance Work Statement (PWS) and Service Level Agreement (SLA) with this RFI to solicit industry feedback on the technical requirements, performance standards, and contract structure. Also attached is information regarding current usage metrics and subscription data. Respondents are strongly encouraged to review and comment on those documents as part of their response.

3. Submittal Information:

Respondents are asked to provide information addressing each of the following areas. VA is seeking substantive, specific feedback not marketing materials. Responses should be organized by section number as listed below. **NO MARKETING MATERIALS ARE ALLOWED AS PART OF THIS RFI.** Generic capability statements will not be accepted or reviewed. Your response must include the following:

a. Provide the following information in the initial paragraph of the submission:

1. Name of Company:
2. Address:
3. Point of Contact:
4. Phone Number:
5. Email address:
6. Socioeconomic data:
   - Company Business Size and Status (For VOSB and SDVOSBs, proof of verification in VetCert):
7. Unique Entity ID:
8. Do you anticipate performing as a prime contractor, subcontractor, or as part of a joint venture:
9. Your company's intent and ability to meet the set aside requirement in accordance with VAAR 852.219-73 VA Notice of Total Set-Aside for Verified Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Businesses and 13 CFR §125.6, which states the contractor will not pay more than 50 percent of the amount paid by the Government to it to firms that are not SDVOSBs.

b. Provide a brief capability statement (no more than12 pages) that addresses:

1. Your firm's relevant experience delivering enterprise service management platforms at federal agency scale, with specific reference to deployments comparable in size and complexity to this requirement (600,000+ users, multi-instance architecture, FedRAMP High environment).
2. Your experience serving as a prime system integrator accountable for platform delivery, migration, and sustained operations, not solely as a software publisher or reseller.
3. Your relationship to the platform OEM, if applicable. Ability to meet solution requirements identified below
4. If you are a small business, describe how your team would address the full scope of the base requirement, including platform licensing, migration, operations, and sustainment.
5. Provide your Federal Risk and Authorization Management Program (FedRAMP high) certification status and risk level.

c. Identify existing Government-wide Acquisition Contracts (GWACs, GSA Multiple Award Schedule (MAS)), or other existing contract mechanisms through which this requirement could be competed. For each vehicle identified, provide:

1. Contract vehicle:
2. Contract number:
3. Does your firm hold a current contract under that vehicle:
4. Any limitations of that vehicle for this type of requirement (e.g., scope, ceiling, labor category restrictions, socioeconomic eligibility):

5. How would you propose to meet all the PWS requirements (SI +PaaS/SaaS subscriptions) if utilizing GSA MAS?

d. Provide feedback on the draft PWS and SLAs.
   1. Provide comments on the draft PWS requirements, scope, structure, and feasibility, and identify any requirements that are ambiguous, duplicative, unreasonable, or that may limit competition. Suggest additions or modifications that would better align the PWS with industry standards and best practices for an enterprise System Integrator delivery model.
   2. Identify any specific PWS sections that are currently worded or phrased in a manner that serves as a cost driver or increases risk and provide suggested adjustments or requested changes that would reduce risk and lower associated cost drivers.
   3. Provide feedback on the proposed SLA targets, acceptable quality levels, and performance standards in the draft PWS. Identify any metrics that are not measurable, unrealistic, or missing.

e. Provide feedback on licensing models.
   1. What licensing model would you recommend that provides VA with cost predictability, scalability, and transparency consistent with the intent described in the PWS?
   2. Are the licensing transparency and optimization requirements in Section 5.2.3 compatible with the licensing model you would propose?
   3. Provide how you would reduce licensing in the out years if usage drops.

f. Provide a Rought Order of Magnitude (ROM) for the full scope of base and optional services described in the PWS, broken out by base period and option periods/optional tasks to the extent possible. See ROM Template Attached.
   1. Identify factors that most significantly drive cost for this type of requirement to inform where requirements decisions have the most significant impact on pricing.

Responses are due no later than 3PM EST, July 13th, 2026 via email to John A Adamitis, Contract Specialist at john.adamitis1@va.gov, Christina Balacco, Contract Specialist at christina.balacco@va.gov and Heather Utt, Contracting Officer at heather.utt@va.gov. Please note "ERP SI" in the subject line) of your response. Mark your response as "Proprietary Information" if the information is considered business sensitive.