

Question and Answer Set #4

Q#	Section/ Document(s)	Page #	Question/Request for Change	Bidder's Rationale for Change Request	Answer
1.	N/A	N/A	Given the additional information released, we kindly request an extension of at least 4 weeks to the current response deadline. This additional time would allow our team to carefully review the updates and prepare a thorough and well-considered response. We understand the State is working within its own timelines and appreciate your consideration of our request.	N/A	See revisions in EDD RFP 3475 for Salesforce M&O, Addendum 5, Part 1, Section 2.3. Key Action Dates.
2.	N/A	N/A	Vendors are awaiting pricing from Salesforce which is anticipated to be sometime next week. This coordination with Salesforce will impact all vendors and their ability to submit the Cost Worksheet. Could you please let us know if the State would be able to extend the submission due date by an additional one (1) week?	N/A	See revisions in EDD RFP 3475 for Salesforce M&O, Addendum 5, Part 1, Section 2.3. Key Action Dates.
3.	N/A	N/A	We are thrilled at the opportunity to respond to EDD RFP 3475 for Salesforce Maintenance and Operations Support. We're working alongside Salesforce on a licensing option that brings more value to the State and	N/A	See revisions in EDD RFP 3475 for Salesforce M&O, Addendum 5, Part 1, Section 2.3. Key Action Dates.

Question and Answer Set #4

			would like to request additional time to reflect pricing into our response. Would the State consider a two-week extension to the submission deadline?		
4.	ATTACHMENT 16: NARRATIVE RESPONSE	156	The RFP requires respondents to discuss six narrative areas and address: Explanation of responsibilities and/or objective(s) in the situation; A detailed description of the steps and strategies the bidder used to address the situation; Risks and challenges in addressing the situation and, Impacts and lessons learned, if any. Providing the requested level of detail to gain all the evaluation points within only 20 pages, on average, to fully articulate our defined processes for each topic is extremely challenging. Can the page count be increased to 160 pages.	This change allows us to more thoroughly provide the requested details in response to the questions posed by EDD.	The State has reviewed and considered this request, and no change will be made.
5.	2.3. Key Action Dates	Page 18	In order to allow bidders to revise their approach and pricing, per the Q&A sets 1, 2 and 3 and subsequent addendums: Will EDD consider extending the RFP due date from the current due date of 26th	The addendums and Q&A clarifications impact licensing assumptions, cost workbook, and contractual obligations. Additional time would allow bidders to update their response approaches, coordinate with licensing partners, and submit comprehensive, accurate, and	See revisions in EDD RFP 3475 for Salesforce M&O, Addendum 5, Part 1, Section 2.3. Key Action Dates.

Question and Answer Set #4

			August 2026 to at least 18 September 2026?	competitive proposals that fully reflect EDD's clarified requirements and maximize the State's opportunity to receive the highest-quality proposals.	
6.	01._EDD_RFP_3475 _for_Salesforce_M_ O__Addendum_2 Section 31 of the SOW in the RFP	Page 226	We observed a change to the language of section 31. Liquidated Damages in Addendum 2. Will EDD reconsider the revisions to Section 31, Liquidated Damages, in Addendum 2, and update to reinstate the aggregate cap on Liquidated Damages, not to exceed 10% of the total Agreement? To further reduce costs to the State while aligning with the stated intent of the LDs and similar California contracts, we would further request a monthly cap of no more than 10% of the associated month's M&O deliverable value.	The revisions to Section 31 appear to significantly alter the practical effect of the Liquidated Damages limitation. As currently written, each SLA failure may be treated as a separate incident subject to damages of up to 10% of the total contract value. Because multiple SLA measurements and multiple SLA categories may occur throughout the contract term, the cumulative exposure could exceed the total contract value, effectively eliminating any meaningful aggregate cap on Liquidated Damages. This creates substantial uncertainty regarding vendors' maximum financial exposure and their ability to accurately assess risk and develop pricing. The change may reduce competition by discouraging participation from otherwise qualified bidders that are unable to accept potentially unlimited liability exposure. It may also increase costs to the State, as vendors that do bid will need to incorporate significant risk premiums into their pricing.	The State has reviewed and considered this request, and no change will be made.