

Mississippi State University
Request for Proposals (RFP) 2026051
Planning, Design & Construction Project Management Software System

Questions and Answers

March 23, 2026

See below the questions asked and answered for RFP 2026051 and use this information to respond accordingly. Please note that we are extending the opening date for this RFP.

Responses will now be due no later than 2:00 CST on April 7, 2026.

1. Does MSU have an existing Ellucian Ethos integration layer deployed, or will the selected vendor be responsible for establishing the Ethos connection from scratch? **MSU does have an Ethos integration layer deployed.**
2. Is direct Banner database access (Oracle) an acceptable alternative if Ethos is not yet configured? **Direct database access would not be appropriate at this point in time.**
3. For the AiM AssetWorks integration, what specific data objects and fields does MSU expect to be transferred at project closeout (e.g., asset IDs, equipment records, warranty documents, O&M manuals)? **We would be interested in all those things. We're not sure it would need to be an integration but instead more of an export so that the information can be imported into AiM.**
4. Is there an existing AiM API or data export specification available for vendor reference?
Yes
5. For the Jaggaer / Bully Buy integration, is MSU seeking a real-time bi-directional data sync, or a document/metadata linkage (e.g., reference to executed contract records)? **We're not aware of a reason for a bi-directional data sync with Jaggaer. There is a need to update records in the PMIS software with information from Jaggaer.**
6. Which Jaggaer modules are in scope, for example eProcurement only, Contracts only, or both? **Both**
7. Is a pre-built, out-of-the-box integration required for Bluebeam Studio, or will an API-based integration be acceptable? **Pre-Built out-of-the-box should work.**

8. Will MSU provide access to a Bluebeam Studio sandbox environment for integration testing during implementation? **No**
9. For the SharePoint integration, is MSU looking for SharePoint as a primary document repository with the PMIS acting as a metadata and workflow layer, or is SharePoint intended as a secondary/backup storage reference only? **We expect SharePoint to be a secondary/backup storage reference only.**
10. Are there any additional enterprise systems beyond those listed (Banner, Jaggaer, AiM, Power BI, Bluebeam, SharePoint) that the selected PMIS will be expected to integrate with during the initial contract term? **No**
11. Does MSU's SSO environment use CAS, Shibboleth, or both? Is SAML 2.0 or OIDC the preferred federation protocol for vendor SSO integration? **CAS SAML 2.0**
12. Will MSU require the vendor to complete MSU's own internal IT security review process as a condition of contract award, and if so, can that documentation be shared in advance? **Yes and we'll share as needed after opening the RFP.**
13. When MSU states "unlimited users," does this include all external participants — architects, engineers, general contractors, subcontractors, and specialty consultants without additional per-user or per-seat charges? **Yes**
14. Does MSU anticipate a specific number of named internal users (PDCA staff) at go-live? This is for planning purposes only and will not affect the unlimited user pricing requirement. **Plan on 25**
15. Will external vendors (designers, contractors) access the PMIS through the same licensed environment, or does MSU anticipate a separate external/guest access tier? **Probably separate**
16. For the owner-managed public bidding requirement: does MSU require the PMIS to integrate with or replace the existing Plan House bidding process, or simply coexist with it? **Plan House process will remain for Capital Projects**
17. What is the expected role of the PMIS in the public solicitation workflow? **PMIS could be used for smaller, non-capital projects that are constructed "in house" when MSU acts as their own G.C.**

18. For asset management, does MSU require assets to exist as independent, first-class records within the PMIS (with their own persistent IDs and history independent of any project), or is project-linked asset data capture at closeout sufficient for the initial implementation?
Project-linked asset data capture at closeout is sufficient
19. For the schedule management requirement, does MSU require native Gantt scheduling within the PMIS, or is integration/import from an external scheduling tool (MS Project, Primavera P6) sufficient for owner-side oversight? **External**
20. The RFP references AutoCAD integration for space and asset data consistency. Is this a required integration at contract start, or a future-phase item? **Future phase**
21. What specific data exchange is expected between AutoCAD and the PMIS? **At this time it would primarily be for space management purposes**
22. For electronic signatures, does MSU have an existing enterprise agreement with Adobe Sign or DocuSign that the PMIS must integrate with, or is the vendor expected to provide e-signature capability independently? **MSU uses AdobeSign**
23. Approximately how many active in-progress projects are currently tracked in Excel workbooks that will need to be onboarded into the PMIS at go-live? **Approx. 50**
24. The RFP references pricing per 50 projects, is this the expected scale? **Yes**
25. Does MSU have a preferred go-live date within the July 2026 contract start, or is a phased go-live acceptable (e.g., core modules first, integrations in a second phase)? **Open to phased**
26. Will MSU provide a dedicated internal project team and system administrator for the implementation, or is the vendor expected to provide more comprehensive hands-on configuration support beyond the stated training sessions? **Vendor provided**
27. For historical/closed project data: while the RFP states a full historical conversion is not required, does MSU anticipate any need to reference or report on closed project data from within the new PMIS? **Perhaps in the future**
28. The RFP requires 10 validation scenario videos to be ready by the proposal due date of March 31. Will videos be submitted simultaneously with the written proposal via Bully Buy, or will MSU contact vendors separately after proposals are opened to request the video links/files? **MSU will contact vendors separately after proposals are opened to request the**

video links/files, but links/files must be ready upon request.

29. For the requirements workbook, are vendors expected to provide effort estimates in total hours for the full enablement of each requirement, or only for requirements classified as B, C, or D? **Yes – each requirement**
30. Is there a maximum file size or format restriction for proposal submissions via the Bully Buy portal? **There is no format restriction however we prefer pdf. For file size the max is 19 KB.**
31. Does MSU anticipate conducting vendor interviews or presentations as part of the evaluation process, and if so, what is the anticipated timeline relative to the May 31 award date? **See Page 25, Section Seven. Timeline is currently unknown.**
32. Are vendors permitted to propose alternative or phased approaches to optional services (e.g., a phased integration roadmap), or must all optional services be fully scoped and priced as complete deliverables? **Phased is an option**
33. Given the scope of response (including video's), will MSU consider a postponement of response due date? With only 5 business days between question responses and response due date, we will likely need more time to refine our response. **Yes, we have extended the opening date to April 7, 2026 at 2:00 p.m.**
34. Clarify that electronic submissions for responses are acceptable via Bully Buy and no paper submission would be required. How do we access Bully Buy System? **Yes, responding just in Bully Buy is fine. If you did not receive an invitation to register in Bully Buy, send an email to Jennifer Mayfield, jmayfield@procurement.msstate.edu asking for an invitation.**
35. Confirm demo videos should NOT be submitted with response due on Mar 31. **Correct. We will contact you after the opening time asking for your videos.**
36. Was a consultant engaged to build RFP? If so, which one? **Yes. We partnered with OnIndus to draft the RFP.**
37. Has MSU interviewed any vendors for this type of solution in the last 2 years? If so, which ones? **N/A**
38. Capability Classification and Solution Enablement Effort (pg 4) – does MSU have a preferred approach, in general? I.e., configurable with certain limitation or customize all aspects with no limitations? **No preference. List capabilities**

39. Workflows – how are these requirements addressed in the current environment? Can MSU provide a list of expected workflows to be configured? Include example of “conditional” logic expected. **Workflows will be provided upon vendor selection**
40. Provide examples of “sub-projects” for clarity. Is this a phase breakdown within a project such as Design, Bid, Contract, Build, Close-Out? Or segmentation of a project deliverable (final drawings, framing, plumbing, electrical, finish out, FFE, etc.)? **Both**
41. Elaborate on how AssetWorks is populated with asset data in today’s process and environment. Once an asset is profiled in AssetWorks, describe use cases of how Project Management System will need to interact and why. **We are tracking building Assets for preventive maintenance and long-range strategic facility planning and capital budgeting based on asset condition and lifecycle data. After Assets are identified during a project in the PMIS system and exported to AIM, there will not be a need to track assets in the PMIS system.**
42. For integration, does MSU prefer flat file exchanges or API based interaction? **We are well versed in both.**
43. Does MSU expect vendors to provide external systems (Banner, AssetWorks) development services to complete the integration? Or will MSU provide those services working in tandem with vendor? **MSU will provide those services working in tandem**
44. Recorded Demo Video: Confirm max per scenario is 15 minutes and confirm a scenario is outlined by numbered topics in RFP. I.e, “1. Workflow Configuration” **Confirmed**
45. As these videos are provided upon request, is it MSU’s plan to only request such from a shortlist of vendors participating? Will this shortlist be determined by written responses to functional requirements or from the overall proposal? **Videos need to be ready to the day the proposal is due.**
46. Does MSU prefer multi-tenant cloud services or a private cloud? **Multi-tenant cloud services**
47. What other cloud environments are in use at MSU? **Jaggaer E-Procurement**
48. Confirm all 3 Security Certifications are needed: SOC 2, HECVAT and penetration test. Some of these overlap to some degree. **Confirmed**

49. For migration, does MSU expect an automated approach or can vendors propose using import utilities to “build” these projects in the new platform? **For migration of existing projects we would use any tools available to us to get the project data loaded into the new platform.**

50. On pg 20, the table at the top does not correlate with preceding section (reports). It appears to be about Training services expected. Please confirm. **The following verbiage was left out of the RFP draft. This would be Section K, at the top of page 20 before the table:**

K. Training

The team will adopt a train-the-trainer approach, with the client's Facilities IT team being trained as trainers in addition to the following end-user training being executed by the implementation partner

51. If table is Training deliverables, please clarify column heading “Quantity of Sessions”. Should this represent the number of attendees for each class “Type”. As these seem specifics, how did MSU determine the structure and quantity for these training events?
Estimate

52. As MSU is asking for services to be priced separately, will there be a separate RFP issued for that purchase? Has MSU already contracted for these types of services with a Service Only Vendor? If so, which vendor? **There will not be a separate RFP. We’re asking for you to break your price out so we can decide which services we’d like to use. We do not want one total price submitted without seeing the price for all the various parts.**

53. What is the expectation for implementation timing? From contract sign to “go live” production use? **6-9 months**

54. Integration Options on Pricing – if these options are a blend of software licenses and implementation services, how should these be defined? Does MSU expect Vendor to provide a full turn-key integration with each 3rd party system. Without specific details on data mapping, turn-key quote will be difficult. **Provide estimate for potential integration with each.**

55. Has a budget been defined and approved for this purchase? If so, to what degree? Software only or with services included? **We don’t provide budget information**

56. For Section 9 – PCI Compliance: clarify this is included for payments to vendor from MSU? Confirm the system does NOT need to process payments using one of these PCI standards.
Not applicable to this project
57. We recognize MSU has asked for unlimited users. Can you provide guidance on the number of users expected for both internal (employee) and external (contractors, etc.) communities involved in these projects on a concurrent basis. **Internal could start at 20, and grow to 30-40. External ebbs and flows with projects. We do not anticipate external users to include subcontractors and suppliers.**
58. Per the Requirements Worksheet: Req #13 – doesn't AssetWorks record Maintenance and replacement cost projections? If so, why would these elements be duplicated in PMIS? **N/A**
59. Req #15 – if invoice references line items spanning multiple funding sources, how that impact the workflow for approvals? **Different funding sources and amounts could trigger different approval workflows**
60. Other/Roadmap – detailed information can only be disclosed with a MNDA due to confidential nature. Should we describe our roadmap process but defer details on major product enhancements until we are down-selected as a finalist and put MNDA in place?
General roadmap process information is fine for now.
61. How is this new RFP related to your RFP 25-40 for Facilities Management Software System last year? **The RFP last year was canceled for technical reasons before it was awarded. This is a replacement of that RFP.**
62. Can you confirm the vendor who won RFP 25-40 and what software solution they are implementing? **N/A**
63. How successfully has the implementation proceeded on RFP 25-40? **N/A**
64. Is the requested solution for this new RFP 2026051 intended to integrate with the solution being implemented for RFP 25-40? **N/A**
65. Would MSU accept a proposal from a single prime bidder with integrated software solutions from more than one vendor? **No**
66. Would MSU extend the submission deadline to 5/1/26? **No, but we have extended to April 7, 2026.**
67. Has MSU received any demonstrations of solutions? If so, which ones? **N/A**

68. While we understand you need unlimited users, can you provide a number of users (internal vs. external)? Approximately how many of each. **N/A – please use unlimited number of users as a default**
69. What is the yearly capital spend (construction budget) for MSU? **This varies based on several factors, such as legislative appropriations, but is typically around \$50,000,000 a year.**
70. Can you confirm the data for bi-directional integration has not been fully defined/scoped at this time- correct? **Confirmed**
71. Can the pricing for integration services be a range of costs? **Yes as long as the range is well defined**
72. For the videos, are you expecting one video for all scenarios or a video for each scenario? **1 video per scenario**
73. At the bottom of section J, is the cadence the training schedule? **Estimated training schedule**
74. Can you describe the ongoing yearly support requirements? **N/A**
75. During the past year, has PDCA received any formal product demonstrations? If so, could you provide information on the demonstrated software and the vendors involved? **N/A**
76. Can PDCA verify the total number of internal users vs external users that need access to the system? We understand PDCA is looking for an unlimited user modal, but what is an estimated user count? (10 internal? 100, 1000?) **See question 57**
77. For video demos, please confirm that we do not need to send them in on a thumb drive but should be ready to send another way only once requested? **Confirmed**
78. Please confirm that PDCA is looking for four different 10-15 videos. (Video 1. Foundation & Control (How MSU sets the system up), 2. Core Execution (How MSU runs projects), 3. Lifecycle & Change (How the system holds up over time), 4. Operations & Reality (How people actually live in it)) **Wrong – PDCA is looking for 10 videos. One each for scenarios 1-10 listed on Pages 6-12**

79. Does page 26 of the RFP document give the option to submit electronically via Bully Buy OR submit via mail carrier? If Bully Buy is an option, do you have instructions for that? **See Question 34**
80. For the integrations, does PDCA have well-documented expected data flows including transformation rules, triggering events, error cases, etc. or will that be part of a discovery process after the a vendor is selected? **Discovery process after vendor selection**
81. Is there a recommended process for redacting sensitive information from our response? **See Page 30, Section 15**
82. Given the scope of the required validation scenario videos, would MSU consider extending the proposal deadline to allow adequate preparation time? **See question 33**
83. To help us provide accurate pricing for the enterprise site license as well as implementation and training services, could you please provide an estimated number of internal university users and external collaborators (consultants, contractors, etc.) expected to access the system? **See question 57**