2360 Congress Street
Portland, ME 04102
207 871 7771
maineturnpike.com

October 30, 2026

Addendum No. 1
Finance & Accounting ERP System Implementation Consultant Request for Proposal.

Questions	Answers
1. Is MTA planning on using NetSuite to perform the implementation, and so the consultant you are looking to hire will help MTA manage the process?	1. Yes, NetSuite will perform the implementation. The consultant will help MTA manage the process.
2. Has Oracle NetSuite for Governments been formally selected and contracted, or is the acquisition still being finalized?	2. Yes, Oracle NetSuite for Governments has been formally selected. The contract negotiations are in progress.
3. Will the NetSuite implementation partner be responsible for technical configuration, integrations, and platform deployment, with the selected consultant providing independent financial, operational, and project implementation oversight?	3. The selected consultant is expected to provide independent financial, operational, and project implementation oversight.
4. Is the selected consultant expected to perform hands-on financial data cleansing, chart-of-accounts mapping, reconciliation, conversion validation, and accounting process implementation, or primarily coordinate and oversee those activities?	4. Primarily coordinate and oversee those activities.
5. Which existing accounting and financial systems are being replaced, and approximately how many years of historical transaction data are expected to be converted?	5. Epicor Enterprise is the existing accounting and financial system being replaced. At least 3 years of historical transaction data are expected to be converted. We are open to discussing best practices.

Michael J. Cianchette | Falmouth, Chairman
Jane L. Lincoln | Farmingdale, Vice Chair
Emily N. Becker | Poland
Nina A. Fisher | Farmingdale
William Benson | Gorham
Thomas J. Zuke | Saco
Dale F. Doughty | MaineDOT Ex-Officio

Andre J. Briere, USAF (ret) | Executive Director
John P. Sirois | Chief Financial Officer & Treasurer
Erin T. Sullivan | Chief Administrative Officer
John W. Cannell, P.E. | Chief Operations Officer
Kristi M. Van Ooyen, P.E. | Chief Engineer
Jonathan A. Arey | Secretary & General Counsel

6. Does the Authority anticipate implementing all financial modules simultaneously, or will deployment occur in phases?

6. Each module will be developed in phases. Deployment will occur all at once.

7. Which modules are included in the initial implementation, including general ledger, accounts payable, accounts receivable, purchasing, fixed assets, budgeting, grants, project accounting, and financial reporting?

7. General ledger, accounts payable, accounts receivable, purchasing, fixed assets, budgeting, project accounting, cash management, contract management, inventory, and financial reporting.

8. Are toll collection, E-ZPass, banking, payroll, procurement, asset management, or other operational systems expected to integrate with NetSuite?

8. Banking and procurement are expected to integrate. Toll collection and E-ZPass are not expected to be integrated. Other operational systems integration with NetSuite is to be determined.

9. Will the Authority provide dedicated internal accounting, finance, IT, and operational subject-matter experts throughout implementation?

9. Yes.

10. Is the consultant expected to develop training materials and deliver employee training directly, or coordinate training provided by the NetSuite implementation partner?

10. The consultant is expected to coordinate training provided by the NetSuite implementation partner.

11. What level of post-go-live stabilization and hypercare support does the Authority anticipate?

11. Low to Moderate

12. Does the Authority have a target project kickoff date and planned go-live date?

12. First quarter of 2027 is our target project kickoff date. Go-live is 9-12 months after that.

13. Is a hybrid delivery model acceptable, combining remote project execution with scheduled on-site visits for workshops, testing, training, and deployment?

13. Yes.

14. Does the Authority anticipate a full-time on-site project manager, or may the proposed staffing model vary by implementation phase and workload?

14. A variable staffing model dictated by implementation phase and workload is acceptable.

15. How will responsibilities and final decision-making authority be allocated among the Authority, NetSuite implementation partner, and selected consultant?	15. MTA has 100% of the final decision-making authority.
16. May a bidder present directly relevant ERP implementations personally led by its proposed project executive while employed by other organizations, provided that the individual's role and the contracting entities are clearly disclosed?	16. Yes.
17. The RFP requests at least three client references. May references from the proposed project executive's prior employment be accepted when those references can independently verify the individual's implementation work?	17. Yes.
18. Does the Authority prefer a fixed-fee engagement, time-and-materials pricing, or a hybrid structure with defined phase deliverables and separately priced optional services?	18. A hybrid structure with defined phase deliverables and separately priced optional services is preferred.
19. Is there a maximum proposal page count or prescribed formatting beyond the listed required sections?	19. No.
20. The proposal deadline is listed as 11:59 a.m. on November 6, 2026, while the subsequent paragraph references 11:59 p.m. Would the Authority please confirm the controlling submission deadline?	20. 11:59 a.m. on November 6, 2026.
21. Does the Maine Turnpike Authority require bidders to complete vendor registration, prequalification, or any other administrative process before submitting a proposal? Alternatively, are vendor onboarding requirements completed following selection and prior to contract execution?	21. No. Vendor onboarding requirements are completed with contract execution.
22. Whether the engagement permits primarily remote advisory delivery with scheduled onsite workshops.	22. Yes.
23. Whether the selected consultant must provide hands-on Oracle NetSuite	23. The selected consultant will advise the MTA on Oracle NetSuite configuration.

configuration or may serve as the independent owner-side implementation and governance advisor.

24. The anticipated project duration and expected level of onsite participation.

24. 9 to 12 months duration. Onsite participation as needed.

25. The RFP states, "The selected consultant will provide advisory and implementation support throughout the ERP lifecycle." Does MTA already have, or plan to engage, a separate professional services firm to lead the implementation and perform the following activities?

    - Overall project management
    - Solution design
    - Configuration
    - Data migration
    - Interface development
    - Security and role design and configuration
    - Report development
    - Testing (unit, system, integration, and end-to-end)
    - Issue management
    - Risk management

    Or will the ERP System Implementation Consultant be responsible for some or all of these activities? If responsibilities will be shared, please clarify how they will be divided.

25. The selected consultant is expected to provide advisory support with overall project management, solution design, and testing.

26. **Delivery accountability:** Will the selected consultant serve as MTA's independent advisor, a co-delivery partner alongside NetSuite's implementation partner, or the accountable implementation lead for configuration, data migration, integrations, and go-live?

26. The selected consultant serves as MTA's independent advisor.

27. **Legacy systems and integrations:** Can MTA share the current finance/accounting systems being replaced, approximate data volumes, integration inventory, reporting

27. Epicor Enterprise is the finance/accounting system being replaced; refer to question 50 for transaction volume. For reporting dependencies: General Ledger (GL) Close Dependencies are Subledger close (AP, AR,

dependencies, and known data-quality issues?

Fixed Assets), journal entry approvals, etc. Financial reporting with GAAP compliance: Budget vs. Actual, Company Trial Balance.

28. **Go-live success measures:** Which outcomes are non-negotiable at go-live for example, month-end close, fund accounting, procurement controls, toll-revenue reconciliation, fixed assets, grants/projects, or audit-ready reporting?

28. All of the above.

29. **Timeline and phasing:** Does MTA have a target go-live date or fiscal-year deadline? Should implementation follow a single cutover or a phased sequence?

29. Target go-live date is expected 9 to 12 months after implementation begins. The Authority is on a calendar year reporting cycle, but a January 1 go-live date is preferred but not required.

30. **External integrations:** Which systems must integrate with NetSuite such as tolling/revenue, banking/treasury, procurement, HR/payroll, fixed assets, budgeting, or reporting/BI platforms and what transaction volumes or reconciliation requirements apply?

30. Banking/treasury, procurement, fixed assets, budgeting, and reporting/BI platforms.

31. **Change readiness:** Which MTA teams will participate in design, testing, training, and adoption, and what internal capacity or change-management constraints should the implementation plan assume?

31. Yes, MTA teams will participate in design, testing, training, and adoption. This will be all hands-on deck for the finance and accounting department. We do not anticipate delays due to internal capacity or managerial changes.

32. Will the selected consultant also be responsible for configuring NetSuite, or will Oracle NetSuite (or another implementation partner) perform configuration while the consultant provides advisory, oversight and project management support?

32. Oracle will perform configuration and consultant will perform oversight/advisory and PM support.

33. If Oracle NetSuite or another partner is already engaged for configuration, can MTA share that party's statement of work,

33. MTA will share Oracle's SOW when it is available.

methodology and timeline so our approach can complement it without duplication?

34. The project scope lists Phases 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 8. Is a Phase 4 missing, and if so, what activities does it cover?

34. Phase 4 is not missing. The numbering skip was a clerical error.

35. For testing and training (Phases 6 and 7), should the consultant author the test scripts, training materials and user guides, or review and approve materials produced by MTA or the configuring partner?

35. NetSuite will provide training. The implementation consultant will help test configuration and functionality of the modules configured by NetSuite.

36. What hypercare duration does MTA expect after go-live (e.g., 30, 60 or 90 days), and should a first month-end and year-end close be supported?

36. 90 days.

37. Should bidders include an optional post-go-live managed services or ongoing support agreement? If so, what is the desired duration (e.g., 12 months), and what support levels or service hours does MTA expect (e.g., administrator support, enhancements, release management)?

37. Post-live support for 3 months on an as-needed basis.

38. What are the main drivers behind MTA's decision to replace its current finance systems (e.g., end of support, manual workarounds, reporting gaps, audit findings, integration issues)?

38. The current system is significantly outdated and no longer meets organizational needs. Its reporting tool is no longer supported by Microsoft, and Epicor now provides only limited maintenance and software updates

39. Can MTA share a list of the main pain points with its current finance systems and processes, ideally by process area (e.g., month-end close, AP, procurement, revenue reconciliation, fixed assets, budgeting, reporting), including any manual workarounds, spreadsheets or audit findings?

39. AP, procurement, contract management, inventory, Fixed Assets, treasury management (Excel), Budgeting (Excel) & financial reporting. A paper dependent on current process. There have not been audit findings.

40. Please share the NetSuite Bill of Materials (order form or quote) showing the edition, service tier, user counts, licensed modules

40. This not yet available.

(e.g., GL, AP, AR, Purchasing, Fixed Assets, Budgeting, Grants, Projects, SuitePeople/Payroll, Planning and Budgeting), sandbox accounts, and any Oracle NetSuite professional services (e.g., SuiteSuccess, ACS) included.

41. Beyond core financials, will any additional NetSuite modules or capabilities be required, either now or in a later phase? For example: maintenance and work order management, advanced procurement, inventory management, critical spare parts tracking, manufacturing, construction in progress (CIP) tracking for capital projects, and advanced revenue recognition.

41. Undecided at this time.

42. Is payroll, HR and timekeeping in scope for NetSuite, or will those remain in current systems and integrate to the GL?

42. No.

43. How many NetSuite users are expected by role (finance and accounting staff, approvers, requisitioners, employee self-service)?

43. 13-20 daily users. Additional users will be included as part of workflow activities. Specific roles will be defined during the solution design phase.

44. How many sandbox or development accounts has MTA licensed?

44. None yet.

45. Can MTA provide its current-state system landscape and process/data flow (diagrams or a list of systems, owners and how data moves between them)?

45. No, these are not available.

46. Which current systems are being replaced (vendor and version for general ledger, AP, purchasing, budgeting, fixed assets, payroll), and which will remain in place?

46. All existing Epicor Enterprise modules. General ledger, financial reporting, purchasing, accounts payable.

47. What is MTA's current annual license and support cost for the systems being replaced?

47. $69,000.

48. Which integrations are expected in scope, and what is MTA's desired future-state system landscape? Please list all peripheral or satellite systems that will remain (for example: toll back-office and E-ZPass revenue, banking and investment feeds, payroll/timekeeping, asset management such as Bentley AssetWise, fuel and inventory, and any reporting to MaineDOT), and for each, indicate whether it should integrate with NetSuite and the preferred integration method (real-time API, scheduled file/flat-file import, middleware, or manual upload).

48. Toll back-office, E-ZPass revenue, payroll/timekeeping are all currently added as a journal entry. We would like direct interfaces into the GL.

49. What is MTA's expectation for data migration: number of years of history, whether history should come over as trial balance movements only or as detailed transactions, and how open items should be handled?

49. We would like to transfer at least 3 years of data as detailed transactions

50. To help size data migration and system design, please provide: (a) the number of transactions in the current system over the past 12 months by transaction type (e.g., customer invoices, vendor invoices/bills, purchase orders, payments, journal entries); and (b) the number of records in each master data register (employees, items/products/SKUs, vendors, customers, fixed assets, leases).

50. Jan 1 to Dec 31, 2025, we had the following volume of transactions: AP – 3,919, GL JEs – 1,103, and POs- 1,103

51. Who will be responsible for extracting and cleansing legacy data and building integrations: MTA IT staff, the consultant, or the configuring partner?

51. MTA and the consulting company will collaborate on it.

52. Does MTA have an existing integration platform or middleware, and what internal IT resources will be available to the project?

52. MTA could integrate using its own IT resources as needed.

53. Which business processes are in scope? For example: general ledger, accounts payable, accounts receivable and billing, purchasing/procurement, fixed assets, leases

53. General ledger, accounts payable, billing, purchasing/procurement, fixed assets,

and subscription arrangements (GASB 87/96), cash management and bank reconciliation, inventory, and payroll accounting.	cash management, bank reconciliation, and inventory.
54. Can MTA share its current month-end close checklist, including the tasks, owners, systems used and how many business days the close takes today? Is there a target close timeline for the future state?	54. It takes 21-25 days. Close CIP, FA, AP, and AR independently before closing the GL. We are targeting a 15-day close cycle.
55. How many legal entities or subsidiaries will be set up in NetSuite? Do any of them transact with each other, requiring an intercompany process (e.g., intercompany billing, due to/due from, eliminations)?	55. We currently have one legal entity, but we may expand in the future.
56. Does MTA expect to redesign its chart of accounts and fund structure (e.g., Revenue, Operating, Reserve Maintenance, Debt Service and Capital funds) as part of the project?	56. No major changes are anticipated
57. Are capital program cost tracking, infrastructure asset accounting (GASB 34), grants and project accounting in scope?	57. Project accounting and Fixed Assets are in scope.
58. Will budget development, budgetary control and encumbrance accounting be managed in NetSuite?	58. Yes, for Budget. No, for Encumbrances
59. Is a budgeting or FP&A solution (e.g., NetSuite Planning and Budgeting) in scope? Does MTA use an FP&A tool today, and if so, will it remain and integrate with NetSuite?	59. Budgeting and FP&A solution are in scope. The current FP&A system is obsolete. Budget is done in Excel.
60. What are MTA's year-end and external reporting expectations from NetSuite (annual financial statements, bond covenant and Trustee reporting, Legislative reporting)?	60. We plan to use their reporting package to its full potential.
61. Can MTA provide a list of the reports required from the new ERP (financial statements, management and departmental reports,	61. Multiple reports are being distributed; we will discuss their relevance at the time of implementation.

board and Treasurer reports, budget-to-actual, regulatory and Legislative reports, operational and ad hoc reports), including the approximate number of reports produced today, their frequency and audience, and any that are currently prepared manually outside the system?

62. What is MTA's target go-live date, and is there a preference to go live at the start of a fiscal year (January 1)?

62. The target go-live date is expected 9 to 12 months after implementation begins. January 1 go-live is desired, but may not be practical in the timeline.

63. What is the anticipated award date and desired project start date?

63. Anticipated award date: 11/19/2026. Start date 1st quarter 2027.

64. Are there known dependencies or blackout periods (e.g., annual audit, budget and Legislative allocation cycle, toll system upgrade work)?

64. No

65. What are MTA's on-site expectations at the Portland headquarters (e.g., key workshops, UAT, go-live).

65. All integration activities will be conducted at the Portland headquarters, unless otherwise specified.

66. What internal resources will MTA make available, and which tasks will the MTA team perform? We typically expect: an internal project/program manager; accounting, finance and operations staff for discovery and UAT; an IT team that manages enterprise applications; and accounting/finance staff for data extraction, mapping and validation during data migration. Please confirm availability and expected time commitment.

66. This will be all hands on deck for the finance and accounting department. Our IT will assist as needed.

67. What prior experience do MTA's accounting, finance and IT team members have with NetSuite or other cloud ERP systems? Will any team members be designated as NetSuite administrators after go-live?

67. On the Finance side, no experience with NetSuite. Limited experience with other cloud ERP systems.
Yes, MTA will designate administrator (s) after go-live.

68. Should travel expenses be included in a fixed fee or billed at actual cost? Does MTA follow a specific travel reimbursement policy?

68. Reasonable travel exp will be reimbursed by the MTA.For guidance on travel reimbursement policy, review the Compensation and Payments section of the general conditions document found here: https://www.maineturnpike.com/business-with-mta/consultants/general conditions

69. Has MTA established a budget or not-to-exceed amount for these consulting services?

69. No.

70. Does MTA prefer fixed fee by phase, time and materials, or a hybrid? Should payments be tied to deliverable acceptance?

70. MTA will accept fixed-fee pricing for the defined scope and provide hourly rates for optional or out-of-scope services.

71. Can MTA provide its standard consulting services agreement and insurance requirements so bidders can note exceptions in the proposal?

71. Yes, please see “CONSULTANT GENERAL CONDITIONS” and “GENERAL CONSULTANT AGREEMENT” documents published here: https://www.maineturnpike.com/business-with-mta/consultants/erp-implementation-consultant

72. Are there any restrictions on use of offshore resources or on where MTA data may be accessed or stored?

72. Does not apply to this RFP.

73. Part IX.B references a website for amendments but no address is given. Please confirm the URL where amendments and the Q&A summary will be posted.

73. MTA’s web site. https://www.maineturnpike.com/business-with-mta/consultants

74. Must references be public-sector or transportation agencies, or are commercial clients of similar size acceptable?

74. Commercial clients of similar size are acceptable.

75. Does MTA plan oral presentations or demonstrations of finalists? If so, what are the tentative dates? Is the preference for in-person or remote presentation?

75. No.

76. Has MTA executed contracts for the NetSuite subscription and implementation partner? If so, please identify the partner and provide a summary of its scope of services, so proposers can avoid duplicating effort.	76. We are working on the contract.
77. Will the ERP Implementation Consultant participate in Steering Committee meetings and executive governance activities?	77. Yes
78. Given the phased nature of the engagement, does MTA anticipate validating assumptions and priorities at phase transitions to ensure subsequent activities remain aligned with project objectives and implementation realities?	78. Yes
79. Will MTA accept a hybrid delivery model, with onsite presence for key activities (e.g., workshops) and remote delivery for other activities as appropriate? Please also indicate whether MTA staff involved in the project primarily work onsite or in a hybrid arrangement.	79. Yes. MTA's team primarily works on site
80. Part II.A lists the project objectives. Has MTA prioritized these, or identified specific pain points or measurable success criteria (KPIs) it considers most critical to project success?	80. Not at this time
81. Does the module scope in MTA's March 2026 F&A ERP RFP (Accounting, Budget/CIP, Assets, Procurement, Inventory, Payables, Treasury, Dashboards, Expense Management) represent the final implementation scope? Have any modules been added or deferred? Please confirm whether HR/Payroll (ADP) remains outside scope.	81. HR/Payroll remains outside scope. All others are part of the contract negotiation, including contract management.

82. Are there any managed service providers, outsourced support providers, or consulting partners currently supporting Finance, Accounting, Procurement, Budgeting, Reporting, or ERP-related functions?	82. No.
83. Has MTA previously completed a detailed business process assessment or requirements definition effort (e.g., the requirements developed for the F&A ERP RFP)? If so, will this documentation be made available to the selected consultant?	83. No.
84. Several implementation-related deliverables identified in the RFP, such as gap analysis, implementation planning, data migration, integrations, testing, security, and hypercare, are often developed by the implementation partner. Does MTA envision the ERP Implementation Consultant acting as a co-author of these deliverables, or providing independent review, validation, and oversight of work performed by the implementation partner?	84. MTA envisions the ERP Implementation Consultant acting as an independent reviewer, validator, advisor, and oversight of work performed by the implementation partner
85. What level of testing support does MTA expect from the ERP Implementation Consultant during System Integration Testing (SIT), User Acceptance Testing (UAT), and go-live readiness activities, including whether the consultant is expected to author and/or execute test scripts or coordinate UAT executed by MTA staff?	85. MTA expects that the ERP Implementation Consultant coordinates UAT executed by MTA staff.
86. What are the primary success measures MTA will use to evaluate the performance of the ERP Implementation Consultant?	86. The consultant is expected to deliver all agreed-upon project components on time, within scope, and within the approved budget, with minimal variance and clear documentation of any required changes.
87. What is the anticipated contract term, and are extension options contemplated should the go-live date shift?	87. The anticipated contract term should align with 9-12 months for implementation time outlined by the NetSuite proposal plus 3

months of after go-live care. Extension will be negotiated as needed.

88. Will MTA share its standard services contract and insurance requirements?

88. Yes, please see "CONSULTANT GENERAL CONDITIONS" and "GENERAL CONSULTANT AGREEMENT" documents published here: https://www.maineturnpike.com/business-with-mta/consultants/erp-implementation-consultant

89. Is the selected NetSuite implementation partner eligible to submit a proposal in response to this RFP, or does MTA intend for the ERP Implementation Consultant to be a separate firm, independent of the implementation partner?

89. MTA intends for the ERP Implementation Consultant to be a separate firm, independent of the implementation partner.

90. Has MTA previously worked with any consulting firms on ERP strategy or selection for this initiative? If so, will those firms be allowed to bid on this implementation consulting RFP?

90. No.

91. Please provide a high-level description of the current finance and accounting application landscape that Oracle NetSuite for Governments will replace or integrate with (e.g., general ledger, AP, AR, fixed assets, budgeting, procurement, grants, project accounting, timekeeping, etc.).

91. Epicor Enterprise is the system MTA is replacing. Current modules in use include general ledger, AP, and procurement. Sage Premium Depreciation is used for Fixed Assets.

92. Are there any functional areas that are explicitly out of scope for this ERP implementation (e.g., HR/payroll, asset management, maintenance, tolling back-office systems)?

92. Yes, HR/payroll and tolling back-office systems.

93. Approximately how many finance and accounting users, and how many total end users (including non-finance staff) are expected to use the ERP system?

93. 13 accounting users, approximately 20 total users, maybe more once design phase is completed.

94. Which departments beyond Finance (e.g., Procurement, Operations, Engineering, HR, IT) will be materially impacted by the ERP implementation and should be considered in stakeholder engagement and change management planning?	94. The whole entity will be impacted.
95. Does MTA intend to contract separately with an implementation partner / system integrator for Oracle NetSuite for Governments, or is MTA expecting the selected consultant to also configure and implement the ERP directly? Some of the in-scope efforts include reviews of technical implementation work (e.g., solution design review, configuration guidance), but it is unclear who is responsible for the initial technical implementation work.	95. No and no
96. If a separate system integrator will be engaged, has MTA already selected that partner or issued a separate RFP? If not yet selected, what role do you envision this consultant playing in system integrator selection and oversight?	96. N/A. See above answer.
97. Please describe the current systems that will be sources for data migration (e.g., legacy GL, subledgers, Excel-based processes) and any known data quality issues that may affect migration scope and effort.	97. Legacy GL ledger and subledgers.
98. Does MTA have preferred integration tools, middleware, or standards (e.g., existing ESB, API gateway, ETL tools) that the consultant should plan to leverage?	98. We have no preference
99. The pricing section indicates that bidders must provide fixed fees, hourly rates, travel expenses, optional services, assumptions, and a payment schedule. Does MTA have a preferred or recommended pricing structure (e.g., primarily fixed-fee by phase with T&M for optional services), or any expectations regarding how costs should be allocated across phases and deliverables (e.g., caps on	99. MTA will accept fixed-fee pricing for the defined scope and provide hourly rates for optional or out-of-scope services.

travel, limits on optional services, or desired not to exceed amounts)?"

100. Is MTA currently maintaining its accounting records on a cash basis, accrual basis, modified accrual basis, or a combination? Please identify the basis used for statutory reporting, management reporting, and budgeting	100. Accrual basis
101. Does MTA require NetSuite to produce both cash-basis and accrual-basis financial statements?	101. Only accrual-basis financial statements
102. What financial reporting standards and regulatory requirements must the new system support?	102. Governmental GAAP
103. How many separate funds, departments, cost centers, programs, projects, or reporting entities must be maintained?	103. 7 funds, approximately 20 Depts., 1 reporting entity, several projects/programs.
104. Does MTA require interfund or intercompany accounting, allocations, or eliminations?	104. We have interfund transactions which include allocations.
105. How many years of historical financial information are currently maintained?	105. At least 3 years
106. Are all historical financial records reconciled and current?	106. Yes.
107. Are there known outstanding reconciliation differences, unsupported balances, or unresolved accounting issues?	107. No.
108. Does MTA intend to retain its existing chart of accounts or redesign it during implementation?	108. Very few changes are anticipated.
109. Who will be responsible for designing and approving the new chart of accounts?	109. MTA.
110. Will the consultant be expected to develop account mappings between legacy systems and NetSuite?	110. No.
111. Are there existing departmental, project, grant, fund, or cost-center reporting requirements that must be preserved?	111. Yes.
112. Does MTA require consolidated financial reporting across multiple accounting structures?	112. Yes.

113. Will historical account balances need to be restated or reclassified?	113. No.
114. Who will determine and approve accounting policy changes resulting from implementation?	114. MTA.
115. Are there known financial-reporting limitations in the current environment that the new system must resolve?	115. Yes. We have limited flexibility in our current financial model
116. Has Oracle or its implementation provider completed a documented fit-gap assessment?	116. No.
117. Has MTA received a written disclosure of known NetSuite limitations affecting its requirements?	117. No.
118. Are any third-party applications, connectors, or add-ons already included in the planned solution?	118. No.
119. Does the existing NetSuite agreement include all functionality necessary to meet the RFP objectives?	119. MTA & NetSuite are still working on the agreement.
120. Who will be financially responsible if required functionality is unavailable without additional licensing, development, or third-party products?	120. TBD.
121. Will the consultant be expected to identify and document functional gaps before configuration begins?	121. Yes.
122. Is MTA willing to modify business processes to accommodate native NetSuite functionality, or does it anticipate custom development?	122. MTA is willing to modify business processes. No custom development is anticipated.
123. Who has authority to approve additional software costs, changes in functionality, or deviations from the original implementation requirements?	123. MTA.
124. How many vendor invoices does MTA process annually?	124. This question falls outside the scope of the RFP.
125. How many active vendors are maintained in its current systems?	125. This question falls outside the scope of the RFP.

126. What percentage of invoices currently require manual entry or processing?	126. This question falls outside the scope of the RFP.
127. Does MTA require automated invoice capture, validation, coding, and approval routing?	127. Yes
128. Does MTA require two-way or three-way matching among purchase orders, receiving records, and invoices?	128. Three-way matching
129. Has the NetSuite AP functionality been evaluated against MTA's complete invoice-processing requirements?	129. No
130. Are there known transaction-volume limits, workflow restrictions, or other functionality constraints?	130. No.
131. Is the proposed AP automation functionality included in the existing NetSuite agreement, or is an additional product contemplated?	131. Will be included in the upcoming NetSuite agreement.
132. Who will be responsible for resolving AP functionality gaps discovered during implementation?	132. It's expected to be a collaborative effort between NetSuite, MTA, and the consultant.
133. Does MTA require historical vendor-payment analysis, duplicate-payment identification, or reconciliation of outstanding vendor credits?	133. Yes.
134. What accounts receivable activities will be maintained within NetSuite?	134. This question falls outside the scope of the RFP.
135. Will toll revenue be recorded through summarized interfaces, detailed transaction feeds, or another process?	135. Currently with Journal Entries. Hoping for API integration in the near future.
136. Which toll collection and E-ZPass systems must interface with the financial system?	136. None.

137. How many daily or monthly transactions will require reconciliation?	137. This question falls outside the scope of the RFP.
138. Are there existing differences between toll-system activity, settlement records, bank deposits, and general ledger balances?	138. No.
139. Will the consultant be responsible for designing or validating toll-revenue reconciliation procedures?	139. No.
140. How many bank accounts and financial institutions must be integrated or reconciled?	140. This question falls outside the scope of the RFP.
141. Will bank feeds, cash receipts, merchant settlements, and other treasury transactions be automated?	141. As much as possible
142. Are there specific revenue recognition, deferred revenue, or settlement timing requirements?	142. This question falls outside the scope of the RFP.
143. Does MTA require automated identification and reporting of revenue discrepancies?	143. No
144. Are legacy data dictionaries, system documentation, and chart-of-account mappings available?	144. Yes.
145. Does MTA anticipate significant historical data-quality or reconciliation issues?	145. No.
146. Who will determine the authoritative source when financial records conflict?	146. MTA
147. What level of transaction-level reconciliation and validation will be required before acceptance?	147. 100%

148. Will the consultant be responsible for documenting and resolving historical exceptions discovered during migration?

148. The consultant will be responsible for documenting and resolving historical exceptions discovered during migration

149. How many mock conversions and reconciliation cycles are anticipated?

149. 1

150. Who will provide final written approval of converted financial balances and historical records?

150. MTA

151. Please identify all organizations expected to participate in the implementation, including Oracle, software implementation providers, internal IT, and other contractors.

151. MTA, internal IT, NetSuite, and Consultant

152. Who will serve as the primary technical implementation provider?

152. NetSuite

153. Has a detailed responsibility matrix been established among MTA, Oracle, the technical implementer, and the consultant selected under this RFP?

153. No.

154. Will the consultant have authority to direct technical implementation activities, or will its role be advisory and coordination-based?

154. Advisory and coordination-based

155. Who is responsible for NetSuite configuration, customization, integrations, and technical troubleshooting?

155. Co-delivery partnership

156. Who will determine whether a problem constitutes a software defect, implementation deficiency, data issue, or change in requirements?

156. It's expected to be a collaborative effort between NetSuite, MTA, and the consultant.

157. Will the consultant be expected to approve technical deliverables or certify completion of work performed by another contractor?

157. No

158. Can the consultant withhold a recommendation for acceptance or go-live when material financial or operational deficiencies remain unresolved?

158. Yes.

159. What escalation process will apply when the consultant identifies a material problem that the software provider has not corrected?

159. Inform both parties.

160. Does MTA require formal parallel processing between legacy financial systems and NetSuite?

160. No.

161. Who will establish financial reconciliation tolerances and acceptance criteria?

161. MTA

162. Will testing include complete end-to-end financial transactions across integrated systems?

162. Yes.

163. Who will develop test scripts, coordinate testing, and document results?

163. The consultant

164. Who will be responsible for correcting defects identified during testing?

164. Depending on the defect.

165. What conditions must be satisfied before MTA authorizes go-live?

165. All modules and their interactions should have been fully tested and accepted.

166. Will the consultant be expected to support a fiscal year-end or external reporting cycle immediately following go-live?

166. No.

167. May the consultant propose qualified subcontractors or project-specific specialists, subject to MTA approval?

167. Yes.

168. Does MTA prefer fixed-fee, time-and-materials, milestone-based, or hybrid pricing? May bidders propose an alternative structure with clearly stated assumptions?

168. MTA will accept fixed-fee pricing for the defined scope and provide hourly rates for optional or out-of-scope services.

169. Will reasonable travel, lodging, and other approved project expenses be reimbursed separately from professional fees?

169. Yes

170. How will scope changes, unexpected historical remediation, additional integrations, extended parallel processing, or vendor-caused delays be authorized and compensated?

170. On a case-by-case basis

171. What payment milestones, invoicing requirements, acceptance conditions, and termination provisions are anticipated?

171. Monthly invoicing with an itemized list of tasks completed for the period linked to their cost.

172. May bidders use comparable ERP conversion projects completed by proposed leadership during prior employment as references, provided the individual's role and former employer are clearly disclosed? Are three references from different client organizations mandatory?

172. Yes, to both questions

173. Does MTA currently generate its balance sheet, income statement, cash flow statement, and other required financial reports directly from its existing accounting software, or does it export general ledger data into Excel or another reporting application to prepare these statements? If external reporting is used, please identify the reports, supporting workbooks, and manual procedures involved.

173. Standard reporting is generated from the existing software. Excel is used for customized reports.

174. Does MTA expect the selected implementation consultant to evaluate, document, reconstruct, and validate existing financial reporting processes within Oracle NetSuite, including account groupings, reporting hierarchies,

174. The selected implementation consultant and MTA will collaborate on evaluation and reconstruction.
MTA will approve the financial statements

allocations, adjustments, comparative financial statements, and reconciliation to historical reports? Who will be responsible for approving the resulting financial statements?

175. Has MTA evaluated whether its existing chart of accounts and financial reporting structure are suitable for direct conversion into NetSuite, or does the Authority anticipate a redesign? If redesign is required, will the selected consultant be responsible for developing and validating the new financial architecture?

175. Minimal redesign is anticipated.

176. Please identify the vendor, exact product name, version, implementation year, current support status, and modules used for each existing financial and operational system. Please confirm whether Epicor remains in use and, if so, which Epicor product and version.

176. Epicor Enterprise implemented in 2000 is still in use.

177. Are any existing systems operating on unsupported software versions, legacy databases, customized applications, or platforms requiring specialized technical assistance to extract historical information? Please identify the systems and known limitations.

177. No.

178. Are complete transaction-level exports available from each legacy system, including general ledger activity, accounts payable, accounts receivable, vendor and customer records, fixed assets, purchasing, and historical supporting detail? Please identify any limitations involving data access, extraction formats, archived records, or transaction history.

178. Yes.

179. Will the existing software vendors or technical providers be available to assist with data extraction, interpretation of legacy

179. We do not anticipate needing their assistance.

database structures, historical transaction mapping, and reconciliation? If so, who will be responsible for coordinating and paying for their services?	
180. Are there known legacy system limitations, custom reports, manual workarounds, unsupported integrations, or external spreadsheets that must be reconstructed, replaced, or eliminated during the NetSuite implementation? Will the selected consultant be responsible for identifying and remediating these issues?	180. We will address this need as it presents.
181. Are there any mandatory minimum requirements concerning the bidding company's years in business, annual revenue, financial capacity, number of employees, or prior contract values?	181. No.
182. Are Oracle NetSuite certifications, PMP certification, Prosci certification, or other professional credentials mandatory for eligibility, or will equivalent demonstrated experience be accepted?	182. No.
183. Can a bidder propose a project team whose principal ERP implementation experience was gained while employed by other organizations, with that experience clearly attributed to the individuals involved?	183. Yes.
184. Are there any Maine-specific business registration, licensing, tax registration, or authorization requirements that must be satisfied before proposal submission, contract award, or commencement of services?	184. No.
185. What insurance coverage and minimum policy limits will the successful consultant be required to maintain, including	185. Please see “CONSULTANT GENERAL CONDITIONS” and “GENERAL CONSULTANT AGREEMENT” documents published here:

professional liability, general liability, cyber liability, and workers' compensation?	https://www.maineturnpike.com/business-with-mta/consultants/erp-implementation-consultant
186. Will MTA provide a proposed professional-services agreement before award, including indemnification, limitation of liability, intellectual property, confidentiality, termination, and dispute-resolution provisions?	186. No.
187. Will the consultant's contractual liability be limited to work and deliverables within its control, excluding defects, delays, or failures attributable to Oracle, other vendors, or MTA-controlled activities?	187. Yes.
188. Will the consultant be permitted to identify assumptions, exclusions, dependencies, and proposed contractual exceptions in its bid without the proposal being considered nonresponsive?	188. Yes.
189. What background checks, security clearances, cybersecurity certifications, data-protection requirements, or system-access approvals will apply to consultant personnel and subcontractors?	189. Please see “CONSULTANT GENERAL CONDITIONS” and “GENERAL CONSULTANT AGREEMENT” documents published here: https://www.maineturnpike.com/business-with-mta/consultants/erp-implementation-consultant
190. Will MTA provide the necessary system access, licenses, test environments, documentation, secure data-transfer facilities, and technical resources at its expense?	190. Yes.
191. Is the consultant expected to develop and maintain the entire project schedule, including deliverables and activities controlled by Oracle and other contractors, or only its own assigned workstreams?	191. The consultant is expected to develop and maintain the entire project schedule.

192. Who will be responsible for maintaining the master risk register, issue log, change-control register, decision log, and project governance documentation?	192. The consultant.
193. What specific deliverables and acceptance criteria will determine completion of each implementation phase, and how long will MTA have to review and approve submitted deliverables?	193. TBD
194. If the project is delayed by software defects, vendor performance, unavailable MTA personnel, or changes in organizational requirements, how will the consultant's schedule, staffing commitments, and compensation be adjusted?	194. Through open communication
195. Will MTA permit phased implementation and phased acceptance of financial modules, integrations, reporting, and operational workflows when doing so reduces implementation risk?	195. Yes.
196. Will the Authority accept a team of a small prime with a named NetSuite specialist subcontractor?	196. Yes.
197. For the Business Process Assessment, could you provide additional context on the anticipated organizational scope, including the business units/departments expected to participate and the approximate number of stakeholder interviews or process sessions anticipated?	197. It will be MTA's accounting and finance department, including AP and purchasing. Expense management and workflow may involve other departments. We anticipate no more than a dozen.
198. For activities that involve both the selected consultant and Oracle/NetSuite Direct, particularly training and go-live/hypercare support, could you clarify how MTA envisions responsibilities being divided between the two parties?	198. NetSuite has included a training schedule in the proposal. MTA would like consulting hypercare 0-3 months after go-live.

199. The pricing section requests both fixed fees and hourly rates. Should respondents propose fixed-fee pricing for the defined scope and provide hourly rates for optional or out-of-scope services, or does MTA have another preferred pricing structure?

199. MTA will accept fixed-fee pricing for the defined scope and provide hourly rates for optional or out-of-scope services.