Exhibit A — Customer Order Form

Customer-specific commercial terms under the Handrail Master Services Agreement

How this form works. Selecting a preprinted Build or Service Plan incorporates the preprinted terms for that selection. Later sections may add services or record operational choices, but they do not replace an included entitlement or standard price. Any change to a preprinted standard term or to the MSA must appear in Section Q, identify the term or MSA section being changed, and be expressly approved by both Parties. A blank, handwritten entry, or billing-summary calculation elsewhere does not amend a standard term.

A. Order Information

Order Form Number **HFG-EDMS-2026-01**	**Order Form Effective Date** To be completed at execution
MSA Version: Standard Form v2026.08	**MSA Effective Date (First Order Form):** Order Form Effective Date

CUSTOMER LEGAL NAME
Houchens Food Group - contracting legal entity to be confirmed

CUSTOMER PRIMARY ADDRESS
To be completed before execution

CUSTOMER LEGAL NOTICE ADDRESS / EMAIL
Amanda Benson · abenson@houchens.com (RFP contact; legal notice details to confirm)

HITCENTS LEGAL NOTICE ADDRESS / EMAIL
To be completed before execution

BILLING CONTACT To be designated by HFG	**BILLING EMAIL** To be completed at execution
PROJECT OWNER Amanda Benson (RFP contact; project owner to confirm)	**PROJECT OWNER EMAIL** abenson@houchens.com
PURCHASE ORDER REQUIREMENT To be confirmed by HFG	**HITCENTS ACCOUNT LEAD** To be designated by Hitcents

B. Initial Build Selection

Select	Build	Fixed Fee	Standard Payment Schedule	Typical Positioning
☐	Foundation	$48,000	$4,000/month x 12	Focused application or workflow

Select	Build	Fixed Fee	Standard Payment Schedule	Typical Positioning
☐	Advanced	$72,000	$6,000/month x 12	Broader operational system
☒	Enterprise	$120,000+	$10,000+/month x 12	ERP or complex business system
☐	Custom	Specified in Section Q	Specified in Section Q	Custom terms must be stated expressly

ADDITIONAL INITIAL BUILD SCOPE REQUIREMENTS	ADDITIONAL INITIAL BUILD FEE
Dedicated implementation and integration engineering capacity for the Initial Build: source discovery; 12-PoS ingestion and normalization; connector and data-pipeline implementation; data migration and validation; phased rollout; production-readiness and stabilization support; and coordination with HFG and third-party system owners.	**$235,000 additional** **Total fixed Initial Build: $355,000** 11 × $19,583.33 + final $19,583.37, paid with standard installments

INITIAL BUILD BILLING START DATE	PURCHASE ORDER / INTERNAL REFERENCE
At kickoff; date to be completed at execution	**HFG EDMS RFP**

Initial Build acknowledgment. The selected preprinted fee and payment schedule control unless Section Q expressly changes them. The Initial Build Fee is fixed; the installment schedule is a payment accommodation; early delivery does not reduce the fee; remaining installments continue after Go-Live; and the recurring subscription begins separately on the Subscription Commencement Date.

C. Initial Scope

The Initial Scope for this Order Form is set forth in the document attached to this Order Form as Attachment A-1 — Initial Scope (the "Scope Attachment"). The Scope Attachment is incorporated into this Order Form solely for purposes of describing the Initial Build.

Scope Attachment Identification

Document Title: **HFG EDMS RFP + Vendor Q&A Scope Package**

Document Date or Version: RFP issued 8/6 through 8/7/2026; Q&A issued 8/20/2026

Number of Pages: 21 PDF pages, plus referenced RFP Attachments A and B

Attachment A-1 is attached to this Order Form.

The Scope Attachment may include, as applicable:

- business objectives;
- material workflows and functionality;
- planned integrations;
- Customer-provided systems, data, and dependencies;
- implementation assumptions;
- expressly excluded items;
- target milestones;
- acceptance criteria; and
- other Initial Scope requirements.

Within this Order Form:

- the completed pricing and service-plan selections;
- the completed usage and capacity selections; and
- Section Q, Special Terms Modifying the MSA or Standard Plan Terms

control over any inconsistent statement in the Scope Attachment.

Unless Section Q expressly identifies and modifies the applicable provision, the Scope Attachment does not:

- amend the MSA;
- alter the selected pricing or payment obligations;
- alter included User Capacity or Resource Credits;
- create source-code ownership or other intellectual-property rights;
- change the Subscription Commencement Date;
- establish a guaranteed completion date;
- create or modify a service level, warranty, or acceptance right;
- modify a standard service-plan entitlement; or
- otherwise change the legal or commercial terms of this Order Form or the MSA.

Only the document specifically identified above and attached to this Order Form is incorporated as the Scope Attachment. Proposals, presentations, emails, estimates, tickets, messages, product-board entries, and other working materials are not part of the Initial Scope unless they are expressly included in the Scope Attachment or incorporated through a written change order.

Any change to the Scope Attachment after execution must be approved in accordance with Section 4.6 of the MSA and documented through:

- a written change order;
- a replacement Scope Attachment signed by both Parties; or
- another written amendment signed by authorized representatives of both Parties.

If the Scope Attachment is not attached when this Order Form is signed, Hitcents is not required to begin substantive Initial Build work until the Parties have executed or otherwise mutually approved the Scope Attachment in writing.

D. Timing and Subscription Commencement

TARGET INITIAL PRODUCTION RELEASE	TARGET INITIAL-SCOPE COMPLETION
Planning target: first material production phase after five build months (start of Month 6)	Planning target: Month 12 after kickoff

Target dates are planning targets unless Section Q expressly identifies a binding milestone. The Subscription Commencement Date is determined under MSA Section 5.5 unless Section Q expressly modifies that section.

E. Standard Recurring Service Plan Selection

Select one. The selected row is authoritative for the listed standard price and included quantities. Do not rewrite those values elsewhere in this Order Form.

Select	Plan	Base Monthly Fee	Included Users	Infrastructure Credits / Month	AI Credits / Month	Included Human Engineering
☐	Core	$2,000	50	250	150	None reserved
☐	Pro	$6,000	250	750	500	8 hours/month
☒	Enterprise	$15,000+	500	2,000	1,500	40 hours/month

Select	Plan	Base Monthly Fee	Included Users	Infrastructure Credits / Month	AI Credits / Month	Included Human Engineering
☐	Custom	See Section Q				

ADDITIONAL RECURRING SERVICE PLAN SCOPE REQUIREMENTS	ADDITIONAL RECURRING SERVICE PLAN MONTHLY FEE
No additional recurring scope requirement beyond the selected Enterprise service plan and Enterprise capacity add-on for up to 1,000 total users.	$0

Standard subscription term. Unless Section Q expressly states otherwise, the MSA default applies: a twelve-month initial subscription term beginning on the Subscription Commencement Date, followed by automatic twelve-month renewals subject to the MSA's nonrenewal provisions.

Continuous evolution. Automated software evolution and new modules within the same Deployment are included within purchased usage. A new build fee is not triggered solely because Customer adds substantial functionality such as HRM, CRM, ERP, or other business modules.

F. Standard Plan Entitlements and Service Levels

The selected plan automatically includes the applicable column below. These terms are not blanks to be completed. Service levels are objectives unless the MSA or Section Q expressly makes a particular SLA binding.

Entitlement	Core	Pro	Enterprise
Production hosting and backups	Standard	Enhanced	Enterprise
Monthly Change Requests	100	350	1000
Monitoring	Standard	Advanced	Proactive
Security scanning	Baseline automated	Advanced automated	Advanced + human review
Vulnerability monitoring	Baseline	Included	Included
Compliance assistance	Not included	Standard assistance	Advanced / custom
System health review	Billable on request	Quarterly	Monthly
Optimization review	Automated	Quarterly	Ongoing
Account contact	Shared	Named contact	Dedicated
Support level	Standard	Enhanced	Priority
Severity 1 initial response target	1 business day	4 business hours	1 hour
Severity 2 initial response target	2 business days	1 business day	4 hours
Severity 3 initial response target	5 business days	3 business days	1 business day
Disaster Recovery	Not included	Standard SLA applies	Standard SLA applies
Monthly production uptime objective	99.5%	99.9%	99.9% or custom SLA
Source-code continuity protection	Included	Included	Included

G. Additional User Capacity

The included user quantity is fixed by the selected plan above. Complete only the applicable add-on selection below.

Selected Plan	**Standard Add-On**	**Standard Price**	**Quantity Selected at Signing**
Core	50 additional users	$1,000/month	_____ blocks (_____ users)
Pro	100 additional users	$1,500/month	_____ blocks (_____ users)
Enterprise	Up to 1,000 total users	+$5,000/month	☒ Selected
Enterprise	Up to 2,500 total users	+$12,500/month	☐ Selected
Enterprise	More than 2,500 users	Custom in Section Q	☐ Selected

ADDITIONAL USER CAPACITY MONTHLY FEE	**TOTAL PURCHASED CAPACITY AT SIGNING (CONVENIENCE SUMMARY)**
$5,000/month	1,000 enabled human users

H. Resource Usage and Overage Elections

Standard rate. Infrastructure and AI usage above the selected plan's included credits is billed at $1.25 per Resource Credit unless Section Q expressly states a different rate.

Infrastructure Overage Handling Policy Election:

- ☒ Automatic billing
- ☐ Hard Stop
- ☐ Monthly cap $_______
- ☐ Approval above $_______
- ☐ Custom in Section Q

If no box is checked, automatic infrastructure overage billing applies. Production infrastructure may continue above a cap when reasonably necessary to preserve availability, security, or data integrity under the MSA.

AI Features Overage Handling Policy Election:

- ☒ Hard stop
- ☐ Automatic billing
- ☐ Monthly cap $_______
- ☐ Approval above $_______

If no box is checked, a hard stop applies to discretionary AI Features when included credits are exhausted.

USAGE CONTACT NAME	**USAGE CONTACT EMAIL / PHONE**
HFG project owner (to be designated)	To be completed at execution

I. Human Engineering Add-Ons and Approval

Included Human Engineering is fixed by the selected plan in Section E. This section records additional work only.

Core Standard Additional Rate	**Pro Standard Additional Rate**	**Enterprise Standard Additional Rate**
$250/hour	$225/hour	$200/hour

ADDITIONAL RESERVED HOURS / MONTH, IF PURCHASED	ADDITIONAL RESERVED CAPACITY MONTHLY FEE
None	$0

Human Engineering Hours Overage Handling Policy Election:

- [x] Written approval required
- [ ] Pre-approved up to $______/month
- [ ] Custom in Section Q

If no box is checked, written approval is required before billable Human Engineering Services beyond included hours are performed.

J. Deployments

Standard inclusion. This Order Form includes one Deployment. Multiple modules, workflows, departments, locations, divisions, or business functions inside that Deployment do not create an additional Deployment.

ADDITIONAL SEPARATE DEPLOYMENTS PURCHASED	MONTHLY FEE PER ADDITIONAL DEPLOYMENT	ONE-TIME SETUP FEE
0 additional	**$0**	**$0**

ADDITIONAL DEPLOYMENT DESCRIPTION / TERMS (OR REFER TO SECTION Q)
One common HFG EDMS Deployment is included; no Separate Deployment selected.

K. Security, Compliance, and Service Add-Ons

- [x] SSO / SAML
- [x] Advanced audit logging
- [ ] Extended log retention
- [ ] Role / permission review
- [ ] Human security review
- [ ] Third-party penetration test
- [ ] Vendor questionnaire support
- [ ] DPA
- [ ] Business Associate Agreement
- [ ] Custom backup / disaster recovery
- [ ] Data residency
- [ ] Compliance assistance
- [ ] Binding SLA

ADDITIONAL MONTHLY FEE	ONE-TIME FEE
$0	**$0**

DESCRIPTION / THIRD-PARTY COSTS / ADDITIONAL TERMS
SSO / SAML and advanced audit logging included in the proposal baseline at $0 additional fee. MFA is provided through the selected identity provider. Other optional add-ons require written selection.

L. Voluntary Source-Code Buyout Selection

- [x] No Voluntary Source-Code Buyout Right
- [ ] Formula Source-Code Buyout Right: greater of $150,000 or 3x Annualized Recurring Fees

- [ ] Fixed or Custom Source-Code Buyout Right, stated in Section Q

If no box is checked, no Voluntary Source-Code Buyout Right is granted. This selection does not limit Customer's standard continuity rights under MSA Section 17.

BUYOUT PACKAGE ADDITIONS / INCLUDED TRANSITION SERVICES (ADDITIVE ONLY; PRICE CHANGES BELONG IN SECTION Q)

M. Source-Code Continuity and Optional Escrow

Standard protection included. Customer receives the continuity protection in MSA Section 17 without a buyout or release fee following a Continuity Event.

Optional Escrow Election:

- [x] No third-party escrow requested
- [ ] Establish third-party escrow
- [ ] Escrow with build verification
- [ ] Custom in Section Q

Optional Escrow Details

Complete only if third-party escrow is selected.

ESCROW PROVIDER	**DEPOSIT UPDATE FREQUENCY**
SETUP / ANNUAL / VERIFICATION FEES	**FEE ALLOCATION**

N. Specific Third-Party Services

List only services specifically selected for this Customer. Ordinary variable third-party costs remain governed by the Resource Credit provisions unless expressly stated otherwise.

SERVICES CUSTOMER CONTRACTS FOR AND PAYS DIRECTLY
Existing HFG third-party systems, accounts, and licenses; specific providers and costs to be confirmed during discovery.

SERVICES HITCENTS PAYS AND PASSES THROUGH TO CUSTOMER
None selected at signing. Variable third-party costs remain governed by Resource Credits unless expressly added.

SERVICES SPECIFICALLY BUNDLED INTO A RECURRING OR ONE-TIME FEE
None beyond the selected Enterprise plan, 1,000-user capacity, and standard included entitlements.

O. Billing Summary

Convenience summary only. This section is arithmetic and does not override the selected Build, selected Service Plan, standard add-on prices, usage rules, or Section Q. If a calculation here conflicts with an operative selection, the operative selection controls.

Component	Amount	Billing Timing
Initial Build installment	**$29,583.33 (final $29,583.37)**	Monthly × 12
Recurring platform subscription	$15,000/month	From Subscription Commencement Date
Additional User Capacity	$5,000/month	From Subscription Commencement Date
Reserved Human Engineering add-on	$0	Not selected
Security / compliance / service add-ons	$0	Not selected
Separate Deployment fees	$0	Not selected
Other recurring charges	$0	Not selected
Estimated monthly total before variable overages	**$20,000/month**	From Subscription Commencement Date
One-time charges at signing / setup	$0	None in proposal baseline

P. Publicity

- ☐ Hitcents may identify Customer as a Handrail customer and use Customer's name and logo in customer lists.
- ☒ Hitcents may not publicly identify Customer without separate written approval.

If neither box is checked, Hitcents may not publicly identify Customer without separate written approval.

Q. Express Overrides to Standard Terms

This is the only section that changes a preprinted standard price, included entitlement, allowance, response target, service level, payment schedule, renewal term, or provision of the MSA. Each override must identify the affected standard term or specific MSA section and state the replacement language. If this section is blank, all preprinted standards and MSA terms remain unchanged.

Standard Term or MSA Section	Existing Standard	Express Replacement / Modification	Both Initial
No express overrides. Standard MSA terms and the selected preprinted Order Form terms apply.			

Standard Term or MSA Section	Existing Standard	Express Replacement / Modification	Both Initial

No implied changes. A quoted price, scope description, billing summary, purchase order, email, proposal, attachment, or field completed elsewhere does not modify a conflicting preprinted standard or MSA provision unless expressly recorded above. An attachment modifies terms only when identified above by title and date.

R. Order Form Signatures

By signing below, each Party agrees to this Order Form and to the Hitcents.com, Inc. Master Services Agreement for Handrail Platform Services, Standard Form v2026.08, which is incorporated by reference. If this is the first Order Form between the Parties, the MSA becomes effective on the Order Form Effective Date.

Each signer further acknowledges that:

1. The selected Build and Service Plan incorporate the preprinted standard terms shown in this Order Form.
2. Sections G through P add services or record choices but do not silently replace included terms.
3. Only Section Q can expressly override a preprinted standard term or modify the MSA.
4. The billing summary is non-operative and provided only for convenience.

Hitcents.com, Inc.	Customer
Authorized Signature	Customer Legal Name
Printed Name and Title	Authorized Signature
Date	Printed Name and Title / Date

ATTACHMENT A-1 - INITIAL SCOPE

HFG EDMS RFP + Vendor Q&A Scope Package

This Attachment A-1 is incorporated into the HFG Handrail Order Form solely to describe the Initial Build. It consists of HFG's Enterprise Data Management System RFP and the August 20, 2026 Vendor Q&A. RFP Attachments A and B remain referenced requirements and process materials.

Attached source documents

1. EDMS - RFP - HFG (10 pages)

2. EDMS - RFP Vendor Q&A - HFG (11 pages)

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

Enterprise Data Management System

EDMS

Centralized Operational Intelligence Platform

Issuing Organization:	HFG (Houchens Food Group)
RFP Title:	Enterprise Data Management System (EDMS)
Issue Date:	Thursday 8/6/2026 – Friday 8/7/2026
Response Deadline:	Wednesday 9/9/2026 12:00 PM CST
Primary Contact:	Amanda Benson
Contact Email:	abenson@houchens.com
Classification:	Confidential – Do Not Distribute

1. Introduction & Purpose

About HFG

Houchens Food Group is a subsidiary of Houchens Industries, Inc., one of the largest, most diversified 100% employee-owned companies in the nation. HFG operates over 400 locations throughout 15 states, spanning grocery, convenience, hardware, and quick-serve restaurants. Due to the distinct brand banners & business format types, HFG has 12 unique point-of-sale systems in use, and hundreds of distinct data sources.

Purpose of This RFP

This Request for Proposal (RFP) invites qualified vendors to propose solutions capable of serving as HFG's Enterprise Data Management System (EDMS) - a single platform that centralizes operational, financial, merchandising, marketing, and loss prevention data and delivers reporting, dashboards, inventory management, workflow tools, forecasting, and future AI capabilities.

2. Current State & Problem Statement

Current Challenges

- Critical business data is spread across disconnected systems requiring significant manual effort to consolidate.
- Paper-based and spreadsheet-driven processes introduce errors, delays, and ***inconsistency***.
- Business tools such as ad forecasting and promotion planning lack a reliable unified data foundation.
- No tool available to manage perpetual inventory at an enterprise level.
- Executives lack a trusted single book of record for strategic decision-making.
- Loss prevention and compliance monitoring is reactive rather than proactive.
- Fragmented systems require duplicate data feeds, straining limited IT resources.

Business Functions Impacted

Department	Key Pain Points
IT	Data spread across systems, limited integration visibility, vendor dependency, data quality challenges, duplicated workload.
Merchandising	Limited category visibility, difficulty measuring promotional effectiveness, manual data gathering.
Operations	Inventory inaccuracies, receiving discrepancies, lack of store-level visibility, tools many tools to learn at store.
Accounting	Manual reconciliation, invoice discrepancies, limited inventory visibility.
Marketing	Limited campaign performance visibility, difficulty measuring ROI.
Loss Prevention	Reactive investigations, delayed reporting, limited exception visibility.
Executive	Inconsistent reporting, delayed decision-making, lack of enterprise-wide visibility.

3. Scope of Work

What We Are Seeking

HFG is seeking a centralized platform to serve as the operational intelligence foundation for the entire organization. The selected solution will provide:

- A POS-agnostic platform that consolidates data across all systems into a single book of record & reporting
- Full perpetual inventory management and gross profit visibility by item
- A custom, open architecture that allows vendor support during implementation while minimizing long-term vendor dependency, so the platform can adapt to HFG's unique and evolving business needs

While there are many additional capabilities HFG would ultimately like from this system, the scope below has been limited to what is required or represents a high-value "Nice to Have."

Feature / Capability	Classification	Notes / Context
FEATURES		
Perpetual inventory management	**Required**	*Real-time inventory position maintained from all transaction sources, with transaction, receipt, adjustment, credit & transfer, with custom internal inventory calculation rules*
Computer-generated ordering (auto-replenishment) & Transmission to vendor	**Required**	*System generates suggested orders based on sales velocity, on-hand, and par levels; store reviews and approves*
Order management — store review, approval, and transmission	**Required**	*Stores interact with system-generated orders before submission to suppliers*
Out-of-stock identification and alerting	**Required**	*Automated detection of zero or critically low on-hand positions*
On-order visibility (open purchase orders)	**Required**	*Visibility into inbound inventory to support planning decisions*
Transfer management — store-to-store and DC transfers	**Required**	*Full transfer workflow with discrepancy tracking and audit history*
Product transformation tracking & production planning (fresh / production departments)	**Required**	*Track raw input inventory, yield, finished product output, and waste for meat, deli, and other fresh departments, along with planned quantities*
Promotion planning and management (Ad Builder, TPR Builder, predictive sales lift & margin impact) with forecasting	**Required**	*Build, manage, and track promotional events within the platform*
Custom Dashboards & Reporting – self service & admin built/published	**Required**	*To support loss prevention, operations, compliance, marketing, merchandising, IT, accounting and executive needs – examples include daily sales, sales tax, customer count info, receipt lookup, tender type reporting, avg. basket size, etc.*
Food safety and FSMA compliance tracking	**Required**	*Regulatory compliance records, traceability, and audit support*
Drill-down from summary to transaction level	**Required**	*Users can investigate from high-level metrics to individual records*
Scheduled report delivery and email distribution	**Required**	*Reports delivered automatically on configurable schedules*

Feature / Capability	Classification	Notes / Context
EDI vendor invoice ingestion & translation	**Required**	*Built in support for automated electronic invoice receipt; eliminates manual invoice entry*
Store Operations Tools	**Required**	*Allows store teams to complete daily cash management tasks - deposit preparation and register balancing - within the platform, with structured data automatically flowing to the accounting system to support financial reconciliation and close processes*
Natural language querying (NLQ) & AI insights & predictions & recommendations	**Nice to Have**	*Users ask questions in plain language; platform returns data and visualizations, & shares opportunities*
Base price optimization	**Nice to Have**	*Algorithmic pricing recommendations based on margin, velocity, and competitive position*
Assortment optimization recommendations	**Nice to Have**	*AI-generated suggestions for assortment changes based on performance data*
Master Data Management (MDM) — item attributes, descriptions, hierarchy	**Nice to Have**	*EDMS becomes the master book of record; Feeds/exports item maintenance data to POS host*
Vendor portal — electronic contract and document submission & inventory management support	**Nice to Have**	*Vendors submit contracts, funding agreements, and supporting documents directly into EDMS*
Investigation management and case tracking	**Nice to Have**	*Cases opened, documented, and tracked to resolution within EDMS*
DATA, CONNECTIVITY & PLATFORM		
Multi-format POS data ingestion (12 POS systems, varied formats)	**Required**	*Core platform must normalize and unify transaction data from all POS sources*
Open database accessibility to cleansed data	**Required**	*For admin users - querying, custom exports, scheduled custom outgoing vendor files that can be emailed, exported, API connections*
Data quality monitoring and validation rules	**Required**	*Automated identification of missing, invalid, or inconsistent data with auto retry & HFG team ability to monitor & recover missing data*
User data input and manual record modifications with full change logging	**Required**	*Users can correct, adjust, and enrich data; all changes logged with user, timestamp, and reason. Closing period for some screens/modifications.*
Historical data retention (2 years queryable + 7 years backup for audits)	**Required**	*Required for trend analysis, forecasting, and AI initiatives, and audits*
Flat-file import / export (CSV, Excel, fixed-width, XML)	**Required**	*Support for systems that lack API capability & export ability for users for all reports & platform data*
Multi unlimited data source integrations	**Required**	*Paylocity, Door Dash, Instacart, Uber, Neilsen, Salesforce, Competitive Retails, etc., that can be customized into any reporting, screens, views, filters, etc.*
REST API integration framework	**Required**	*Open API for connecting source systems and downstream consumers*
Product roadmap visibility and customer input process with published release notes	**Required**	*Regular roadmap reviews; customers can influence product direction*
Vendor support SLAs with defined escalation procedures	**Required**	*Published support tiers, response times, and escalation paths*
Disaster recovery — documented RTO/RPO with testing schedule	**Required**	*Business continuity in the event of system outage*
Scalability — supports additional stores, banners, and data sources	**Required**	*Platform grows with the organization without significant rework*

Feature / Capability	Classification	Notes / Context
Mobile & in-store application access	**Required**	*Dashboards and reports accessible on mobile devices, and tools that feed data input into EDMS available from Zebra instore application*
SECURITY & ADMIN		
Role-based access control (RBAC)	**Required**	*Users see only the data and functions appropriate for their role*
Group/Row/Object level permissions/security	**Required**	*Permissions managed at custom levels*
Configuration management (without vendor involvement)	**Required**	*Administrators can configure users, roles, workflows, and settings independently*
User impersonation / view-as capability	**Nice to Have**	*Administrators can validate permissions by viewing as another user*
Inactive user auto-disablement (configurable threshold)	**Nice to Have**	*Security risk mitigation*

4. Vendor Response Requirements

Vendors must provide complete written responses to all sections below. Responses should be clear, specific, and reference actual product capabilities. Generic marketing materials should not be submitted in place of direct responses.

4.1 Company Overview

1. Provide a brief overview of your company, including years in business, company size, key markets served, and financial stability indicators.
2. Describe your experience serving both non-grocery and grocery organizations. Include customer names and use cases where permitted.
3. Provide a list of 3–5 customer references in the retail or grocery space that HFG may contact.

4.2 Solution Overview

1. Provide a high-level overview of your platform and how it aligns with HFG's EDMS requirements.
2. Describe your platform architecture (cloud, on-premise, hybrid). Include information on hosting, multi-tenancy, and data isolation.
3. Describe how your platform supports multi-banner, multi-region retail organizations.
4. Provide statistics on percentage of system downtime, including time of day.

4.3 Functional Capabilities

For each capability domain, describe your platform's current capabilities, identify any gaps, and note planned future enhancements.

Capability Domain	Current Capabilities	Gaps / Roadmap
Data Management & Governance		
Security & Administration (RBAC, SSO, MFA)		
Integrations & Connectivity		
Reporting & Analytics (Self-Service)		
Merchandising Intelligence		
Operations Intelligence		

Capability Domain	Current Capabilities	Gaps / Roadmap
Financial Intelligence		
Marketing & Loyalty Intelligence		
Loss Prevention Intelligence		
Workflow & Business Tools		
Forecasting & Optimization		
AI & Advanced Analytics		

4.4 Dashboard & Reporting Capabilities

1. Describe your dashboard creation capabilities. How are dashboards built — by vendors, by IT, or by business users? What customization is possible without vendor involvement?
2. Describe your self-service reporting capabilities. Can business users build their own reports? What tools are available?
3. Describe export capabilities (Excel, PDF, CSV), scheduled delivery, and email distribution of reports and dashboards.

4.5 Data Integration & Governance

1. Describe your integration framework. What methods are supported (REST API, flat file, SFTP, database connectors)? How is integration monitoring and error handling managed?
2. Describe your data governance capabilities — data quality monitoring, data lineage, audit history, data correction workflows.
3. How does your platform ensure HFG retains full ownership and portability of its data? Describe data export and migration capabilities.

4.6 Security & Administration

1. Describe your role-based security model. How are roles, groups, and permissions managed? Is user impersonation (view-as) supported?
2. Describe your SSO and MFA support. What identity providers are supported?
3. Describe audit logging and user activity monitoring capabilities.

4.7 AI & Future Capabilities

1. Describe any current AI or machine learning capabilities within your platform (natural language querying, anomaly detection, recommendations, predictive analytics).
2. Describe your product roadmap for AI and advanced analytics. What capabilities are planned and on what timeline?

4.8 Vendor Partnership & Support

1. Describe your standard support model — tiers, SLAs, escalation procedures, and hours of coverage.
2. Describe your implementation approach, including typical timelines, resource requirements, and methodology.
3. Describe your customer success and account management programs.
4. Describe your product roadmap process. How do customers participate in roadmap discussions? How frequently is the product updated?
5. Describe your disaster recovery capabilities, including RTO, RPO, and testing frequency.

4.9 Requirements & Nice-to-Haves

Vendors must complete the Functionality Requirements Response Workbook (Attachment A), included with this RFP. This workbook lists all platform capabilities identified by HFG and requires a structured response for each item.

For each capability, vendors must indicate:

1. Available Today - the capability is fully available in the current product release
2. Roadmap (with date) - the capability is planned; vendor must provide an expected delivery date
3. Ability to Build - confident the feature can be built, although it's not currently available or roadmapped
4. Available via Integration - he capability is delivered through a supported third-party integration; vendor must identify the integration partner and method
5. Not Available - the capability is not currently available and is not on the vendor's roadmap

Vendors should use the Notes column to provide any relevant context, limitations, workarounds, or clarifications.

4.10 Pricing Summary & Notes

Cost Category	Pricing Model	Estimated Cost
Platform / SaaS Licensing	Annual $	
Implementation Services	One-Time $	
Data Integration / Connector Fees	Annual $	
User Licensing (if applicable)	Per User / Annual $	
Training	One-Time $	
Ongoing Support	Annual $	
Additional Modules or Add-Ons	As Applicable	

*Note: Preferred method is implementation fee followed by a bundled annual price.

Vendors should provide a complete cost proposal covering all cost components, including any equipment required to be purchased. HFG expects pricing transparency with no hidden fees.

1. Describe your pricing model in detail. Are there user limits, data volume limits, or other constraints that affect cost?
2. Describe any additional costs that may arise during or after implementation that are not included above.
3. Are volume discounts, multi-year pricing, or contract flexibility options available?

5. Solution Demonstration Requirements

Vendors selected to proceed beyond the written response phase will be required to participate in structured solution demonstrations. Demonstrations must be conducted using actual product functionality, not slides or mockups.

Demonstration Expectations

- Demonstrations should focus on the business scenarios defined below using real product functionality.
- Generic marketing presentations should be minimized.
- Vendors should be prepared to demonstrate with representative sample data.
- Business stakeholders from multiple departments will participate in the evaluation.

6. Submission Instructions

Response Deadline

All RFP responses must be submitted no later than **Wednesday September 9th 2026 at 12:00 PM CST**.

Late submissions will not be considered.

Submission Format

- Written Responses should be submitted in PDF or Word format.
- All attachments should be clearly labeled with the vendor name and section number.
- Submissions should be emailed to abenson@houchens.com with the subject line: EDMS RFP Response – [Vendor Name].

Questions & Clarifications

- All questions regarding this RFP must be submitted in writing to Amanda Benson by **Friday August 14TH 2026 at 12:00 PM CST.**
- Responses to all questions will be distributed to all participating vendors.

RFP Timeline

Milestone	Target Date
RFP Issued	8/6/2026 – 8/7/2026
Vendor Questions Deadline	8/14/2026
Questions Answered / Distributed	8/19/2026
RFP Response Deadline	9/9/2026
Short-List Notification	TBD
Solution Demonstrations	TBD
Final Selection	TBD
Contract Execution Target	TBD

7. Evaluation & Selection Process

Evaluation Criteria

Criterion	Weight	What Is Evaluated
Functional Fit	20%	Ability to support dashboards, reports, workflows, and business tools across all departments, meet requirements outlined in document
Technical Fit	20%	Integration capabilities, architecture, security, scalability, data ownership
Data Management & Governance	15%	Data quality, lineage, audit history, correction workflows, historical retention
Reporting & Analytics	15%	Self-service, drill-down, scheduling, ad hoc analysis, export capabilities
User Experience	10%	Ease of use, self-service, mobile accessibility, adoption potential
Vendor Partnership	10%	Support SLAs, product roadmap, customer success, training, retail references
Total Cost of Ownership	5%	Licensing, implementation, integration, and ongoing costs
AI & Future Capabilities	5%	NLQ, AI insights, predictive analytics, AI product roadmap

Selection Process

Phase	Activity	Description
Phase 1	RFP Response Review	Written responses reviewed by evaluation team
Phase 2	Short-List Selection	2–4 vendors selected for demonstration
Phase 3	Solution Demonstrations	Structured demonstrations using business scenarios
Phase 4	Technical Review	Architecture, security, integration, and data governance deep-dive
Phase 5	Reference Checks	Customer references contacted and reviewed
Phase 6	Final Recommendation	Evaluation consolidated into a final vendor recommendation
Phase 7	Contract Negotiation	Contractual terms finalized

Guiding Principles

- Business value over feature count
- Simplicity over complexity
- Scalability over short-term convenience
- Data ownership over vendor dependency
- User adoption over technical novelty
- Long-term partnership over short-term cost savings

8. Terms & Conditions

Confidentiality

This RFP and all information contained within it is confidential and intended solely for the use of the receiving vendor. Vendors may not share, distribute, or reproduce this document without prior written consent from HFG.

Right to Reject

HFG reserves the right to reject any or all proposals, to waive informalities, and to accept the proposal deemed most advantageous to HFG. HFG is not obligated to select the lowest-cost proposal.

No Commitment

Issuance of this RFP does not commit HFG to award a contract or to pay any costs incurred in the preparation of a response. All costs associated with preparing and submitting a response are the sole responsibility of the vendor.

Ownership of Responses

All responses submitted become the property of HFG and will not be returned. HFG reserves the right to use any ideas presented in any response, whether or not that proposal is selected.

Data Ownership Requirement

Any solution selected must ensure HFG retains full ownership of all operational, financial, customer, and reporting data. The selected vendor must support unrestricted data export and migration at any time. Vendor lock-in through proprietary data formats or access restrictions is not acceptable.

9. Attachments

Attachment	Document	Description
Attachment A	Functionality Requirements Response Workbook	Complete line-by-line vendor response to all platform capability requirements. Must be returned with RFP response.
Attachment B	HFG Internal Process Mapping	Documents HFG's current-state operational processes across all functional areas. Provided for vendor context to inform solution design and implementation approach. Vendors should reference this document when describing implementation methodology and integration strategy.

VENDOR QUESTIONS & HFG RESPONSES

Enterprise Data Management System (EDMS)

Issuing Organization:	HFG (Houchens Food Group)
Document Title:	EDMS RFP – Vendor Questions & HFG Responses (Anonymized)
Related RFP:	Enterprise Data Management System (EDMS) RFP
Issue Date:	8/20/26
Primary Contact:	Amanda Benson
Contact Email:	abenson@houchens.com
Classification:	Confidential – Do Not Distribute

1. Purpose of This Document

During the RFP question-and-answer period, HFG received written questions from multiple prospective vendors regarding the Enterprise Data Management System (EDMS) RFP. In the interest of fairness and transparency, this document consolidates all submitted questions along with HFG's official responses and distributes them to every participating vendor.

Questions are presented anonymously and organized by topic rather than by submitting vendor, so that no vendor's identity or line of inquiry is attributed to them. Questions appear exactly as submitted, grouped with related questions on the same subject for readability; their wording has not been altered.

This document does not amend or supersede the RFP. In the event of any conflict between this Q&A and the RFP itself, the RFP governs unless a formal RFP amendment is issued.

2. Program Vision, Business Drivers & Success Measures

Q#	Submitted Question	HFG Response
1	What is the primary business driver behind the EDMS initiative?	Primary drivers are data fragmentation across HFG's 12 POS systems, the lack of a single trusted book of record, and heavy reliance on manual/spreadsheet-driven processes. Compliance and accounting friction (e.g., food safety/FSMA traceability and manual reconciliation) are also contributing factors, alongside the need for a real enterprise perpetual inventory capability, which does not exist today.

Q#	Submitted Question	HFG Response
2	What are the most important business and finance outcomes driving this change? (Faster close, improved cash visibility, AP automation, spend visibility, vendor performance, etc.)	Data accessibility for operational decision making is our most important business outcome.
3	What measurable business and technical outcomes will HFG use to determine whether the EDMS implementation is successful?	Success will be measured against the initiative's strategic pillars — improved margin visibility, unified reporting adoption across banners, reduced manual/spreadsheet effort, and inventory accuracy. Formal KPIs and targets will be defined with the selected vendor during implementation planning.
4	For example, are there target improvements related to inventory accuracy, out-of-stock visibility, reporting timeliness, accounting reconciliation, manual effort, promotional effectiveness, or data quality? Are current-state baseline measurements available?	Formal baselines are limited today given the current manual, spreadsheet-driven state — this is part of what EDMS is intended to establish. Baselining will occur during early implementation.

3. Scope of Work, Prioritization & Solution Approach

Q#	Submitted Question	HFG Response
1	Is the target state a centralized enterprise data platform, a reporting layer, or both?	Both — EDMS is intended to be a centralized data platform and the reporting/dashboard layer built on top of it, plus workflow tools (ordering, inventory, store operations) and a roadmap toward AI capabilities.
2	The RFP describes an enterprise wide platform across grocery, convenience, hardware, and quick-serve formats. Are the franchise operated formats included?	The initiative's initial and primary focus is tools and centralization for our company-operated grocery banner operations. For franchise-operated formats, the goal is to combine and centralize their data at the reporting layer.
3	You describe a need for a single platform that centralizes data and delivers such capabilites as inventory management, forecasting and AI capabilites. Solutions that can deliver functional / operational intelligence such as inventory management, forecasting, pricing and promotions planning and optimization require foundational data to create plans and recommendations but are separate solutions with different capabilities than a data repository or MDM system. Are you looking for both, or just a data repository / data management solution at this time?	Both. HFG is seeking a platform that combines a centralized data foundation with the operational/functional capabilities themselves (inventory management, ordering, promotion planning, etc.) rather than a data repository or MDM system alone — see the Required items in the Scope of Work.

Q#	Submitted Question	HFG Response
4	Your RFP indicates business value over feature count is most important. In your feature / capability scope of work, you indicate capabilities like inventory management, order management, promotion planning are required, but master data management (MDM) is a nice to have. Do you see this as a project with multiple phases, where initial phases can deliver value to fund future phases or do you see this as one single project without any phasing?	Yes, HFG anticipates this as a multi-phase effort. Foundational, high-value capabilities are prioritized as Required, while MDM and other Nice-to-Have items are expected to layer in during later phases as the platform matures.
5	Based on your response above, are functional improvements the priority with data management developing as functional improvements are deilvered or is consolidating data your priimary initial goal and delivering additional operational capabilities would follow?	Data consolidation (a single book of record) is the necessary foundation, but functional capabilities — inventory, ordering, reporting — are expected to be delivered early and concurrently rather than strictly after full data consolidation is complete.
6	Is HFG open to evaluating a multi-vendor or partner-led solution in which one prime vendor remains accountable for the end-to-end solution, or is the intent to select a single vendor and product to satisfy all requirements?	HFG is open to either approach. As noted in the RFP, EDMS is expected to be a combination of inherent platform capabilities and supported integrations rather than a single monolithic build — HFG is not requiring one vendor to natively build every capability, but does expect a clear, accountable primary point of ownership for the overall solution.
7	For capabilities delivered through a supported third-party integration, would HFG expect to contract only with the prime vendor, or could there be separate agreements with individual solution providers?	Contracting approach will depend on the specific integration and how central it is to core functionality; this will be worked out during negotiation. In general, HFG would prefer a primary contract with the core platform vendor, with that vendor responsible for coordinating supported third-party integrations where practical.
8	Among the capabilities classified as “Required,” what are the top three business problems or outcomes HFG would like to address first?	Based on current priorities, these are the top 3 of equal importance: (1) a single POS-agnostic book of record consolidating all 12 POS systems, (2) enterprise perpetual inventory management, and (3) elimination of manual/spreadsheet-driven reporting through self-service dashboards.
9	Once the highest-priority need has been addressed, which capabilities or outcomes would HFG prioritize second and third? Is HFG envisioning a phased implementation, and if so, what capabilities should be included in the initial phase?	Yes, HFG anticipates a phased implementation. After the core data consolidation and inventory foundation, next priorities would likely include EDI invoice ingestion, store operations tools, and promotion planning/forecasting, with Nice-to-Have items (MDM, NLQ/AI, vendor portal) following in later phases.

Q#	Submitted Question	HFG Response
10	Additionally, are any of the “Required” capabilities absolute pass/fail criteria, or could certain requirements be delivered in a later phase, through an integration, or under a committed product roadmap?	Most Required items reflect near-term business needs rather than absolute pass/fail gates. HFG is open to items being delivered via a later phase, a supported integration, or a committed and dated roadmap item, provided the vendor can speak clearly to timing and approach. The foundational exceptions are POS-agnostic data consolidation and perpetual inventory, which are central to the initiative.
11	Several of the functional requirements outlined are standalone solutions while others are interdependent on other areas. Can you outline the business priority across these solution areas?	Core priority areas are POS-agnostic data consolidation, perpetual inventory, computer-generated ordering, and self-service reporting/dashboards — these are treated as foundational, with other capability domains (promotion planning, MDM, AI/NLQ, vendor portal) building on top of them.
12	Attachment B outlines both current-state and future-state process flows for several solution areas. How much influence is the solution provider expected to have on shaping that future state? Is it a fixed target, or open to solution provider recommendation?	Attachment B represents HFG's current-state process documentation, provided for vendor context. HFG is open to vendor recommendations in shaping the future state rather than treating it as a fixed target.
13	Given the breadth of scope, does HFG anticipate a single go-live or phased delivery by capability?	Given the breadth of scope, a phased delivery by capability area is anticipated rather than a single big-bang go-live. The exact sequencing is open to vendor recommendation.

4. Current Environment, POS & Systems Integration

Q#	Submitted Question	HFG Response
1	Can you send us your current system architecture and include details around which solutions are integrated? Please indicate which systems are currently up for replacement.	EDMS is not intended to replace core transaction systems (POS, ERP/financials); it is an integration and intelligence layer that ingests and normalizes data from those systems. A full architecture diagram and list of current systems (including any slated for replacement) will be shared with short-listed vendors under NDA during the technical review phase.
2	Are there any mandatory integration standards? (example: EDI)	EDI is required for vendor invoice ingestion, and a REST API framework plus flat-file (CSV, Excel, fixed-width, XML) support are required for source systems lacking APIs. Beyond that, HFG is not mandating a single proprietary

Q#	Submitted Question	HFG Response
		standard — open architecture is preferred so the platform can adapt over time.
3	Are all 12 POS systems currently sending data to a central location, or does the EDMS need to establish collection at each source?	No — today all 12 POS systems do not feed a central location. This fragmentation is the core problem EDMS is intended to solve, so the platform will need to establish ingestion from each source.
4	Could HFG clarify the intended business use case and scope for the "Multi-Format POS data ingestion" requirement? RFP line item: "Multi-format POS data ingestion (12 POS systems, varied formats)" — Required. "Core platform must normalize and unify transaction data from all POS sources."	The intent is broader than reporting alone. The normalized, unified transaction data is expected to be the foundation for perpetual inventory, accounting reconciliation, loss prevention, store operations, promotion analysis, forecasting, and downstream system feeds — not just a reporting data set.
5	Could you walk us through the business use case behind this requirement? What decision, report, or process is currently blocked or limited by not having unified data across your 12 POS systems today?	Today, decisions such as accurate item-level gross profit, timely promotional effectiveness measurement, and enterprise-wide inventory visibility are all delayed or limited because data must be manually consolidated across disconnected POS systems.
6	Is the primary objective to consolidate POS transaction data for reporting and analytics, or is the normalized data also expected to support perpetual inventory, accounting reconciliation, loss prevention, store operations, promotion analysis, forecasting, and downstream system feeds?	Both. Consolidating POS data for reporting/analytics is necessary but not sufficient — the normalized data must also support perpetual inventory, accounting reconciliation, loss prevention, store operations, promotion analysis, forecasting, and downstream feeds.
7	Which POS platforms and versions are currently in use?	Specific POS platforms, versions, and technical documentation will be provided to short-listed vendors under NDA during the technical discovery/demonstration phase rather than in the open RFP.
8	What specific data domains are required, such as item sales, tenders, returns, voids, discounts, taxes, loyalty activity, cash-office activity, and inventory-related transactions?	Yes — item sales, tenders, returns, voids, discounts, taxes, loyalty activity, cash-office activity, and inventory-related transactions are all expected data domains.
9	What file formats, APIs, database connections, or other integration methods are available from each POS system?	Integration methods vary by POS platform, and will include a variety of mandatory integration standards (API, CSV, XML, etc.). Detailed interface documentation will be shared with short-listed vendors during technical discovery.

Q#	Submitted Question	HFG Response
10	Can HFG provide representative data samples, file layouts, or interface documentation?	Yes, representative data samples and file layouts can be made available to short-listed vendors under NDA.
11	What are the expected transaction volumes, ingestion frequency, and latency requirements?	Expected volumes, ingestion frequency, and latency requirements will be provided during technical discovery; near-real-time/intraday ingestion is preferred to support perpetual inventory use cases.
12	How much historical POS data must be loaded during implementation?	Where available, the required historical retention window of two years of queryable data should be loaded during implementation, with additional history considered where feasible.
13	Does HFG expect the selected vendor to build and maintain all connectors, mappings, normalization rules, monitoring, and error-recovery processes?	Yes, HFG expects the selected vendor to build and maintain the core connectors, mappings, normalization rules, monitoring, and error-recovery processes, in partnership with HFG IT. HFG also expects the platform to support adding new data sources independently going forward, without requiring vendor involvement for every addition.
14	Is this expected to be one-way ingestion, or will any data need to be written back to the POS systems?	Primarily one-way ingestion from POS. The exception is Master Data Management: Should EDMS become the master book of record for item data and feed/export item maintenance data back to the POS host systems.
15	Attachment B describes child items appearing as a purchase from the parent, with quantities determined by scale data at packaging. Should vendors assume scale integration is in scope, or that scale data arrives through an existing feed?	Yes, scale integration should be assumed in scope to support product transformation tracking (yield, finished product output, and waste) for fresh/production departments.

5. Data Management, Governance & Reporting

Q#	Submitted Question	HFG Response
1	What are the data retention and audit requirements for your system of record?	Two years of queryable history plus seven years of backup retention for audit purposes, with full change logging (user, timestamp, reason) on any manually entered or modified data.

Q#	Submitted Question	HFG Response
2	What BI or reporting tools does HFG use today, and should the EDMS replace those tools or feed them?	Current reporting is largely manual and spreadsheet-driven rather than centralized in a single BI tool. Where existing analytics tools are in use, EDMS is generally expected to ingest and surface that data (per the Executive Overview's integration-first approach) rather than duplicate existing best-in-class capabilities; specifics will be confirmed during discovery.
3	The mapping distinguishes parent-level shrink as production efficiency from child-level shrink as theft or overproduction. Should this distinction be reflected in standard reporting, or is it an analysis HFG performs separately?	Yes, this distinction should be reflected in standard reporting, consistent with the RFP's requirement for proactive, exception-based loss prevention visibility rather than after-the-fact manual analysis.
4	In addition to the listed examples—daily sales, sales tax, customer count, receipt lookup, tender type, and average basket size—what other information or methods do you use to review and track loss prevention?	Beyond the listed examples, HFG's loss prevention approach today is largely reactive (investigations after the fact, delayed reporting, limited exception visibility) rather than built on proactive exception-based monitoring — closing that gap is a core objective of this initiative. Case/investigation tracking is listed as a Nice-to-Have capability.

6. Multi-Banner Business Operations & Process Standardization

Q#	Submitted Question	HFG Response
1	Are distribution centers unique to each banner, or are there distribution centers that serve stores across multiple banners?	Distribution centers can serve across banners. Structure relative to banners will be detailed during technical discovery; in general HFG's banners are not fully siloed from an operations standpoint, so vendors should design for the possibility of shared or cross-banner distribution.
2	Are there any situations where store-to-store transfers are required between different banners?	Yes — the platform should support the full transfer workflow (Required in the RFP) across banners, not assume transfers are limited to a single banner.
3	Are promotions run across all or multiple banners, or are promotions unique to each banner?	Promotion planning needs may include both banner-specific and multi-banner promotions; the Ad Builder/TPR Builder capability should be flexible enough to support both.
4	The transfers mapping states that pending transfers should resolve before weekly close. Is a weekly close	This may vary by process rather than being uniform across all inventory functions; HFG

Q#	Submitted Question	HFG Response
	cadence expected across all inventory functions, or does it vary by process?	will confirm specific closing cadences by workflow during implementation planning.
5	To minimize manual errors and adjustments, is HFG prepared to standardize on defined, scoped operational processes as part of the program — and does HFG anticipate the associated change management and training effort being in scope for the vendor?	Yes, HFG is prepared to standardize on defined operational processes as part of this program, and expects change management and training to be a shared responsibility, with specific scope and division of labor defined contractually with the selected vendor.

7. Implementation Scope, Timeline & Resources

Q#	Submitted Question	HFG Response
1	Is the initial implementation expected to include all banners, all locations, and all 12 POS systems, or would HFG prefer to begin with a specific banner, store group, POS platform, or capability area?	Not yet finalized. The RFP does not require a simultaneous rollout across all banners, locations, and POS systems — HFG is open to a phased or pilot-based approach and welcomes vendor recommendations on sequencing.
2	Are there any business units or capabilities that are explicitly out of scope for the initial implementation?	No business units or capabilities have been formally excluded at this stage. That said, the initial focus of the initiative is centralizing *grocery* operations; hardware and QSR formats may follow in later phases.
3	What is the total user population that will need access to the new system?	Not yet finalized. The user population will span store-level associates (via mobile/in-store tools) as well as corporate users across IT, Merchandising, Operations, Accounting, Marketing, Loss Prevention, and Executive teams. Exact counts will be scoped with the selected vendor.
4	When is your anticipated go-live for this solution?	TBD. As noted in the RFP timeline, specific dates have not yet been finalized. HFG will begin establishing target dates as we approach vendor selection.
5	What target dates does HFG have in mind for contract execution, implementation kickoff, pilot deployment, and production go-live?	TBD. As noted in the RFP timeline, specific dates have not yet been finalized. HFG will begin establishing target dates as we approach vendor selection.
6	Is there a specific business event or operational deadline driving the implementation schedule? What internal HFG resources and subject-matter experts are	No single fixed external deadline has been published. Expected participants include cross-functional stakeholders from IT,

Q#	Submitted Question	HFG Response
	expected to participate in data mapping, integration, testing, training, and change management?	Merchandising, Operations, Accounting, Marketing, and Loss Prevention for data mapping, integration, testing, training, and change management.
7	What overall program duration does HFG anticipate from award to full go-live, and are there fixed milestones or business dates the schedule must accommodate?	Not yet finalized — per the RFP timeline, program duration and milestones will be established after vendor selection based on the chosen solution's implementation approach.

8. Platform Ownership & Post-Implementation Administration

Q#	Submitted Question	HFG Response
1	What level of configuration does HFG expect to perform independently post-implementation?	Per the RFP's Security & Admin requirements, HFG expects to independently manage users, roles, workflows, configuration, and the ability to add & modify data sources without requiring vendor involvement for routine changes.
2	Does HFG have an internal team that would take ownership of platform administration, and would that team be resourced at implementation or grown over time?	Yes, HFG's IT organization is expected to own platform administration. Whether that team is resourced at implementation or grows over time will be determined during implementation planning.

9. Evaluation, Decision Process & Demonstrations

Q#	Submitted Question	HFG Response
1	Could HFG provide additional detail regarding the decision-making and approval process, including the primary business and technical stakeholder groups?	Per RFP Section 7, an internal evaluation team reviews written responses, selects a short list for demonstrations, conducts a technical review and reference checks, and consolidates findings into a final recommendation before contract negotiation. Both business and technical stakeholders are represented on this team.
2	Will the groupings of "Available Today," "Roadmap," "Able to Build," and "Via Integration" be scored as equally compliant responses, or is there a scoring hierarchy that favors one groups of functionality over the others?	Available Today responses will be weighted most favorably in evaluation. Roadmap and Ability to Build responses remain viable when accompanied by a clear, credible delivery date, and Available via Integration is

Q#	Submitted Question	HFG Response
		acceptable where the integration is proven and supportable. A precise numeric scoring hierarchy has not been published.
3	How much time will be allocated per demonstration, and will HFG provide the business scenarios in advance so vendors can prepare against them specifically?	Specific demo duration and logistics will be determined with the short-listed vendors. As noted in Section 5 of the RFP, HFG intends to provide business scenarios in advance so vendors can prepare against them directly.
4	Will a formal gap analysis be a requirement of the evaluation process?	Effectively yes, though HFG has already done much of this work internally — the requirements are defined, and the integration points are mapped. The Attachment A Functionality Requirements Response Workbook and the Section 4.3 capability-domain responses (current capabilities vs. gaps/roadmap) serve as the structured gap analysis, capturing where each vendor's platform fits against what HFG has already scoped.
5	Will HFG provide specific business scenarios and representative sample data for the solution demonstrations?	Yes — per Section 5, HFG will provide specific business scenarios (and expects vendors to use representative sample data) for solution demonstrations.
6	Is a proof of concept or pilot expected before final selection, and, if so, what technical and business acceptance criteria would be used?	Not required of every vendor, but a proof of concept or pilot may be deemed favorable & requested of finalist(s) depending on the evaluation team's needs after the demonstration phase.

10. Commercial, Contracting & Pricing

Q#	Submitted Question	HFG Response
1	Has HFG established an investment range or target total cost of ownership that vendors should design toward? Are there procurement, legal, insurance, or contracting requirements that should be considered before the final selection stage?	A specific investment range has not been published in the RFP; pricing will be evaluated through the Section 4.10 Pricing Summary responses and standard HFG procurement/legal review.
2	Does HFG have a target budget range or expected investment level for this initiative?	A specific budget range has not been published in the RFP. Vendors should provide complete, transparent pricing per Section 4.10, which HFG will evaluate against total cost of ownership as part of the scoring criteria.

Q#	Submitted Question	HFG Response
3	What contract term is HFG anticipating, and are multi-year commitments preferred?	Contract term has not been predetermined. Per Section 4.10, vendors should describe available multi-year pricing and contract flexibility options, and HFG will weigh these along with overall value and long-term partnership fit.