

WRITTEN RFP RESPONSE

Software built for Houchens. Improved as your needs change.



Enterprise Data Management System

Prepared for Houchens Food Group
September 8, 2026 | Review draft

Connect your business information. Build the inventory and reporting tools your teams need. Keep working with a partner you know to improve them.

Before the decision, try it for yourself.

We strongly recommend opening the interactive proposal. Follow a receiving example, try the sample screens, and ask Handrail AI about price, timing, or future changes.

houchens.handrail-daas.com/



Scan to open

\$355,000 fixed initial build + \$20,000/month recurring

Up to 1,000 users. Subscription commencement, allowances, and possible extra charges are explained inside. Contract drafts are included.

READING GUIDE

Start with the decision. Keep the detail close.

Executive brief	3
Executive brief / Delivery	4
RFP 4.10 / Pricing summary	5
RFP 4.10 / Limits and billing	6
RFP 4.1 / Company overview	7
RFP 4.2 / Solution overview	8
RFP 4.3 / Functional capabilities (1 of 2)	9
RFP 4.3 / Functional capabilities (2 of 2)	10
RFP 4.4 and 4.5 / Reports and records	11
RFP 4.5.3 / Ownership and portability	12
RFP 4.6 and 4.7 / Security and AI	13
RFP 4.8 and 5 / Partnership and demonstration	14
RFP 4.9, 6 and 9 / Response and attachments	15
RFP 4.9 / Attachment A response	16
Contract appendices	26
Appendix B / HFG draft Order Form	27
Appendix C / Handrail MSA v2026.08	58

For executive discussion, start with pages 1-6. The narrative-only PDF has 25 pages; the complete packet has 122, including the full contract appendices. Return the separate completed Attachment A XLSX with the written response.

Review draft: see the company overview and submission notes for facts still needed.

EXECUTIVE BRIEF

A system that keeps up with Houchens.

Choose Hitcents to bring your information together, build the tools your teams need, and keep improving them as the business changes.

Start with the work that matters

Connect all 12 point-of-sale systems. Keep inventory current as goods are received, sold, transferred, or adjusted. Give store and corporate teams dependable reports without rebuilding spreadsheets. Core checkout and financial systems stay in place.

Your RFP has already moved the work forward

Your team has done the hard work of explaining what it needs. We use the RFP, your answers, and your process maps to guide what we build and how we check it. You do not have to predict every detail perfectly before we begin.

Work with a partner who knows Houchens

Hitcents has worked with Houchens for years and remains a technology provider today. That experience helps us ask informed questions and work through business rules with your people. Handrail helps our team develop, test, and run the software.

Keep improving after launch

HFG sets priorities and reviews results. Hitcents builds, tests, and introduces agreed changes. Once the subscription begins, adding a function to the same system does not, by itself, trigger another build fee. Usage limits and extra work can affect cost.

What to discuss in the decision meeting

Will the system make inventory and reports more dependable? Can HFG manage routine accounts and settings? How quickly can a business rule change, and what will that change cost? Judge the working results and the cost of continued improvement alongside the feature list.

Sources: RFP §§2-3, 7; Vendor Q&A §§3-4, 8; approved Hitcents context; MSA §§4.7, 7.

See the work. Then put it into use.

First working prototypes are targeted for the end of Month 1. By the end of Month 4, HFG can review working prototypes for all 38 capabilities, including the nice-to-haves. Production rollout follows.

Today | Try the proposed screens

The interactive proposal shows sample inventory, reporting, and receiving screens before award. These explain the design; they are not completed HFG software. The next evaluation stage requires actual functions with representative records.

Months 1-4 | Working prototypes for every capability

Month 1: first records, inventory, reports, and roles. Month 2: ordering, transfers, invoices, and mobile tasks. Month 3: all 12 source-format mappings, fresh production, promotions, and store cash. Month 4: vendor tools, investigations, and business AI. Review representative records in a test environment; no working prototype is promised before the end of Month 1.

Start of Month 6 | Target first daily use

Begin with an agreed group of grocery stores and the first inventory and reporting tools. Check quantities and reports against source records, train employees, and agree readiness. Continue connecting other systems as these teams begin using the tools.

Month 12 | Target completion of the initial build

Complete the agreed connections and business functions in stages. Sequence capabilities with HFG. The targets are measured from project start and depend on access, records, other providers, and HFG decisions; they are not guaranteed dates.

A practical example: 100 cases invoiced, 96 received

The store needs the correct inventory count. Accounting needs to track the credit for four missing cases. HFG approves the rule; Hitcents builds and tests it with Handrail. If a manager later needs to approve large credits, we agree, build, and check that change.

Measure whether the work is paying off

Measure reporting effort, inventory accuracy, outstanding credits, report use, and the time and cost to introduce a change. Agree starting measurements and targets with HFG. Count cash savings separately from employee time freed for other work.

Sources: Draft Order Form; RFP §§4.8, 5; Vendor Q&A §§3, 7; Attachment B, Nonfuel Grocery Receiving.

RFP 4.10 • PRICING SUMMARY

What Houchens pays.

The proposed price is \$355,000 for the initial build, plus \$20,000 per month once the subscription begins. The monthly price covers one shared HFG system for up to 1,000 users.

RFP cost category	Proposed cost / treatment
Platform / SaaS licensing	\$180,000/year (\$15,000/month Enterprise base).
Implementation services	\$355,000 fixed: \$120,000 base + \$235,000 dedicated build team. Paid in 12 installments.
Data integration / connectors	Agreed initial connections are included in the build. Ongoing changes use service allowances. No separate annual connector fee is selected; other providers may charge fees.
User licensing	\$60,000/year (\$5,000/month) adds capacity up to 1,000 total users. Combined recurring price: \$240,000/year.
Training	Shared HFG / Hitcents responsibility. Specific sessions and division of work must be agreed; no separate training charge is selected in the draft.
Ongoing support	Bundled in the \$240,000 annual recurring baseline; allowances and service terms apply.
Modules, add-ons / equipment	No separately priced module or equipment purchase is selected. Extra usage, work, devices, and third-party services may add cost if needed; quantities and prices remain to be confirmed.

Example for the first 12 months: about \$495,000

\$355,000 build plus seven months at \$20,000 if first daily use begins at the start of Month 6. The actual subscription start determines the total. Completing the build early does not cancel the fixed fee or remaining installments.

Volume, term, and flexibility

Up to 2,500 total users is \$27,500/month (\$330,000/year); higher capacity is custom. The standard subscription term is 12 months with 12-month renewals unless notice is given at least 60 days before term end. No multi-year discount is quoted. Any different pricing or term must be agreed in the Order Form.

Sources: RFP §4.10; approved commercial brief; draft Order Form; MSA standard pricing and renewal terms.

What is included. What can cost extra.

The subscription pays to run and improve the system within the purchased allowances. It is not an unlimited budget for every kind of work.

Monthly allowances

Enterprise includes 1,000 Change Requests, 2,000 infrastructure credits, 1,500 AI credits, and 40 engineering hours. A distinct automated change or follow-up counts as a Change Request. A support inquiry or defect report does not. Automated changes beyond the request pool use applicable Resource Credits.

Extra usage and engineer time

Resource Credits measure usage, not engineering hours or guaranteed feature completion. Extra credits cost \$1.25 each. Extra infrastructure usage can be billed automatically to keep the system running. Optional AI work stops at its allowance unless HFG approves more. Extra engineering is \$200/hour, normally with written approval first.

Some work needs separate terms

A separately operated system, a guaranteed-date project, substantial human-led migration or architecture work, third-party services, or work beyond purchased Handrail functions can require separate terms. A feature may take more than one month's allowance. Confirmed Handrail platform incidents and Hitcents-caused defects do not consume the 40 included engineering hours.

When recurring billing begins

Under MSA §5.5, billing starts at the earliest of go-live, HFG's instruction to make the system available for production, material live use, or 15 business days after a valid Production-Ready Notice when delay is not caused by an unresolved material Hitcents defect. The notice formally states that the system is ready for its intended use.

Phased launch and initial build changes

The first material production phase starts the subscription unless the signed Order Form expressly sets another staged schedule. Build installments can overlap with recurring fees. During implementation, changes are reviewed against the agreed initial scope; the monthly service's included changes apply once it starts.

Before agreeing a final total

Validate users, source interfaces and volumes, retention costs, devices, training work, and third-party charges. Taxes and unselected options are not included. The attached draft Order Form and MSA set out the full terms; the narrative is a summary.

Sources: RFP §4.10; MSA §§4.7, 5.5-5.6, 7.1-7.7; draft Order Form.

RFP 4.1 • COMPANY OVERVIEW

Hitcents is the partner responsible for the work.

Handrail is the system our team uses to build, test, and run the software. HFG would contract with Hitcents and work with Hitcents throughout the program.

4.1.1 | Company background, size, and stability

Hitcents builds custom software and has an existing technology-provider relationship with Houchens. The company facts below still need approved information before the written response can be finalized.

Years in business

Not supplied for this draft. Hitcents must provide its founding year and years in business before submission.

Company size and financial stability

Not supplied for this draft. Hitcents must provide current company size before submission. Financial stability indicators have not been supplied. Hitcents must provide approved evidence before submission.

4.1.2 | Grocery and non-grocery experience

Hitcents has worked with Houchens for years and remains a provider today. Named grocery and non-grocery case studies and key markets beyond the Houchens relationship have not been supplied for this draft.

4.1.3 | Customer references

The required 3-5 retail or grocery reference contacts have not been supplied. Hitcents must add permitted customer names, use cases, contact names, and contact details before submission.

Proposal contact

Clinton Mills | clinton.mills@hitcents.com

Sources: Approved Hitcents company context. Missing company facts are explicitly identified; no customer references or financial evidence are invented.

Connect existing systems. Build the tools around them.

The proposed EDMS brings HFG's records into a shared system for inventory, reporting, and daily business work. It does not replace the core checkout or financial systems.

4.2.1 | Fit with HFG's requirements

Collect and normalize records from all 12 point-of-sale systems and other agreed sources. Use those records for perpetual inventory, ordering, reconciliation, reports, promotion planning, and other agreed functions. Start with grocery operations and expand in stages.

4.2.2 | Proposed architecture and hosting

Propose a cloud-hosted HFG application operated by Hitcents under the Enterprise service. Source connections feed checked records into shared business data; business rules then support workflows, reports, and exports. The final infrastructure design, provider, region, sizing, and network controls require technical review. No on-premise or hybrid configuration is selected in the draft.

4.2.2 | Multi-tenancy and data isolation

The commercial proposal is for one shared HFG system. Store, banner, region, and role restrictions would apply to data access, reports, exports, and AI queries. The exact isolation design between customers, services, and environments, including any dedicated resources, must be documented and demonstrated in technical review. A shared HFG system does not imply permission to expose HFG data to other customers.

4.2.3 | Multiple banners and regions

Model locations, banners, regions, distribution centers, and permitted cross-banner activity. Support transfers across banners, shared distribution centers, and both banner-specific and multi-banner promotions. Agree accounting close rules by workflow rather than assuming every process closes on the same schedule.

4.2.4 | Downtime statistics

Measured downtime percentages, reporting period, and time-of-day breakdown have not been supplied. The 99.9% availability objective is a service target, not a historical uptime measurement.

Sources: RFP §§3, 4.2; Vendor Q&A §§4, 6-8; draft Order Form. Architecture is proposed, not a claim of completed HFG infrastructure.

RFP 4.3 • FUNCTIONAL CAPABILITIES (1 OF 2)

What we propose to build, and what remains to prove.

The supplied HFG screens are a design preview. Current screen coverage is distinguished below from functioning HFG software. Detailed capability responses follow in the Section 4.9 appendix.

Data Management & Governance

Current evidence: sample record and administration views. Proposed: normalize records, apply validation, keep source history, log corrections, and retain two years queryable plus seven years of backups. Gap: actual connections, retention sizing, restore evidence, and production acceptance remain to be completed.

Security & Administration (RBAC, SSO, MFA)

Current evidence: role-switching and administration samples. Proposed: role, group, row, and object restrictions; company sign-in; activity logs; inactive-account rules. Gap: enforced permissions, identity-provider integration, and security test results require implementation and review.

Integrations & Connectivity

Current evidence: proposed connection and recovery design. Proposed: all 12 point-of-sale sources, EDI invoices, REST APIs, files, downstream feeds, and fresh-department scale data. Gap: interfaces, credentials, partner capabilities, throughput, and replay tests need source-specific validation.

Reporting & Analytics (Self-Service)

Current evidence: sample dashboards, report builder, and drill-down screens. Proposed: business-user reports, IT-published views, transaction detail, exports, and scheduled email. Gap: working report creation, permission enforcement, and reconciled results must be demonstrated.

Merchandising Intelligence

Current evidence: sample promotion and item views. Proposed: ad/temporary-price-reduction planning, sales-lift and margin forecasts, funding analysis, and item information. Gap: live source coverage and forecasting quality need validation with HFG records.

Operations Intelligence

Current evidence: inventory, ordering, transfer, fresh production, and store-task samples. Proposed: inventory changes from all transaction types, store-approved ordering, out-of-stock alerts, transfers, yield, waste, cash balancing, and deposits. Gap: end-to-end calculations and store/device workflows require implementation.

Sources: RFP §4.3; Attachment A; current proposal sample screens. Proposed initial scope targets Month 12 overall; capability sequence must be agreed. All capabilities are Able to Build; working-prototype targets run from the end of Month 1 through the end of Month 4.

RFP 4.3 • FUNCTIONAL CAPABILITIES (2 OF 2)

Use the same records across the business.

These domains build on dependable source records and agreed business rules. They are proposed capabilities, not claims that all HFG functions are available today.

Financial Intelligence

Current evidence: invoice, credit, and store-cash samples. Proposed: receiving and supplier-credit reconciliation, item-level gross profit, deposit/register records, and structured feeds to existing financial systems. Gap: cost rules, close periods, financial interfaces, and reconciled outputs need HFG approval.

Marketing & Loyalty Intelligence

Current evidence: sample performance/reporting views. Proposed: connect agreed marketing and loyalty records to sales and promotion reporting, with access controls. Gap: specific source interfaces, measures, and data permissions must be confirmed; no completed loyalty connector is claimed.

Loss Prevention Intelligence

Current evidence: exception and case-tracking samples. Proposed: drill into suspicious transactions, compare inventory and shrink, distinguish production inefficiency from child-item loss, and optionally track investigations. Gap: alert thresholds, investigation permissions, and useful signal quality require HFG validation.

Workflow & Business Tools

Current evidence: receiving, transfer, and store-task samples. Proposed: record receipts, track credits, approve orders, manage transfers, log manual corrections, and support food-safety traceability records. Gap: business rules, exception handling, and acceptance checks remain to be implemented.

Forecasting & Optimization

Current evidence: illustrative forecasts and price/assortment suggestions. Proposed: sales-lift, margin, replenishment, and optional price/assortment recommendations. Gap: sufficient history, model selection, accuracy targets, and business approval; no measured forecasting result is claimed.

AI & Advanced Analytics

Current evidence: Ask Handrail explains this proposal from its documents. The sample business assistant uses prepared examples. Proposed: permission-aware questions about HFG records, anomalies, predictions, and recommendations. Gap: live business-data integration, evaluations, permissions, and human review before use. Proposal chat is not proof of those business AI functions.

Sources: RFP §4.3; Vendor Q&A §§4-5; Attachment B. Initial-scope targets are program-level planning targets, not guaranteed per-feature dates. All capabilities are Able to Build; working-prototype targets run from the end of Month 1 through the end of Month 4.

Let teams get answers and check the numbers.

Reporting and integrations are proposed parts of the HFG build. We would demonstrate the complete path from a source record to a report and its export.

4.4.1 | Who builds dashboards

Propose dashboards that business users can arrange using approved measures, filters, and store/banner views. HFG IT can publish shared dashboards and manage access. Hitcents builds the underlying tools and agreed complex views. The sample builder illustrates the design; independent configuration must be proven in working software.

4.4.2 | Self-service reports

Business users would select permitted fields, measures, filters, and groupings; save reports; and drill from totals to source transactions. HFG IT governs definitions and access. Begin with daily sales, taxes, customer counts, receipts, tender types, average basket size, inventory, and gross profit.

4.4.3 | Exports and scheduled delivery

Propose Excel, PDF, and CSV report exports, scheduled generation, and email distribution. Validate output, scheduling, recipient permissions, and failure handling during acceptance. These are proposed functions; the printed proposal itself is not evidence of the future EDMS report engine.

4.5.1 | Integration methods and operations

Plan for REST APIs, EDI vendor invoices, and CSV, Excel, fixed-width, and XML files. SFTP and direct database connectors would be selected where source systems support them. Validate each interface during discovery. Monitor missing and late feeds, isolate bad records, retry failures, and let HFG inspect and recover work without duplicating transactions.

4.5.2 | Governance and correction

Keep the source record and track how it becomes a normalized record and report. Log manual changes with user, time, reason, and relevant close period. Use agreed validation rules and exception queues. Load two years of available history, plan seven-year backup retention, and test recovery. Confirm record volumes and timing needs with HFG.

HFG owns its information. Agree the full exit rights.

HFG's RFP requires unrestricted data export and migration at any time. The standard MSA offers specific export rights with conditions. That difference must be resolved in the signed agreement.

Ownership of HFG data and reports

HFG owns its operational, financial, customer, and reporting information and outputs under the agreement. Propose permission-controlled access to cleaned records, queries, exports, and downstream interfaces. Agree formats and access that let HFG use its information independently.

Standard exports and migration work

During an active subscription, the MSA allows a standard copy of customer data in a commonly used format. Rearranging records or helping migrate to a different system may require additional work and cost. The final agreement must settle HFG's unrestricted-export requirement, including access, timing, formats, and migration charges.

If the subscription ends

Under the standard terms, HFG has 30 days after the agreement ends to request its data, subject to payment of undisputed amounts. Data may be deleted after that period. The response does not describe these terms as equivalent to HFG's unrestricted data-access requirement.

Software rights are different from data ownership

Hitcents owns the application software. MSA §17 provides conditional rights to operate and maintain the application after defined continuity events, including certain permanent service failures. Ordinary nonrenewal does not trigger those rights. The draft does not select a voluntary source-code buyout or independent escrow arrangement.

HFG's routine administration

Propose HFG-managed users, roles, settings, workflows, and routine addition or modification of data sources. Document the controls and provide agreed training. These controls reduce routine dependence on Hitcents; they do not replace the written export and continuity protections.

Technical review and contracting decision

Demonstrate an export of representative records and reports, confirm completeness and format, and review the data-access and continuity terms with HFG. Put any added rights into the executed documents before signing.

Sources: RFP §4.5.3, 8; Vendor Q&A §8; MSA customer-data and continuity terms, including §17.

Control who can act. Check what AI produces.

HFG makes business decisions. Hitcents remains responsible for the agreed technical work. Access restrictions must apply to screens, reports, exports, and AI answers.

4.6.1 | Roles, groups, and view-as

Propose centrally managed roles and groups with store/banner, row, object, and action permissions. The sample view-as tool illustrates how an administrator could check another role's view. Production enforcement, authorized impersonation, logging, and limits must be built and security-tested.

4.6.2 | SSO, MFA, and identity providers

The selected draft includes SSO/SAML support at no additional fee. MFA is supplied by the chosen identity provider. HFG's provider, supported configuration, account lifecycle, and sign-in tests must be confirmed. No named provider integration is asserted as already deployed for HFG.

4.6.3 | Audit and user activity

Propose logs for sign-ins, access changes, imports, approvals, manual corrections, and sensitive actions. Keep the actor, time, record, and reason where applicable. Agree log access, retention, review, and inactive-user rules. The draft includes enhanced activity records; end-to-end enforcement requires validation.

4.7.1 | AI available in this proposal

Ask Handrail answers questions about the proposal documents and shows sources. Hitcents uses Handrail to help write, test, and introduce software changes. The prepared AI examples in sample business screens are not a live HFG data assistant, and no production HFG predictions or accuracy statistics are claimed.

4.7.2 | Business AI roadmap and timing

Target working prototypes of plain-language business questions, anomaly insights, and pricing/assortment recommendations by the end of Month 4 from kickoff. Build on representative records and permissions established in earlier months. HFG reviews expected answers, predictions, and recommendations before use. No HFG implementation is built today; these are Able to Build targets, not current availability or guaranteed production-release dates.

How HFG would evaluate it

Use known sample questions and expected results. Test that users cannot retrieve restricted records, that answers identify source information, and that weak or incomplete evidence is visible. Require human approval for consequential business actions and measure usefulness before expanding use.

Sources: RFP §§4.6-4.7; draft Order Form; approved Handrail positioning. Proposed HFG security and AI functions require implementation and evidence.

RFP 4.8 AND 5 • PARTNERSHIP AND DEMONSTRATION

Agree the work. Show the results.

A shared work list, regular reviews, and named decision makers keep the program moving. The proposed operating rhythm must be agreed with HFG.

4.8.1 | Support, response targets, and escalation

Selected Enterprise service includes proactive monitoring, priority support, backups, and standard disaster recovery. Initial response targets are one hour for Severity 1, four hours for Severity 2, and one business day for Severity 3. Coverage hours, severity definitions, named escalation contacts, and the escalation sequence still need agreement. Targets are not guaranteed fix times; binding SLAs and remedies require express agreement.

4.8.2 | Implementation and resources

Use phased delivery, source mapping, business-rule review, and testing with HFG. Target first working prototypes at the end of Month 1 and prototypes for all 38 capabilities by the end of Month 4. Production targets remain Month 6 for first daily use and Month 12 for initial completion. HFG provides records, access, and cross-functional decision makers. Hitcents supplies engineering; agree staffing and training responsibilities.

4.8.3 | Account management and customer success

Enterprise includes a dedicated account contact, monthly system-health review, and optimization review. Propose reviewing adoption, reporting effort, inventory accuracy, and open issues together. Name the customer and Hitcents leads at kickoff.

4.8.4 | Roadmap participation and release notes

Maintain a shared list of requested work. HFG sets business priorities; Hitcents explains readiness, dependencies, and results. Propose regular demonstrations and published notes for changes put into use. Agree meeting and release frequency; no fixed release schedule is promised.

4.8.5 | Disaster recovery

Enterprise includes backups and standard disaster recovery. Document recovery procedures and test restoration. HFG-specific RTO (how long restoration may take), RPO (how much recent data may be lost), and test frequency have not been agreed and must be set in the service terms.

Section 5 | Demonstrate actual functionality

For the shortlist stage, use HFG's scenarios and representative records. Propose tracing a receipt and credit through inventory and a report, then reviewing an agreed rule change. Agree agenda, sample data, and timing with HFG. The current clickable screens complement this written response and do not replace the required working-software demonstration.

Sources: RFP §§4.8, 5; Vendor Q&A §§7-9; draft Order Form and MSA service terms.

A response for every requirement.

The following appendix reproduces Hitcents' line-by-line response to all 38 capabilities. The completed Attachment A workbook is also available separately and must accompany the written submission.

4.9 | Use HFG's response categories

All 38 requirements, including the 8 nice-to-haves, are Able to Build. Nothing is built for HFG today. Each workbook row names a demonstration and a working-prototype target from the end of Month 1 through the end of Month 4. Prototypes run with representative records in a test environment; production completion is a later milestone. Service terms identified in the notes still need agreement.

What remains open before submission

Company years and size, financial stability indicators, permitted grocery/non-grocery examples, 3-5 reference contacts, measured downtime with time-of-day data are not supplied in the current source material. Those are explicit response gaps, not proof of compliance. Replace the marked draft responses with approved facts before sending.

What remains to settle in evaluation and contracting

Confirm technical architecture and isolation, final user counts, source interfaces and volumes, device needs, training scope, named support contacts and coverage, binding SLAs, RTO/RPO and testing, and the data-portability difference. See the relevant numbered responses and contract appendices.

Section 6 | Submission instructions

The RFP requests PDF or Word written responses with clearly labeled attachments. Email the response and completed Attachment A workbook to Amanda Benson at abenson@houchens.com, subject 'EDMS RFP Response - Hitcents'. The deadline is September 9, 2026 at 12:00 PM CST, as stated in the RFP.

Section 9 | Included materials

The PDF includes the 38-item response, the existing HFG draft Order Form (with its incorporated initial-scope documents), and the full MSA. The separate XLSX preserves HFG's capability rows. Attachment B is referenced throughout the implementation and integration responses as HFG's process context.

Before making the final recommendation

We strongly recommend that each decision maker also open the interactive proposal. Follow the receiving example, try the sample screens, and ask Handrail AI about price, changes, or timing. The PDF explains the offer; interacting with the proposal makes the proposed way of working easier to assess.

Sources: RFP §§4.9, 6, 9; Attachment A instructions; Vendor Q&A §9. Review draft pending identified facts and final response-owner validation.

RFP 4.9 • ATTACHMENT A RESPONSE

Capability responses 1-4

Formal response: Able to Build. The proposed HFG functions are not represented as Available Today. Read the notes for evidence and limits.

F-01 | Perpetual inventory management

Required • Able to Build

Working prototype target: end of Month 1 from kickoff. Demonstration: Apply receipts, sales, adjustments, credits, and transfers to a sample item inventory; check the quantities against agreed rules. Current status: not built for HFG; all functionality is Able to Build. Existing screens are design samples. Prototype review uses representative records in a test environment. Production targets remain Month 6 for first daily use and Month 12 for the initial build; dependencies and acceptance apply.

F-02 | Computer-generated ordering (auto-replenishment) & Transmission to vendor

Required • Able to Build

Working prototype target: end of Month 2 from kickoff. Demonstration: Generate suggested replenishment from sample sales, stock, and par levels; prepare an approved order for a test vendor interface. Current status: not built for HFG; all functionality is Able to Build. Existing screens are design samples. Prototype review uses representative records in a test environment. Production targets remain Month 6 for first daily use and Month 12 for the initial build; dependencies and acceptance apply.

F-03 | Order management , store review, approval, and transmission

Required • Able to Build

Working prototype target: end of Month 2 from kickoff. Demonstration: Review, edit, approve, and transmit a test order; show its status and activity history. Current status: not built for HFG; all functionality is Able to Build. Existing screens are design samples. Prototype review uses representative records in a test environment. Production targets remain Month 6 for first daily use and Month 12 for the initial build; dependencies and acceptance apply.

F-04 | Out-of-stock identification and alerting

Required • Able to Build

Working prototype target: end of Month 2 from kickoff. Demonstration: Identify zero or low stock in representative records and notify an assigned reviewer. Current status: not built for HFG; all functionality is Able to Build. Existing screens are design samples. Prototype review uses representative records in a test environment. Production targets remain Month 6 for first daily use and Month 12 for the initial build; dependencies and acceptance apply.

Capability responses 5-8

Formal response: Able to Build. The proposed HFG functions are not represented as Available Today. Read the notes for evidence and limits.

F-05 | On-order visibility (open purchase orders)

Required • Able to Build

Working prototype target: end of Month 2 from kickoff. Demonstration: Show open purchase orders and inbound quantities alongside current stock. Current status: not built for HFG; all functionality is Able to Build. Existing screens are design samples. Prototype review uses representative records in a test environment. Production targets remain Month 6 for first daily use and Month 12 for the initial build; dependencies and acceptance apply.

F-06 | Transfer management , store-to-store and DC transfers

Required • Able to Build

Working prototype target: end of Month 2 from kickoff. Demonstration: Create a store or distribution-center transfer, record a receiving difference, and trace the inventory entries. Current status: not built for HFG; all functionality is Able to Build. Existing screens are design samples. Prototype review uses representative records in a test environment. Production targets remain Month 6 for first daily use and Month 12 for the initial build; dependencies and acceptance apply.

F-07 | Product transformation tracking & production planning (fresh / production departments)

Required • Able to Build

Working prototype target: end of Month 3 from kickoff. Demonstration: Use representative scale records to turn raw inputs into finished items, recording yield, waste, and planned quantities. Current status: not built for HFG; all functionality is Able to Build. Existing screens are design samples. Prototype review uses representative records in a test environment. Production targets remain Month 6 for first daily use and Month 12 for the initial build; dependencies and acceptance apply.

F-08 | Promotion planning and management (Ad Builder, TPR Builder, predictive sales lift & margin impact) with forecasting

Required • Able to Build

Working prototype target: end of Month 3 from kickoff. Demonstration: Build a sample ad or temporary-price-reduction event and calculate illustrative sales-lift and margin forecasts. Current status: not built for HFG; all functionality is Able to Build. Existing screens are design samples. Prototype review uses representative records in a test environment. Production targets remain Month 6 for first daily use and Month 12 for the initial build; dependencies and acceptance apply.

RFP 4.9 • ATTACHMENT A RESPONSE

Capability responses 9-12

Formal response: Able to Build. The proposed HFG functions are not represented as Available Today. Read the notes for evidence and limits.

F-09 | Custom Dashboards & Reporting - self service & admin built/published

Required • Able to Build

Working prototype target: end of Month 1 from kickoff. Demonstration: Build and save a report from representative records, filter by store, and publish a basic dashboard. Current status: not built for HFG; all functionality is Able to Build. Existing screens are design samples. Prototype review uses representative records in a test environment. Production targets remain Month 6 for first daily use and Month 12 for the initial build; dependencies and acceptance apply.

F-10 | Food safety and FSMA compliance tracking

Required • Able to Build

Working prototype target: end of Month 3 from kickoff. Demonstration: Record representative lots and food events and trace a sample recall; HFG validates required fields. Current status: not built for HFG; all functionality is Able to Build. Existing screens are design samples. HFG must validate traceability requirements; no compliance certification is claimed. Prototype review uses representative records in a test environment. Production targets remain Month 6 for first daily use and Month 12 for the initial build; dependencies and acceptance apply.

F-11 | Drill-down from summary to transaction level

Required • Able to Build

Working prototype target: end of Month 1 from kickoff. Demonstration: Open a report total and trace it to the underlying sample transactions. Current status: not built for HFG; all functionality is Able to Build. Existing screens are design samples. Prototype review uses representative records in a test environment. Production targets remain Month 6 for first daily use and Month 12 for the initial build; dependencies and acceptance apply.

F-12 | Scheduled report delivery and email distribution

Required • Able to Build

Working prototype target: end of Month 2 from kickoff. Demonstration: Schedule a report and deliver a test export/email to approved test recipients. Current status: not built for HFG; all functionality is Able to Build. Existing screens are design samples. Prototype review uses representative records in a test environment. Production targets remain Month 6 for first daily use and Month 12 for the initial build; dependencies and acceptance apply.

Capability responses 13-16

Formal response: Able to Build. The proposed HFG functions are not represented as Available Today. Read the notes for evidence and limits.

F-13 | EDI vendor invoice ingestion & translation

Required • Able to Build

Working prototype target: end of Month 2 from kickoff. Demonstration: Parse representative EDI invoices, map fields, and route quantity or cost differences for review. Current status: not built for HFG; all functionality is Able to Build. Existing screens are design samples. Prototype review uses representative records in a test environment. Production targets remain Month 6 for first daily use and Month 12 for the initial build; dependencies and acceptance apply.

F-14 | Store Operations Tools

Required • Able to Build

Working prototype target: end of Month 3 from kickoff. Demonstration: Balance sample registers, prepare a deposit, and produce a test accounting export. Current status: not built for HFG; all functionality is Able to Build. Existing screens are design samples. Prototype review uses representative records in a test environment. Production targets remain Month 6 for first daily use and Month 12 for the initial build; dependencies and acceptance apply.

F-15 | Natural language querying (NLQ) & AI insights & predictions & recommendations

Nice to Have • Able to Build

Working prototype target: end of Month 4 from kickoff. Demonstration: Answer an agreed set of business questions from representative data, with permission checks and source references. Current status: not built for HFG; all functionality is Able to Build. Existing screens are design samples. Prototype review uses representative records in a test environment. Production targets remain Month 6 for first daily use and Month 12 for the initial build; dependencies and acceptance apply.

F-16 | Base price optimization

Nice to Have • Able to Build

Working prototype target: end of Month 4 from kickoff. Demonstration: Produce explainable sample price recommendations from agreed sales and margin inputs; review with merchandising. Current status: not built for HFG; all functionality is Able to Build. Existing screens are design samples. Prototype review uses representative records in a test environment. Production targets remain Month 6 for first daily use and Month 12 for the initial build; dependencies and acceptance apply.

Capability responses 17-20

Formal response: Able to Build. The proposed HFG functions are not represented as Available Today. Read the notes for evidence and limits.

F-17 | Assortment optimization recommendations

Nice to Have • Able to Build

Working prototype target: end of Month 4 from kickoff. Demonstration: Produce sample keep/add/remove assortment suggestions with reasons based on representative performance records. Current status: not built for HFG; all functionality is Able to Build. Existing screens are design samples. Prototype review uses representative records in a test environment. Production targets remain Month 6 for first daily use and Month 12 for the initial build; dependencies and acceptance apply.

F-18 | Master Data Management (MDM) , item attributes, descriptions, hierarchy

Nice to Have • Able to Build

Working prototype target: end of Month 3 from kickoff. Demonstration: Maintain an item hierarchy and attributes and generate a test item-maintenance export for a point-of-sale host. Current status: not built for HFG; all functionality is Able to Build. Existing screens are design samples. Prototype review uses representative records in a test environment. Production targets remain Month 6 for first daily use and Month 12 for the initial build; dependencies and acceptance apply.

F-19 | Vendor portal , electronic contract and document submission & inventory management support

Nice to Have • Able to Build

Working prototype target: end of Month 4 from kickoff. Demonstration: Let a test vendor submit a document and see only its permitted contract and inventory information. Current status: not built for HFG; all functionality is Able to Build. Existing screens are design samples. Prototype review uses representative records in a test environment. Production targets remain Month 6 for first daily use and Month 12 for the initial build; dependencies and acceptance apply.

F-20 | Investigation management and case tracking

Nice to Have • Able to Build

Working prototype target: end of Month 4 from kickoff. Demonstration: Open an investigation, attach representative records, assign work, and track resolution. Current status: not built for HFG; all functionality is Able to Build. Existing screens are design samples. Prototype review uses representative records in a test environment. Production targets remain Month 6 for first daily use and Month 12 for the initial build; dependencies and acceptance apply.

Capability responses 21-24

Formal response: Able to Build. The proposed HFG functions are not represented as Available Today. Read the notes for evidence and limits.

P-01 | Multi-format POS data ingestion (12 POS systems, varied formats)

Required • Able to Build

Working prototype target: end of Month 3 from kickoff. Demonstration: Normalize representative records for all 12 identified point-of-sale formats; validate the first source path in Month 1. Current status: not built for HFG; all functionality is Able to Build. Existing screens are design samples. Prototype review uses representative records in a test environment. Production targets remain Month 6 for first daily use and Month 12 for the initial build; dependencies and acceptance apply.

P-02 | Open database accessibility to cleansed data

Required • Able to Build

Working prototype target: end of Month 1 from kickoff. Demonstration: Query cleaned sample records and produce a standard export; demonstrate access permissions. Current status: not built for HFG; all functionality is Able to Build. Existing screens are design samples. Unrestricted export/migration terms differ from the standard MSA and must be resolved before signing. Prototype review uses representative records in a test environment. Production targets remain Month 6 for first daily use and Month 12 for the initial build; dependencies and acceptance apply.

P-03 | Data quality monitoring and validation rules

Required • Able to Build

Working prototype target: end of Month 1 from kickoff. Demonstration: Detect bad or missing sample records, isolate failures, and retry without duplicating accepted transactions. Current status: not built for HFG; all functionality is Able to Build. Existing screens are design samples. Prototype review uses representative records in a test environment. Production targets remain Month 6 for first daily use and Month 12 for the initial build; dependencies and acceptance apply.

P-04 | User data input and manual record modifications with full change logging

Required • Able to Build

Working prototype target: end of Month 1 from kickoff. Demonstration: Correct a sample record while preserving its original value, actor, timestamp, reason, and close-period rule. Current status: not built for HFG; all functionality is Able to Build. Existing screens are design samples. Prototype review uses representative records in a test environment. Production targets remain Month 6 for first daily use and Month 12 for the initial build; dependencies and acceptance apply.

Capability responses 25-28

Formal response: Able to Build. The proposed HFG functions are not represented as Available Today. Read the notes for evidence and limits.

P-05 | Historical data retention (2 years queryable + 7 years backup for audits)

Required • Able to Build

Working prototype target: end of Month 2 from kickoff. Demonstration: Exercise history queries, retention policies, backup, and restoration with representative dated records; no elapsed seven-year operating history is claimed. Current status: not built for HFG; all functionality is Able to Build. Existing screens are design samples. Prototype review uses representative records in a test environment. Production targets remain Month 6 for first daily use and Month 12 for the initial build; dependencies and acceptance apply.

P-06 | Flat-file import / export (CSV, Excel, fixed-width, XML)

Required • Able to Build

Working prototype target: end of Month 2 from kickoff. Demonstration: Import and export representative CSV, Excel, fixed-width, and XML records. Current status: not built for HFG; all functionality is Able to Build. Existing screens are design samples. Prototype review uses representative records in a test environment. Production targets remain Month 6 for first daily use and Month 12 for the initial build; dependencies and acceptance apply.

P-07 | Multi unlimited data source integrations

Required • Able to Build

Working prototype target: end of Month 4 from kickoff. Demonstration: Add and modify a representative non-point-of-sale source through a reusable ingestion workflow; confirm the full source inventory for production rollout. Current status: not built for HFG; all functionality is Able to Build. Existing screens are design samples. Specific rules or service commitments still require agreement. No arbitrary source-count limit is proposed; actual interfaces, usage, human work, and third-party charges remain subject to the agreement. Prototype review uses representative records in a test environment. Production targets remain Month 6 for first daily use and Month 12 for the initial build; dependencies and acceptance apply.

P-08 | REST API integration framework

Required • Able to Build

Working prototype target: end of Month 1 from kickoff. Demonstration: Expose and consume test REST endpoints with authentication, validation, and error responses. Current status: not built for HFG; all functionality is Able to Build. Existing screens are design samples. Prototype review uses representative records in a test environment. Production targets remain Month 6 for first daily use and Month 12 for the initial build; dependencies and acceptance apply.

Capability responses 29-32

Formal response: Able to Build. The proposed HFG functions are not represented as Available Today. Read the notes for evidence and limits.

P-09 | Product roadmap visibility and customer input process with published release notes

Required • Able to Build

Working prototype target: end of Month 1 from kickoff. Demonstration: Demonstrate a shared priority list, change review, and release-note workflow for HFG feedback. Current status: not built for HFG; all functionality is Able to Build. Existing screens are design samples. Specific rules or service commitments still require agreement. Prototype review uses representative records in a test environment. Production targets remain Month 6 for first daily use and Month 12 for the initial build; dependencies and acceptance apply.

P-10 | Vendor support SLAs with defined escalation procedures

Required • Able to Build

Working prototype target: end of Month 1 from kickoff. Demonstration: Exercise incident intake, severity triage, notification, and escalation using a test incident; binding coverage and response commitments still need agreement. Current status: not built for HFG; all functionality is Able to Build. Existing screens are design samples. Specific rules or service commitments still require agreement. Prototype review uses representative records in a test environment. Production targets remain Month 6 for first daily use and Month 12 for the initial build; dependencies and acceptance apply.

P-11 | Disaster recovery , documented RTO/RPO with testing schedule

Required • Able to Build

Working prototype target: end of Month 2 from kickoff. Demonstration: Run and record a test backup/restore rehearsal; agree production recovery targets and testing frequency separately. Current status: not built for HFG; all functionality is Able to Build. Existing screens are design samples. Specific rules or service commitments still require agreement. Prototype review uses representative records in a test environment. Production targets remain Month 6 for first daily use and Month 12 for the initial build; dependencies and acceptance apply.

P-12 | Scalability , supports additional stores, banners, and data sources

Required • Able to Build

Working prototype target: end of Month 3 from kickoff. Demonstration: Add representative stores and banners and test increased sample workloads; production sizing still requires measured volumes. Current status: not built for HFG; all functionality is Able to Build. Existing screens are design samples. Prototype review uses representative records in a test environment. Production targets remain Month 6 for first daily use and Month 12 for the initial build; dependencies and acceptance apply.

Capability responses 33-36

Formal response: Able to Build. The proposed HFG functions are not represented as Available Today. Read the notes for evidence and limits.

P-13 | Mobile & in-store application access

Required • Able to Build

Working prototype target: end of Month 2 from kickoff. Demonstration: Run a report and data-entry task on mobile layouts and an agreed Zebra device or test environment. Current status: not built for HFG; all functionality is Able to Build. Existing screens are design samples. Prototype review uses representative records in a test environment. Production targets remain Month 6 for first daily use and Month 12 for the initial build; dependencies and acceptance apply.

S-01 | Role-based access control (RBAC)

Required • Able to Build

Working prototype target: end of Month 1 from kickoff. Demonstration: Enforce basic role permissions on the first inventory/reporting workflow. Current status: not built for HFG; all functionality is Able to Build. Existing screens are design samples. Prototype review uses representative records in a test environment. Production targets remain Month 6 for first daily use and Month 12 for the initial build; dependencies and acceptance apply.

S-02 | Group/Row/Object level permissions/security

Required • Able to Build

Working prototype target: end of Month 2 from kickoff. Demonstration: Exercise group, row, and object restrictions across test screens, queries, and exports. Current status: not built for HFG; all functionality is Able to Build. Existing screens are design samples. Prototype review uses representative records in a test environment. Production targets remain Month 6 for first daily use and Month 12 for the initial build; dependencies and acceptance apply.

S-03 | Configuration management (without vendor involvement)

Required • Able to Build

Working prototype target: end of Month 2 from kickoff. Demonstration: Let an HFG test administrator change users, roles, settings, and a routine workflow or source configuration. Current status: not built for HFG; all functionality is Able to Build. Existing screens are design samples. Prototype review uses representative records in a test environment. Production targets remain Month 6 for first daily use and Month 12 for the initial build; dependencies and acceptance apply.

Capability responses 37-38

Formal response: Able to Build. The proposed HFG functions are not represented as Available Today. Read the notes for evidence and limits.

S-04 | User impersonation / view-as capability

Nice to Have • Able to Build

Working prototype target: end of Month 3 from kickoff. Demonstration: Let an authorized test administrator view another role, with safeguards and activity logging. Current status: not built for HFG; all functionality is Able to Build. Existing screens are design samples. Prototype review uses representative records in a test environment. Production targets remain Month 6 for first daily use and Month 12 for the initial build; dependencies and acceptance apply.

S-05 | Inactive user auto-disablement (configurable threshold)

Nice to Have • Able to Build

Working prototype target: end of Month 2 from kickoff. Demonstration: Disable test accounts after an agreed inactivity threshold and demonstrate authorized restoration. Current status: not built for HFG; all functionality is Able to Build. Existing screens are design samples. Specific rules or service commitments still require agreement. Prototype review uses representative records in a test environment. Production targets remain Month 6 for first daily use and Month 12 for the initial build; dependencies and acceptance apply.