RFP 21-37

Addenda No. 1 – Posted August 20, 2021

Request for Proposals for a Financial Management Software Systems Environment

Deadline for Vendor Questions: Wednesday, September 1, 2021, by 4:00 PM PT

Deadline for Proposal Submissions: Friday, September 10, 2021, 5:00 PM PT

_____

A Pre-Proposal Vendor Teleconference was held on August 18, 2021, at 01:00 p.m. PT. The Pre-Proposal Teleconference was facilitated by the City and the City's consulting partner, BerryDunn, and included participation by City staff. Attendance at the Pre-Proposal Vendor Teleconference was **not** mandatory.

The following vendors identified themselves as being in attendance on the phone:

1. BSG Solutions: Guru Samy
2. CCS Global Tech: Jose Adonay Mora Retana
3. Central Square: Laura Hoffman, Raul Correa
4. Ceridian: Jamie Christensen
5. Cobb Fendley: Floyd Scurry
6. Creoal Consulting: Kelley Fitzpatrick
7. FreeDoc: Rebekah Lumansoc
8. Harris ERP: Carol Oberlohr
9. Infolob: Murali Nakka
10. LNB Solutions: Andrea Simpson
11. OpenGov: Andrew Kercado
12. Oracle: Glenn Mathes
13. Rock Solid Technologies, Inc.: Ashlynn Sonleitner, Barry Fisk
14. Tikor Consulting: Steve Kirby
15. Tyler Technologies: Kyle Johnson

The call included a brief introduction and welcoming remarks from BerryDunn. Next, the City provided an introduction to the City participants on the line and discussed the overall background of the project as well as the City's current software systems environment. The City highlighted that it operates with a very lean staffing model, with six staff in the finance department, however the City is fully committed to the implementation of a new system and will align resources internally as needed. The City reiterated that the core focus of this RFP opportunity relates to financial management, and that the City intends to keep NeoGov for human capital management and payroll management. Following the City introduction and background, the RFP schedule of events and submittal requirements were reviewed, and vendors were offered the opportunity to ask questions of the City.

Questions and answers received by the City, including those asked before and during the Pre-Proposal Vendor Teleconference, are provided below.

1. Does the City anticipate the vendor software demonstration stage being conducted onsite, or remotely?

    City Response: The City anticipates that this will be conducted remotely but reserves the right to consider onsite demonstrations.

2. Does the City have the budget approved for this project, and if so, can you share the amount?

    City Response: The City is not prepared to share this information at this time. The City is subject to annual appropriations. The proposals received as part of this process will help

to inform the budgeting process. This project is a high priority for the City, and City administration at all levels is aware of this process and the objectives.

3. Is the City open to implementation approaches whereby the selected vendor uses both onshore and offshore resources to support activities? This could include testing, training, data conversion, report writing, integration building, etc. without any specific task being requested, but more as a general approach to implementation.

   City Response: The City is open to considering such approaches where onshore and offshore resources are used to support the implementation work effort, so long as appropriate security and system controls are in place, and the use of resources in differing time zones does not negatively impact the project progress or success. If a vendor intends to use offshore resources to support the implementation, the City requests that this be clearly identified in the project approach (Attachment A, Tab 3) and the specific tasks to be completed and associated security protocols be identified.

4. Would the City be open to a deployment model where the vendor hosts, and manages, the software in its own data warehouse – but without using a subscription basis for the software?

   City Response: The City has prepared infrastructure with the anticipation of a new ERP system and would prefer the deployment to be on-premise. If a vendor only offers a vendor-hosted solution, the City would be open to discussing the vendor-hosted deployment method. A separate cost worksheet has been provided as part of this addendum for Vendor-hosted deployments.

5. Is the City able to expand upon the technical and other requirements/goals related to business and occupancy tax collection?

   City Response: The City has viewed standalone third-party systems that are available to support this functionality, however, if there is a way to manage this process through the selected financial management system this would be the preference of the City.

6. Is the City able to expand upon any requirements related to investment management?

   City Response: The City does not have a defined need for investment management.

7. Does the City intend to consider replacing NeoGov?

   City Response: No. Integration with NeoGov will be required.

8. Is the City interested in an e-payment solution to support electronic payments, including those for business & occupancy tax?

   City Response: Yes.

9. As it related to the Department of Revenue at the State of Washington, and the need to collect revenue, the RFP states this is currently managed manually. Is the City looking for a direct interface/integration with the DOR?

   City Response: The City is interested in understanding the ways in which the exchange of data can be more streamlined and automated, including through integration or scheduled file transfers. Vendors are encouraged to explain what options are available.

10. Does the City anticipate allocating all six (6) finance staff to the project full-time, part-time, or a combination thereof? Or, is the City looking for vendors to provide recommendations on resource planning?

    City Response: The City intends to commit the necessary resources to support the project, but does not anticipate all six (6) staff working on the project full-time. The City expects to use the vendor responses to the RFP, and most particularly that information in Attachment A, Tab 3, to help inform the resource planning strategy.

11. The RFP criteria for Costs states the City "may" evaluate costs on a 10-year basis. Can you elaborate?

City Response: The City will not be sharing any specifics as to how the cost proposals will be evaluated, or more explicitly, scored. As stated in the RFP, under Table 11, "In evaluating cost, the City may evaluate on a fully loaded ten-year cost of ownership…. The City reserves the right to add their own estimates of the costs (including any anticipated savings) associated with the required level of internal staffing (business users and IT staff) for implementation and for ongoing support, hardware and overhead costs and savings, and may rely on the Respondent's resource estimates as a basis for their calculations." This is intended to demonstrate that, as also stated in the RFP, "The City recognizes there are many factors contributing to a comparison of cost Proposals for these various deployment methods including needed infrastructure and/or hardware costs, the potential for reduced hardware and support costs in hosted/SaaS models, a particular Proposer's approach to managing upgrades, and technical staffing needs. It is well understood among the City team that a "higher" cost from a SaaS vendor may be equalized by considering these other cost areas when comparing to an on-premise deployment." In requesting the cost projections over a 10-year basis the City wishes to understand not only the acquisition cost of a new system, but also the greater lifecycle costs of operating the system.

12. Does the City intend to convert any data, all data, or start in a new system with no legacy data?

City Response: Please see Attachment B, Tab 9. The City wishes to understand through responses if the potential data conversions listed are proposed, and, if the vendors standard/recommended approach to data conversion deviates in any manner.

13. Whether companies from Outside USA can apply for this? (like, from India or Canada)

City Response: All companies, not dependent on location, are welcome to submit a proposal.

14. Whether we need to come over there for meetings?

City Response: The City is open to remote approaches, or hybrid approaches, to the implementation. Vendors are encouraged to describe the proposed approach to onsite and remote activities as part of the response to Tab 3 of the proposal (Project Approach and Implementation Methodology).

15. Can we perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside USA? (like, from India or Canada)

City Response: Please see the response to question 3.

16. Can we submit the proposals via email?

City Response: Please see Section 4 of the RFP.

17. Is GASB compliance 100% required in order to be considered? Our product is GAAP compliant but is not considered GASB compliant out of the box.

City Response: The City has not identified any minimum/mandatory requirements in terms of functionality as part of this RFP process. Vendors are encouraged to be transparent in proposal requirement responses, and in any areas where the software may not be able to address a requirement, the City would simply request that the vendor include comments in the comments column to address any recommended work-arounds.

_____
SIGNATURE

_____   _____
COMPANY   DATE