RFP 21-37

Addenda No. 2 – Posted September 8, 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

_____

Questions received by the City, including those asked following the Pre-Proposal Vendor Teleconference, are provided below with responses.

1. GT.32: "The system has the ability to store passwords in encrypted form." Is the City asking the solution to store the password or are they wanting it store through integration with Active Directory?

     City Response: The City has not made a definite decision on this and wishes to explore the flexibility and capabilities of systems to support either approach. The City is open to recommendations from vendors if one approach is recommended over the other.

2. PU.52: "The system has the ability to auto-populate fields based on inventory item selected." Please provide more information on what specific fields the City would like populated.

     City Response: The City recognizes that the fields that may be populated (or available to populate) may be specific as to the system selected, and configuration decisions made during implementation. At the highest level, the City sees it as a desired piece of functionality for a future system to populate specifications (make/model/SKU/etc.) information related to an inventory item that is added to a requisition, in an effort to reduce the amount of manual keying of information by staff.

3. AP.35: "The system has the ability to support multiple status modes for invoices including: Other, user-defined." Please provide more information for us to understand what is meant by "other" user-defined status modes.

     City Response: The City is interested in exploring the ability to configure differing statuses for invoices in the configuration process, or in the future. This may include statuses that are determined based on workflow configuration or other set-up decisions that will be made during implementation.

4. AP.110: "The system has the ability to verify new vendors information upon entry." What does the City mean by "verify" new vendors?

City Response: The City would like the system to verify if a use of a SSN or Federal Tax ID has been previously used to warn the use that the Vendor exists in the database.

5. PG.38: "The system has the ability to allow configurable change order forms to be established to capture specific data elements related to the change." Please provide more information on what specific changes the City is wanting to make.

   City Response: The City would like to have a system that allows certain fields (e.g., delivery instructions) to be able to be changed without electronic approval but other fields (e.g., unit price) require an approval.

6. GT.13: "The system's API is not rate limited in any way." More information is needed to understand this question.

   City Response: Examples of rate limits include, but are not limited to:

   The amount of times an API transaction can occur per day/hour/minute.

   The total API transactions capped at a particular amount, that is reset after a certain amount of time.

   API usage is limited by type of system (onprem vs cloud), license level, support agreement, etc.

7. In regard to Section 2.4 of the RFP, Deployment Model (page 14), the City stated they have a slight preference towards a SaaS offering. However, in regard to Question #4 in the Addendum #1, the City stated they would prefer the deployment to be On-Premise. Can the City please identify the priority ranking for deployment methods SaaS, On-Premise, and Vendor-Hosted?

   City Response: The City has a preference for an On-Premise model but in the event that a particular vendor does not offer an On-Premise solution, the City is willing to see all proposals.

8. Also, in regard to Question #4 in the Addendum #1, the City said a separate cost worksheet has been provided as part of this addendum for Vendor-Hosted deployments. However, we did not see a separate or updated cost worksheet for vendor-hosted deployment. Therefore, could the City please provide this document?

   City Response: The City has provided updated versions of Attachment C1 (Cost Worksheets). Vendors are requested to complete the reissued versions and use these in place of the original versions. In this reissued version, a "Vendor Hosted" tab has been included to capture vendor solutions that are hosted/managed within a vendor's own data center and uses either a subscription or licensing model for the software.

9. Does the City currently utilize a BI/Reporting solution? If yes, is it a standard? Does the City have a preference for a standard for a BI/Reporting Solution?

   City Response: No, the City doesn't have a BI/Reporting solution.

10. In regard to Interface requirement #Int.6 on Attachment B, Positive Pay, could you please explain why NeoGov is not interfacing directly to the bank for Positive Pay? Is there a business reason, a software reason, or another reason for this configuration?

    City Response: The City will need positive pay for the Accounts Payable checks as well as payroll checks.

11. In regard to addenda 1, we have a follow up question to the City's response to question number 4. (Question/Answer appear below)

    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.

Question: Can the City share the infrastructure/hardware currently in place in preparation for the ERP system?

City Response: To help clarify the response to Question #4 from Addenda #1. The City has prepared certain infrastructure in support of an on-premise deployment model whereby the City hosts the software and pays the selected vendor for annual maintenance/updates to the software and the City is responsible for maintaining hardware/infrastructure. The City is open to considering all solutions through this process, including the following:

- **Subscription ("SaaS") models whereby a vendor offers the software through a third-party hosting service (MS Azure for Government, Amazon Web Services, etc.). This is typically offered with a single annual cost that covers access, maintenance, upgrades, etc.**

- **Vendor-hosted/managed models where a vendor offers the software through its' own hosting/data warehouse and manages all software upgrades and costs associated with infrastructure/hardware upgrades/costs. This is typically offered with a either a perpetual licensing model with annual hosting/maintenance costs, or, through a single annual cost that covers access, maintenance, upgrades, etc.**

As to the infrastructure that has been put in place, the City has a VMWare clustered virtual environment.

_____
SIGNATURE

_____ _____
COMPANY   DATE