



**State of West Virginia**  
**Request for Best and Final Offer**  
**for**  
**RFP # FAR226005**  
**Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP)**  
**Software and Services**

**August 5, 2011**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>SECTION ONE: GENERAL INFORMATION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Purpose .....	1
1.2 Relationship to RFP #FAR226005.....	1
1.3 BAFO Schedule of Events .....	1
1.4 Inquiries.....	2
1.5 Verbal Communication .....	2
1.6 Addenda .....	2
1.7 Proposal Submission.....	2
1.8 Vendors Should Allow Sufficient Time for Delivery.....	2
1.9 Contract Provisions .....	3
 <b>SECTION TWO: CLARIFICATIONS .....</b>	 <b>4</b>
2.1 Functional Scope Clarifications .....	4
2.1.1 Transportation Bridge Management Functionality .....	4
2.1.2 Transportation Pavement Management Functionality .....	4
2.1.3 Cashier Functionality .....	4
2.1.4 PEIA Benefits Administration.....	4
2.1.5 Applicant Services .....	5
2.1.6 Travel Management.....	5
2.2 Other Items of Clarification .....	5
2.2.1 Implementation Phasing and Timeline.....	5
2.2.2 Staffing Plan .....	6
2.2.3 Proposed Staff.....	6
2.2.4 Customizations .....	6
2.2.5 Interface Development and Testing Responsibilities .....	7
2.2.6 Acceptable Vendor Work Locations.....	7
2.2.7 Hosted Development Environment.....	8
2.2.8 Completion of Cost Schedules .....	8
2.2.9 Descriptions Required for All Items in the Cost Proposal .....	8
2.2.10 Completion of the Software Licensing Cost Schedule .....	9
2.2.11 Statement of Work Update .....	9
2.2.12 Rates for BAFO .....	9
2.2.13 Rates for Services Requested in the RFP .....	9
2.2.14 Assumptions.....	9
2.2.14.1 Assumptions Relating to Document Review Timeframes .....	9
2.2.14.2 Assumptions Relating to Software Defects.....	9
2.2.14.3 Assumptions Relating to Ensuring Cooperation .....	10
2.2.14.4 Assumptions Relating to Standard Business Processes .....	10
2.2.14.5 Assumptions Relating to Standard Security Roles .....	10
2.2.14.6 Assumptions Relating to Document Management Systems .....	10
2.2.14.7 Assumptions Relating to Capturing Data from Document Images...	10
2.2.14.8 Assumptions Relating to Upgrade Estimates .....	11
2.2.14.9 Assumptions Relating to Communications .....	11
2.2.14.10 Assumptions Relating to Supporting User Inquiries.....	11
2.2.14.11 Assumptions Relating to Support for Software Patches .....	11

---

2.2.14.12	Assumptions Relating to the New Pension System .....	11
2.2.14.13	Assumptions Relating to Checkpoints .....	11
2.2.14.14	Assumptions Relating to State Resources .....	12
2.2.15	Requested Changes to Terms and Conditions .....	12
2.2.15.1	Order of Precedence .....	12
2.2.15.2	Limitation of Liability .....	12
2.2.15.3	Contract Termination .....	12
2.2.16	Anticipated System Interfaces .....	12
<b>SECTION THREE: RESPONSE FORMAT.....</b>		<b>16</b>
3.1	General BAFO Technical Proposal Response Format .....	16
3.2	BAFO Technical Proposal Staffing Plan .....	16
3.3	BAFO Cost Proposal Schedules.....	16

## SECTION ONE: GENERAL INFORMATION

### 1.1 Purpose

In accordance with Section 3.10 of RFP # FAR226005, the State is soliciting Best and Final Offers (BAFO) from Vendors meeting the minimum acceptable score pursuant to section 4.2.2 and determined to be reasonably susceptible of being selected for award.

The State has completed its review of the Technical Proposals and the Cost Proposals for the Vendors meeting the minimum acceptable score on the evaluation of their Technical Proposals. During this review, the Evaluation Committee identified a number of issues which it determined should be clarified.

To expedite the process of obtaining and evaluating the BAFOs, the State has opted to develop a common Request for BAFO which incorporates those items determined to require clarification and provide it to all Vendors determined to be reasonably susceptible of being selected for award. In an effort to further minimize the amount of time required of Vendors to respond to the Request for BAFO, the State also determined that it is not necessary to reopen DecisionDirector for Vendors to provide revisions to their responses to the Functional and System-Wide Requirements during the BAFO process. As a result of these decisions, the State expects Vendors to complete and submit their BAFOs by the date specified in Section 1.3 and does not anticipate granting any requests for extension that may be submitted by Vendors.

### 1.2 Relationship to RFP #FAR226005

This Request for BAFO is related to and a component of RFP # FAR226005. All provisions of RFP # FAR226005 remain applicable except as amended through published RFP Addenda or through this BAFO.

### 1.3 BAFO Schedule of Events

The following Schedule of Events represents the State's estimate of the anticipated schedule that will be followed. When a specific time of day is referenced, it means Eastern Time Zone. Unless otherwise specified, the time of day for the following events will be between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. The State reserves the right, at its sole discretion, to adjust this schedule as it deems necessary. The Purchasing Division will communicate any substantive adjustments to the RFP Schedule of Events in one or more addendums.

#### Exhibit 1: BAFO Schedule of Events

EVENT		DATE
1.	Request for BAFO Issued to Qualified Vendors	August 3, 2011
2.	<b>BAFO Opening Date</b>	<b>August 26, 2011, 1:30 PM</b>
3.	<b>BAFO Cost Opening Date</b>	<b>TBD</b>
4.	Final Evaluation of Vendors and Recommendation for Award	TBD

EVENT		DATE
5.	Contract Negotiations and Preparation	TBD
6.	ERP Implementation Begins	TBD

#### 1.4 Inquiries

Inquiries regarding specifications of this Request for BAFO must be submitted in writing to the State Buyer with the exception of questions regarding the proposal submission which may be oral. All inquiries of specification clarification must be addressed to:

**Krista Ferrell, Buyer Supervisor**  
**Purchasing Division**  
**2019 Washington Street, East**  
**P.O. Box 50130**  
**Charleston, WV 25305-0130**  
**Email: [krista.s.ferrell@wv.gov](mailto:krista.s.ferrell@wv.gov)**  
**Phone: (304) 558-2596**  
**Fax: (304) 558-4115**

**No contact between the Vendor and any State employees or contractors assisting the State regarding the subject matter of this Request for BAFO is permitted without the express written consent of the State Buyer.** Violation may result in rejection of the bid. The State Buyer named above is the sole contact for any and all inquiries after this Request for BAFO has been released.

#### 1.5 Verbal Communication

Any verbal communication between the Vendor and any State personnel is **not** binding. Only information issued in writing by an official written addendum by the Purchasing Division is binding.

#### 1.6 Addenda

If it becomes necessary to revise any part of this Request for BAFO, an official written addendum will be issued by the Purchasing Division.

#### 1.7 Proposal Submission

Proposals must be received in **two distinct parts**: technical and cost.

- ◆ **Technical proposals** must not contain any cost information relating to the project.
  - ◆ **Cost proposal** shall be sealed in a separate envelope and will not be opened initially.
- All proposals must be submitted to the Purchasing Division **prior** to the date and time stipulated in this Request for BAFO as the opening date. All bids will be dated and time stamped to verify official time and date of receipt.

#### 1.8 Vendors Should Allow Sufficient Time for Delivery

In accordance with **West Virginia Code** §5A-3-11, the Purchasing Division cannot waive or excuse late receipt of a proposal, which is delayed or late for any reason. Any proposal received after the bid opening date and time will be immediately disqualified in accordance with State law.

**Vendors responding to this RFP shall submit:**

One original technical and cost proposal plus 5 convenience copies and 2 convenience copies of each on CDs should be delivered to:

**Purchasing Division  
2019 Washington Street, East  
P.O. Box 50130  
Charleston, WV 25305-0130**

The electronic versions of the technical and cost proposal should be provided on CD, and placed in the front cover sleeve of the paper original of the respective technical and cost proposals. The CDs should include the proposal in both PDF format and in the appropriate Microsoft Office 2007 format. Cost schedules should be provided in Microsoft Office 2007® format, and project plans should be provided in Microsoft Project 2007® format. The CDs should be labeled as provided below. Separate CDs should be used for the Technical and Cost Proposals. Vendors should not include cost information on the CDs that contain the Technical Proposal.

The outside of the envelope or package(s) and the CD labels for both the technical and the cost proposals should be clearly marked as either "BAFO Technical Proposal" or "BAFO Cost Proposal" and include the following information:

**Vendor:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Buyer:** Krista Ferrell  
**Req #:** FAR226005  
**Opening Date:** Friday, August 26, 2011  
**Opening Time:** 1:30 p.m.

## 1.9 Contract Provisions

The RFP and the Vendor's response will be incorporated into the contract by reference. The order of precedence shall be the contract, the Request for BAFO, the RFP and any addendum, the Vendor's BAFO, and the Vendor's proposal in response to the RFP.

---

## SECTION TWO: CLARIFICATIONS

### 2.1 Functional Scope Clarifications

In accordance with Section 3.10 of the RFP, clarification is provided relating to the following functional areas included in the RFP.

#### 2.1.1 Transportation Bridge Management Functionality

Clarification is hereby provided in reference to Section 2.9.18.6 of the RFP that the State has made a determination that all specifications relating to Bridge Management, including the Functional Requirements, should be removed from the scope of the ERP system. The State has determined that it will maintain its current InspectTech BridgeInspect® application and interface this application to the ERP system. The transportation asset inventory function of the Vendor's proposed ERP solution will interface with the InspectTech BridgeInspect® application to obtain bridge asset inventory, bridge inspection, and bridge condition information. The State has also determined that it will not implement any bridge management modeling or analysis capabilities at this time. In preparing their BAFO, Vendors should make all necessary adjustments to their Technical Proposal and Cost Proposal to reflect this clarification.

#### 2.1.2 Transportation Pavement Management Functionality

Clarification is hereby provided in reference to Section 2.9.18.7 of the RFP that the State has made a determination that all specifications relating to Pavement Management, including the Functional Requirements, should be removed from the scope of the ERP system. The State has determined that it will maintain its current Deighton dTIMS pavement management system and interface this system to the ERP system. The transportation asset inventory function of the Vendor's proposed ERP solution will interface with Deighton dTIMS to obtain pavement asset inventory and condition information. The project management function of the Vendor's proposed ERP solution will interface with Deighton dTIMS to provide information on candidate pavement preservation projects for use in preparing the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). There is no change to the requirements for the transportation asset inventory function of the proposed ERP solution to interface with Fugro-RoadWare software. Vendors should make all necessary adjustments to their Technical Proposal and Cost Proposal to reflect this clarification.

#### 2.1.3 Cashier Functionality

Clarification is hereby provided that the State does not intend to implement, as part of the initial phases of the ERP system, the specifications relating to the Cashier functionality addressed in the Accounts Receivable, Point of Sale section of the Functional Requirements. Vendors should make all necessary adjustments to their Technical Proposal and Cost Proposal to reflect this clarification.

#### 2.1.4 PEIA Benefits Administration

Clarification is hereby provided in reference to Section 2.9.3 of the RFP that the ERP system should support PEIA benefits administration for State employees and interface to PEIA's BAS system. PEIA will continue to use BAS for non-state customers and retirees. Vendors should make all necessary adjustments to their Technical Proposal and Cost Proposal to reflect this clarification.

### 2.1.5 Applicant Services

Clarification is hereby provided in reference to Section 2.9.17 of the RFP that the ERP system will support interfaces with NeoGov, but will not include additional services or software licenses to expand NeoGov to additional agencies or to expand the Applicant Services functionality currently used by the State. Vendors should make all necessary adjustments to their Technical Proposal and Cost Proposal to reflect this clarification.

### 2.1.6 Travel Management

Clarification is hereby provided in reference to Section 2.9.16 of the RFP that the State has made a determination to implement the ERP system's travel management functionality. The ERP system should only interface with TRX to utilize the functionality for booking travel. Vendors should make all necessary adjustments to their Technical Proposal and Cost Proposal to reflect this clarification.

## 2.2 Other Items of Clarification

In accordance with Section 3.10 of the RFP, clarification is provided relating to the following areas included in the RFP.

### 2.2.1 Implementation Phasing and Timeline

Clarification is hereby provided in reference to Section 2.7 of the RFP that Vendors should adjust their proposed phasing and timeline to conform to the State's RFP phasing & go-live schedule incorporating the changes referenced below assuming a revised contract start date of November 1, 2011. No changes to the functionality are envisioned for any phase of the project as defined in Exhibit 16 in Section 2.7.2 of the RFP other than those functions which are being removed from scope through this clarification document (e.g., bridge management and pavement management).

Vendors should ensure that their proposed project staffing is sufficient to support production cut-over activities per the State's revised implementation phasing and timeline. Similarly, Vendors should ensure that their level of production support staff is sufficient to provide support for all functions of the ERP as defined in Exhibit 36 of Appendix K of the RFP. This includes the Vendor having full responsibility for production support through one year after the go-live of the Facilities/Remaining Transportation phase (Phase 4). From the time of the go-live of Core Financials/Procurement through the first full year of production operations (one year after the go-live of the Facilities/Remaining Transportation phase (Phase 4), the vendor should have sufficient resources on-site to meet the issue resolution timelines as defined in Exhibit 37 in Appendix K of the RFP. Vendors should make all necessary adjustments to their Technical Proposal and Cost Proposal to reflect this clarification.

- ◆ **Core Financials/Procurement Phase (Phase 1)** - Assume a revised go-live date for this phase of October 1, 2013;
- ◆ **Transportation/Extended Financials Phase (Phase 2)** - Assume a revised go-live date for this phase of April 1, 2014;
- ◆ **HR/Payroll Phase (Phase 3)** - Assume a go-live date for this phase of January 1, 2014;
- ◆ **Facilities/Remaining Transportation Phase (Phase 4)** - Assume a go-live date for this phase of July 1, 2014.



## 2.2.2 Staffing Plan

Clarification is hereby provided in reference to Sections 2.3 and 3.3.1.9.1 of the RFP that Vendors should provide an updated Staffing Plan in the format provided in Section 3.2 of this document to clearly reflect the number of staff being proposed by the Vendor to support the proposed implementation phasing and timeline. The hours by month reflected in this schedule should reconcile to the Staffing by Position Schedule required as part of the Cost Proposal. Additionally, Vendors should provide the names for the individuals being proposed for each position for each phase. If an individual has not been identified for a particular position at this time, then Vendors should insert "TBD" in lieu of a name.

For purposes of clarification, the State anticipates that Vendors will propose an appropriate number of staff to support go-live and provide a reasonable amount of post-implementation support following go-live. With regard to post implementation support the State expects the vendor to continue to mentor and assist the State's full functional team after the go-live of each phase. During the initial 90 days after go live it is expected that both functional and technical resources (developers) will be consumed processing trouble tickets received from the help desk to help resolve defects or other problems reported by users in the initial use of the system. It is expected that the level of post implementation support will be greater during this initial 90 day period and will gradually be reduced sometime thereafter. For presentation purposes, the post-implementation support is viewed as a component of production support and should be reflected on the updated Staffing Plan as production support. Vendors should make all necessary adjustments to their Technical Proposal and Cost Proposal to reflect this clarification.

## 2.2.3 Proposed Staff

Clarification is hereby provided in reference to Section 3.3.1.9.3 of the RFP that vendors should provide resumes for their proposed project team identified in the Staffing Plan referenced in the prior section. Vendors should identify by name and provide up-to-date resumes for individuals being proposed for the following positions:

- ◆ Project Management Team;
- ◆ Functional and Technical Team Leads;
- ◆ Functional Team Members proposed for the first three phases of the project; and
- ◆ As many of the Technical Team and Functional Team Members proposed for the fourth phase as possible.

## 2.2.4 Customizations

Clarification is hereby provided in reference to Section 2.10.5 of the RFP that the State's intent is to create a pool or bank of hours related to all FRICE-W related customizations which were included in the Vendor's proposal, but which the Vendor is not required to complete during implementation. Examples might include instances where the State changes a business process eliminating the need for the proposed customization or assigns State staff to develop the customization rather than Vendor staff. The State expects that any hours associated with customizations which are no longer required be developed by the Vendor to go into a pool of hours which could be jointly managed and applied to address additional FRICE-W customizations identified during the project. Vendors that did not provide sufficient detail to associate a specific number of hours with each proposed FRICE-W customization in their Cost Proposal will be expected to do so in their BAFO. Vendors should make any necessary adjustments to their Technical Proposal and Cost Proposal to reflect this clarification.

## 2.2.5 Interface Development and Testing Responsibilities

Clarification is hereby provided in reference to Section 2.10.7 of the RFP that Exhibit 21 should be revised to be consistent with the narrative text of this section of the RFP concerning the role of the Vendor and the State in development and unit testing of interface programs. Specifically, Exhibit 21 is modified to clarify that the Vendor is responsible for the development and unit testing of transformation processes, load processes to the proposed ERP solution and extracts from the proposed ERP solution. The State is responsible for the development and unit testing of extract processes from State legacy systems or systems of external entities which interface with the State. The State is also responsible for load processes into State legacy systems or the systems of external entities which interface with the State. The two impacted rows from Exhibit 21 are reflected below. Vendors should make any necessary adjustments to their Technical Proposal and Cost Proposal to reflect this clarification.

### Interface Responsibility Matrix Clarifications

Interface Roles and Responsibilities	Vendor	State
Interface Development/Unit Test: Required Transformation Processes, Load Processes to ERP, Extracts from ERP	<b>Primary</b>	<b>Support</b>
Interface Development/Unit Test: Extract Processes from State Legacy Systems or Systems of External Entities and Load Processes to State Legacy Systems or Systems of External Entities	<b>Support</b>	<b>Primary</b>

## 2.2.6 Acceptable Vendor Work Locations

Clarification is hereby provided that Vendors should adhere to the following table to determine which project activities are expected to be performed on-site in Charleston, West Virginia and which project activities may be performed off-site at domestic locations or at Vendor locations outside the United States. The goal of the State is to provide Vendors as much flexibility as possible in performing project activities in the most efficient and cost effective way while ensuring there is a significant on-site presence to facilitate knowledge transfer to the State team and to protect data in the ERP system and other state systems with all sensitive data maintained within the State of West Virginia.

The following table outlines the work locations which are acceptable to the State by major project task/activity. If a project or production support task/activity is not specifically identified in this chart, Vendors should assume that this activity should be performed on-site. Vendors should make any necessary adjustments to their Technical Proposal and Cost Proposal to reflect this clarification.

- ◆ **On-Site** refers to work which must be performed in Charleston, West Virginia;
- ◆ **Off-Site WV** refers to work which may be performed in West Virginia outside of Charleston;
- ◆ **Off-Site Domestic** refers to work which may be performed in the United States (limited to the 50 states); and
- ◆ **Off-Site Other** refers to work which may be performed outside of the United States.

**Acceptable Vendor Work Locations for ERP System Related Activities**

	Project Activity	On-Site	Off-Site WV	Off-Site Domestic	Off-Site Other
<b>Implementation Related Activities:</b>					
	Design of To-Be business processes	√			
	Hosting of development environment		√	√	
	Configuration of software	√			
	Development and unit testing of customizations and interfaces	√	√	√	√
	Development of system and integration test scripts	√	√	√	√
	Development of training materials	√	√	√	√
	System testing	√			
	Integration testing	√			
	Data conversion	√			
	End User Training delivery	√	√		
	User acceptance testing	√			
	Database administration and technical support	√	√ *	√ *	
	Systems programming	√	√ *	√ *	
	Operations support for the Production environment and other project infrastructure	√	√ *	√ *	
<b>Production Support Related Activities:</b>					
	Functional and application support	√	√ *	√ *	
	Database administration and technical support	√	√ *	√ *	
	Systems programming	√	√ *	√ *	
	Operations support for the Production environment and other project infrastructure	√	√ *	√ *	

\* indicates work which may be performed on an emergency basis during off-hours in the United States

**2.2.7 Hosted Development Environment**

Clarification is hereby provided in reference to Sections 2.10.22 and 3.3.2.14 and Appendix L of the RFP that the State expects the hosted development environment to be operated by the Vendor through three (3) months after the go-live of the Core Financials/Procurement Phase (Phase 1). Vendors should make any necessary adjustments to their Technical Proposal and Cost Proposal to reflect this clarification.

**2.2.8 Completion of Cost Schedules**

Clarification is hereby provided in reference to Section 3.3.2 of the RFP that Vendors should complete the attached BAFO Cost Proposal Schedules reflecting the effect of all revisions made by the Vendor in response to clarifications provided by the State or other revisions that the Vendor determined were necessary for their Best and Final Offer. Vendors should take care to assure that their BAFO Technical Proposal and BAFO Cost Proposal reflect the solution being offered.

**2.2.9 Descriptions Required for All Items in the Cost Proposal**

Clarification is hereby provided in reference to Section 3.3.2 of the RFP that Vendors are expected to provide a description for any cost items included on rows in the Cost Proposal which include a generic "Other (specify)" description. Vendors should make any necessary adjustments to their Cost Proposal to reflect this clarification.

## 2.2.10 Completion of the Software Licensing Cost Schedule

Clarification is hereby provided in reference to Sections 3.3.2.9 and 3.3.2.15 of the RFP that Vendors should not combine implementation costs into software licensing or maintenance costs on the Software Licensed Products Schedule resulting in a distortion of actual software licensing and implementation costs. The cost for all staff providing implementation services should be reflected on the Staffing Plan by Position Schedule.

## 2.2.11 Statement of Work Update

Clarification is hereby provided in reference to Section 3.3.1.14 of the RFP that Vendors should provide an updated sample Statement of Work to reflect any changes resulting from this request for clarification. This sample Statement of Work should include the elements outlined in this Section 3.3.1.14. Vendors should make any necessary adjustments to their Technical Proposal and Cost Proposal to reflect this clarification.

## 2.2.12 Rates for BAFO

Clarification is hereby provided in reference to Section 3.3.2 of the RFP that Vendors may not increase the hourly rates proposed in the BAFO Cost Proposal for any position above the hourly rate proposed for that position in the Vendor's original Cost Proposal.

## 2.2.13 Rates for Services Requested in the RFP

Clarification is hereby provided that in the event a Vendor responded "Does Not Meet" to one or more Functional or System-wide Requirements which the State subsequently determines must be addressed after award and sufficient hours are not available in the pool of hours referenced previously in Section 2.2.4, then the Vendor will be expected to provide a cost estimate following the approved change order process to address those requirements using the hourly rates which would have been applicable if the requirements had been addressed in the Vendor's Cost Proposal. Vendors should make any necessary adjustments to their Technical Proposal and Cost Proposal to reflect this clarification.

## 2.2.14 Assumptions

Clarification is hereby provided in reference to Sections 3.3.1.4 and 3.3.2.5 of the RFP relating to assumptions. Following a review of the assumptions submitted by Vendors in their Technical Proposals and Cost Proposals, the following clarification is offered to Vendors to make any necessary adjustments to their Technical Proposal and Cost Proposal.

### 2.2.14.1 Assumptions Relating to Document Review Timeframes

One or more Vendors included assumptions assuming constructive approval of deliverables, change orders, issue resolution, and other Vendor work products typically within 5 or 10 business days. The State recognizes the importance of timely review and approval of these types of Vendor work products, especially in light of a planned deliverables-based payment schedule. To clarify, the State intends to work with the selected Vendor to develop standard Vendor work product and project management standards and procedures which provide reasonable review timeframes and protect the interests of both parties.

### 2.2.14.2 Assumptions Relating to Software Defects

One or more Vendors included an assumption that if the software proposed by the Vendor did not function as represented by the Software Provider, then any that result in additional development will be considered a change in scope and subject to a change order. To clarify,

the State considers this to be an unreasonable assumption that is inconsistent with the intent of the RFP and does not intend to entertain this type of assumption apparently intended to absolve a Vendor of its responsibility for the proposed software.

#### 2.2.14.3 Assumptions Relating to Ensuring Cooperation

One or more Vendors included an assumption that the State will negotiate with the various software vendors proposed by the integrator to ensure cooperation between the software vendor and integrator. For purposes of clarity, this assumption is inconsistent with the intent of the RFP. While the State intends to enter into licensing agreements directly with the Software Providers, it is not the State's responsibility to establish a working relationship between the Vendor and the Vendor's chosen Software Providers. The State has previously clarified its position on this matter in a response to a Vendor inquiry received before the Vendor proposals were submitted.

#### 2.2.14.4 Assumptions Relating to Standard Business Processes

One or more Vendors included an assumption that a standard set of business processes will be used by all state agencies. Although Section 2.4.2 of the RFP provides that one of the goals of the ERP system is to facilitate standardization, the State considers it unreasonable to assume that a single standard set of business processes can be implemented across all agencies for all functionality given the complexity of state government and the diverse business requirements of the various state agencies. State agencies range from large, complex agencies to small boards and commissions. To clarify, while the State intends to adopt standard business processes whenever appropriate, Vendors should not assume that a single standard business process will be used by all state agencies.

#### 2.2.14.5 Assumptions Relating to Standard Security Roles

One or more Vendors included an assumption that all agencies will use the same security roles. The precise meaning and intent of this assumption was unclear, so this clarification is offered. While the State anticipates that the Vendor will develop a standard set of security roles for use by all agencies, it is anticipated that agencies may need to use different combinations of security roles to address their business needs.

#### 2.2.14.6 Assumptions Relating to Document Management Systems

One or more Vendors included an assumption that all documents that currently exist in the document management systems do not need to be linked in the ERP system. To clarify, the intent is for documents that reside in the existing document management systems that reference items such as open grants, projects, or contracts that are converted to the ERP system should be linked in the ERP system.

#### 2.2.14.7 Assumptions Relating to Capturing Data from Document Images

One or more Vendors included an assumption that the solution shall not be designed to directly read Optical Character Recognition (OCR), Intelligent Character Recognition (ICR) and Optical Mark Recognition (OMR) to capture data from the document images. For purposes of clarification, this assumption is inconsistent with certain of the Functional Requirements provided in the RFP.

#### 2.2.14.8 Assumptions Relating to Upgrade Estimates

One or more Vendors included an assumption that the upgrade estimate is provided for planning purposes only and the Vendor will re-estimate the level of effort required to support the software upgrade following implementation. For purposes of clarification, the State recognizes that, from a practical perspective, the cost to implement the upgrade will need to be assessed and validated at a later point in the project. However, any necessary adjustments to the contract would need to be addressed as a change order.

#### 2.2.14.9 Assumptions Relating to Communications

One or more Vendors included an assumption that the State will be responsible for the development of communication plans and materials and delivery of communications. This assumption is inconsistent with Section 2.10.18 of the RFP. For purposes of clarification, the State does not intend to accept sole responsibility for the development and production of the communications plan or related materials.

#### 2.2.14.10 Assumptions Relating to Supporting User Inquiries

One or more Vendors included an assumption that 80% of the functional support inquiries submitted to Production Support will be handled by State super users. For purposes of clarification, the Vendor is required to provide production support consistent with the RFP and should not assume any additional State resources beyond those identified in the RFP. The State will look to the Vendor to develop a mutually agreeable transition plan which will enable the State's production support team to assume these responsibilities after an appropriate amount of training, experience using the system, and demonstrated ability in supporting functional support inquiries.

#### 2.2.14.11 Assumptions Relating to Support for Software Patches

One or more Vendors included an assumption that support services for patches and bundles is limited to minor patches and bundles of the in-scope applications while major patches and bundles of the in-scope software required in the support of the on-going solution shall be a change in scope. For purposes of clarification, the Vendor is responsible for maintaining the software until production support is turned over to the State. This includes support services for all required patches and bundles.

#### 2.2.14.12 Assumptions Relating to the New Pension System

One or more Vendors included an assumption that the new pension system will be implemented and have gone live prior to the start of the ERP Project Phase 3 - Human Resource, Payroll and Time and Leave Management with required interfaces developed by the State from their existing system(s). For purposes of clarity, the new pension system and the ERP system are independent projects that are being implemented in parallel. While the ERP project team intends to coordinate with the pension system project team, this is not a valid assumption.

#### 2.2.14.13 Assumptions Relating to Checkpoints

One or more Vendors included an assumption that the vendor will have the opportunity to work with the State to review and confirm proposal estimates at the end of the Analysis Phase for each Phase of the project ("checkpoints"). These checkpoints will confirm that the level of effort and price stated are fair and appropriate for the effort required based on a more thorough understanding of the set of requirements and effort required to meet them. For purposes of



clarity, the intent is for this to be a firm, fixed fee contract with no opportunity to increase the contract price based on checkpoints.

### 2.2.14.14 Assumptions Relating to State Resources

One or more Vendors included an assumption that State resources, in addition to those identified in the RFP, may be required at certain points in the project. For purposes of clarity, the resources identified by the State in the RFP are the only resources the State has available to assign to the project. However, it is reasonable to expect that additional resources may be provided by the State on a limited, as-needed basis to participate in selected ERP project related activities such as To-Be process workgroups, topical focus groups, training, testing, etc.

### 2.2.15 Requested Changes to Terms and Conditions

Each Vendor's proposal included a number of requested exceptions to the State's standard contract terms and conditions. While any changes in terms and conditions must be addressed during contract negotiations, there are certain exceptions that the State clearly finds unacceptable. A few sample exceptions to the standard terms and conditions that the State considers to be unacceptable are provided below for purposes of clarity. The following clarification is offered to Vendors to make any necessary adjustments to their Technical Proposal and Cost Proposal.

#### 2.2.15.1 Order of Precedence

For purposes of clarity, the order of precedence as defined in the RFP and BAFO documents is the only order of precedence that the State is willing to accept.

#### 2.2.15.2 Limitation of Liability

For purposes of clarity, the State does not intend to accept a limitation of liability that is less than two (2) times the contract value.

#### 2.2.15.3 Contract Termination

For purposes of clarity, the State expects the vendor to fully discharge its responsibilities as set forth in the contract. The State will not entertain changes to its standard Contract Termination language.

### 2.2.16 Anticipated System Interfaces

This section provides a summary of clarifications to the anticipated system interfaces provided in Exhibit 35 in Appendix J of the RFP. It includes clarifications to items defined in Exhibit 35, as well as some additional interfaces which have been identified as a result of other clarifications and/or changes in State business processes since the RFP was initially published.

***Revisions to List of Anticipated System Interfaces Included in Appendix J, Exhibit 35***

Reference Numbers from Exhibit 35	Clarification
50 - 57	These interfaces are <b>no longer required</b> as the State now plans to integrate with TRX for the booking tool only. Valid travelers will be identified in the human resources function within the ERP.
84	The remarks included in the notes column in the RFP are hereby deleted. This interface is <b>confirmed as required</b> due to the State's decision to remove pavement management from the scope of the ERP.

Reference Numbers from Exhibit 35	Clarification
94 - 95	The remarks included in the notes column in the RFP are hereby deleted. This interface is <b>confirmed as required</b> due to the State's decision to remove pavement management from the scope of the ERP.
96	The remarks included in the notes column in the RFP are hereby deleted This interface <b>is confirmed as required</b> due to the State's decision to remove bridge management from the scope of the ERP.
98 - 99	This interface is <b>no longer required</b> due to the State determining that "non-State" entities will continue to be handled by PEIA's BAS system.
100 - 101	This interface is <b>confirmed as required</b> for those participants tracked within the ERP.
102 - 103	The Consolidated Public Retirement Board will be implementing a new system concurrent to the State's ERP implementation. Consequently, these interfaces are <b>confirmed as required</b> , but 102 could have 2 receivers – the old system and new and 103 could have 2 sources.
104	This interface is <b>confirmed as required</b> for those participants tracked within the ERP.
133	This interface is still <b>required</b> but must be capable of supporting multiple agency specific applicant services systems including but not limited to NeoGov and PeopleAdmin.
134 - 135	These interfaces are <b>no longer required</b> as the State now plans to integrate with TRX for the booking tool only.
138 - 139	These interfaces are <b>no longer required</b> as the State now plans to integrate with TRX for the booking tool only
140 - 142	These interfaces are <b>no longer required</b> due to the State determining that bridge management was out of scope for the ERP.
145 - 147	These interfaces are <b>no longer required</b> due to the State determining that pavement management was out of scope for the ERP.



For clarification purposes, the following additional interfaces will be required:

***Additional Interfaces Needed As Part of Statewide ERP Implementation***

No.	Phase	Function	External Entity	Type of Data	Inbound / Outbound	Approx. Sources / Receivers	Number of File Formats	Existing or New	Notes
166	Core Financials and Procurement	Financial	DHHR -WIC	Transactional activity affecting WIC accounts and grants	Outbound	1	1	Existing	
167	Core Financials and Procurement	Travel	TRX Booking Engine	Trip demographic info from TRX	Inbound	1	1	New	
168	Core Financials and Procurement	Grants	Health Insurance Exchange	TBD	Outbound	1	1	New	
169	Human Resources and Payroll	Travel	TRX Booking Engine	Employee Demographics from ERP Personnel Administration to TRX	Outbound	1	1	New	
170	Human Resources and Payroll	Benefits	BAS	Accounts Receivable for non-state participants from BAS to ERP Accounts Receivable	Inbound	1	1	New	
171	Human Resources and Payroll	Personnel	Various Agencies	Employee data updates from Higher Education or other non ERP HR Systems to ERP for new employees or changes to key employee information	Both	8	1	Existing	

No.	Phase	Function	External Entity	Type of Data	Inbound / Outbound	Approx. Sources / Receivers	Number of File Formats	Existing or New	Notes
172	Human Resources and Payroll	Temporary Bridge	WV Department of Transportation (WVDOT)	ERP Timekeeping to DOT REMIS system for personnel time charges and cost allocation	Both	1	2	New	Needed to support operations during the time period between Human Resources and Payroll Go-Live and the transition of WVDOT financials to the Statewide ERP
173	Human Resources and Payroll	Temporary Bridge	WV Department of Transportation (WVDOT)	ERP Payroll to DOT General Ledger for allocation of actual payroll cost	Both	1	2	New	support operations during the time period between Human Resources and Payroll Go-Live and the transition of WVDOT financials to the Statewide ERP
174	Human Resources and Payroll	AR	PEIA BAS	Non State accounts receivables	Inbound	1	1	New	
175	Core Financials and Procurement	Travel	TRX	ERP demographic HR data for travel policy enforcement	Outbound	1	1	New	

## SECTION THREE: RESPONSE FORMAT

### 3.1 General BAFO Technical Proposal Response Format

Vendors should either acknowledge or address each of the clarification items included in this Request for BAFO. Vendors should use the table format provided below for their responses to the Technical Proposal portion of their BAFO referencing the BAFO section and the section of their Technical Proposal being addressed. The response to the clarification or other revision should clearly explain the basis for the revision. This format is intended to assist the Evaluation Committee in completing its review and evaluation of the Vendors' BAFO Technical Proposals.

BAFO Section	Proposal Reference	Response to Clarification or Explanation

### 3.2 BAFO Technical Proposal Staffing Plan

Vendors should complete the attached BAFO Technical Proposal Staffing Plan in a manner which clearly reflects the staffing by position including the proposed individual's name or "TBD". This Staffing Plan is organized in a manner which will enable the Evaluation Committee to clearly identify the names and level of effort for the staff being proposed by the Vendor for each phase of the project in addition to the staff being proposed across multiple phases of the project.

### 3.3 BAFO Cost Proposal Schedules

Vendors should provide updated Cost Proposals as part of their BAFO using the attached BAFO Cost Schedules. These Schedules have been updated to reflect the State's decision to take Bridge Management and Safety Management out of scope for the ERP project.