

RFP # FAR226005 - Addendum #4
Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Software and Services

Purpose of this Addendum:

Vendor Inquiries and responses are provided. Where appropriate, the impacted section(s) of the RFP have been inserted to reflect the amended language. Clarification has also been provided for certain other sections as deemed appropriate.

CLARIFICATIONS PROVIDED NOT IN RESPONSE TO A VENDOR INQUIRY

Section 3.3.2.4, Section 3.3.2.6, and Section 2.2.3.4 are amended as follows:

3.3.2.4 Administrative Requirements

The Vendor should ~~submit a signed transmittal letter on Vendor letterhead fill out the Signature Sheet form and submit it~~ with the Cost Proposal as the first entry in this section. The person who signs the Cost Proposal Signature Sheet should be the same person who signed the Technical Proposal Signature Sheet.

Immediately following the Signature Sheet form, Vendors should include, as the second entry in this section, a copy of each proposed Software License and Annual Maintenance Agreement (Agreement) for all proposed Software Providers. Provide the ERP Software Provider's Agreement first, and then all Third party Agreements in alphabetical order.

3.3.2.6 TAB 2 - Total Cost Summary Schedule

This section should include the Total Cost Summary Schedule from Appendix C Cost Proposal Schedules. This schedule is comprised of ~~three (3)~~ five (5) sections:

- ◆ Section 1 - the Required ERP and Other Software Licenses section, should include pricing for the five (5) year contract term plus the three (3) one-year renewals periods for any fees related to the licensing of ERP products.
 - Provide the cost for each individual application module and third party tools included as part of the proposed solution and any associated proposed tool. The costs for each item are to be quoted separately unless bundled pricing is proposed.
 - Additionally, if third party products (specialized functional software, middleware, database instances, operating system software, compilers, job schedulers, security-related packages, etc.) are expected to successfully implement the proposed integrated software solution the Vendor should list these products. The Vendor should include a worksheet describing the quantities, release levels, etc., of each of these products.
 - Vendors should enter the Required ERP and Other Software Licenses information into Section 1 of the Schedule.
 - Because the State intends to implement the ERP software and required third party products using a phased approach covering several years, it is imperative that the State buy only the licenses for the products that are required for each phase in accordance with the proposed phasing and approach. As an example, the software costs for bridge management, pavement management, and facilities management should be reflected in the actual year in which those functions will be addressed in the proposed phasing approach. The State requires a firm price commitment on all proposed software in each proposal; however, software payments will be made in accordance with the proposed phasing plan to ensure that the State does not pay for software and associated annual maintenance costs that will not be utilized until a later date.
- ◆ Section 2 - the Ongoing Software Maintenance section, should include pricing for the

RFP # FAR226005 - Addendum #4
Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Software and Services

ongoing software annual maintenance fees.

- Any fees related to the maintenance should be included, as well as any discounts to be provided. The initial basis for annual maintenance fees should be based on the negotiated purchase price for the licensed products (not the “then list” price of software purchased).
 - In no event should any maintenance fees for any proposed software products be increased during the period covered by this RFP and in any year thereafter by more than the lower of: (a) three percent (3%) of the previous year's maintenance fees, or (b) the increase in the U.S. Consumer Price Index (CPI) as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Notwithstanding the foregoing, in no event should the maintenance factor used to calculate the annual maintenance fees exceed the “then current” factor in effect used generally by the Software Provider to calculate annual maintenance fees for similarly situated licensees in the United States.
 - Vendors should enter the Ongoing Software License and Maintenance Support information into Section 2 of the Schedule. As referenced in Section 1 above, the State strongly prefers that all application software licensing be acquired “just in time” for usage in accordance with the Vendor’s proposed phasing approach in order to eliminate paying annual maintenance on software not being utilized.
- ◆ Section 3 - the ERP Implementation and Post-Implementation Services section, should provide pricing for the proposed solution for each specified activity. This section should be consistent with the Staffing Plan by Function Schedule submitted in Cost Proposal TAB 4 and the Staffing Plan by Position Schedule submitted in Cost Proposal TAB 5. No entry is expected for this section. Section 3 pulls data from the Staffing Plan by Activity Schedule.
 - ◆ Section 4 includes the cost for the Software Major Release Upgrade Services being proposed by the Vendor. It should be consistent with the Upgrade Schedule provided in TAB 12.
 - ◆ Section 5 includes the cost for Technical Infrastructure and Support consistent with the Technical Infrastructure Schedule provided in TAB 10.

2.2.3.4 Requisition Tracking System (ReqTrak)

In 2001, the Purchasing Division commissioned the Office of Technology (OT) to develop the Requisition Tracking (ReqTrak) system to supplement the tracking and workflow functionality of the TEAM purchasing system. The ReqTrak system was implemented in the first quarter of 2002. The system’s main functionality is the ability to track elapsed time starting from the receipt of a requisition, progressing through the bid process, and ending at the final distribution of the approved purchase order(s). The functionality includes workflow and the ability to separate and report “purchasing time” versus “non-purchasing time.”

The system includes the additional ability to produce purchase order transmittal documents and procurement reporting based on United Nations Standard Product and Services (UNSPSC) ~~and NIGP~~ commodity codes. State agencies are able to inquire on the status of their active requisitions by means of a “Requisition Tracking Report” which is posted daily to an intranet.

RESPONSES TO VENDOR INQUIRIES

1. **QUESTION** - Appendix M states, “provide Advantiv a list of software product names and report or query tool names to populate Vendor's Functional Requirements Source response options field allowing the Vendor to designate which software product will provide the

RFP # FAR226005 - Addendum #4
Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Software and Services

required functionality. Software product names should be listed on the spreadsheet provided by Advantiv”.

The DD2 Source column is populated with BES, TPI, TPC, RQ, and DNM. Please clarify if the vendor’s software modules should replace these in DD2, and if so, is the product or specific module required (e.g., product name: Financial vs. module: Procurement).

RESPONSE - The intent is for Vendors to provide Advantiv with the software product names to use in DD2 in lieu of "BES", "TPI", etc.

2. **QUESTION** - Please confirm how many total employees in State agencies and Higher Ed will be part of the ERP payroll system.

RESPONSE - At the end of 2010, the State of West Virginia EPICS payroll system paid 26,392 fulltime and part-time State employees and 22,603 fulltime and part-time Higher Education employees for a total of 48,995 fulltime and part-time paid employees. All employees currently paid using the EPICS system are anticipated to be paid using the ERP Payroll System.

3. **QUESTION** - Please confirm exactly what involvement and usage Higher Ed institutions will have with the state ERP system. What Higher Ed institutions will use the ERP system, and exactly what functions of the ERP system will they utilize?

RESPONSE - All financial transactions affecting state funds must be processed through WVFIMS. This includes disbursements, deposits, investments, and transfers by Higher Education institutions. The Higher Education institutions enter all of their financial transactions that affect state funds into WVFIMS either through online entry or batch interfaces. The Higher Education institutions have their own financial systems that they use to further define these transactions.

In addition to WVFIMS, the Higher Education institutions are also required to have their payrolls processed through EPICS. EPICS performs the gross to net calculation, creates the payments, and updates WVFIMS with the payroll information. The Higher Education institutions also have their own payroll systems that they use to further define their payroll transactions, perform position control, and update their financial systems.

The State will require the Higher Education institutions to use the ERP systems for all HR, Payroll, and Financial transactions that affect state funds, in much the same way that they process their financial and payroll transactions in WVFIMS and EPICS today. For the immediate future, the Higher Education institutions plan to continue to maintain their own HR, Payroll, and Financial systems as well.

At some point in the future, the State may be interested in migrating the Higher Education institutions from their own internal systems to the ERP system.

4. **QUESTION** - TAB 8 instructions state to include the completed response in TAB 9. Please clarify the content that is required for TAB 8.

RESPONSE - Section 3.3.1.11 is amended as follows:

3.3.1.11 TAB 8 – Project Goals and Objectives

The Vendor should complete the responses to each of the State's goals and objectives identified in Section 2.4 following the format provided in Appendix A. Vendors should describe how they will comply with each. The completed response should be inserted in the Technical Proposal in TAB ~~8~~9.

RFP # FAR226005 - Addendum #4
Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Software and Services

5. **QUESTION** - TAB 9 instructions state to use Appendix B to complete the requirements and insert response in TAB 10; however, the instructions for Appendix B state to insert response behind TAB 1 - Executive Summary. Please clarify where the response to TAB 9 should be included within the proposal.

RESPONSE - Section 3.3.1.12 and Appendix B Mandatory Specification Checklist are amended as follows:

3.3.1.12 TAB 9 – Mandatory Specifications Checklist

The mandatory specifications contained in Section 2.5 must be completed along with the certification in the format provided in Appendix B. Vendors must respond to each mandatory requirement describing how they will comply with each and complete the required certification. The completed Mandatory Specification Checklist and certification should be inserted in the Technical Proposal in TAB ~~9-10~~.

Appendix B - Mandatory Specification Checklist

The mandatory specifications contained in Section 2.5 are provided below. Vendors must respond to each mandatory requirement describing how they will comply with each and complete the required certification. The completed Mandatory Specification Checklist and certification should be inserted in the Technical Proposal behind TAB ~~9~~ Mandatory Specification Checklist~~1-Executive Summary~~.

6. **QUESTION** - TAB 10 instructions state to include completed response in TAB 11. Please clarify where the response to TAB 10 should be included within the proposal.

RESPONSE - Section 3.3.1.13 is amended as follows:

3.3.1.13 TAB 10 – Technical Architecture Questionnaire

The Technical Architecture Questionnaire found in Appendix E should be completed and inserted in the Technical Proposal in TAB ~~10-11~~. The survey is intended to obtain the Vendor's recommendations about the technical architecture and other areas such as: configuration and maintenance, customizations and upgrades, report development, and security.

7. **QUESTION** - TAB 11 instructions stated that a Sample SOW should be included in TAB 12. Please clarify where the response to TAB 11 should be included within the proposal.

RESPONSE - Section 3.3.1.14 is amended as follows:

3.3.1.14 TAB 11 – Sample Statement of Work

The Vendor should submit a Sample Statement of Work in TAB ~~11-12~~. This Sample Statement of Work will provide a starting point for drafting the final Statement of Work that will be included in the contract with the Awarded Vendor as part of contract execution. The Sample Statement of Work should include a description of the roles and responsibilities for each of the services requested in this RFP in accordance with the vendor's proposed project plan and methodology, and descriptions of all deliverables to be provided.

8. **QUESTION** - Can the State please confirm that they are only using ESRI ArcGIS for its GIS capabilities?

RESPONSE - All of the GIS applications likely to be integrated with the ERP operate in an ESRI ArcGIS environment. Most State agencies currently utilize ArcGIS 9.3, but are planning to migrate to ArcGIS 10. There is a Department of Revenue property tax

RFP # FAR226005 - Addendum #4
Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Software and Services

application which utilizes MapInfo version 10.5, but it is not expected that this application would be integrated with the ERP.

9. **QUESTION** - RFP Section 2.5.1: Will the State change its approach of executing only one contract for products and services to an approach that is a more typical industry approach wherein the State would separately contract for the products and the system implementation (SI) services?

We believe we understand the intent of this provision but as explained below, the net effect of this provision will be to unnecessarily restrict competition and increase the State's cost without reducing its risks. In our experience, the system integrator's (SI's) "accountability" is achieved via an appropriate solution or system type warranty. The SI should warrant its services and the functionality of the solution to effectively include the selection decision around the third party software (i.e., provided the third party software performs to its documentation, it is the SI that is accountable if the system's performance does not meet the contract's specifications/requirements). However, the third party software vendor's license, warranty and maintenance terms must exclusively govern, among other things, correction of defects in its product (i.e., where the third party software does not perform according to its documentation). The SI can agree to facilitate those defect corrections but cannot in good faith agree to correct those defects as it is not in position to modify that code. Other reasons that support our request include: (1) this structure will likely generate material revenue recognition and tax issues (combining the sale of products with services under a single contract can be problematic) and therefore, increase the costs to the state; (2) many of the basic commitments such as support, maintenance, and warranty are properly between the State and the COTS vendors as the State's relationship with those vendors will continue after the SI has completed its work/support and the State should be in a position to negotiate and have the ongoing contractual commitments it requires; and (3) a single contract structure will require extensive negotiations between the SI and the SI's COTS vendors in an effort align terms with the proposed prime contract as finally negotiated and could result in a delay and other uncertainty. Given the above, we request that the State amend the RFP to provide that it will purchase the third party COTS products directly from the product vendors/resellers, including the use of existing State contracts for those products. The SI's should be permitted to propose revisions to the existing T&C's and to propose additional T&C's in its proposal, including a proposed system warranty. That will put the State in a position to exercise its judgment in context of this "best value" procurement and select the vendor (and negotiate with that vendor) to obtain what it considers to be the best value for the State. As stated above, a failure to make this adjustment will unnecessarily limit competition and increase the costs to the State.

RESPONSE - The State intends for the Vendor to warrant its services and the performance of the proposed solution. As such, the State will not hold the Vendor responsible for correcting a defect in a Software Provider's software. However, the State will hold the Vendor responsible for meeting the system requirements specified in Appendix M. If a Software Provider cannot correct a defect in their software solution that was intended to support a system requirement, it will be the responsibility of the Vendor to define an alternative approach to meet that requirement (i.e. an additional software module, a customization, etc.) at no additional cost to the State.

The State intends for the Software Provider to provide the proposed software in accordance with the pricing offered in the Cost Proposal and correct identified defects in the software adversely impacting the performance of the proposed solution in accordance with the

RFP # FAR226005 - Addendum #4
Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Software and Services

software license, warranty, and maintenance terms. The State intends to obtain the software licenses directly from the Software Providers.

For purposes of clarity, Section 2.5.1 Single Vendor to Execute the Contract is amended to read as follows:

2.5.1 Single Vendor to Execute the Contract

The State is seeking a single Vendor that **shall** be responsible for providing both a complete software solution and all requested services required for a successful implementation, including production support. The Vendor may team with multiple firms in its proposal but there **shall** be a single Vendor that will execute the Contract expected to result from this RFP and will coordinate, integrate, and be accountable for all products and services proposed. This excludes an arrangement between vendors of joint venturing or joint response to this RFP as such arrangements will not be allowed. This restriction does not prohibit multiple vendors from proposing the same subcontractor(s) or software as a part of their proposals.

For purposes of clarity, the Vendor is responsible for providing a complete solution that addresses the required functionality requested by the State. The Vendor is responsible for working directly with all Software Providers included in its proposal to resolve any issues regarding the installation and performance of the software during the implementation of the ERP System and for 12 months following the final go-live date to ensure that the software performs as proposed. It is the intent of the State to issue individual purchase orders with each of the Software Providers included in the successful proposal to obtain the software licenses and on-going software maintenance directly from the Software Providers at the firm pricing offered in the Vendor's cost proposal. The State is willing to take advantage of existing licensing agreements with the State or contracts with Software Providers where appropriate. Any pricing submitted in a Vendor cost proposal should be equal to or better than any pricing in an existing State contract with the Software Provider for the same software.

10. **QUESTION** - Will questions asked after today (during Pre-Bid Conference) in writing prior to February 9th be answered prior to the February 25th date on the proposal?

RESPONSE - Yes, but it depends upon when the questions were submitted and the level of effort required to provide the response. The intent is to answer all questions by February 25th.

11. **QUESTION** - Will the names of all vendors who submitted a bid at the time of bid opening be available and/or published?

RESPONSE - The names of all Vendors who submitted a proposal will be announced when the Technical Proposals are opened by the Purchasing Division on March 23rd.

12. **QUESTION** - What are the total number of users across the state departments for traditional EAM functions asset tracking, work, materials management? What are the total number of users across the state departments for traditional EAM functions asset tracking, work, materials management?

RESPONSE - This question is being researched and a response will be provided in a subsequent Addendum.

13. **QUESTION** - In reviewing the RFP, there seems to be system requirements detailed or expected functionality contained in the narrative sections, that in some cases are broader in

RFP # FAR226005 - Addendum #4
Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Software and Services

scope than those in the functional matrix. Are the expecting vendors to respond to the broader functionality or just to those requirements in the matrix?

RESPONSE - The information provided in the narrative sections of the RFP is intended to provide potential vendors with an overview of the required functionality. Vendors should respond to the detailed requirements presented in Appendix M.

14. **QUESTION** - Do the existing HR systems (i.e. NEOGOV and IRX) identified in Sections 2.2, 3.11, 2.9.17, 4.2, 2.2.3.8 meet the requirements for Applicant Tracking and Travel in the RFP?

RESPONSE - A formal fit-gap analysis has not been performed between the requirements for Applicant Tracking and the current configuration of NEOGOV or Travel and the current configuration of TRX. It is believed that both systems are generally capable of meeting the requirements, but the State is interested in the potential advantages offered by a fully integrated solution.

15. **QUESTION** - Please elaborate on the plans (including training) for the integration of the separate pension project.

RESPONSE - The Pension Administration System (PAS) project is a separate initiative on its own track. The plan is to establish a protocol between the PMOs of each project to insure the two projects are exchanging information throughout the planning, design, testing, training, and cutover phases such that the coordination of the two initiatives minimizes any distribution to either project or to the State. Design sessions involving interface touch points and the exchange of data between PAS and ERP will have representatives from both projects. Development of the required touch points and interface testing will involve resources from both teams. The timing of when the two systems are put into production will impact the temporary or permanent nature of the interfaces. CPRB will be offered ERP training as appropriate.

16. **QUESTION** - What hardware and OS does West Virginia utilize?

RESPONSE - Please refer to Section 2.2.4 of the RFP for a discussion of the State's current technical environment. For the ERP project, potential vendors should propose the technical architecture which the vendor believes is most appropriate to meet the State's requirements given the ERP solution the vendor is proposing. The State expects the vendor to propose a platform which is a proven solution and has the lowest cost of ownership, while meeting the performance requirements defined in the RFP.

17. **QUESTION** - Will the planned renovations of Building 5 occur during the time period of the ERP implementation? Will separate space be planned?

RESPONSE - This question is not relevant to the RFP. Please refer to Section 2.1 of the RFP regarding the location of the ERP Project.

18. **QUESTION** - The cost proposal dates begin in July 2011. Should our project plan start the project on July 1, 2011?

RESPONSE - The project start date is dependent upon the length of the procurement and final approval processes. For planning purposes, a project start date of September 2011 may be more realistic.

19. **QUESTION** - Can the work products of the Chart of Accounts Workgroup be shared with the vendors? (Section 2.9.1)

RFP # FAR226005 - Addendum #4
Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Software and Services

RESPONSE - No, but it will be made available to the successful Vendor. The State has included a proposed Chart of Accounts coding block in Section 2.9.1 of the RFP and is interested in seeing how Vendors propose to meet the State's needs.

20. **QUESTION** - Please explain the integration of higher education payroll in the state's current applications, for example, can the state confirm that payroll processing for higher education is in or not in scope? (i.e. issuance of payroll checks, performing gross to net calculations)

RESPONSE - Please refer to the answer to question #3.

21. **QUESTION** - Is an identity management system used to support one to six document management systems on one to five GIS systems on the Open Enrollment Applications?

RESPONSE - At least four different identity management systems are currently utilized by the State. The Office of Technology manages two different Microsoft Active Directory (AD) 2008 implementations. The State Treasurer's Office also utilizes Microsoft AD 2008. The State Auditor's Office utilizes Windows Server AD 2003 to authenticate users to its network and is planning to migrate to AD 2008 in 2011. At this time, we are not able to determine if all of the systems identified in the question are covered by identity management systems. However, PEIA's Open Enrollment System utilizes an application specific security process rather than an identity management system. In preparing their proposal, potential vendors should consider alternative approaches and provide a recommendation for interconnecting these different identify management solutions utilized by agencies that will have ERP users.

22. **QUESTION** - What is your current working/operating environment?

RESPONSE - Please refer to the answer to question #16.

23. **QUESTION** - Please clarify the involvement of higher education institutions in the ERP project.

RESPONSE - Please refer to the answer to question #3.

24. **QUESTION** - Does the state have a preference on a Platform O/S?

RESPONSE - Vendors should propose the technical architecture which the vendor believes is most appropriate to meet the State's requirements given the ERP solution the vendor is proposing. The State expects the vendor to propose a platform which is a proven solution and has the lowest cost of ownership, while meeting the performance requirements defined in the RFP.

25. **QUESTION** - If multiple vendors bid the same software product, will you conduct one demo for each software vendor (like in Kansas), or will each software vendor demo for each systems integrator?

RESPONSE - The State intends to schedule one demonstration session around each ERP software proposed. If Vendors propose different solutions for scripts selected for demonstration, then time will be allocated for each separate solution to be demonstrated. Please refer to Section 1.3, items 6 and 7.

26. **QUESTION** - (Section 2.51) Please clarify one vendor to sign contract. Will the state allow individual contracts with third party software providers?

RESPONSE - Please refer to the answer to question #9.

27. **QUESTION** - Once a winning vendor is chosen, it may be that some components (e.g. subcontractor's software products) may not be exactly what the state wants. Will the state have the right to mandate that the winner substitute a more appropriate/desired component?

RFP # FAR226005 - Addendum #4
Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Software and Services

RESPONSE - No. The State intends to make an award in accordance with Section 4.1 of the RFP based on the software and services proposed by the selected Vendor.

28. **QUESTION** - Does the state have a preference on a Platform O/S?

RESPONSE - Please refer to the answer to question #24.

29. **QUESTION** - Would the State be willing to consider less than 99.999 percent availability, which only allows for slightly over 5 minutes of downtime per year? There is a significant cost to having that limited amount of downtime.

RESPONSE - This question is being researched and a response will be provided in a subsequent Addendum.

30. **QUESTION** - The RFP indicates the State will complete its assessment of the feasibility of implementing a shared services center prior to the start of the implementation phase of the ERP project. Is this intended to indicate that the assessment will be complete and available prior to the start of the project, i.e., by 9/1/11)?

RESPONSE - The State is currently planning to complete a high-level assessment of the feasibility of implementing a shared services model prior to the start of the ERP implementation phase. The work product(s) from this assessment effort will be made available to the successful vendor.

31. **QUESTION** - Can the State provide the HR/Payroll Standardization Workgroup study report regarding Pay, Time and Leave standardization that was planned to be complete by January, 2011?

RESPONSE - No, but it will be made available to the successful Vendor. The study has been completed and shared with the Executive Sponsors but is still a working draft at this time.

32. **QUESTION** - When are institutions of higher education expected to use Fleet Management functionality within the scope of this procurement? The RFP indicates "There are additional State entities including Higher Education Planning Commission...which is expected to utilize the fleet management functionality".

RESPONSE - Senate Bill 219, which was passed by the West Virginia Legislature in 2010, gave the new West Virginia State Fleet Management Office responsibility for managing the fleet units utilized by higher education institutions. Consequently, the State would expect that the fleet units utilized by higher education institutions would be included, like the fleet units of other state agencies, within the ERP fleet module.

33. **QUESTION** - What identity management system(s) is (are) used by the State (software, version) and what Departments currently use the system? Is an identity management system used to support the six document management systems or the five GIS systems or the Open Enrollment application?.

RESPONSE - Please refer to the answer to question #21.

34. **QUESTION** - What systems, if any, are anticipated to be replaced as part of the Safety Management System?.

RESPONSE - The proposed ERP Safety management function is not intended to specifically replace any existing systems. Instead, it is expected to draw data from a number of safety related systems and make this data available for use in analysis and

RFP # FAR226005 - Addendum #4
Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Software and Services

decision making. A number of the systems expected to provide data to the ERP Safety Management function are identified in Section 2.9.18.8 of the RFP.

35. **QUESTION** - Is the State expecting that integration with GIS systems is only to be performed with DOT'S ESRI system and the other references are to just provide the capability if the State decided to implement the integration at a later date? Or does the State wish to have the integration for all of the GIS systems included in the project?.

RESPONSE - The vendor's proposed ERP solution is expected to provide GIS viewer capabilities within the ERP for specific functions which involve geospatial based information. The vendor's proposed ERP solution is also expected to have the capability to provide application level integration to allow ERP functions and data to be displayed and accessed by agency GIS applications. Each of these GIS capabilities is expected to be general features of the vendor's proposed ERP system. However, vendors are only expected to integrate their proposed ERP solution with the WVDOT GIS at the specific integration points defined in the detailed requirements in Appendix M and in the interface requirements in Appendix J. The State may choose to integrate the ERP with other agency's GIS applications at a later date.

36. **QUESTION** - What is the functionality of the training database that is targeted be replaced by Phase 3 of the ERP project? Is this system planned to be used for registering and conducting training for Phase 1 and 2?

RESPONSE - The functionality and capabilities of the training database is defined in the requirements contained in the Learning Management section of the RFP. It is not anticipated to be used in Phase 1 and 2.

37. **QUESTION** - Please describe the license components and software versions currently in production for each of the six document management systems that are intended to be integrated with the ERP? What agencies and institutions use FileNet, Kofax, and ADIS (in addition to Fairmont State University)? Do each of these systems have test and training instances that will support the proposed ERP project timeline?

RESPONSE - This question is being researched and a response will be provided in a subsequent Addendum.

38. **QUESTION** - What GIS system does each Department license, what versions are used? These Departments are identified as having GIS systems: 1) WVDOT has ESRI ArcGIS; 2) DHHR, 3) DEP, 4) Revenue, and 5) Commerce.

RESPONSE - Please refer to Question #8.

39. **QUESTION** - Is an identity management system used to support any of the State's current self service applications (such as the PEIA Open Enrollment System)?

RESPONSE - PEIA's Open Enrollment System utilizes an application specific security process. The State Auditor's Office also utilizes an application specific security process for its myApps and Vista self service portals.

40. **QUESTION** - There may be a discrepancy between the tab numbers and the appendices. Would the State please confirm location of each appendix within the technical proposal submission? We request clarification of these items we've noted below: 3.3.1.11 TAB 8 – Project Goals and Objectives The Vendor should complete the responses to each of the State's goals and objectives identified in Section 2.4 following the format provided in

RFP # FAR226005 - Addendum #4
Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Software and Services

Appendix A. Vendors should describe how they will comply with each. The completed response should be inserted in the Technical Proposal in TAB 9.

RESPONSE - Please refer to the answer to question #4.

41. **QUESTION** - There may be a discrepancy between the tab numbers and the appendices. Would the State please confirm location of each appendix within the technical proposal submission? We request clarification of these items we've noted below: 3.3.1.12 TAB 9 – Mandatory Specifications Checklist The mandatory specifications contained in Section 2.5 must be completed along with the certification in the format provided in Appendix B. Vendors must respond to each mandatory requirement describing how they will comply with each and complete the required certification. The completed Mandatory Specification Checklist and certification should be inserted in the Technical Proposal in TAB 10.

RESPONSE - Please refer to the answer to question #5.

42. **QUESTION** - There may be a discrepancy between the tab numbers and the appendices. Would the State please confirm location of each appendix within the technical proposal submission? We request clarification of these items we've noted below: 3.3.1.13 TAB 10 – Technical Architecture Questionnaire The Technical Architecture Questionnaire found in Appendix E should be completed and inserted in the Technical Proposal in TAB 11. The survey is intended to obtain the Vendor's recommendations about the technical architecture and other areas such as: configuration and maintenance, customizations and upgrades, report development, and security.

RESPONSE - Please refer to the answer to question #6.

43. **QUESTION** - There may be a discrepancy between the tab numbers and the appendices. Would the State please confirm location of each appendix within the technical proposal submission? We request clarification of these items we've noted below: 3.3.1.14 TAB 11 – Sample Statement of Work The Vendor should submit a Sample Statement of Work in TAB 12. This Sample Statement of Work will provide a starting point for drafting the final Statement of Work that will be included in the contract with the Awarded Vendor as part of contract execution. The Sample Statement of Work should include a description of the roles and responsibilities for each of the services requested in this RFP in accordance with the vendor's proposed project plan and methodology, and descriptions of all deliverables to be provided.

RESPONSE - Please refer to the answer to question #7.

44. **QUESTION** - Where in our proposal should we highlight the two different costs requested for eTravel (one approach is to interface to the hosted IRX solutions solution and a second approach is to use ERP functionality)? When evaluating the cost proposal, how will the cost of Travel be evaluated? What is the cost of the current IRX Travel Solutions functionality? Have all State agencies and Departments that are part of the scope of this procurement implemented the IRX travel solution? If not, which ones have not implemented the solution and are they planned to be implemented sometime in the next two years.

RESPONSE - ERP or Third Party Software product. On the Software Licensed Products Schedule tab of the cost worksheet identify and enter the license cost for the ERP Travel module or third party Travel software product. Identify and enter the cost of any necessary customizations to the Travel software on the Customizations Tab. On the Other row of the Staffing Plan by Function Schedule tab identify and enter the cost associated with implementation of the Travel module. On the Training Breakdown Schedule tab identify and

RFP # FAR226005 - Addendum #4
Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Software and Services

enter the cost of training activities related to the Travel module. If the Travel module will be included in the planned software upgrade those costs should be identified and included on the Software Upgrade tab. On the Other Cost Schedule in the Interface section identify and enter the cost associated with the interfaces to/from the TRX Travel system. On the Training Breakdown Schedule identify and enter the cost of training activities related to the IRX interfaces. Be sure to distinguish these training costs from any training costs associated with the Travel module. The travel cost will be evaluated as part of the overall cost evaluation. The cost of the TRX Travel Solutions is not relevant to the current RFP. The State will decide to pursue either the ERP Travel System option or the TRX Interface option not both and clarification will be provided to Vendors as part of the discussion and final offer process. All of the state agencies within the scope of this project will be implemented on the selected option. As such, the question is not relevant to the current RFP.

45. **QUESTION** - What are the performance evaluation cycles used by the State (e.g., July to June, January to December, quarterly based on hire date, etc.)? Does the performance evaluation cycle vary by State Department?

RESPONSE - The performance evaluation cycles vary by agencies. Many DOP covered agencies use an October through September cycle.

46. **QUESTION** - What is the percent availability of the Document Management System to which the ERP will be integrated? If the some of the ERP system functionality is not available because It is dependent on the Document Management System, would this time be excluded from the 99.999% availability?

RESPONSE - The percent availability of the various document management systems utilized by state agencies is not known. The availability requirement for the ERP system is intended to apply to ERP specific components only and is not intended to include other State systems outside of the ERP environment which are not under the operational control of the vendor. The availability requirement would apply to any vendor proposed third party solutions.

47. **QUESTION** - What is the percent availability of the GIS applications to which the ERP will be integrated? If the some of the ERP system functionality is not available because It is dependent on the Document Management System, would this time be excluded from the 99.999% availability?

RESPONSE - The percent availability of the WVDOT GIS and other state agency GIS applications is not known. The availability requirement for the ERP system is intended to apply to ERP specific components only and is not intended to include other State systems outside of the ERP environment which are not under the operational control of the vendor. The availability requirement would apply to any vendor proposed third party solutions.

48. **QUESTION** - For planning purposes, is the vendor to assume the only business functions that need to be designed to operate with and without shared services are the eight functions identified on page 56 of the RFP.

RESPONSE - The business processes identified in the RFP as potential candidates for shared services are those processes which have been identified to date as the most likely candidates for implementation in a shared services model. This assessment is based on the experience of other public sector organizations, the way these functions are currently performed by the State and other factors. This list of processes should provide the vendor a general idea of functions which could be implemented in a shared services environment.

RFP # FAR226005 - Addendum #4
Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Software and Services

However, the State would expect to work with the selected vendor to refine and finalize this list of processes as part of the To-Be modeling efforts during implementation.

49. **QUESTION** - What functionality has the State implemented as part of the NEOGOV solution? What is the annual cost of this solution?

RESPONSE - The Division of Personnel has a license for and has implemented NEOGOV Insight Enterprise. The annual subscription license is \$48,000 for unlimited Insight Enterprise access to all system functionality as well as an unlimited number of Insight Enterprise users (Division of Personnel and user agencies).

50. **QUESTION** - Rather than limiting liability to two (2) times the value of the contract, would the State be open to limiting liability to two (2) times the amount paid? This would likely reduce the price of the proposals and still provide the State leverage to help ensure vendor performance.

RESPONSE - No.

51. **QUESTION** - Please indicate where in the proposal response Bidders should include the list of terms it proposes to modify.

RESPONSE - Please refer to Section 3.3.1.4 TAB 1 - Executive Summary of the RFP.

52. **QUESTION** - Will the State find it beneficial for vendors to provide and discuss revenue generating options of their solutions, to reduce the states costs associated with this project?

RESPONSE - Please include as part of TAB 1 - Executive Summary. Anticipated revenues may be reflected in the Executive Summary, but any cost information must be reflected in the Cost Proposal.

53. **QUESTION** - The RFP states that "There are 155 Employer ID Numbers (EIN) identified in EPICS, one for each state entity." Is the State considering the possibility of consolidating the separate entities under a single state EIN as part of this project? Should the Vendor provide a plan to aid in the consolidation process?

RESPONSE - Yes, the State is considering the possibility of consolidating under a single EIN or to a small number of EIN if there are reasons why consolidating to a single number is not feasible. A plan to aid in the consolidation process would be helpful.

54. **QUESTION** - Is an assumption of 600 total concurrent users for the Financial system an accurate estimate of the number of users using the Financial system at any given point in time? This includes all modules of a Financial system (e.g. GL, AP, AR, Procurement, etc.).

RESPONSE - At the present time, we don't really have a good way of measuring concurrent users, assuming of course that concurrent users is defined as the number of users online in the financial system at the same time. Currently WVFIMS has a maximum of 100 DB2 threads. So as a practical matter their can never be more than 100 concurrent users in WVFIMS at one time. On occasion the Office of Technology randomly checks to see how many users are online at any given time. Usually the number ranges between 10 to 15 users. That said there are currently 3,337 active WVFIMS user id's. This is the best information that we have available at this time. Keep in mind that the current financial system does not provide all of the functionality that is being requested of the ERP financial system. Also keep in mind that these statistics apply only to the current financial system. They do not include procurement, HR/Payroll, or the transportation systems being requested.

RFP # FAR226005 - Addendum #4
Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Software and Services

55. **QUESTION** - Is an assumption of 250,000 Financial documents processed per month an accurate assumption? One document typically results in several account line postings to GL.

RESPONSE - No. An average month was approximately 127,000 WVFIMS transactions for Fiscal Year 2010. However within that year, the totals by month vary due to "seasonal" transactions from a low of 74,785 in November of 2009 to 265,024 for February of 2010. To further clarify this response, it does not include counts of individual purchase card transactions nor does it attempt to anticipate the move from "off systems" to individual payments under the ERP implementation.

56. **QUESTION** - a) Is an assumption of 39,000 total employees and 26,000 active employees accurate? b) Are the remaining employees retirees?

RESPONSE - Part A - The assumption is low, please refer to answer to Question #2.

Part B - No.

57. **QUESTION** - What is the maximum number of employees you would pay in any pay period?

RESPONSE - There is no set maximum number. On an average the EPICS system process approximately 45,000 employees during a regular payroll cycle.

58. **QUESTION** - How many daily solicitations and responses do you estimate to post and receive?

RESPONSE - The Purchasing Division issued 759 formal solicitations and received 3,592 formal responses for fiscal year 2010. There is no practical method to estimate informal (delegated purchasing authority) solicitations and responses that are not captured in the statewide purchasing system.

59. **QUESTION** - Will the State please provide the names of the members of the Selection Committee?

RESPONSE - The State does not intend to disclose the names of the members of the Evaluation Committee during the procurement. Please refer to Section 1.5 of the RFP.

60. **QUESTION** - Will the recommendations made by the HR/Payroll Standardization Workgroup or the final adopted legislative changes be available to vendors and if so, when?

RESPONSE - Please refer to the response for question #31.

61. **QUESTION** - Please confirm that the testing tools that the contractor is providing is strictly for non-production use.

RESPONSE - The testing tools to be provided by the vendor will be utilized for development activities, system testing, integration testing and performance testing. These tools will generally be utilized in the development environment. However, based on the State team's prior experience, there could be very rare occasions when the testing tools may need to be utilized against production data to research a production problem which cannot be replicated in the test environment. The State would not expect that this potential need, since rare, would require separate licenses for the production environment.

62. **QUESTION** - Please distinguish between "customizations" in Section 2.10.5 and "enhancements and modifications" in Section 2.10.6 and how this factors into bidder's proposed pricing.

RFP # FAR226005 - Addendum #4
Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Software and Services

RESPONSE - All required customizations, enhancements and modifications should be generically identified in Vendor responses to the Functional and System-wide Requirements in DD2 as major, medium or minor customizations in accordance with the instructions provided in Appendix M. The required customizations identified in DD2 should be provided in the Cost Proposal by completing the Customizations Schedule.

63. **QUESTION** - Section 2.10.22 and Appendix L of the RFP requires that the Vendor hosts the development environments for the State until 3 months following the go-live of Phase 1. If feasible, is the State willing to alternatively place such an environment in one of the State Data-Centers as long as the machines and environments are still operated by the Vendor considering there will be some duplication of effort to establish the development environment in both locations?

RESPONSE - Potential vendors must fully respond to the requirements for vendor hosting of the development environment until 3 months following the go-live of Phase 1 as specified in the RFP. However, the State is willing to consider as an option the vendor hosting and operating the development environment on-site in a State managed facility. At the vendor's option, the vendor may provide pricing for this alternative as part of its cost proposal. Based on this information, the State will consider potentially modifying the requirements related to hosting of the development environment during the clarification and best and final offer process.

64. **QUESTION** - Section 2.10.22 and Appendix L of the RFP discusses the operations environments of the ERP. Will the State find it beneficial for vendors to provide cost-saving alternate solutions, such as management of the infrastructure using off-site personnel, turning over a Vendor data center to the State, or running hosted production environments in a Vendor data center?

RESPONSE - The State spent considerable time analyzing various options for operating the ERP production environment. At this time, the State only wants vendors to propose a solution for implementing, supporting and maintaining the ERP production operations environment which are consistent with and meet the specifications included within the RFP.

65. **QUESTION** - RFP section 3.3.1.10.4 Detailed Description of Services / Deliverables to be Provided states "The Vendor should describe in detail how each of the services listed in Section 2.9, Services to be Provided, should be addressed in accordance with the Vendor's methodology and approach taking into account the items discussed in Section 2.8, Items for Special Consideration. A listing and description of proposed deliverables should be included with each service discussion. All deliverables identified in Section 2.9 should be included." The section numbers in this requirement to not match up to the section headings. Could the state please confirm the appropriate references as it relates to the desired content required for this section?

RESPONSE - Section 3.3.1.10.4 is amended to read as follows: The Vendor should describe in detail how each of the services listed in Section 2.109, Services to be Provided, should be addressed in accordance with the Vendor's methodology and approach taking into account the items discussed in Section 2.98, Items for Special Consideration. A listing and description of proposed deliverables should be included with each service discussion. All deliverables identified in Section 2.109 should be included.

66. **QUESTION** - Sections 3.3.2.6 and 5.5 state that there are 3 optional one-year renewals whereas Section 2.10.21 states that there are 2. Can the State please confirm which is correct?

RFP # FAR226005 - Addendum #4
Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Software and Services

RESPONSE - Section 2.10.21 is amended to read as follows:

2.10.21 Production Maintenance and Support

On-site technical support and maintenance is expected to be required after the acceptance of each phase of the implemented ERP System. The on-site presence is essential to maintaining a stable production environment, and to providing for a smooth turnover of system responsibility to the State.

The Vendor must provide full onsite post-implementation maintenance and support for 24 months after Go-Live of Phase 1 or until three (3) months after the last implementation phase is in production, whichever is later. The Vendor must then jointly manage and perform post-implementation support with the State for a period of 48 months. It is the intent of the State that the Vendor includes this level of support in its proposal even if it extends beyond the five (5) year contract period into the ~~two (2)~~ three (3) one-year renewal option periods.

This post-implementation maintenance and support will consist of technical, functional, and operational support, and must be provided by skilled personnel who have become familiar with the project over the course of the implementation effort.

The Vendor will have primary responsibility for the production support of the ERP application during the phased deployment of the ERP solution as described above. During this period, the Vendor must also be responsible for mentoring assigned State staff involved in production support to prepare them to assume this responsibility in accordance with a transition plan to be provided by the Vendor. At the designated point in time when the ERP application production support becomes a joint responsibility between the State and the Vendor, the parties will jointly manage the production support with the Vendor continuing to mentor and assist the State staff in accordance with the transition plan approved by the State. After 48 months of Phase 1 being in production or three (3) months after the final phase is in production, whichever is later, the State expects to manage and lead the ERP application production support activities, with the Vendor providing advisory support or providing specialized subject matter expertise for a period of 12 months. During the last six (6) months of production support, the Vendor must complete a major upgrade of the ERP software.

Please refer to Appendix K for detailed specifications on the required ERP production support.

67. **QUESTION** - In section 3.3.1.11 TAB 8, the RFP requests vendors to complete Appendix A and insert behind TAB 9. Additionally the instructions for Appendix A requests vendors to insert it behind Tab 9 in accordance with section 3.3.1.12. a) Can the State please clarify behind which Tab the completed Appendix A should be inserted in the Technical proposal? b) If the State wants vendors to insert it behind Tab 9, could clarification be provided on what content should appear in Tab 8?

RESPONSE - Please refer to the answer to question #4.

68. **QUESTION** - RFP section 3.3.1.12 TAB 9, requests vendors to insert "The completed Mandatory Specification /Checklist and certification" in the Technical proposal behind TAB 10. The RFP instructions provided for Appendix B requests vendors to insert the completed and signed Appendix B behind TAB 1 – Executive Summary. a) Can the State please clarify which tab vendors should insert the completed and signed Appendix B behind? b) If the

RFP # FAR226005 - Addendum #4
Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Software and Services

answer to “a” above is behind Tab 1, could the State please provide clarification on what content should appear in TAB 9?

RESPONSE - Please refer to the answer to question #5.

69. **QUESTION** - RFP section 3.3.1.13 TAB 10, requests vendors to complete Appendix E and insert it behind TAB 11 of the Technical Proposal. Additionally, the RFP instructions provided for Appendix E instruct vendors to include Appendix E behind TAB 11. a) Can the State please clarify which tab should include the completed Appendix E? b) If the answer to “a)” above is Tab 11, could the State please clarify what content should be included for Tab 10.

RESPONSE - Please refer to the answer to question #6.

70. **QUESTION** - RFP section 3.3.1.14 TAB 11 requests vendors to “submit a sample State of Work in TAB 12.” However the instructions for section 3.3.1.15 TAB 12 requests vendors to insert the vendors response to Appendix M. Can the State please clarify what content should be included for Tab 11 and Tab 12?

RESPONSE - Please refer to the answer to question #7.

71. **QUESTION** - RFP page 214 of Appendix K, Are the 500 hours of advisory services requested during the second full year of production operations the same as the .25 FTE requirement for ‘Other experience ERP resources on as needed basis to perform advisory services...’ noted in the 6th bullet under the Second Full Year of Production Operations heading? If not, how are these different?

RESPONSE - Yes, the reference to 500 hours of advisory services and the reference to a 0.25 FTE are referring to the same requirement.

72. **QUESTION** - The Software/Upgrade section on Page 215 (Appendix K) of the RFP mentions “the next generally available major release of the software.” It is likely that a major release of the ERP software, (e.g. 4.0 to 5.0) may not be generally available in the timeframe when the State is requesting a post deployment upgrade to commence. In addition, major releases often are not best implemented solely as “technical upgrades” in order to take advantage of new capabilities in these larger releases. As definitions for ‘major’ can vary, is this requirement possibly intended to suggest the application of a generally available minor (e.g. 4.1 to 4.2) or major release?

RESPONSE - The intended scope of the software upgrade as defined in the RFP is from the major release of the proposed ERP solution initially implemented in production to the next available major release of the proposed ERP solution. The State envisions this to be a technical upgrade only. The State was anticipating that at least one additional major release of a potential vendor's ERP solution would likely be released during the implementation period given the phased deployment approach envisioned by the State. If a vendor is not anticipating a major release of its proposed ERP solution during the timelines anticipated for an upgrade during the RFP, the vendor should describe what type of an upgrade it can accomplish during the timelines outlined in the RFP. To the extent that this is something other than an upgrade to the next major release of the software, the State will consider this factor as part of its technical evaluation of the vendor's upgrade approach. Likewise, the State would expect an upgrade to something other than a major release to require a reduced effort by the vendor with a corresponding reduction in staff hours and proposed cost in its cost proposal.

RFP # FAR226005 - Addendum #4
Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Software and Services

73. **QUESTION** - On page 222 in Appendix L of the RFP, once the development environment is at the State and the State is responsible for it while at the same time the Vendor is responsible for production, will the Vendor be coordinating activities (such as migration/change control) that span the use of all environments cohesively?

RESPONSE - The vendor will be responsible for coordinating activities such as migration/change control that span across both the production and development environments. One example would be ensuring that changes to the production environment to support an emergency change to production are replicated to the development, system test, training and user acceptance testing environments.

74. **QUESTION** - Requirement #709401 under General Benefits Administration indicates notification distribution methods of either email or US mail. Does the State expect either one method or the other to be supported for any notification or the ability for both? Do these methods apply to all other notifications referenced in subsequent requirements in the Benefits Administration sections?

RESPONSE - The State anticipated the need to support both email and US mail notification/communication capabilities. Requirements containing the words "email or letter" or "letters" will require either option.

75. **QUESTION** - There are multiple requirements having the term "burdened overlays". Can the State elaborate on what an "overlay" is and how it is used?

RESPONSE - In this context, an overlay is burdened labor expense comprising of both benefits/fringe costs and labor costs.

76. **QUESTION** - Can the state elaborate on how they use the CIC - geographic identifiers for job classes and what kind of validation is required as indicated in #711233.

RESPONSE - The census tracking information is NOT specific to job class (i.e., Transportation Worker 2's are employed throughout the state), but to position (e.g., a Transportation Worker 2 position assigned to the Barbour County garage).

77. **QUESTION** - Can the state elaborate on other languages, in addition to Spanish, that may be required in the future to support personnel administration functions via employee self service?

RESPONSE - Not at this time, but the capability to support a language(s) other than English should be noted if available in self service.

78. **QUESTION** - a) Can the State confirm whether a "pseudo" timesheet is just a default submitted for the employee when an actual timesheet is not submitted? b) How does the State handle situations when a pseudo timecard has been submitted, but an actual timecard is submitted at a later time? We are requesting clarification on "according to user defined business rules" used in #712001.

RESPONSE - Part A - Yes

Part B - It is anticipated that the process of approval and/or adjustments of the "pseudo" time sheet may include the recalculation of time and pay type usage. The solution needs flexibility to have user defined workflow capabilities to finalize "replacement" timesheets prior to or after payroll processing. (e.g. recalculations based on time/pay types, manager override, corrections based on current defaults)

79. **QUESTION** - WVDOT has recently purchased Oracle Primavera to provide more robust program and project management capabilities. It is our opinion that this Primavera solution

RFP # FAR226005 - Addendum #4
Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Software and Services

should support WVDOT's transportation programming process and interface with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to manage project authorization. Will the State consider Primavera as the solution of choice, and will the requirements on pages 108 through 112 or Appendix M be modified to adjust for the use of an existing State product?

RESPONSE - The State's expectation is that potential vendors will fully complete the matrices in Appendix M including the requirements to support the WVDOT transportation programming process for their proposed ERP solution. Potential vendors must also include the estimated effort and associated cost in their cost proposal for developing the required interfaces between their proposed ERP solution and Primavera specified in Appendix J. The identified interfaces in Appendix J include interfaces between ERP and Primavera to support the WVDOT transportation programming process. The State anticipates making a decision on whether to utilize ERP or Primavera to support the WVDOT transportation programming process after a review of vendor proposals and the conduct of demos. The State would then provide clarification to vendors on the proposed approach for transportation programming as part of the clarification and best and final offer process.

80. **QUESTION** - Pages 168-173 of Appendix M speak to the requirements for Employee Travel. Section 2.9.16 and Appendix J speak to interfacing to the current TRX Solutions travel system. Since the State is considering continuing with the current system, a vendor may choose to select to either replace the TRX solution, or interface to the TRX solution, instead of choosing to do both. Will there be a scoring adjustment in order to not penalize vendors who choose not to bid to both interface AND replace?

RESPONSE - The State's expectation is that potential vendors will complete the travel requirements matrix in Appendix M for their proposed ERP solution. Potential vendors must also include the estimated effort and associated cost in their cost proposal for developing required interfaces between TRX and their proposed ERP solution. The State anticipates making a decision on whether to either replace TRX with the ERP or interface TRX to the ERP after a review of vendor proposals and the conduct of demos. The State would then provide clarification to vendors on the proposed approach for providing the travel functionality as part of the clarification and best and final offer process.

81. **QUESTION** - It was mentioned in the Pre-Bid conference on February 1 that the proposal technical responses will be made available to the public. Approximately when will these responses be made available, after the Bid Opening Date or later in the selection process?

RESPONSE - Please refer to Section 5.2 of the RFP.

82. **QUESTION** - What is the Annual Net Operating budget from West Virginia for 2011? How much of this number is made up of Federal funds and Capital funds?

RESPONSE - The Net Appropriations for West Virginia for FY 2011 are \$11,616,719,578. Federal funds comprise \$4,481,897,420 of the total. The State appropriates funding for capital outlay purposes, but does not have a separate capital budget.

83. **QUESTION** - How many State employees are there in West Virginia in 2011?

RESPONSE - Please refer to the answer to Question #2.

84. **QUESTION** - Appendix M (Section: PL-Safety Management, Safety Grants (18 Reqs)) StmtID 717000 Requirement: Support multiple safety grant programs including grants programs administered by WVDOT and West Virginia State Police. Question: Can you provide the list of Safety Grants programs associated with this requirement?

RFP # FAR226005 - Addendum #4
Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Software and Services

RESPONSE - The safety grants programs include National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) Section 402, Section 406 and Section 408 programs and those administered by the Commission on Drunk Driving through the West Virginia State Police, as well as a few other similar programs.

85. **QUESTION** - Page 221: " Provide ability to support scaling of the application to accommodate 10 years of future growth with minimal user impact." Please describe the growth anticipated: in data, in volume of transactions, in users, etc. Also please estimate the annual growth for each dimension so that a 10 year growth can be approximated.

RESPONSE - It is very difficult for the State to anticipate our future growth patterns at this time. The State believes that future growth will be significantly impacted by potential changes in business processes as a result of the ERP implementation. For example, we will have a statewide accounts receivable and facilities management functionality that is not available today. In addition, it is likely that many more users will utilize the ERP procurement functionality than utilize the State's current TEAM system. Likewise, there could be additional transaction activity if for example accounts payable transactions that are currently processed as off-system transactions are shifted to be fully processed within the ERP. The State expects each potential vendor to use their experience and their knowledge of the impact of changes in business processes as a result of a new ERP system in developing their sizing assumptions. Potential vendors should document any assumptions they make relative to their sizing assumptions in their technical response.

86. **QUESTION** - On page 73. In addition to production, the state lists these environments: Baseline (vanilla); Sandbox; Development; System Test; Training; Acceptance Test. On page 218, the State lists these in addition to production: Baseline (vanilla); Sandbox; Development; System testing; and Training. Questions: "Acceptance Test" is missing from the list on 218. Is "Acceptance test" a required environment and if so, must it meet the requirements specified on page 218 for the other environments (99.9% availability, failover, etc.)? Please estimate the number of users for these non-production environments.

RESPONSE - The list on page 73 is correct. "Acceptance Test" should have been included in the list on page 218. The Acceptance Test environment must also meet the requirements for 99.9% availability. Based on the current anticipated size of the ERP project team (State, Vendor and STA), the State estimates that there will be approximately 100 unique users for the Baseline, Sandbox and Development environment and approximately 150-175 unique users for the System Test, Training and Acceptance Test environments.

87. **QUESTION** - System Wide Requirements Statement ID 718239: [Low] Integrate with existing State of West Virginia identification systems in order for user identifications and passwords required within the ERP system to be maintained and updated through various agency identity management systems. What are the existing State of West Virginia identifications systems that are referenced in this question?

RESPONSE - Please refer to Question #21.

88. **QUESTION** - RFP: The Vendor should complete the responses to each of the State's goals and objectives identified in Section 2.4 following the format provided in Appendix A. Vendors should describe how they will comply with each. The completed response should be inserted in the Technical Proposal in TAB 9. Question: Should the response be in TAB 9 or TAB 8?

RESPONSE - Please refer to Question #4.

RFP # FAR226005 - Addendum #4
Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Software and Services

89. **QUESTION** - RFP: The mandatory specifications contained in Section 2.5 must be completed along with the certification in the format provided in Appendix B. Vendors must respond to each mandatory requirement describing how they will comply with each and complete the required certification. The completed Mandatory Specification Checklist and certification should be inserted in the Technical Proposal in TAB 10. The mandatory specifications contained in Section 2.5 are provided below. Vendors must respond to each mandatory requirement describing how they will comply with each and complete the required certification. The completed Mandatory Specification Checklist and certification should be inserted in the Technical Proposal behind TAB 1 - Executive Summary. Question: Should the Mandatory Specification Checklists be in TAB 10, TAB 9 or TAB 1?

RESPONSE - Please refer to Question #5.

90. **QUESTION** - RFP: The Technical Architecture Questionnaire found in Appendix E should be completed and inserted in the Technical Proposal in TAB 11. The survey is intended to obtain the Vendor's recommendations about the technical architecture and other areas such as: configuration and maintenance, customizations and upgrades, report development, and security. Question: Should the response be in TAB 11 or TAB 10?

RESPONSE - Please refer to Question #6.

91. **QUESTION** - RFP: The Vendor should submit a Sample Statement of Work in TAB 12. This Sample Statement of Work will provide a starting point for drafting the final Statement of Work that will be included in the contract with the Awarded Vendor as part of contract execution. The Sample Statement of Work should include a description of the roles and responsibilities for each of the services requested in this RFP in accordance with the vendor's proposed project plan and methodology, and descriptions of all deliverables to be provided. Question: Should the Mandatory Specification Checklists be in TAB 11 or TAB 12?

RESPONSE - Please refer to Question #7.

92. **QUESTION** - CherryRoad Technologies is requesting a one month extension to the due date of the receipt of the RFP response. The State has issued a very complete RFP, with a number of special consideration items that go beyond the standard capabilities of an ERP system. In addition, there is a comprehensive requirement for hosting of development and production environments, as well as an extended period of post production technical and functional support. We believe the additional time is warranted in order to submit the best possible offer and complete solution to the State.

RESPONSE - In the RFP, the State provided Vendors with approximately ten (10) weeks to complete their Proposals. This timeframe was deemed appropriate to respond to the extensive scope anticipated for the ERP system. However, the State will extend the RFP submission date by two weeks to provide Vendors with additional time to provide thorough responses to the RFP. Section 1.3 of the RFP is amended to read as follows:

1.3 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

**RFP # FAR226005 - Addendum #4
Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Software and Services**

substantive adjustments to the RFP Schedule of Events in one or more addendums as described below in Section 1.7.

Exhibit 1: Schedule of Events

| EVENT | | DATE |
|------------|---|--|
| 1. | RFP Issued | Fri., Jan.14, 2011 |
| 2. | Pre-Bid Conference | Tue., Feb. 1, 2011 |
| 3. | Deadline for Vendors to Submit Written Inquiries | Wed., Feb. 9, 2011 |
| 4. | Responses to Vendor Inquiries Provided | Fri., Feb. 25, 2011 |
| 5. | RFP Bid Opening Date | Wed., Mar. 23 <u>Apr. 6</u>, 2011, 1:30 pm |
| 6. | Information Related to Software Demonstrations and Vendor Oral Presentations Distributed to Qualified Vendors | Mon., Mar. 28 <u>Apr. 11</u> , 2011 |
| 7. | Scripted Software Demonstrations and Vendor Oral Presentations Scheduled | Mon., Apr. 18 <u>May 2</u> - Fri., May 27 <u>Jun. 17</u> , 2011 |
| 8. | Cost Proposal Opening Date | TBD |
| 9. | Discussion Period per West Virginia Code, §5A-3-11b | TBD |
| 10. | Request for Best and Final Offer (BAFO) Issued to Qualified Vendors | TBD |
| 11. | BAFO Opening Date | TBD |
| 12. | Final Evaluation and Ranking of Vendors | TBD |
| 13. | ERP Implementation Begins | TBD |

93. **QUESTION** - Does the State have a preference on a specific platform (Operating System/RDBMS) that would leverage their current skillsets?

RESPONSE - Please refer to Question #24.

94. **QUESTION** - Does the State expect the hosted System Testing environment to replicate the capacity of their production environment?

RFP # FAR226005 - Addendum #4
Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Software and Services

RESPONSE - No. The hosted system testing environment, however, must be configured to support execution of rigorous integration testing. This includes loading as a part of the system testing process at least some amount of converted data which should then be utilized in the execution of various test scripts. User acceptance testing and performance testing are expected to be conducted in the user acceptance testing environment. The user acceptance testing environment must be established as part of the ERP production environment.

95. **QUESTION** - Will the State be centralizing all entities on a single Active Directory server, or will identity information continue to be decentralized?

RESPONSE - The State has considered several potential solutions ranging from the ERP system having its own “user store” to establishing trust relationships between the various existing active directory servers. In preparing their proposal, potential vendors should consider alternative approaches and make appropriate recommendations for interconnecting these different identify management solutions utilized by agencies that will have ERP users.