



COLLIN COUNTY, TEXAS

ADDENDUM No. Two (2)

RFP No. 2015-192

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
FOR

**SOFTWARE AND IMPLEMENTATION SERVICES
FOR AN ERP FINANCIAL SYSTEM**

DATE: July 27, 2015

NOTICE TO ALL PROSPECTIVE OFFERORS:

YOU ARE HEREBY DIRECTED TO MAKE CHANGES TO THE REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ATTACHED INFORMATION.

- DELETE: Attachment F -Third Party Firm Reference Form.docx
REPLACE WITH: Attachment F -Third Party Firm Reference Form_Addendum 2.docx
(Corrected the number of references required)
- DELETE: Attachment C – Cost.xlsx
REPLACE WITH: Attachment C – Cost_Addendum2.xlsx
(Removed Investments for pricing)
- ADD: Pre-Proposal Attendance Form
ADD: Pre-Proposal Questions (Pre-Proposal Questions_0722015_Addendum2.pdf)
ADD: Questions and Answers-July 21, 2015 (QA_07212015_Addendum2.pdf)
ADD: Questions and Answers-July 24, 2015 (QA_07242015_Addendum2.pdf)
- DELETE: Attachment A- Functional Requirements_Addendum1: Delete AUD-AP-137, AUD-AP-119, and PO-173.05 from the list.
- DELETE: High Level System Implementation Timeframe in section 1.6
REPLACE WITH: New High Level System Implementation Timeframe
July 6, 2015 Release RFP
July 22, 2015 Pre-Proposal Conference, 10:00 a.m. (see 1.7.17)
August 5, 2015 Cutoff Date for Question
August **20**, 2015 Receive RFP responses
August **25**, 2015 Distribute responses to Steering Committee
September 10, 2015 Evaluations due from team members

September 15, 2015	Select and notify vendors for on-site demo
October <u>13</u> , 2015	Begin demo process
November 3, 2015	Clarification Conference Calls
November 20, 2015	Best and Final Offers Due
December 8, 2015	Begin Contract Process
January 18, 2016	System selection/Court Award
March 1, 2016	Implementation Start
March 1, 2017	Integration testing & user training
August 28, 2017	Configuration freeze
October 2, 2017	Go Live

PLEASE NOTE ALL OTHER TERMS, CONDITIONS, SPECIFICATIONS DRAWINGS, ETC.
REMAIN UNCHANGED.

SINCERELY,
MICHALYN RAINS, CPPO, CPPB
PURCHASING AGENT

Attachment C

Schedule 1: Summary
Summary of Total Software, Professional Services, and Maintenance Costs

Cost Categories	Proposed Cost in RFP	Explanation/Notes (if necessary)**
Software License Fees (Schedule 2)(*)(**)		
Professional Services (Schedules 3, 4, & 5):		
Implementation Services (Schedule 3)		
Data Conversion and Interfaces Estimate (Schedule 3)		
Training (Schedule 4)		
Travel and Other Costs (Schedule 5)		
Hardware Costs (if any)		
Total Cost During Project Period	\$ -	

Ongoing Maintenance & Support (Years 1-5)

Period	Proposed Cost in RFP	Explanation/Notes (if necessary)**
Year One*		
Year Two		
Year Three		
Year Four		
Year Five		

**Please identify the time at which "Year One" support begins (e.g., once software goes into production).*

***Attach additional notes (if needed) to provide full explanation.*

Assumptions/Additional Comments

List here the maintenance & support starting point (e.g., 10% of license) and annual caps in growth (e.g., lower of x% per year or inflation). Also list all other assumptions and use additional space if necessary.

Please check all cell formulas!!

Attachment C

Schedule 2: Licensing Fees
Detailed Licensing Fees By Module

Module	Proposed Cost in RFP	Number of Users/Employees	Fee Per User/Employee	Explanation/Notes (if necessary)**
General Ledger				
Accounts Payable				
Accounts Receivable				
Project Accounting				
Grant Accounting				
Budget Preparation				
Purchasing				
Fixed Assets				
Inventory				
Cash Receipts				
Work Orders				
Fleet Management/Public Works				
Land				
Permits				
Animal Services				
Code Enforcement				
Event Management/Parks and Recreation				
Subtotal	\$ -			
Third-Party Software (List Individually)				
Subtotal	\$ -			
Pre-Requisite Software (List Individually)				
Subtotal	\$ -			
List Price	\$ -			
Discountable Software				
Less Discount				
Total License Fees				

**Attach additional notes (if needed) to provide full explanation.

<p>Assumptions/Additional Comments</p> <p>List all other assumptions here.</p> <p>Please check all cell formulas!!</p>

Attachment C

Schedule 3: Professional Services
Estimated Professional Services By Implementation Phase

1. Estimated Vendor Hours and Cost

Phase \ Activity	Data Conversion			Interfaces			All Other Implementation Services			Total	
	Hours	Rate*	Cost	Hours	Rate*	Cost	Hours	Rate*	Cost	Hours	Cost
Design										0	\$ -
Configure										0	\$ -
Build										0	\$ -
Deploy										0	\$ -
Change Management										0	\$ -
(add additional cells if needed)										0	\$ -
Total	0		\$ -	0		\$ -	0		\$ -	0	\$ -

* Please use (and specify) the proposed blended rate for each phase.

2. Assumed Government Hourly Participation (Please input the estimated "Hours" only)

Phase \ Activity	Data Conversion			Interfaces			All Other Implementation Services			Total	
	Hours	Rate*	Cost	Hours	Rate*	Cost	Hours	Rate**	Cost	Hours	Cost
Design											
Configure											
Build											
Deploy											
Change Management											
(add additional cells if needed)											
Total	0.00			0.00			0.00			0.00	

Assumptions/Additional Comments

Please check all cell formulas!!
 Respondents proposing to implement in multiple phases must identify any project phases in this section.

Attachment C

Schedule 4: Training Costs
Estimated Cost of Training by Phase

1. Training Hours and Costs By Trainee

Trainee Type \ Phase	Number of Students	Project Team			Functional SME			Med/Heavy User			Inquiry Only			Other			Total	
		Units	Cost/Unit	Cost	Units	Cost/Unit	Cost	Units	Cost/Unit	Cost	Units	Cost/Unit	Cost	Units	Cost/Unit	Cost	Units	Cost
Total	0	0		\$0	0		\$0	0		\$0	0		\$0	0		\$0	0	\$0

**Please label each Phase to be consistent with your implementation methodology.*

2. Additional Training Costs

Type \ Phase		Project Team			Functional SME			Med/Heavy User			Inquiry Only			Other			Total	
		Units	Cost/Unit	Cost	Units	Cost/Unit	Cost	Units	Cost/Unit	Cost	Units	Cost/Unit	Cost	Units	Cost/Unit	Cost	Units	Cost
Total		0		\$0	0		\$0	0		\$0	0		\$0	0		\$0	0	\$0

3. Total Training Costs

Total Cost \ Phase		Project Team			Functional SME			Med/Heavy User			Inquiry Only			Other			Total	
				Cost			Cost			Cost			Cost			Cost		Cost
Total Cost		0		\$0	0		\$0	0		\$0	0		\$0	0		\$0	0	\$0

Assumptions/Additional Comments

Note: Phases are provided for illustration purposes only. Cost submittal must match any phases proposed in implementation plan.

Please check all cell formulas!!

Attachment F - Third Party Firm Reference Form- Addendum 2

Provide at least three (3) client references that are similar in size and complexity to this procurement (preferably Counties) and have utilized the proposed system in a comparable computing environment.

Organization Name:			
Organization Project Manager:		Phone:	
		Email:	
IT Contact:		Phone:	
		Email:	
Organization Address:			
Implementation Period:		through	
General Operating Budget:		Employees:	
Project Summary:			

Project Scope			
General Ledger		Accounts Payable	
Accounts Receivable		Project Accounting	
Grant Accounting		Purchasing	
Budget		Inventory	
Fixed Assets		Facility Work Orders	
Development Services			
Public Works			

Project Budget			
Hardware Cost:		Software License Cost:	
Data Conversion Cost:		Implementation Cost:	
Interface Development Cost:			

Project Infrastructure	
Hardware Platform:	
OS Platform/Version:	
Database Platform:	
Required Data Storage:	



PRE-PROPOSAL MEETING SIGN-IN

Project: RFP 2015-192, Software and Implementation Services for an ERP Financial System **Meeting Date:** July 22, 2015

Facilitator: Matt Dobecka, CPPO, CPPB **Place/Room:** Collin County Purchasing Commissioners' Courtroom

Name	Company	Phone	E-Mail
MARK BROADWELL	INFOLOB SOLUTIONS	972 679-7409	Mark.Broadwell@Infolob.com
Shelby Carroll	Infor Global	972-754-3098	Shelby.Carroll@infor.com
Misty Brown	Collin County	972-548-5593	mbrown@collincountytx.gov
Estella Almodarez	"	972 548 4553	eamendarez@collincountytx.gov
Monika Aris	"	x4603	
Jessica Moore	"	x4650	fmore@collincountytx.gov
Matt Parfil	Infolob Solutions	972 365 5302	Matt.Parfil@infolob.com
Robert Arriero	Collin County	4647	
Bryan Yates	IT	4584	
Stephen Gong	"	4555	sgong@cc
Caren Shipman	"	4501	



PRE-PROPOSAL MEETING SIGN-IN

Project: RFP 2015-192, Software and Implementation Services for an ERP Financial System **Meeting Date:** July 22, 2015

Facilitator: Matt Dobecka, CPPO, CPPB Collin County Purchasing **Place/Room:** Commissioners' Courtroom

Name	Company	Phone	E-Mail
GREG ALGGRIM	Crowe Horwath LLP	305-905-1669	g-algrim@crowehorwath.com
DEREK RILEY	COLLIN COUNTY	903-227-2913	driley@co.collin.tx.us
Michalbyn Raim	Collin County	972-548-4111	
TERESA MOSES	ORACLE	773-905-8077	teresa.moses@oracle.com
Lance Shealy	Oracle	713-412-5035	Lance.Shealy@Oracle.com
PAM DUGGER	Collin County	972-548-4009	co.collin.tx.us pdugger2@co.collin.tx.us
Terry Rider	Auditor's	972-548-4628	trider@co.collin.tx.us
Lisa Nunley	Audit	972-548-4733	
MARK CEVILL	Facilities	469-660-2219	
MIKE MALAK	IT - COLLIN	972-548-4537	
Winda Riggs	Auditor	972-548-4643	wriggs@co.collin.tx.us
Jeff May	"	972-548-4641	jmay@co.collin.tx.us

Rylee A Winn FT

rwinans@co.collin.tx.us

PRE-PROPOSAL QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

July 22, 2015

RFP 2015-192 - Software and Implementation Services for an ERP Financial System

PPQ1. Can we get a count of users per module?

PPA1. There are 1700 possible view only users and 250 core module users. A further breakdown will be provided in addendum No. 2.

PPQ2. What is Parks and Req. currently using for event management?

PPA2. They use Excel and accept credit card payments.

PPQ3. Is a hard copy required if you submit online? What is the file size limit?

PPA3. A hard copy is not required if submitting online. If submitting manually please provide a flash drive or compact disk instead of paper. Paper will be accepted but is not preferred.

PPQ4. Due to Attachment A being changed can we get a one week extension?

PPA5. We will discuss with the team and get back with you. We have received another request for an extension.

PPQ5. Attachment A-Addendum 1, can we see what changes were made?

PPA5. The requirements did not change, only the format of the document. Drop down boxes were removed and you need to simply place an "X" in the appropriate column.

PPQ6. Regarding section 1.5.5 and PeopleSoft integration, what is the expectation of bringing data into the new system from PeopleSoft? Is it just a flat file?

PPA6. Currently it is a flat file. The County will be changing GL account numbers but PeopleSoft and Tyler Odyssey will continue to use the old account structure so a crosswalk will need to be used to map accounts.

PPQ7. Is the expectation to embed Laserfiche RMS into the new system?

PPA7. Laserfiche is our document management system but if your systems include a content manager we would use your solution. Laserfiche has an API toolkit that allows us to pull documents from any system into Laserfiche. Laserfiche sets retention limits but if your system allows it then your system will suffice.

PPQ8. Regarding core modules what do you consider optional?

PPA8. Price land management, permitting, work orders, parks and reqs. as optional modules.

PPQ9. Is a PDF acceptable for proposal file format?

PPA9. Yes, as long as it is searchable.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Released July 21, 2015

RFP 2015-192 - Software and Implementation Services for an ERP Financial System

Q1. In order for us to adequately prepare our response to your solicitation, we would like to request that the due date be extended two week time until the 28th of August 2015. Please advise if this can be accomodated.

A1. No extension will be granted at this time.

Q2. In section 1.4 of the document "Statement of Work," you had indicated that:

- 1) Functions for facility management, permit issuance and tracking, fleet management and public works processes will be provided by other third party tools which will require integration to the selected financial system.

Additionally, in Attachment G – Anticipated Interfaces, you indicate in the fourth row from the top that:

- 2) "Ancillary functions" which are defined as "Permitting, work order and public works systems" are at this point "TBD" or "To Be Determined" from both an application and platform standpoint.

Reading these two points, one concludes that permitting, work order (i.e. facility management) and public works processes (i.e. fleet management) are business processes that respondents to this solicitation are not required to address in terms of offering a solution or a price as they are deemed out of scope by this wording

- 3) However, in Attachment A – Business Requirements, there are the following tabs which include business requirements.

Functional Category: Fleet Management & Public Works

Functional Category: Permits

Functional Category: Work Orders

As such, it appears the language references in points 1 and 2 are contradictory with the requirements indicated in point 3. To remove any doubt, can you please confirm if these requirements are to be included or excluded for the submission of this bid?

A2. The third party systems will be addressed in a future addendum that will correct attachment G. We currently use third party systems for those systems and would like a solution to incorporate them. If not, then the new system must be able to talk with the current systems to transfer data into the new system.

Q3. Your RFP document indicates there are 1,700 employees working for the County. Would it be possible to offer greater specificity as to the number of people directly involved with a potential new financial system? This will help with arriving at our initial software configuration.

Example – how many people would be involved with a projected new financial system from the perspective of:

- Making approvals (e.g. create requisitions, record time/expenses, approve invoices)
- Business user – uses the software as part of their job, completing transactions

- **IT user/Super user – access to server software across the entire system**

This will help us to best offer a software configuration so any more specific estimates are greatly appreciated.

A3. Yes, breakdown will be available in addendum No. 1.

Q4a. Can you offer a bit of clarification as to when one should choose “Fully Provided Out of the Box” (F) versus “Configuration?” (CO)? Is an “F” response intended for a requirement that is met automatically with no user configuration needed?

A4a. “Fully Provided Out of the Box” – Meaning: The functionality is provided. Example: The business requirement might be that the system must allow the user to select a state, Canadian province, and the District of Columbia from a pulldown selection box. The system provides the ability to select a ‘state’ using a drop-down selection box. A list of 50 states is provided, but the system also gives the user the ability to ‘configure’ the states in the selection box and add another selection for “District of Columbia” or “Puerto Rico” or all Canadian provinces. For this example, you would check (F) and (CO).

Is an “F” response intended for a requirement that is met automatically with no user configuration needed? Example: The business requirement might be that the system must allow the user to select a state, Canadian province, and the District of Columbia from a pulldown selection box. The system provides the ability to select a ‘state’ using a drop down box. A list of 50 states is provided, but the system does NOT allow configuration of those 50 states in the drop down. Therefore, an end user could not add “District of Columbia” to the drop down without a modification made to the system to allow the states to be configured or District of Columbia to be added to the list of 50 states. For this example, you would only check (F) since configuration by the end user is not allowed.

Another Example: The business requirement might be that the system must allow the user to select a state, Canadian province, and the District of Columbia from a pulldown selection box. The system does not provide a selection box for “State”. But, the system is configurable by letting the end user (usually a system administrator) add a selection box to a screen for “State”, and configuring that selection box with a set of 50 or more ‘states’ in the drop down box. For this example, you would only check (CO) since the functionality of selecting a state is not provided by the system but can be accomplished through configuration.

In the comment box, you should qualify why you selected either or both options.

Q4b. The reason that we are looking for clarification is that our responses will most likely have a very large number of “CO” answers, as a system is by definition meant to be configurable, which leads us to asking when it would be appropriate to choose “Fully Provided” as a response. (In other words, how would we respond to a requirement if our system fully meets the requirement with minor setup? Is that Fully meeting the requirement or meeting the requirement through configuration?

A4b. Fully meeting the requirement and allowing configuration.

Q5. Additionally, we have some formatting questions based on Attachment A. For “Answer Submitted,” is that expected to be a narrative provided from the bidder as to the answer for each requirement? Is that different from “Comments?”

A5. Corrected attachment A will released with addendum No. 1.

Q6. There are some inconsistencies with Column D (the choice of answer) in the different tabs. There are some tabs that have a drop-down menu from which to choose whereas others have a blank drop down menu. Here are the different tabs and how Column D is set up.

A6. Corrected attachment A will released with addendum No. 1.

Q7. Only five (5) of the tabs, Fleet Mgt &Public Works, Land, Work Orders, Animal Services, and Event Mgt Parks & Rec, within the Attachment A – Business Requirements matrix have response codes that are available for choosing on the drop down list in the Response column. Is it sufficient for vendors to simply put an X in the appropriate column to the right of the Response column, or will a new spreadsheet be issued for vendors to complete? Screen examples are below. Please clarify how vendors should respond in the tabs where a response code is not available in the drop down list.

A7. Corrected attachment A will released with addendum No. 1.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Released July 24, 2015

RFP 2015-192 - Software and Implementation Services for an ERP Financial System

Q8. For requirement TECH-27, Technical training IT staff and system administrators must be provided for the solution, can the County please confirm or re-state this requirement? Should this read “Technical training for IT staff and system administrators” and what does the County mean, specifically, by technical training? Does this refer primarily to administration training or does this also refer to “developer training”?

A8. The assumption about the wording is correct. Technical training should be provided for any system administrator, developer or other technical administrative function that the county will be required to support after the system is implemented. The proposal response should cover all facets of the system which will require IT department involvement.

Administrative (ie security, user creation and maintenance, code maintenance as so on) as well as other IT related admin support, plus developer training on tools for add-ons, integrations and other tools such as workflow customization.

Q9. For requirement TECH-33, Mass changes supported by table-driven data with proper security, can the County please provide more information on this requirement? What does “changes supported by table-driven data” refer to? Please provide an example.

A9. There are times where we may want to be able upload data from a spreadsheet or other database and create a journal entry without having to re-enter each transaction into the system. This could occur with journal entries or possibly budget amendments.

Q10. For requirement TECH-44, Solution must comply with county DMZ architecture and security processes (refer to Attachment K), can the County please specify where the DMZ architecture and security processes are documented? Attachment K is a conflict of interest questionnaire.

A10. Attached is our Technology Architecture. This needs to be added as an attachment and Tech 44 needs to be updated to list the correct Attachment.

Q11. For requirement TECH-46, any credit card processing must be supported via county's third party payment processors with no credit card information or data stored in the system; can the County please provide more detail on this requirement? Who are the processors? How many are there? Is there a single, common interface used by the County or is each specify to the processor?

A11. We currently have only one procurement card processor. Our credit card processor, Citibank, currently provides us a text file that we upload into our system to create a batch. The credit card number and additional information needed for purchases should not be required to be stored in the financial system in order to account for transactions. It is okay to have a partial number in order to identify the card holder.

Q12. For requirement TECH-53, Approval non-repudiation, can the County please provide more detail regarding this requirement? What specifically does the County require?

A12. The county needs to be able to approve or return workflow items at multiple levels.

Q13. For requirement AUD-GL-18, Ability to add user defined fields that are not part of the general ledger account segments, can the County please explain this requirement in further detail? Add user defined fields to what?

A13. The additional fields give the ability to identify or tag gl accounts or projects for reporting purposes. A user defined field could be additional reporting roll-ups needed for slicing the data in ways other than CAFR or normal financial reporting. This can occur when the state legislature is meeting and request certain types of specific information or asks how a specific bill will impact the county financially. It is also occasionally needed for situations where we could obtain additional funds such as Tobacco Settlement funding where specific data must be pulled from multiple departments.

Q14. For requirement AUD-GL-30.12, User-Defined Field, can the County please explain this requirement in further detail? Can you please explain what type of user defined fields would be considered?

A14. The additional fields give the ability to identify or tag gl accounts or projects for reporting purposes. A user defined field could be additional reporting roll-ups needed for slicing the data in ways other than CAFR or normal financial reporting. This can occur when the state legislature is meeting and request certain types of specific information or asks how a specific bill will impact the county financially. It is also occasionally needed for situations where we could obtain additional funds such as Tobacco Settlement funding where specific data must be pulled from multiple departments.

Q15. For requirement AUD-GL-46.09, and for requirement AUD-GL-47.10, Breakdown of fund balance into categories, can the County please explain these requirements in further detail? Can you please explain in more detail the “categories”?

A15. These fund balance categories are the categories required for reporting in GASB Statement No. 54 and includes Non-spendable, Restricted, Committed, Assigned and Unassigned.

Q16. For requirement AUD-GL-78.02, Fixed, and for requirement AUD-GL-78.03, Open, can the County please explain these requirements in further detail? Respectively, what is fixed in the recurring transaction scenario? Can you explain the open recurring transaction scenario in more detail please?

A16. The fixed is when the amounts and gl account and/or projects are constant from one period to the next, and the open is when the amounts may change from period to period but the gl accounts and/or projects remain constant.

Q17. For requirement AUD-GL-81, Create allocation templates for use with items such as utility bills. The allocation should be based upon user defined criteria such as Unit of Measure or other statistical journal item, can the County please explain this requirement in further detail and/or provide an example?

A17. This can allow the county to allocate costs amongst departments based on usage. Utility bills are an example where each department could be charged a prorated portion of a utility bill based on square footage.

Q18. For requirement AUD-GL-118.10, Functional area, can you please explain a scenario in where you would report by functional area? Is this like department?

A18. Expenditures/expenses by functional area must be reported in the CAFR. The functional area serve as a roll-up of departments.

Q19. For requirement AUD-GL-118.13, User-Defined Fields, can you please elaborate on the user defined fields and what that would entail?

A19. The additional fields give the ability to identify or tag gl accounts or projects for reporting purposes. A user defined field could be additional reporting roll-ups needed for slicing the data in ways other than CAFR or normal financial reporting. This can occur when the state legislature is meeting and request certain types of specific information or asks how a specific bill will impact the county financially. It

is also occasionally needed for situations where we could obtain additional funds such as Tobacco Settlement funding where specific data must be pulled from multiple departments.

Q20. For requirement AUD-AP-19, Support interfaces to/from various systems to create vouchers for payments, can we safely assume that this would refer to only those integrations defined for this project and that this requirement in and of itself doesn't introduce additional interfaces not otherwise included?

A20. The interfaces will need to include check printing software and with the procurement card system. The system will also need to interface with Odyssey for our indigent attorney payments. Other interfaces with the financial system related to check printing but not necessarily AP would include PeopleSoft (payroll) and the jury management system.

Q21. For requirement AUD-AP-31, Allocate an invoice amount to multiple chart of account distributions according to a user-defined distribution of the invoice amount, can you please elaborate on user defined fields? Would this be strictly percentage-based across user-defined financial distributions, or would the user-defined items need to be more comprehensive than that?

A21. The user defined fields could be gl accounts or projects. This allocation would need to be flexible enough to be allocated by percentage or by other user defined formulas. An example of this is when the county contracts with an engineering firm to evaluate the structure of multiple county bridges, each bridge having its own project code.

Q22. For requirement AUD-AP-66, Accept electronic billings from vendors and process appropriate payments to vendors, can the County please provide more details with regards to the electronic billings it requires? Is the County expecting to accommodate EDI-based billings (i.e., EDI 810 transactions) and/or other types of billings?

A22. We currently are not capable of accepting electronic billings but would like to through a web based portal. We would like to accommodate EDI-based billings in the future.

Q23. For requirement AUD-AP-137, Report travel payments on a W-2 form in compliance with current and ongoing IRS rules and regulations, can the County please provide more information regarding this requirement? Will W-2 forms be created out of the financial system or out of PeopleSoft HRMS?

A23. Item to be removed from business requirements.

Q24. For requirement AUD-AR-9, Creation of secure interfaces with other billing and receipting systems, can we safely assume that this would refer to only those integrations defined for this project and that this requirement in and of itself doesn't introduce additional interfaces not otherwise included?

A24. Yes, would refer to only those integrations defined currently for this project.

Q25. For requirement AUD-AR-40, Archive inactive accounts based upon user-defined criteria and proper security, can the County please provide more detail on the term "archive" and what that means exactly in this context? Does archive mean that inactive accounts are removed from the financial system altogether and, if so, what would the requirements be for otherwise storing or retaining these accounts?

A25. Treasury requirement would be the ability to flag an Accounts Receivable customer or an Accounts Receivable charge code type for a customer as "Inactive". We would also require the ability to remove this flag indicator if the customer or charge code type became again "Active".

If the number of "Inactive" customers became excessive, to have the ability to move the customer record to an "Archive" file, but not removed from the financial system altogether. Currently, this is being done

with 'Inactive' vendor records. We would also require the ability to move the customer record back to "Active" if necessary.

Q26. For requirement AUD-AR-56, Change account coding on billing documents through a mass change functionality, with audit trail and proper security, can the County please describe the scenario in more detail?

A26. The ability to change a GL number on all charge codes linked to that GL number, rather than making change to GL number for each individual charge code.

Q27. For requirement AUD-AR-69, Convert negative A/R balances to appropriate transaction based upon user-defined criteria, can the County please provide more detail with regards to its user defined requirements? And what is the "appropriate transaction" referenced?

A27. If the AR customer submits an overpayment (paid more than the invoiced amount), the overpayment amount posted would deduct with notation from the amount due of the next invoice processed the following month. The invoiced amount (minus the previous overpayment) would then be the balance due.

Q28. For requirement AUD-AR-76, Generate various user-defined reports, based upon any billing document data field and "in collection" flag, can the County please provide more information on user defined reports? Does this question assume any particular level of technical skill for the user (e.g., can it be assumed that the user can create reports using a reporting tool like SSRS)?

A28. The ability to process reports by user defined criteria such as customer name, paid or unpaid charges, individual charge codes, or by GL account numbers linked to charge codes. Out of the box reports should provide fields for user defined criteria when processing a report.

Q29. For requirement AUD-AR-88, Read and utilize a predefined interface for bar code or scan line information which can capture any and all fields of the account code segments applied to financial transactions, can the County please explain this requirement in more detail? Where would the County envision the bar code or scan line information being printed or displayed and where, how, and when would it be read? (Note: also applies to requirement AUD-CR-22)

A29. As related to Treasury AR, the bar code would be displayed on the invoice "return with payment" stub. By scanning the bar code, the invoice information would be pulled for posting the invoice payment. The scan line information would be read at the time of payment with possibly hand held scanners.

Q30. For requirement AUD-AR-102, Provides for the user to set up multiple methodologies for applying partial and full payments to billing documents. Methodologies will be based upon user-defined criteria, can the County please provide more information on this requirement? What are some of those user defined criteria? (Note: also applies to requirement AUD-CR-36)

A30. As related to Treasury AR, the ability to apply a "short" invoice payment and then the "balance due" be included and notated with the next amount invoiced for the following month.

Q31. For requirement AUD-CR-10, Creation of secure interfaces with other billing and receipting systems, can we safely assume that this would refer to only those integrations defined for this project and that this requirement in and of itself doesn't introduce additional interfaces not otherwise included?

A31. Yes, would refer to only those integrations defined currently for this project.

Q32. For requirement AUD-CR-19.01, Ability to create cash receipt payment codes linked to GL number to expedite daily cash receipt entry. Payment code would be entered to issue receipt without having to enter multiple digit GL number, can the County please provide an example of a payment code scenario?

A32. In a maintenance file, a payment code (user defined) is assigned and linked to the GL number, the GL description, and a bank account ID (bank account identification for deposit). Payment codes are assigned as new fees are created/collected or new collection amounts are received that will be a frequent transaction.

We would also require the ability to post a Cash Receipt by using the GL number for "one time" payments received.

Example: Weekly report of fees collected plus check is received from the District Clerk department. The fees collected are spread to different financial funds and posted to the financial system thru Cash Receipts.

Description: Linked	GL Number	Bank ID	Amount	Payment Code
District Clerk/Due From	001-0000-125-9735	91	5,534.92	D1
Judicial Appellate Fee	013-0000-125-9735	91	200.00	D9
Court Report Fee	015-0000-125-9735	91	350.00	D0
Jury Fee	020-0000-125-9735	91	8.44	DC
Law Library Fee	021-0000-125-9735	91	150.00	D6

In Cash Receipts, the employee would have the option to search for the correct Payment Code (drop box) or enter the payment code, if known, and the dollar amount due to that fund without having to enter the GL number. The amount would post to the correct GL number in the financial system. The description, the GL number, the Payment Code, and dollar amount for each fund plus the check number, total amount of check, and a user comment field (Example: DC report w/e 7-10-15) currently prints on the Cash Receipt. A copy of the Cash Receipt is then returned to the department for auditing backup.

Q33. For requirement INV-10, Accommodate a user-defined stock item table, can the County please elaborate on this requirement? Is the County merely indicating with this requirement that the items master table should be able to be maintained, or is the requirement asking for something beyond that?

A33. Maintain an items master with user defined criteria to allow flexibility. i.e. use a combination of NIGP codes and user defined elements to track stock.

Q34. For requirement INV-26.09, Required environmental conditions for the specific location, can the County please provide more information on "environmental conditions"?

A34. Cool/cold storage location, fuel tanks, etc.

Q35. For requirement INV-26.10, Other fields as defined by users, can the County please provide examples of other user defined fields?

A35. Flexibility to add fields to track stock items not using standard criteria (26.01-26.09)

Q36. For requirement INV-62.07, Cumulative purchases, can the County please provide more information to further clarify this requirement? What is meant by "cumulative purchases"?

A36. Tracking purchases for a particular item to further help with usage data. i.e. purchases for a particular time/date frame).

Q37. For the following requirements, can the County please provide more information regarding the required integrations (specifically, what is the purpose of the interface – what data/transactions are exchanged, how frequently, batch vs. real-time, etc.)? Are these requirements separate from Attachment G? Would you be able to offer more specificity on the interfaces mentioned in Attachment G, with regard to the same line of questioning.....data/transactions...frequency..volume of data..etc.

AUD-GA	70	Ability to interface with:
AUD-GA	70.01	PeopleSoft HRMS
AUD-GA	70.01.01	Payroll
AUD-GA	70.01.02	Time Keeping and Labor Distribution
AUD-GA	70.02	Fleet

A37. PeopleSoft Payroll is currently interfaced after each payroll (every two weeks). The data that comes over includes the employee number, the pay code, the amount paid by pay code, tax information, deductions, etc.

We removed the time keeping and labor distribution requirement off of attachment G and do not anticipate needing an interface with financials for timekeeping and labor distribution.

Fleet interfaces daily and to charges service costs to departments.

Q38. For requirement AUD-GA-71, Ability to import data from other software/systems, can we safely assume that this would refer to only those integrations defined for this project and that this requirement in and of itself doesn't introduce additional interfaces not otherwise included?

A38. The interfaces shown on attachment G are the only interfaces known at this time that need to be integrated.

Q39. For requirement AUD-PA-56, Maintain multiple types of project completions/status. For example, project may be complete from a performance viewpoint but still open for accounting purposes, can the County please specify how many types of "project completions/status" would need to be available? Do the types need to be user-maintainable (meaning, there could be any number of these as defined by the user)?

A39. We currently do not have this capability, but would like the ability to have a level to (1) prevent requisitions and purchases orders, (2) a level to close accounts payable, (3) a level to close journal entries and (4) a level to close the project completely.

Q40. For requirement AUD-PA-72, Record non-financial data without affecting financial accounts, can the County please provide examples of "non-financial data"?

A40. Examples of this are information such as number of papers served by a constable, square footage of offices for a department, number of inmates processed at the jail, etc.

Q41. For requirement AUD-PA-87, Post non-financial transactions to project ledgers without corresponding posting to general ledger accounts, can the County please provide examples of "non-financial transactions"?

A41. Examples of this are information such as number of papers served by a constable, square footage of offices for a department, number of inmates processed at the jail, etc. These can be posted to statistical accounts without affecting financial accounts.

Q42. For a requirement AUD-PA-111, Provide for online project summary history, can the County provide more information – what is meant by "project summary history"?

A42. This refers to the ability to see online data such as the total expenditures, budget, revenues, ect, as well as by line item and fiscal year.

Q43. For requirement AUD-PA-119, Ability for an automated procedure to archive data for closed projects, what is meant by archive? Does this indicate that records need to be moved to storage outside of the financial system and then physically removed from the system?

A43. Item to be removed from business requirements.

Q44. For requirement BUD-125.02, Project Estimated Budget, what is a project "estimated" budget? Is this a simply a "draft" project budget?

A44. Project Estimated Budget is the amount we would expect to receive for the grant or spend on the project.

Q45. For requirement AUD-RP-1.03, Required monthly statutory reporting, can the County please provide more detail as to what "Required monthly statutory reporting" consists of and, specifically, provide details as to whether this reporting is unique to Collin County or whether this requirement refers to reporting requirements of other entities (state, federal, etc.)? How many reports does this consist of?

A45. See provided monthly reports.

Q46. For requirements AUD-RP-25 through AUD-RP-27 Can the County please provide more details as to what it means by "CR postings"? (i.e., at a minimum please clarify the acronym)

AUD-RP	25	Report by User ID and/or user specified date range of CR postings to GL chart of account numbers.
AUD-RP	26	Report by CR Batch ID, User ID, and/or user specified date range of all CR posted payments including but not limited to GL chart of account number, receipt number, User ID, payment code, amount, tender method, and comments.
AUD-RP	27	Deposit report for each CR batch ID including Bank ID summary totals by Batch ID, User ID, and Batch date.

A46. CR is the acronym for cash receipts.

Q47. For requirement PO-13, Utilize the Internet for vendor communication, can the County please provide more detail for this requirement? Does this question simply pertain to utilizing email to send/communicate items to a vendor (e.g., purchase orders), or does this pertain more generally to "vendor portal" or "vendor self-service" functionality?

A47. Pertains to vendor portal or vendor self-service.

Q48. For requirement PO-23, Support purchasing thresholds by vendor (e.g., \$50,000 bid limit), can the County please provide more detail on this requirement? Is it the County's desire that certain vendors will have a "maximum bid limit" that would limit the ability of the vendor to bid more than that maximum amount? Moreover, is it the County's desire that this would be a "global setting" for the vendor (i.e., it would apply to any/all bids, regardless of the commodity being bid on)?

A48. The idea is to set a dollar threshold for certain vendors to block purchases that exceed the bid threshold of \$50,000. Vendors already under contract would not need to be blocked since their goods/services were competitively bid.

Q49. For requirement PO-26, Pre-assignment of commodity codes by requisition initiator tied to line items, can the County please provide more detail on this requirement? Is this requirement

indicating that the County desires that only certain commodity codes should be available on a requisition, where the commodities would be dictated by the preparer of the requisition?

A49. Allow for end user to assign any commodity code at requisition entry.

Q50. For requirement PO-89, Provide a facility for standard and prototype bids with any number of associated vendors, can the County please provide more detail on this requirement? Please specify what is meant by a “prototype bid”.

A50. In this case, prototype should have the meaning of “draft”, meaning not finalized. The module should allow for the creation of a draft document that can then be released, when approved, as a standard/final document without re-entering the bid.

Q51. For requirement PO-108, Review and print contract text, can the County please provide more detail on this requirement? Is the County referring to the actual contract (including the many terms and conditions typically associated with a contract) where they would expect the financial system to allow maintenance of the contract, or does this requirement refer to something else?

A51. It is referring to the actual contract text.

Q52. For requirement PO-140, Send purchase orders to vendors in the following formats: electronic data exchange, fax, e-mail or printed copy (with electronic signature, where applicable), can the County please provide more information on “electronic data exchange”? Is the County desiring EDI capability for POs (i.e., an EDI 850 transaction) or does this statement refer to something else?

A52. EDI- electronic data interchange.

Q53. For requirement PO-173.05, Mismatch report, can the County please elaborate on what this report encompasses, i.e., mismatches of what?

A53. Item to be removed from business requirements.

Q54. Please provide a breakdown of users for back office and mobile for each of the product areas listed on the cost form.

A54. Numbers are estimated. We do not have any mobile users at this time. The number provided below is for future mobile users.

Functional Area	# of Dept. Users	# of County Users	Mobile Users
General Ledger-Includes P-cards	31	213	244
Accounts Payable	11	0	0
Accounts Receivable	3	3	0
Project Accounting	7	0	7
Grant Accounting	8	0	8
Budget Preparation	6	250	5
Purchasing	15	230	245
Fixed Assets	6	0	0
Inventory	8	15	15
Cash Receipts	3	30	6
Work Orders	18	152	0
Fleet Management/Public Works	20	0	6

Land	12	0	3
Permits	12	0	12
Animal Services	16	0	11
Event Management/Parks and Recreation	4	0	3
Code Enforcement	32	0	16

Q55. Has Collin County considered a phased implementation with different go live dates? Collin County has a recommended go live timeline to coincide with their fiscal year. Some of the software products require that the Finance/Supply Chain systems are live before they can go live. Would Collin County prefer to go live on the Finance/Supply Chain systems prior to the start of their fiscal year so that the entire project is live by Oct 2, 2017? Would Collin County be willing to consider some software going live after the Oct 2, 2017 timeframe so that Finance/Supply Chain systems can go live at the beginning of their fiscal year?

A55. It's our preference, due to lessen integrations to the old HTE system that all core modules go-live at the same time. If the County selects any of the optional modules in our RFP we are open to discuss optional go-live dates.

Q56. Please confirm that no hardcopy is required if a Vendor chooses to upload their proposal to the County's ION Wave online procurement tool.

A56. No hard copy is required if submitting on line.

Q57. Please specify what the file size limitations or other document type restrictions are in place if electronic upload is chosen for submitting the response.

A57. The maximum file size limit is 25 megabytes.

Q58. What system is the County currently using for Parks and Recreation / Event Management functionality?

A58. They us Excel and accept credit card payments.

Q59. How many documents does the County process on an annual basis in regards to expense management (e.g. expense reports)?

A59. There is no way to know as job logs are kept on a daily/weekly basis and there is no report that tells the amount of jobs run. Audit estimates that there could hundreds one week and thousands another, especially when working on the CAFR.

Q60. With respect to Section 1.4 and Attachment A of the RFP, please clarify whether or not "Functions for facility management, permit issuance and tracking, fleet management and public works processes will be provided by other third party tools which will require integration to the selected financial system" are in scope for this project.

A60. The paragraph should read: "Functions for facility management, permit issuance and tracking, fleet management and public works processes **are** provided by other third party tools which will require integration to the selected financial system". They should be priced as optional modules to the Core Financial module.

Q61. RFID requirements (i.e, Fixed Assets – AUD-FA-74.02 – AUD-FA-78 - RFID integration for tagging of fixed assets and physical inventory (scanning)) – These requirement reads as an "integration requirement". What is the County's RFID solution that the solution must be integrated with?

A61. The County currently uses HTE for fixed assets and has barcoded labels on assets. We do not use any handheld scanners to read the tags but would like the functionality. We do not currently use RFID tags but would like to investigate their use so the system must support them.

Q62. Can you please confirm that EDI is truly in scope (there are requirements for both EDI810 and EDI850 transactions (POs and invoices))

A62. EDI is in scope.

Q63. For requirement (AUD-AR-88 - Read and utilize a predefined interface for bar code or scan line information which can capture any and all fields of the account code segments applied to financial transactions.) Can you please elaborate as to the County's vision for this. This reads to us as an interface requirement. What is the County's envisioned solution for this that the solution must be integrated with?

A63. As related to Treasury AR, the bar code would be displayed on the invoice "return with payment" stub. By scanning the bar code, the invoice information would be pulled for posting the invoice payment. The scan line information would be read at the time of payment with possibly hand held scanners.

Q64. Section 2.12, page 26 of the RFP asks vendors to have any third-party firms provide three (3) references as part of their submission on the form provided in Attachment F. However the instructions within Appendix F asks for five (5) references to be provided. Please clarify whether five (5) or three (3) references are required for third party firms.

A64. Three (3) references are sufficient. Attachment F will be reissued.

Q65. Due to the pending clarification of several questions and the timing of the release of Addendum 1, [REDACTED] respectfully requests an extension of two weeks' time to submit the responses for RFP 2015-192. This additional time will allow us to more accurately prepare our response.

A65. An extension of one (1) week will be granted. Proposals are now due August 20' 2015 at 2:00 PM, CDT.

Q66. Follow up to Q3. How many people would be involved with a projected new financial system from the perspective of:

- **Making approvals (e.g. create requisitions, record time/expenses, approve invoices)**
- **Business user – uses the software as part of their job, completing transactions**
- **IT user/Super user – access to server software across the entire system**

A66. Approvals: Approximately 77
Business Users: Approximately 230
IT user/Super Users: Approximately 4
Casual Users/View Only: Approximately 1500