



December 22, 2020

**ADDENDUM #1
RP006-21**

Provision of an Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Software on an Annual Contract

This addendum is being issued to provide additional information and clarification:

Proposals will be received until **2:50 P.M. local time on Wednesday, February 3, 2021** at the Gwinnett County Financial Services - Purchasing Division – 2nd Floor, 75 Langley Drive, Lawrenceville, Georgia 30046.

Q1. What is the driver for this initiative?

A1. When the County began this initiative, SAP's end-of-life support was 2025 for both core and HCM systems. This initiative will allow ample time to develop a valid business case, obtain County executive approval, conduct a feasibility study to identify requirements, procure, and implement the selected solution. SAP subsequently moved the end-of-life support dates; however, there is still a need to pursue the replacement solution(s).

Q2. Is there any reservation for SAP S/4 HANA? Did the County run simplification checks and ABAP code change requirements?

A2. Gwinnett County's Purchasing Ordinance requires a new solicitation. SAP S/4HANA is an entirely new environment. This cannot be considered an upgrade/migration and requires a new solicitation.

Q3. Is this proposal restricted to ERP replacement only?

A3. Yes, refer to section 1.7 of proposal document.

Q4. Does the County need recommendation on cloud also or is there a preferred vendor like AZURE, AWS, GCP or HEC?

A4. The County has established technology standards. These standards support each of these options and would request that the proposal address the best solution based on the solution provider. The County has licensing agreements in place for Microsoft Azure.

Q5. Will for profit organizations be acceptable for references?

A5. While the requirement requests specific municipalities of similar size and complexity, consideration will be given to for profit organizations. However, realize that one of the key criteria related to the solicitation is the ability to provide governmental fund accounting.

Q6. Is it the County's intent to keep NeoGov for recruiting?

A6. Gwinnett intends to keep NeoGov for recruiting and onboarding. The requirements are a baseline list of items the County could potentially leverage in the future should the County change direction or move away from NeoGov.

Q7. Provide an example of non-employees obtaining training through County Resources.

A7. Contractors or non-employees doing business with the County are required to go through Code of Ethics training. This is completed via current uPerform software.

Q8. Expand on the request of employee interaction via Social Media?

A8. Currently, the County does not have further specifics outside of current usage (applicant/employee interaction and job posting).

Q9. Provide additional explanation and clarification to the type level setting and job slotting?

A9. The ability to group similar jobs and easily identify them for purposes of compensation analysis based on comparable positions.

Q10. Provide additional clarification to "common table" entries tracking start and end dates.

A10. Common tables are those that maintain critical data available to all modules such as job codes, job start dates etc.

Q11. Outline the current ESS Capability and what software the County is currently deployed.

A11. Ability to interact with other county applications currently in use. Current ESS capability includes multiple modules such as: timesheet entry and approval, employee information viewing/editing, payroll stubs, benefits enrollment applications, W2 and other payroll-related form access, personnel action form access, training and events enrollment, off-duty work requests, manager self-service, organization viewing, and succession planning.

Q12. Does the County have a multi-check scanning process in place for recording checks and invoices in batch? If not, should this be included in the response? What is the annual volume that the County would scan using this process?

A12. The County does have multi-check scanning processes in place. Please include any alternatives in response.

Q13. Does the County have scenarios where different departments need to submit end of day receipt summary information? If so, would the County like to automate that?

A13. Yes, the County has multiple departments that need to submit end of day receipt summary information. The County would like to automate this process.

Q14. Expand on the requirement to interface cashiering and document management.

A14. The County currently uses iNovah and Rec1 cashiering systems and FileNet for document management and would like to interface with the existing solutions where the departments wish to maintain those systems.

Q15. Including the proposal document in the contract is not consistent with procuring a commercially available, true one-to-many solution because such solutions are pre-existing and not custom-built in accordance with an individual customer's specifications. Can vendors offer an alternative solution to protect potential customers against procurement fraud and therefore avoid the requirement to attach or include the Proposal in the definitive contract between the parties?

A15. No. The County expects that the selected vendor includes their proposal response in the contract.

Q16. The parties will need to negotiate contract terms and accordingly, it is not a binding offer that can be offered without negotiation. Will the County consider confirm agreement with that

intent? The Vendor's proposals and other documentation are provided as an offer to negotiate, not as a firm offer.

A16. That is correct. The contract included in the proposal contains the standard terms and conditions. The County requests that vendors provide identified exceptions to those terms and conditions. However, the County will negotiate the final terms and conditions with the highest scoring vendor.

Q17. Will the County consider a commitment that its tenant will be located in the United States will meet the RFP requirement that "All data shall reside in the United States at all times."?

A17. Yes

Q18. Will the County consider use of the vendor's standard agreements? A true one-to-many SaaS solution necessitates a consistent contracting approach with accurate descriptions of what we are delivering and how we deliver it.

A18. Final terms and conditions will be negotiated with the highest scoring vendor.

Q19. Would the County be willing to waive the hard copy submission and accept email submission due to COVID-19?

A19. No.

Q20. In the functional requirements spreadsheet under the tab 'Time and Attendance', lines 65 & 66 'ability to charge time to multiple accounts... support functionality locations, work orders, grants....' – is the county looking to have integration with Work Orders and/or tracking to activities based on dependencies and budgets? If so, how many employees will be using this functionality?

A20. Yes, the County needs the ability to have integration with work orders and/or activities tracking. An estimated number of employees using this functionality is approximately 500; however, that number may increase with the implementation of a new CRM solution.

Q21. Will the County provide Other Required Forms and Attachments (Section 11) forms in an editable format?

A21. The forms are not available in editable format.

Q22. Regarding ability to require vendors to maintain updated vendor files in order for a purchase order to be issued. Discrepancies between requisition vendor profile information and vendor master file must be approved. Is this referring to things like address, contact name, and that type of information?

A22. Yes

Q23. Are bonds required?

A23. No bonds are required.

Q24. Regarding ability to allow multiple vendor addresses (shipping, sales, fulfillment, remit to, corporate headquarters, etc.) with option of electronic remittance. How does this process work today? Does the user select the specific location based on some criteria?

A24. Currently the County has multiple vendor IDs with different addresses. When looking to select a specific address for a vendor we must search for the vendor ID with the appropriate address. We would like to be able to have multiple addresses associated with a single vendor ID.

Q25. Regarding ability to allow multiple vendor email addresses - How would this work? Is the

County looking to give the user the chance to select the location from a dropdown list?

A25. Ability for the user to choose various contacts within a vendor's organization, e.g. email sales, support, billing contacts.

Q26. Regarding an authorized user has option on partial receipt to close remaining amount of purchase order. Provide clarification on what this means or provide a use case.

A26. Option to close partially receipted purchase orders

Q27. Ability to validate all bids with automatic error checking prior to bid submission. Is this referring to spellcheck, or is a step in the process is missing?

A27. Refers to a step in the process is missing

Q28. Ability to include 99 different accounting strings on a PO and have split account coding. Is the question: Ability to divide the cost of one PO between 99 departments?

A28. No. The ability to divide the cost amongst various operating and/or capital & grant funding including cost centers, fund centers, funds, wbs elements, etc.

Q29. Ability to manage Vendor backorders. Provide more details on what it means to manage vendors backorders? What actions would the user like to take if something is on backorder?

A29. This is referring to the ability to designate the unconfirmed quantities of a purchase order as being on backorder. This designation will then allow for the ability to ensure that when the items become available, they will be automatically delivered against the designated purchase order before any subsequent purchase orders are fulfilled.

Q30. Ability to upload vendor contracts. Does this refer to uploading legacy contracts into the new system?

A30. The County needs the ability to load line items from current contracts in the system, so they can be shopped by user departments. We do not need the actual formal signed contracts for legacy contracts in the new system. This is in reference to the County's ability to set up a Contract in SRM that contains both header and line item data. The Header Screen-Controls the terms of the contract (vendor, amount not to exceed, contract date term). The line item data is contained within an Internal Catalog (MDM) that is specific to the header data. This allows departments the ability to create shopping carts by selecting the items from the internal catalog that is controlled by the SRM contract. The shopping carts are automatically converted to purchase orders once department approvals are applied, without Purchasing having to process them from sourcing.

Q31. Ability for optical character recognition on contracts, being able to mine database. Is this referring to OCR? Is the County looking to convert the paper contract into a digital contract?

A31. Yes

Q32. Ability to link to pdf of executed agreement in County's document management system. Are you referring to the ability to add a link to the contract that will open a specific PDF for the user to review?

A32. Yes

Q33. Does the County have requirements for contingent labor and SOW tracking?

A33. Both features should be considered desirable.

Q34. How many power users will the County need for sourcing, contract management and Supplier Life Cycle Management? Power users are anyone who writes, edits or manages reports. View only user are not included in this assumption.

A34. There are 15 power users in Purchasing. This seems to be specifically about report writing rather than actual vendor management. If that's the case, then it would approximately 20 users County-wide.

Q35. How much spend does the procurement team manage today? When the process is fully optimized how much spend under management to you expect?

A35. Procurement currently manages approximately \$600M. We anticipate the amount to increase per future budget increases.

Q36. Ability to configure pre-defined transaction split "templates" for each project with the ability to override. Elaborate on this requirement? Are these just journal entry templates, or is this more detailed than templates?

A36. This requirement is the ability to define a percentage split at the project/WBS level. The system would automatically charge (or encumber) the defined percentage of the total amount posted. It would require other account assignments to cover the remaining amount. This feature would avoid having to set up the percentage for every purchase order, journal entry & payroll document.

Q37. Does the County have a need for electronic signature capabilities?

A37. Yes

Q38. Onboarding is called out as a requirement. Is this a standalone solution or are recruiting capabilities supposed to be part of the functionality the County is seeking?

A38. The County is in the process of implementing an Onboarding solution using NeoGov. Gwinnett intends to keep NeoGov for recruiting and onboarding. The requirements are a baseline list of items we could potentially leverage in the future should the County change direction or move away from NeoGov.

Q39. Does the County have an existing Time and Attendance solution you would like us to interface with or are you looking to see different functionality?

A39. Departments currently use multiple solutions. We would like to see options that provide the functionality identified in the RFP.

Q40. In the Specifications Workbook - General Ledger Tab - Ability for automated creation of appropriation units line, or zero budget revenue or expense lines when entering journal entries with appropriate security access. In the priority column, there is a '-' instead of an R or a D. Is this a typo? If so, can you explain further on what business process you are trying to achieve with this functionality?

A40. This should be marked desirable.

Q41. Specifications Workbook - HR Core and Position Control Tab - Ability to assign only one employee identification number per employee regardless of the number of positions held. Explain further the number of positions for a person? Is this referring to concurrent employment or movements between roles during an individual's overall employment? Any other scenarios to consider?

A41. For example, our Chief Financial Officer also assumes the position of Deputy County Administrator. Another example may be an employee who works in Sheriff full-time but also has a part-time position in Community Services.

Q42. Confirm the number of actual Employees that would have access the HR applications and salary? Will a seasonal and a part time employee be one in the same?

A42. Refer to the table in section 1.8 of the proposal - Seasonal and part-time employees are not the same and require different classifications. In addition, poll workers are a different and separate employee classification as well (though not 'employees' in the traditional sense.)

Q43. Does the County intend to store course content or training materials within the Learning Management solution?

A43. Yes

Q44. Will the County plan to have a Project Manager dedicated to the project?

A44. Yes

Q45. Will the County plan to have a dedicated Project Team/dedicated resources? If no, does the County expect the Vendor to take on a larger part of system configuration and testing?

A45. Yes. The County expects to be involved in system configuration and testing; however, we need to understand the roles and responsibilities of both County resources and software vendor/integrator resources for all project activities including system configuration and testing.

Q46. Will the County Change Management, communications and training resources will be provided for the implementation?

A46. Yes

Q47. Confirm there is an element of Software Implementation work defined within this proposal or will Implementation be defined and requested in a subsequent proposal?

A47. This proposal is for an ERP software vendor only. The County will release a subsequent proposal for a software integrator once an ERP software vendor is selected. The County expects most software implementation services to be provided by the software vendor, however, the software vendor should provide information related to their involvement in the implementation, if/where appropriate.

Q48. Will there be a pre-proposal meeting or conference arranged for bidders?

A48. No

Q49. Is the County looking to consider replacement of SAP with new ERP/CRM solution and seeking around 5,000 countywide ERP users or is it a much smaller amount focused on just the Financial Services Department?

A49. This solicitation is for ERP alone. There will be a separate solicitation for CRM and there are questions related to CRM that should be addressed in this solicitation.

Q50. Does the County currently use Salesforce as a CRM?

A50. Refer to page 13 of the RFP.

Q51. Does the County anticipate needing timeclocks? If so, how many?

A51. DoCS (parks, health and human services, elections) currently has 150 timeclocks.

Q52. How many employees will be using the timekeeping system? How many employees are hourly versus salaried?

A52. 1,046 are exempt and 4,770 are non-exempt.

Q53. Does the County want to ask employees questions about their health when they first punch in and/or have employees attest to their hours before approving timecards?

A53. "Ask about health", No. "Attest to their hours", employees fill out their own timesheets so they would attest to those hours at that time.

Q54. The County currently has Telestaff (for advanced scheduling) in a few departments. Will any integration between Telestaff and the time keeping solution be needed?

A54. Yes, Fire Services uses Telestaff.

Q55. There are some requirements around FMLA. Does the County anticipate needing a fully automated solution to manage and track continuous and intermittent FMLA?

A55. Yes-per HR.

Q56. Is the County considering a potential SAP Migration from On-Premises to the Cloud?

A56. If SAP is the highest scoring solution, then the migration will be considered.

Q57. Due to COVID; would the county consider an electronic submittal to protect our team?

A57. No

Q58. The County has identified technology to replaced, interfaced, etc., would the County consider replacing technologies which could be supported within the new technology?

A58. Potentially.

Q59. Ability to prevent vendor maintenance from affecting the vendor information on historical transactions. This can be overridden with the proper security access. Provide clarification on what this means or provide a use case.

A59. When a vendor changes their DBA, but their tax id remains the same. It would be helpful to see which previous payments were made under old & new doing business as names.

Q60 Does the County desire a full cloud solution or would the County be interested in a hybrid on-premises/cloud solution?

A60. The County is only looking at vendor hosted/cloud solutions hosted off-site.

Q61. What version, including enhancement packs is the County currently running?

Q61. Current versions:

SAP ECC 6.0, EHP 7, SP 20

SAP SRM 7.0, SP 20, EHP3

SAP CRM 7.0, SP20, EHP3

SAP MDM 7.1, SP20, Patch 3

Q62. Does the County desire a direct contract with the software vendor or would the County

consider an indirect contract where the reseller is the same as a system integrator?

A62. The County expects to have a long-term relationship with the software provider, and therefore expects to contract with the software vendor.

Q63. Are there current gaps in the technology which will be required in the new infrastructure? If yes, can you please outline them?

A63. Yes. Refer to the County's functional requirements (Section 4 of the proposal).

Q64. Has the County considered and/or evaluated alternatives to their current enterprise platform? If yes, was the assessment done solely in-house or did the County leverage outside assistance? If the County leveraged outside assistance, can the County please share who they partnered with for the assessment?

A64. Yes, the County performed an ERP Feasibility study with the assistance of a consultant.

Q65. Has the county secured funding for this project?

A65. The funding for this project will be secured during the 2022 budget process initiated in 2021.

Q66. Page 2 of the proposal specifies that pricing should be sealed separately from the technical proposal; however, Section 2.10, item B on page 28 specifies that vendors should "ADD/DEDUCT: Add or deduct amounts indicated on the outside of the envelope are allowed and will be applied to the lump sum amount. Amount shall be clearly stated and should be initialed by an authorized company representative." Please confirm (if hard copies are required) that pricing information should be placed on a label on the outside of the box.

A66. All pricing must be in a separate sealed and labeled envelope. Pricing should not be placed on a label on the outside of the box.

Q67. As part of the County Cyber security initiatives such as NIST would the County also want an option for a FedRamp authorized solution?

A67. Yes

Q68. Confirm the number of users (not total employees) for the following areas:

- Financials
- Purchasing/Inventory
- HR/Payroll
- Work Orders

A68. Refer to the table in section 1.8 of the RFP.

Q69. For section 1.9 (Overall Evaluation Process), 1. Minimum Criteria: a. Although the SI has performed multiple implementations using the same software product(s) being proposed in this proposal to other large municipalities, we have not implemented to 'one previous municipality of similar size'... The software manufacturer DOES MEET this requirement, and we'd like to use their experience as a reference. Is this acceptable?

A69. This solicitation is for software only and the manufacturer's experience would suffice; however, a separate solicitation will be issued for the SI and it is likely that there will be a similar request in that solicitation.

Q70. How many grants does the County handle a year?

A70. The Grants team currently manages 198 active grant awards, however, that number changes

as new grant opportunities become available, are applied for, and are awarded.

Q71. How many inventory storerooms does the County have?

A71. There are 5 inventory warehouses – DWR, Fire, Community Services, Transportation & Sheriff

Q72. Is the County considering using SAP for Inventory? Where is inventory run today? Is it Maximo?

A72. The County currently uses SAP and Maximo for inventory. This solicitation provides an opportunity for the County to consider other inventory management solutions. Additionally, Fleet uses AssetWorks to manage the Fleet inventory.

Q73. The Request for Proposal mentions that uniform tracking is done in a spreadsheet as inventory. Is the inventory in SAP or some other system?

A73. It is managed separately as identified by some departments; though this data in some instances is manually entered into SAP for tracking purposes.

Q74. The Request for Proposal mentions that vehicle and equipment replacement plan is in Excel. Does the County have a model for this evaluation? Does it use a state of good repair or mostly the annual cost for maintenance?

A74. The County has standard criteria for the equipment replacement plan that considers annual maintenance costs and state of good repair and it is currently tracked in Microsoft Excel. The preferred solution will provide an automated solution for this process.

Q75. Clarify the intentions of the use of SAP CRM software that is discussed on page 13 of the Request for Proposal. The County is currently identifying requirements for an updated CRM solution.

A75. The current SAP CRM solution is to be maintained until the requirements for the new solution are identified and the solicitation is issued.

Q76. Item 96: The requirement states “Ability to create budgeting rules that will auto adjust for balancing entries based on users desires.” Provide an example of the rules and how they would be applied.

A76. Each department prepares budget request prior to the consolidation of the data. The desired solution will provide the flexibility for the departments to develop their own budgetary requests based on varying criteria and then consolidated for the final proposal. This process is entirely manual and would prefer to automate this process.

Q77. Item 97: The requirement states “Ability to define budget charges/transfer approvals by segments.” Provide an example of what segments mean or an example of the segments?

A77. Segments are referring to the account assignment elements; including fund, department, cost center, project, WBS element, program, GL account group etc.

Q78. How many employees need the ability to swap shifts?

A78. Approximately 3,000

Q79. How many employees need the ability to initiate coverage requests?

A79. Approximately 2,000

Q80. Specifications Workbook - AR & Misc. Billing Tab - Ability to establish user-defined receivable types using code tables. Can you explain a little further? We want to make sure we understand what the County means by "receivable types" and "code tables." Is this in reference to SAP Special G/L indicators?

A80. Yes, similar to how the special GL indicator has been used. Basically, to have the ability to set up different types of receivables such as accounts receivables, notes receivable and other receivables i.e. loans, settlements due for non-current asset sales, rent receivables, etc. Also to establish different types of receivables based on whether they are expected to be received within the current accounting period within 1 year (current receivables), or those received greater than 1 year (non-current receivables).

This addendum should be acknowledged on Page 74 - 6.2 Proposal Signature Form - Service Provider Information. Failure to do so may result in your proposal being deemed non-responsive.

Thank you
Marlo Puckett, CPPB
Purchasing Associate III