



January 17, 2022

**Addendum #1
RP002-23
Provision of Utility Billing Software and Implementation Services**

Please see the below summation of revisions, questions and answers for the above solicitation.

Revisions

R1. The proposal deadline has been modified. Proposals must be returned in a sealed container marked on the outside with the Request for Proposal number and Service Provider Name. Proposals will be received until 2:50 P.M. local time on **February 27, 2022 at the Gwinnett County Financial Services - Purchasing Division – 2nd Floor, 75 Langley Drive, Lawrenceville, Georgia 30046. Any proposal received after this date and time will not be accepted.**

**R2. Page 16, 1.7, Expected Scope of Utility Billing Solution, Software Scope
Change “Customer Communications” to “Customer Portal”**

R3. Page 46, Section 4.4 Insurance Requirements, 5. – Change From:

- 5. Cyber Liability Insurance
 - (a) ~~\$3,000,000~~ Limit for Network Security or Privacy Liability
 - (b) ~~\$3,000,000~~ Limit for Data Recovery

Page 46, Section 4.4 Insurance Requirements, 5. – Change To:

- 5. Cyber Liability Insurance
 - (a) **\$5,000,000** Limit for Network Security or Privacy Liability
 - (b) **\$5,000,000** Limit for Data Recovery

Questions

Q1. Can service providers outside the USA (i.e., India or Canada) submit proposals for this?

A1. Service providers located outside the USA will not be considered for award.

Q2. Are service providers required to attend on-site meetings?

A2. Yes.

Q3. Can service providers perform the tasks related to request for proposal outside USA (i.e., India or Canada)?

A3. No. Services can be performed outside of Gwinnett County but not offshore.

Q4. Can a service provider submit the proposals via email?

A4. No.

Q5. The request for proposal states “The County is currently operating multiple SAP modules (including SAP ISU and SAP CRM) among other systems; and the County procured Oracle Fusion Cloud suite in November 2022”. There appears to be a sizable commitment to Oracle since much of the SAP/SAP CRM system will be replaced with Oracle Fusion. Does procurement of the Oracle Fusion suite give Oracle an advantage for winning this request for proposal for a Utility Billing System (replacing SAP ISU)? Is there a specific driver for issuing the Billing System RFP separately from the Oracle Fusion implementation?

- A5. **Oracle does not have an advantage over any other service provider. The Department of Water Resources has had many demos over the years from the large pool of robust utility billing solutions. It is in the best interest of the County to competitively procure this solution with the implementation aligning with the implementation of the new core ERP.**
- Q6. There are several "Mobile Workforce Management" requirements in Attachment 1 – Implementation Service Specifications. Is the County looking for a full-service Mobile Workforce Management system or is AssetWorks the County's Mobile Work Management system that the Billing Software will interface with?
- A6. **In terms of Mobile Workforce/Workorder Management, both ArchLogix and SPMR currently interface with SAP. SPMR uploads meter readings from our third-party vendor to SAP so the County can generate the billing, and Archlogix manages field work orders (disconnections, repairs, new service connections etc.) in conjunction with SAP. AssetWorks is the vehicle fleet inventory management system and we do not intend on replacing this. The request for proposal requirements are to integrate with SPMR and replace Archlogix, so mobile service order functionality is desired as part of the proposal and asset mgmt. functionality could be listed as optional.**
- Q7. When will the service provider decision be made? When is the project expected to start?
- A7. **It is County's intent to award to the highest scoring service provider within 6 months after proposal opening with project kickoff during the following month; however, this is dependent on the number of proposals received and the length of the contract negotiations phase of the procurement process.**
- Q8. When is the new customer information system (CIS) solution required to go-live?
- A8. **The chosen CIS solution is not obligated to be operational by a certain date.**
- Q9. A service provider offers a customer portal and field service solution for the work order that is fully integrated to Oracle CCS. Would the County consider using the service provider customer portal instead of the County website? Within the service provider customer portal there is also a payment solution. The service provider connected platform basically ties everything together from field work orders, customer self-service capabilities, and payments.
- A9. **The Department of Water Resources (DWR) does currently operate under the shared County-wide website; however, please submit details on the service provider's complete offering for consideration. DWR is interested in a fully integrated system that would replace various stand-alone applications and software that currently interface with the County ERP. To further clarify, the County did not purchase Oracle's utility billing solution, CCS.**
- Q10. Could the awarded service provider start the project for the customer portal, workforce management first and integrate it SAP IS-U and then later to Oracle since it will likely take 2 years before Oracle CCS is up and running?
- A10. **The County has not purchased Oracle CCS, just the core financials and human capital modules. Ideally the County would prefer one integration of the new Utility Billing (UB) solution with the Oracle Fusion Cloud suite; however, the UB project could begin sooner than projected.**
- Q11. Please confirm the number of wastewater-only customers that Gwinnett has.
- A11. **The County currently has six (6) sewer only customers.**
- Q12. The request for proposal is vague on the whether or not the County is going to replace Elavon for

merchant processing as part of the build out?

- A12. Merchant processing does not fall under the scope of this request for proposal, as it is a different contract; however, the Department of Water Resources is interested in replacing the cashiering solution (currently iNovah) if available as part of a fully integrated solution.**
- Q13. Can the County provide the past 3 months merchant processing statements so that service providers can analyze to see if there is an opportunity for increased approvals, lower cost and least cost routing? Service provider's may be able to route certain types of cards like pin-less debit cards to a lower cost processing fee, (least cost routing) once the card mix is understood.
- A13. Elavon is the County's merchant processor and changing from this service provider is out of scope for this request for proposal. iNovah is used by most County departments as their cashiering system. Water Resources will entertain replacing iNovah if there is a cashiering system incorporated within the new Utility Billing solution but will not entertain integrating with another third-party cashiering system.**
- Q14 The Billing section of the request for proposal has several questions around processing payments, issuing refunds, donations, payment plans, etc., however it's unclear whether or not there is an opening for a new payment processor in the request for proposal? Please elaborate.
- A14. Merchant processing does not fall under the scope of this request for proposal, as it is a different contract; however, the DWR is interested in replacing the cashiering solution (currently iNovah) if available as part of a fully integrated solution.**
- Q15. Are payment plans, potential pay later, Venmo, Apple Pay, G-Pay, PayPal, PayPal Credit in scope?
- A15. DWR has discussed adding PayPal/G-Pay/Apple Pay to the payment line up. Please submit details on the service provider's complete offering for consideration.**
- Q16. Chatbot is in scope. Is payments via the Chatbot in scope also?
- A16. Potentially in the future, if a fully PCI Compliant solution. Please submit details on the service provider's complete offering for consideration.**
- Q17. Can the County share additional details on the leak adjustment requirements? Specifically, how does the County determine leaks?
- A17. DWR envisions an automated leak process from beginning to end. Ideally, the customer would submit their request and any attachments through a portal; the system would digest the information and calculate then apply the applicable leak adjustment to the account for their event, according to programmed rules; and then the system would send an automated notification with the details to the customer as well as create an interaction record for internal use.**
- Q18. Can the County provide a 2-week extension moving the request for proposal response deadline from 2/13/23 to 2/27/23 given the importance of this procurement and hard copy delivery requirement?
- A18. Yes. See R1.**
- Q19. For the implementation pricing, the price sheet requires the estimated hours and hourly rate by module (aligned to the Attachment 1 – Utility billing specifications). For the hourly rate column,

is it permissible to use an average rate given each module includes different roles that have varying hourly rates (e.g., project management, developers)?

A19. Yes.

Q20. Per the Attachment 1 – Utility billing specifications, is the County’s expectation that service providers address as many of the requirements as possible even it that yields customizations, or does the County prefer a baseline approach with alternative business processing that yields low to no customizations and a lower total cost of ownership for long-term maintenance?

A20. DWR would prefer a more out of the box solution that overall best suits the County’s business needs, with little to no need for customization to fit a utility billing operation. Our current solution is highly customizable with various interfaces, which requires a high level of day-to-day maintenance.

Q21. Since this request for proposal is for both licensing and implementation services, what is the County’s expectations in terms of contracting? Meaning is the County seeking one service provider to provide both the license and services? If the bid contains a software provider and 3rd party implementation partner, what recommendations can the County provide since the terms, conditions and any deviations may be different for the software provider and implementor?

A21. The County requires one proposal to be submitted in response to this request for proposal. While the County prefers one contract, the County will consider multiple contracts for this solution. Please provide the terms, conditions, and any deviations for both the software provider and implementor.

Q22. Does the County have any master terms in place with software service providers that may be referenced for this proposal response?

A22. Yes.

Q23. Does the term “shall” reference mandatory or non-mandatory requirements?

A23. Mandatory.

Q24. Please provide a full list of service providers that participated in the pre-bid conference.

A24. The list is provided as the end of this addendum.

Q25. Section 1.7, Expected Scope of Utility Billing System. Customer portal was not included in this section, however there are many requirements in the detailed functional requirement worksheet. Was there a reason it was not included in 1.7 scope?

A25. See R2. Please change “Customer Communications” to “Customer Portal”. With this change, the scope and requirements should match.

Q26. Is the County looking for a new customer portal as a part of this request for proposal?

A26. Yes, the requirements are listed in Attachment 1, Specifications.

Q27. Is the County looking to replace the current payment processing service provider?

A27. Elavon is the County’s merchant processor and changing from this service provider is out of scope for this RFP. iNovah is used by most County departments as their cashiering system. Water Resources will entertain replacing iNovah if there is a cashiering system incorporated within the new Utility Billing solution but will not entertain integrating with another third-party

cashiering system.

Q28. What is Mythics role in this request for proposal?

A28. Mythics is the reseller of the Oracle Cloud solution the County purchased for ERP. The County did not evaluate or purchase the CSS as part of that solution.

Q29. Will this solicitation and RP001-23 Provision of Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) System Integrator Services for the Oracle ERP Cloud System be scored together or independently?

A29. The two solicitations will be scored independently with a separate team of evaluators.

Q30. Is the County looking for the cost proposal to include software licensing and implementation costs?

A30. Yes.

Q31. Does this solicitation include managed services?

A31. Yes. See the Managed Services tab of Attachment 2.

Q32. What should service providers propose regarding software licensing cost?

A32. Please respond as outlined in Attachment 2. The County will evaluate on the 10-year total cost of ownership.

Q33. Does the County intend to implement ERP and Utility Billing at the same time?

A33. Yes.

Q34. Attachment 1 is locked and service providers are unable to modify or wrap text for column H. Please unlock or wrap text for column H.

A34. See attached revised Attachment 1.

Q35. What is the preferred contract duration?

A35. The contract duration will be determined during the negotiation phase of evaluation.

Q36. How many years of data will be migrated to the new system?

A36. 3 years.

Q37. Should references be provided for both the software service provider and the implementation provider if these are two separate service providers?

A37. Yes.

The following service providers attended the Pre-Proposal Conference on January 12, 2023.

- Abjayan
- Advanced Utility Systems
- Averta Corp
- Cayenta
- Diversified Technologies
- Emphasis
- ESC Partners

- Hansen Technologies
- Hexstreams
- Infosys
- Iteneris
- Mythics
- Open International
- Oracle
- RIA Advisory
- Smart Energy Water
- Spry Point
- Star Global
- Systems & Software
- TMG Consulting
- USC
- UTIL360
- Utility Solution Partners
- Vertex One

Attachments

- Attachment 1 - RP002-23 Utility Billing Software and Implementation Services – Specifications.xls

Acknowledge receipt of this addendum on Page 41 of the proposal document.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Dana Garland".

Dana Garland, CPPB, FOII, NIGP-CPP
Purchasing Division