REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS - ADDENDUM #1

ISSUE DATE:	September 11, 2023
ISSUE TITLE:	ERP Solution and Implementation Services – Addendum #1
ISSUING AGENCY:	Northwestern Community Services Board 209 W. Criser Road, Suite 300 Front Royal, VA 22630

Please note the adjusted process and timeline from what was originally published in the RFP; at this time, the Northwestern Community Services Board plans to make a final decision regarding their ERP Solution and Implementation Services RFP by October 23, 2023. Please see the detailed dates and process steps, below:

08/25/2023	Request For Proposals (RFP) released
09/06/2023	Optional Pre-bid Conference @ 10:30am
09/08/2023	Closing Date for Questions until 4:00pm
09/11/2023	Final Addendum Posted by COB
09/22/2023	RFP Responses Due by 2:30pm
10/02/2023	Interviews / Demos expected to be held 10/02/2023 – 10/13/2023
10/23/2023	Announcement of Intent to Award

Additionally, please find below the answers to all questions submitted to the Purchasing Agent prior to the deadline provided in the RFP. This Addendum includes questions that were submitted by email, phone, as well as during the Optional Pre-Bid Conference held on September 6, 2023, at 10:30am via Teams meeting.

Section 1 – Multiple Awards

Q: Is NWCSB open to "best-of-breed" or selecting multiple vendors that specialize in a specific area of functionality and integrate seamlessly with each other's system?

Q: Will the Board entertain a best of breed solution for budget only? The Commonwealth of Virginia currently has an enterprise license for a budget solution.

Q: Are you willing to accept partial submissions?

A: Yes; please see Sec. 6.20 (pg. 26 of the RFP) which states that, "NWCSB reserves the right to make a single award or to award portions to multiple contractors as determined to be in the best interests of NWCSB." Additionally, this possibility is what led to the categorization of Sec. 3.2 – Functional Needs into "Required", "Potential", and "Interface".

Our primary focus initially is to procure a system that will meet all of our “Required” elements, as well as many of our “Potential” elements, and which will accommodate our current “Interface” elements with capacity for future expansion.

Section 2 - Demonstrations

Q: What demos has NWCSB seen from other vendors?

Q: Has the board seen demonstrations of alternate ERP systems prior to this RFP release?

Q: Has the Board seen any ERP demos in the last year?

A: To my knowledge, NWCSB has not seen any demos, and certainly, no demos have been provided to the entirety of the evaluation committee.

Section 3 – Extension of Due Date for Submissions

Q: Our team needs to review the question responses before we commit to a bid. Considering there are only four business days between when responses to questions will be posted (Monday 9.11.23 COB) and when the RFP is due (Friday 9.15.23 @ 2:30 pm), we will only be able to bid if an extension is granted. Is NWCSB willing to grant a 4-week extension on the bid submission due date?

Q: Will the Board entertain an extension? The RFP timeline provides little time for vendors to react to the Board’s responses to questions before the submission is due.

Q: Is it possible to extend the deadline for submission?

Q: Any consideration to extend deadline?

A: As noted in the adjusted timeline on page 1 of this Addendum, the Agency has granted a one-week extension.

Section 4 – IT Security Provisions and Environment

Q: We provide executive summaries of 3rd party penetration tests (pentests) to existing clients (not prospective clients) upon official request. Customers and/or prospective clients are not allowed access to our systems for security reasons. Will NWCSB accept a bid from us under these circumstances?

A: Yes.

Q: Regarding the proposal evaluation requirement for SOC review and evaluation, we provide through an NDA when we are down-selected. Will NWCSB accept a bid from us under these circumstances?

A: Yes.

Q: Does the Agency have systems in Azure?

A: No, we have only a hybrid Active Directory.

Q: Are you allowing a hosted environment with a SaaS environment for payroll timekeeping and human capital management, hybrid approach?

A: The Agency's strong preference is to keep any on-prem footprint as minimal as possible, but we will consider all options included in proposals received.

Section 5 – Questions Regarding the Agency's Current System

Q: What are you currently using for Budgeting software? Is it included in Munis' financial package or are you using a different system?

A: While budgeting capability exists in the Tyler Technologies solution that is currently deployed, it is only used sparingly, and much of the budgetary data that is used on reports is kept in spreadsheets.

Q: Why is the NWCSB leaving Tyler Technologies (Munis)?

Q: What circumstances led to this decision?

A: No decision has been made to discontinue use of the current system; however, we believe our current system is under-utilized and under-implemented; with new leadership, a decision was made to explore all options to determine if another system would better fit the Agency's needs. All vendors, including our current vendor, are welcome to participate in this process.

Q: Knowing that NWCSB would either keep the ERP that you have, and we could sync to the GL or select a new ERP that we would integrate with would you still like me to proceed in the bidding process and submit a proposal and conduct a demo?

A: As stated in Section 1 of this Addendum, the Agency would welcome proposals for individual components that match either "Required" elements, or "Potential" elements, and reserves the right under this RFP to make multiple awards.

Section 6 – Data Migration from Legacy System

Q: How many years of data conversion do you require?

Q: Data Migration timing, how much of the legacy data is expected to be brought over, how many years? Is it going to be hard data, transactional and historical?

Q: Is there someone on your team to support the Munis extraction of the data, are we comfortable getting the current data into something like excel?

A: The number of years of data conversion required is still a pending discussion and no final decision has been made. While staff is comfortable extracting data if necessary into an intermediary format (Excel, CSV, TXT, etc.), from a data integrity perspective the preference would be to export it directly from the current system to the selected system. Our expectation would be a minimum of five (5) years for G/L, payroll, accounts payable, procurement, and other transactional data. That is somewhat negotiable so Offerors should include in their proposal the number of years of data conversion that is included in their base pricing (by type, if applicable) and the cost to expand that by year (or potential savings if a decision is made to limit to fewer years than proposed).

Some of the transactional data is logged, and some is manual.

Q: In regard to data cleanup, will this be a collaborative approach for cleanup where you will take some data you don't want or need out so you don't ingest that unneeded data, or would you like a project management piece to the quote for services and implementation where you review it and then make decisions? What's the process for that?

A: This would be collaborative approach, but primarily internally staffed.

Section 7 – Interfaces

Q: What other key systems do you have that we will have to integrate with?

A: Credible; GlobalPay merchant services system; Agency's merchant services provider; eVA (state procurement system); Agency's bank/treasury management provider (interface for banking/treasury data);

Q: Will the ERP interface with any DBHDS systems? State systems such as Cardinal, Performance Budgeting?

A: There are none at present; however, the Agency is open to the potential for future enhancements in this area, if applicable.

Q: What system Benefit Administrator we use and what is the IT Platform?

A: We are working with Benefit First to launch the system and they use a system called 'Namely'.

Section 8 – Other Questions

Q: Is timekeeping and scheduling required? Is this a future opportunity?

A: This is covered in the RFP; see Sec. 3.2.III.E – Manage workforce on RFP page 18.

Q: Are you working with an external consultant in the procurement process? If so, whom?

A: No, we are not currently working with an external consultant on this process.

Q: Is NWCSB one entity? Do you have other locations?

A: The Agency is a single entity with approximately 250-275 employees, and multiple locations.

Q: Does NWCSB have Rep to Payee accounting?

A: No.

Q: Do you have any field technicians who drive in trucks, where you would need some type of mobile application to manage their day? Are they collecting payments?

A: We do have numerous service providers who travel throughout our service region. At a minimum, we would like the ability for them to utilize a mobile app to keep their time and attendance reports, expense reimbursements, etc. Some use corporate cards to purchase items that they need for services they are providing; the ability to capture receipts for attachment to expense reimbursement reports would add value. So yes, there is a place where mobile app capability would be beneficial to the Agency.

Q: Are you looking for implementation to be onsite or online?

A: The idea would be to have some people on site to be on the forefront to understand the current situation, where the data is located, what data needs to be migrated, workflows, operational changes that may be needed, etc. But some of this can be done in a hybrid/online approach. We would expect to have someone on site to understand the data needs. Testing, certain configuration discussions/decisions, UAT, and FUAT would all be preferred to be on site.

Q: Can you expand under Sec. 3.2.I.G that talks about managed fixed capital assets? Can you talk about what some of your major assets would be?

A: Our capital asset inventory is comprised mainly of buildings and vehicles. We have some FF&E within those buildings, but it is not extensive. Our main objective here is to have the capability to manage our capital asset inventory within the financial system, rather than by spreadsheet.

Q: Looking at your user estimate in the table provided it would appear that some of these users are the same person needing access to different modules. Is that accurate? If so, how many W-2s need access to the system? How many W-2s are core users?

A: All employees would need to have access to ESS, time and attendance, expense reimbursement, performance management, and other segments of the system that are geared toward the entire workforce. Most other modules and system segments would be limited to core users, depending on the outcome of business process analysis and design under the new system.

Q: What is the budget for the ERP implementation? Have funds been provided?

A: There is no formally adopted budget for this project; we will evaluate the pricing proposals included with RFP submissions – proposed cost is an element of our evaluation criteria (see RFP Sec. 5.3 on page 22).

Q: How much outstanding debt (if any) does the agency have (In dollar value)?

A: As of the completion of our most recent audit, there were five total issuances with a principal balance outstanding of just under $2.5 million.

Q: How many Leases does the agency have?

A: The Agency reported 141 leases as of the completion of our most recent audit; however, we have some question as to whether all of these agreements should have been classified as leases.

Q: How many Subscription Based IT Agreements does the agency have?

A: The Agency is still in the process of implementing GASB Statement No. 96, and at present, does not have a final count of SBITAs.

Q: What format should the response follow. Section 4.3 Specific Requirements details what offerors are required to submit. Are there any templates to use or do we simply put our responses in one word document? How do you want to see costing? Is there an excel table to complete?

A: To the extent possible, it would be helpful if proposals followed the structure of Sec. 3.1 and 3.2 in detailing system capabilities to show how closely those capabilities match the requested requirements and priorities of the Agency. Proposals would probably best be received and formatted as intended if provided in PDF format, although that is not a requirement. Offerors should provide cost proposals in whatever format is consistent with their pricing structures; however, they should be prepared to alter that format during a "Best and Final Offer" stage to alternative format(s) that best allow the Agency to conduct comparisons with other finalists.

A signed acknowledgment of this addendum must be received at the location indicated on the RFP either prior to the bid due date and time or attached to your proposal. Signature on this addendum does not substitute for your signature on the original proposal document. The original proposal document must be signed.

Thank you,

Bonnie Mihill

Bonnie Mihill
Purchasing Agent
Office (540) 636-4250, Ext. 2247

____
Name of Firm

____
Signature/Title

____
Date