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# Introduction

## Objective

Utah County Government (the County) seeks proposals from qualified respondents for Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Software and Implementation Services. The initial scope of award will be for the financial functions provided by an ERP system, however, as detailed further in section 1.3.1, the County’s evaluation will consider the functionality and capabilities of both finance and human capital management in the proposed system.

This Request for Proposals (RFP) is designed to provide qualified and interested proposers (Respondents) with sufficient information to submit proposals meeting minimum requirements but is not intended to limit a proposal’s content or exclude any relevant or essential data. The County expects that this RFP will result in a contract(s) awarded to the Respondent whose proposal is determined to provide the best value for the County based on the evaluation criteria (the Selected Vendor).

## Background Information About Utah County

Utah County is located in north-central Utah, immediately south of Salt Lake County, Utah. The County, incorporated in 1850, covers an area of approximately 2,143 square miles. The County had an estimated 702,000 residents according to the 2022 U.S. Census Bureau estimate, making it the second largest county by population in the state of Utah. The County’s general fund budget for 2024 is approximately $133 million. The County’s fiscal period is the calendar year (i.e., January 1 – December 31). The County currently has approximately 1,200 full-time equivalent (FTE) positions in its approved staffing plan.

## About the Project

The County currently utilizes an in-house built financial system (COFIS), which is an Oracle-based platform and has been in place for over 20 years, to manage its general ledger, asset tracking, procurement, vendor management, treasury, customer billing, and financial reporting functions. Since the initial implementation, County staff have continued to build additional features and modify COFIS to meet current business process needs. The County uses Workday for its human capital management (HCM) to manage human resources and payroll functions. The County also uses other third-party solutions for specific needs, as well as relying on a multitude of Excel spreadsheets maintained across almost all departments to track various financial information.

The current systems allow the County to process its required business transactions but not always in the most efficient manner. Manual, and often duplicative, entry still occurs and is not only time-consuming, but also increases the likelihood of errors.

Business users desire more functionality and reliability than is currently available. The County would like to explore and assess the functionality of modern, cloud-based ERP solutions and, more importantly, improve overall business processes and underlying system integration. As such, the County made the strategic decision to assess the full ERP market before investing in a long-term ERP solution.

### Finance and HCM

While the County is committed to Workday in the near term to serve its HCM needs, the County believes a single ERP provider for both finance and HCM needs will lead to better long-term outcomes than two separate providers. To best align the long-term interests of the County, the evaluation will consider the features and functionality of financial and HCM components to best position the County in the long term. While the County only intends to initially contract for a finance system at this time, aligning both finance and HCM will likely result in the County implementing the same solution for both finance and HCM in the future.

### Project Preparation

The Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) was selected by the County to guide it through the ERP selection process. GFOA is a professional membership organization representing over 23,500 public sector professionals across the United States and Canada. GFOA has no ties to any specific ERP technology.

As part of the scoping activities for this project, GFOA and the County worked together to review existing business processes. The County was divided into Process Improvement Teams (PITs) by functional area. Each PIT crew met with GFOA to identify gaps in current processes when compared to best practices and modern ERP functionality. The PIT crews will remain intact during selection and implementation.

Areas for improvement have been documented into a plan of action (Action Plan). The Action Plan describes changes that range from changing existing practices without regard to technology to preparing for change when technology is available. Many Action Plan items and related readiness activities will be addressed in advance of implementation. Some improvement items may be technology dependent, and the County will rely on collaboration with and expertise of the Selected Vendor to complete these activities.

## Project Governance

The County’s ERP is managed by the Auditor’s Office, which has a dedicated Project Manager for the preparation of this RFP and will continue during selection and implementation. A Steering Committee has been established to provide guidance regarding project scope, funding, and business processes and County policies impacted by the project. As mentioned above, the project is supported by multiple PIT crews, with each PIT crew consisting of County stakeholders representing various stages of a functional process.

**Governance Structure**
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Figure 1

| Role | Description | Duties |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Project Sponsor (County Auditor) | Serves as a member of the Steering Committee. Resolves conflict within the Steering Committee or on the project and is the final decision-maker during Steering Committee impasses. | * Act as project champion. * Secure necessary resources and remove obstacles for the project. * Provide strategic direction for the project. * Promote the project to County leadership and department staff. * Participate on the Steering Committee. |
| Steering Committee (9 senior leaders for the County) | Provides ongoing leadership to the ERP Project. | * Act as project champions, assist with making the project an organizational priority and assist with providing resources for the project. * Provide project guidance and direction. * Resolve issues and policy conflicts. * Approve scope changes; * Provide a strategic perspective when defining needs for a future software system and the associated processes. * Assist with change management across the organization. * Communicate progress of overall project to Departmental staff on a frequent basis. |
| Advisory Committee  (Department heads) | Supports the Steering Committee and provides feedback on the process from departments. | * Be a project champion and assist with making the project an organizational priority. * Provide a strategic perspective when defining needs for a future software system and the associated processes. * Serve as main point of contact for their department throughout the project. * Communicate project information and progress in their department. * Provide advice on Steering Committee decisions. |
| Project Manager | Coordinates day-to-day activities on the project and serves as primary point of contact for the County’s vendor partners | * Address day-to-day project issues. * Serve as liaison to external consultants. * Work closely with the Project Sponsor and Steering Committee to coordinate resources to meet the project objectives. * Coordinate with County staff to ensure cross-department participation in the project. * Provide regular project updates and communications to project stakeholders. * Schedule and facilitate project meetings. * Coordinate and implement project communication plan. * Resolve issues, review deliverables, and maintain project plan, schedule, and budget. |
| GFOA Consultants | Serves as the ERP program advisor to the County | * Provide general guidance on ERP selection practices. * Provide guidance on best practices in public sector. * Facilitate and guide the County through scoping, solicitation, selection, and contracts for the future ERP solution. * Complete tasks outlined in the Contract, including project planning, businesses process analysis and improvement, and project readiness plan. |
| Process Improvement Teams & Leads | PIT crew members have a general understanding of their functional process. Leads provide functional expertise, coordinate stakeholders, and coordinate tasks and assignments. | * Identify potential areas of improvement and assist with the development of future state processes and system improvements. * Review and validate functional and technical requirements. * Make recommendations and assist in the development of procedures and guidelines to implement best practice business processes. * Serve as project champions within their department. * Confirm that recommendations work for the organization as a whole. |
| Subject Matter Experts | Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) have deep knowledge of a particular process or sub-process within a functional area. | * Provides information and recommendations about their defined area of expertise. * Assist in developing and validating new processes and/or system requirements. |

# Procurement Rules and Procedures

## Rules of Procurement

1. This procurement shall conform to and is governed by the [County’s Procurement Rules and Regulations](https://www.utahcounty.gov/Dept/Auditor/purchasing/prr.html) established by the County’s Division of Procurement.
2. The County reserves the right to award multiple contracts from this RFP.
3. The County reserves the right to reject any or all proposals and to waive technicalities and informalities when such waiver is determined by the County to be in the County’s best interest.
4. The County may modify this RFP by issuance of one or more written addenda.
5. The County reserves the right to meet with select Respondents at any time to gather additional information. Furthermore, the County reserves the right to add, remove, or modify RFP scope until the final contract signing.
6. This RFP does not commit the County to award a contract.
7. All proposals submitted in response to this RFP become the property of the County and public records, and as such, may be subject to public review (see 2.2.5). Respondents concerned with release of proprietary or confidential information are encouraged to not submit that information in the proposal.
8. All proposals must be submitted in the proposal format outlined in Section 4 of this RFP.

## Notice to Respondents

Failure to carefully read and understand this RFP may cause the proposal to be out of compliance, rejected by the County, or legally obligate the Respondent to more than it may realize. Information obtained by the Respondent from any officer, agent, or employee of the County shall not affect the risks or obligations assumed by the Respondent or relieve the Respondent from fulfilling any of the RFP conditions or any subsequent contract conditions.

### Joint Proposals

If all RFP requirements are not met with products and services provided by one firm, Respondents are encouraged to partner with one or more other firms to submit a Joint Proposal.

### Primary Firm

If a Respondent consists of multiple firms submitting a joint proposal, the proposal must identify one firm as the Primary Firm, along with a primary point of contact. This identified person will be the primary point of contact throughout the procurement process and will be held responsible for the overall implementation of all partners included in the joint proposal.

### Proposal Validity

All proposals, including all information and costs provided therein and any subsequent clarification or response to questions, shall be valid for a minimum of 180 days.

### Late Proposals

Proposals received after the proposal due date and time indicated will not be accepted or considered.

Proposals may be withdrawn or modified in writing prior to the proposal submission deadline. Proposals that are resubmitted or modified shall be sealed and submitted prior to the proposal submission deadline.

### Confidentiality

Respondents that deem any part of the proposal confidential shall indicate so in the relevant section of the proposal. The confidential demarcation does not necessarily exclude the section from Utah Government Records Access and Management Act (GRAMA) and any requests for such information will be reviewed by the County’s Attorneys’ Office.

### Pre-Proposal Conference

A pre-proposal vendor conference will be held via web conference on the date and time established in the Procurement Schedule. **Attendance at the pre-proposal conference is not mandatory**, but the County requests vendors interested in participating in the pre-proposal conference RSVP to the contact listed in Section 2.3. Answers to questions submitted prior to the conference and answers to all questions asked at the pre-proposal meeting will be posted after the meeting to the solicitation on U3P.

## Contact Information

The County’s Division of Procurement is the sole point of contact for this solicitation.

Robert Baxter

[RobertB@utahcounty.gov](mailto:RobertB@utahcounty.gov)

Attempts by or on behalf of a Respondent to contact or to influence any member of the Evaluation Committee, any member of the Utah County Commission, or any employee of the County regarding the acceptance of a proposal may lead to elimination of that Respondent from further consideration.

### Clarifications

Any formal requests for clarification, questions, or additional information regarding this solicitation shall be submitted via the Q&A board on the solicitation on the U3P procurement site **no later than 5:00 p.m. MT on April 2, 2024**.

All questions concerning the RFP must reference the RFP section heading. Any questions received after the deadline shall not be considered. Questions received prior to the stated deadline will be collated into addenda and provided to all proposers, no later than April 10, 2024. All questions, requests for clarification, or additional information received by the County regarding this RFP will not be considered confidential in any way, shape, or form.

## Procurement Schedule

The table below represents the anticipated schedule for this procurement. The County reserves the right to change the schedule with appropriate notification.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Activity | Scheduled Date (2024) |
| RFP Issuance | March 19 |
| Optional Pre-Proposal Conference Call | March 26  2:00 PM MDT |
| Deadline to Submit Questions and Requests for Clarification on the RFP | April 2 |
| Answers to Submitted Questions Provided | April 10 |
| Proposals Due | May 1  3:00 PM MDT |
| Blind Evaluation of Proposal Components Completed | May 17 |
| Initial Interviews | May 21 – 23 |
| Completion of Written Proposal Analysis and Notification of Elevation for Software Demonstrations and Implementation Interviews | June 12 |
| Software Demonstrations and Implementation Interviews | July 9 – 11, 16 – 18, & July 30 – August 1 |
| Notification of Elevation to Semi-finalist or Finalist Respondent(s) | August 7 |
| Conduct Discovery Sessions | Week of August 26 |
| Notification to Selected Vendor | September 9 |
| Contract Negotiations and Finalize Statement of Work | September / October |
| Execute Final Contract | October |
| Begin Implementation | November |

# Project Scope

## Overview

The County seeks an integrated ERP solution and a qualified professional services provider to implement the proposed ERP solution, including overseeing the implementation of any proposed third-party software. The scope of the project, including project milestones, will be defined by a Statement of Work (SOW) that identifies the final scope, project approach, roles and responsibilities of the Selected Vendor and County, payment milestones, functional requirements, and acceptance criteria.

## Contract Scope

The County shall enter into a contract with the Selected Vendor, provided however that in the event of a Joint Proposal, multiple contracts may be required for all implementation services as described under this RFP. It is the Respondent's responsibility to partner as necessary and assemble the team, skills, assets, and other qualifications to meet the requirements of this RFP. The County understands that software contracts and third-party solution contracts may be handled separately; however, a comprehensive SOW will be developed to integrate all of the contracts.

## Organization Scope

The full scope of the project, including all functional requirements, must accommodate the needs of all County departments. In addition, the County will use the financial system to store financial data for all other entities listed as being part of the County’s reporting entity. For more information on the County, please refer to the County’s Annual Comprehensive Financial Report, which is available on the County’s website.

## Process Scope

The scope of this project is defined by goals, processes, and requirements.

* **Goals:** The activities undertaken in preparation for this RFP have culminated in several high-level goals the County wishes to achieve. Goals represent major outcomes or improvements the County desires to achieve as a result of using the system and improvements to policy, process, organizational structure, or improved efficiencies.
* **Process:** The major functions the County will use the system for represent the processes. Processes are defined by transactional processes, outputs, or overall groupings of system features the County will use to achieve its goals.
* **Requirements**: Each process is further defined by requirements that will serve as a service to communicate expectations for the system and acceptance. The requirements for each process can be found in Attachment 9 – Functional Requirements.

### General

The ERP will serve as the central hub for enterprise data addressing financial accounting, procurement, enterprise reporting, and, potentially, employee records. General business rules and workflow processes will be defined in the ERP for most transactions related to financials and procurement, as well as potentially human resources and payroll.

Integrated, secured access to the ERP platform is high priority for the County. Internal and external users should be assured of the security of the system and its data. Transaction flow, including notifications, should be easily configured based on County business rules and policies, and user interfaces should be intuitive, with processes available on mobile devices when possible. Report tools should be based on no- or low-code interfaces and business configuration should not require programmer intervention.

While the County is eager to consolidate systems around a new ERP solution, it acknowledges other existing systems will remain, so it is imperative the new ERP sufficiently integrates and shares data with other County systems to provide consistent, timely, and accurate data.

### Accounting

#### Goals

The County’s main financial ledger is maintained by the IT department and administered through the County’s Auditor’s Office. County leadership seeks to employ program-based budgeting and financial management paradigms. The County is planning to enhance its chart of account structure to accommodate a program-based construct by adding program and project segments. The County recognizes altering the chart of accounts structure is a major effort and will begin this effort during the ERP selection process.

GFOA met with the Accounting PIT Crew several times to discuss modern ERP functions. The County conveyed its desire for robust project and grant accounting functionality, as well as functionality to efficiently support internal service charges. Reporting tools should be flexible to accommodate Annual Comprehensive Financial Report (ACFR) requirements, including the ability to accommodate multiple accounting views and periods (e.g., grant reporting year vs. County reporting year) simultaneously. The future ERP solution should also be functionally scalable to accommodate GASB changes.

#### Process Scope

* Chart of Accounts
* General Ledger Transactions
* Internal Service Charges
* Project / Grant Tracking
* Financial Reporting

### Budget

#### Goals

The County seeks an integrated budgeting solution to manage operating, capital, and personnel budget development across the County.

Currently, budget is controlled at the line-item level. While the specific level has not yet been identified, the County intends to begin controlling at a higher level with a new ERP application. Additionally, monitoring and reporting budgets at the program level will be important for the County.

Position control is important to management, and this function is currently being done in the County’s HCM, making it a cumbersome and manual process to accurately track vacancies, understand cost savings based on open positions, and estimate position costs. The County seeks a future ERP solution that budgets and tracks authorized positions, accounts for underfilled positions adequately, and seamlessly integrates with the financial components of the ERP.

Further, the County seeks a budgeting solution that supports scenario-based analysis, allows for departments to actively participate in the budgeting process both during and outside of “budget season,” including multi-year budgeting cycles, and facilitates the development of transparent reports and outputs for internal and external stakeholders.

#### Process Scope

* Operating Budget
* Budget Monitoring / Adjustments
* Capital Improvement Plan
* Capital Budget

### Procure to Pay

#### Goals

The County recently updated its purchasing policy to better align with industry best practices, and the benefits of a modern ERP application will assist in the facilitation of this revised policy. The County envisions a solution that supports integrated contract management, solicitation management, vendor self-service functions, and rules-driven workflows for purchase requisitions and purchase orders. Additionally, there is a desire to provide more automation for expense reimbursements and management of the County’s purchasing card program.

#### Process Scope

* Vendor File
* Requisitions
* Purchase Orders
* Change Order
* P-Card
* Invitation to Bid / RFQ / RFP
* Contracts
* Receiving
* Accounts Payable

### Asset Management

#### Goals

The County tracks its capital assets in COFIS, and it requires an ERP system that tracks assets from purchase through disposition. Some assets are tracked in other systems, and while these systems may remain, it will be important for information to be shared with the ERP without the need for manual intervention. The system will also need the ability to tag and track controlled assets that may not meet the County’s capitalization threshold. Other accounting processes, such as calculating depreciation and disposition management, will also be accommodated in ERP.

The County also seeks system features to manage internal service requests, repairs and maintenance work, and appropriate cost allocation for both internal and external costs. The future vision is to establish the ERP solution as the centralized asset management record.

#### Process Scope

* Acquisition
* Asset Lifecycle
* Work Orders
* Depreciation
* Disposition
* Leases

### Customer Billing

#### Goals

The system will serve as the official accounting record for the County, so it intends to run receivables from some business units and other miscellaneous receivables through the future ERP solution. Specialized receivables systems, such as the medical billing system, will likely remain but will send summarized accounting data to the ERP solution. The County expects to be able to trace payments to open receivables, and management desires a system that can accommodate a central customer database to allow users to drill down from a customer record to the source receivable, even if the receivable is in an external application. Eventually, the County wants to use this ERP project to establish standardized receivable and billing processes that reflect best practices and that can be applied to any receivables application operating in the County.

Additionally, the County maintains multiple point-of-sale (POS) solutions, resulting in manual and redundant processes to transmit information to the financial system. Management has a strong desire to move to a uniform point-of-sale POS application that seamlessly integrates into the ERP and can also support web-based payment portals that match the look and feel of the County website.

#### Process Scope

* Customer File
* Billing
* Online Bill Pay
* Accounts Receivable
* Aging

### Treasury

#### Goals

As a county government, the County is responsible for the collection of numerous taxes and fees that are ultimately distributed to other agencies in the state. This process involves numerous steps and manual interventions, and the County expects a new system to efficiently manage the collection and disbursement of funds. Additionally, the County seeks an integrated cash reporting and forecasting tool that can pull data from various accounts and subledgers and provide reliable cash position data.

Improving and making more efficient the bank reconciliation process is also a goal for the Treasury team. Currently, it can be difficult to research payables and receivables data, and reconciling bank data requirements significant manual effort and use of external spreadsheets. Automating the reconciling process, accounting for bank adjustments in a centralized ledger, and easier access to receivables and payables data are all functions that will help achieve their vision.

#### Process Scope

* Payment Receipts
* Disbursements
* Interest Allocation
* Bank Reconciliation

### Human Resources

#### Goals

A new system must be able to maintain a comprehensive employee record system that follows the career path of an employee, supports career growth, and helps management with succession planning.

Hiring managers should have a clear view of vacancies with the ability to submit personnel requisitions with relative ease. Approvers should have a comprehensive view of the job being filled. Customer service is important to maintaining the human resources vision. Potential employees must have access to a robust recruitment system, and hiring managers and other HR staff must have intuitive tools to analyze candidates.

As new employees are onboarded, data obtained during the recruitment process should carry over into the employee record, and new employees should be guided through the onboarding process, including enrolling in employee benefits. Onboarding managers should be able to track and manage employees as they complete the process, and employee records should be updated accordingly.

As employees progress in their career, they should be assured that accurate collection of data during their evaluation, certification, and training processes. Employee self-service must allow for the updating of information, changing elections, and providing a comprehensive view of their employment history and elections, and Human Resources staff assured of data integrity through comprehensive workflow approval processes.

#### Process Scope

* Position Management
* Recruitment
* New Hire / Onboarding
* Employee File
* Benefits
* Personnel Actions
* Personnel Evaluations

### Payroll

#### Goals

Key to program budgeting and performance management is the ability to rely on complex and accurate time entry and payroll data. The County requires solutions that support labor data collection related to programs and projects, and it expects technology to support scalable and flexible solutions. County management recognizes that accurate labor data collection corresponds to user experience. The solution needs accessible time entry portals, ideally on employee preferred devices. Finally, employees should be able to access their leave balances and pay history through intuitive self-service portals.

Currently, departments use varying methods of scheduling, from formal to informal. The County is interested in exploring scheduling functionality to ensure appropriate coverage where services are provided (e.g., health clinics, jail, etc.). Any scheduling functionality should be dynamic and feed time entry.

Payroll Administrators expect a flexible and scalable solution that is capable of handling complex business rules. The solution must be able to accommodate processes without halting others (e.g., stopping processes while payroll is running), and complex transactions, such as retro pay, should be as automated as possible. When research is required, intuitive reports should be available to aid in the assessment. Adjustments and other similar transactions should be auditable.

#### Process Scope

* Time Entry
* Time Approval
* Scheduling
* Payroll Calculations
* Payroll Processing
* Deductions
* Leave Management

## Conversion Scope

The County has identified its required data conversion from legacy systems in Attachment 10 – Data Conversions. Respondents will be expected to assist the County in working with each of its legacy application vendors as part of the conversion effort. The conversions identified in Attachment 10 – Data Conversions shall be included in the price proposal.

## Interface Scope

The County will continue to rely on third-party systems and integrations to achieve its business goals once the ERP is implemented. Respondents shall support the County in developing proposed integrations to the systems identified in Attachment 11 – Interfaces. Any positive response (“Yes”) shall be considered in scope and the pricing for such integrations shall be included.

## Report Scope

The County has identified Critical Reports required for day one of go-live in Attachment 12 – Reporting. These reporting requirements can be achieved through (1) standard reports provided by Respondents, (2) the ability for users to create ad-hoc reports using no or low-code options within the proposed system, or (3) other reporting tools or dashboards in the system. The County expects that at go-live, all in-scope reports will be available for users to access.

## Implementation Scope

The tasks described below represent project tasks, activities, and completion requirements for the implementation scope. The tasks and deliverable requirements herein are for guidance purposes, and it is up to the Respondent to carefully review and meet these requirements. The County recognizes Respondents may have their own implementation methodologies, and the County encourages Respondents to propose and define their methodologies and tailor the proposed methodology to comply with the task and activity requirements as described under this section.

### Project Management Methodology

The Respondent must implement strong project management methodology practices to conform with proposed project delivery schedule. Project management activities should include:

1. Oversight for overall project guidance and direction.
2. Preparation of project status reports and meetings.
3. Management of issue tracking and resolution processes ensuring consistency and quality of project deliverables.
4. Maintaining project documentation, procedures, issues tracking process, project plan updates, developing and updating project dashboards, executing financial documents and deliverables for invoicing, preparing reports, updating project and associated spend plans, and arranging meeting logistics.

### Re-engineer Business Processes

The County evaluated its business processes and developed proposed future state business processes. However, the County also understands there may be even more efficient processes to achieve the same outcomes, so Respondents are expected to propose business process changes that achieve County outcomes based on best practices and processes germane to the software solution.

### System Design

Respondents shall use the Functional Requirements and process maps from this RFP to assist the County in developing “To-Be” business practices, and Respondents are expected to document analysis of any functional gaps and recommendations of potential solutions.

#### Configuration

Respondents shall configure the proposed solution by incorporating recommendations and approvals from the Design effort. This entails technical development work such as configuring “To-Be” business practices, including workflow configuration, report development, integrations and interfaces, data conversions, security setup, and approved configurations. The County expects the Respondent to provide knowledge transfer opportunities to the County’s project team.

#### Testing and Validation

The Respondent shall implement all system validation and fixing tasks to ensure a smooth transition for deployment. The testing strategy must address the following:

1. Roles and responsibilities for testing (Business Process Testing)
2. Unit testing
3. Integration testing
4. User acceptance testing

#### Deployment and Postproduction

In this phase, the Respondent is preparing the County for solution deployment, which includes end-user training, assessing system go-live readiness, assembling a go-live user support plan, system cutover plan, and other go-live activities.

Respondents should include a post-implementation support period to include the first period closing after go-live.

## Training Scope

Training will play a critical role in the County’s ability to successfully deploy a new ERP solution. Training shall encompass training guides for all processes, including integrations, delivery of training sessions, and training approaches for “super” users, end users, and post implementation.

# Proposal Submission Requirements

**4.0.1 General Proposal Requirements**

It is the sole responsibility of the Respondent to ensure that Proposals are accurate and free of errors, include only the items requested by this RFP, and received prior to the submission deadline. Proposals should be prepared as simply as possible and provide a straightforward, concise description of the proposed products and services to satisfy the requirements of the RFP. Attention should be given to accuracy, completeness, relevance, and clarity of content.

**4.0.2 Organization of Proposal**

Respondents must organize and present their proposal materials in the same order as presented in the Submittal Checklist and include page numbers. Proposals must be submitted in three separate submission packages that contain information consistent with the County’s evaluation process. The submission packages are:

1. Submission Package I – Primary Submission
2. Submission Package II – Submission for Blind Review
3. Submission Package III – Price Proposal

**4.0.3 Attachments**

Attachments included in this RFP are required to be completed and returned with the Respondent’s proposal. Alterations to attachments or a failure to follow the guidelines below may result in the proposal being deemed non-responsive.

1. Respondents shall not change the format or structure of attachments and shall only provide information where indicated.
   1. Microsoft Word attachments may be submitted inline within the body of the RFP response to assist in readability.
2. Respondents shall not change the file name of any attachment but may append the file name to include the Respondents name (e.g., FileName\_CompanyABC).
3. Microsoft Excel attachments should be submitted as Excel files, with a PDF copy.

## Submission Package I – Primary Submission

### Introduction

The introductory material should include a title page with the RFP name, name of the proposer, address, contact information, and the date, as well as a table of contents.

### Executive Summary

The Executive Summary should be limited to a brief narrative summarizing the proposal, including why the Respondent is best suited to complete the project for the County while helping it achieve its project goals.

### Respondent Team

This section shall also identify and provide a concise summary of the Respondent, including all firms providing software or professional services as part of this proposal. The response should highlight the Respondent’s experience delivering similar projects, including the relevant attachments.

### RFP Submittal Checklist

Complete Attachment 1 – Submittal Checklist.

### Signature Page

Complete Attachment 2 – Signature Page.

### Vendor Certification

Complete Attachment 3 – Vendor Certification.

### Respondent Statement

Complete Attachment 4 – Respondent Statement.

### Professional Services Background

Complete Attachment 5 – Profession Services Background.

### Reference Form

Complete Attachment 6 – References.

### Software Background

Complete Attachment 7 – Software Background.

### Detailed Software Products

Complete Attachment 8 – Detail Software Products.

## Submission Package II – Submission for Blind Review

The Evaluation Committee will review this submission package blind (i.e., without knowledge of the specific Respondent). Respondents should limit the use of identifying names in these responses. The procurement team will redact any identifying information before submitting it to the Evaluation Committee.

After these materials are scored by the Evaluation Committee, the scores will be assigned to the submitting Respondent.

### Functional Requirements Response

Complete Attachment 9 – Functional Requirements.

The Functional Requirements describe software and implementation scope of the overall project and the requirements for each functional area. **Responses to the Functional Requirements shall identify the scope of the configured system that will be accepted by the County as part of the project.**

The Functional Requirements are a material component of the proposal evaluation and will allow the County to determine if a Respondent can adequately support the County in meeting its project goals identified in section 3.4. Respondents should accurately reflect the ability of the proposed solution to meet a specific requirement. The inability to provide some requirements or excluding some requirements from scope may affect scoring but will NOT eliminate the proposer from contention. ***However, failure to accurately portray a software’s capability may result in disqualification****.* If Respondents are unsure or unclear on the description of a specific requirement, please send a question or request for clarification by the April 2nd deadline. The requirements responses submitted will become part of the agreement. Respondents are expected to warrant the delivery and configuration / implementation of all positive responses.

### Implementation Team Roles

Respondents shall describe their proposed project team roles and responsibilities for each resource (this does not need to include individual names but shall include specific roles on the project team and a description of responsibilities), including approximate dedication of each resource and approximate time spent on-site.

Respondents shall also complete Attachment 13 – Level of Effort.

### Implementation Approach

Respondents shall describe their implementation approach and methodology taking into account the implementation scope described in Sections 3.8 and 3.9, including any phases the Respondent proposes. This can include but is not limited to:

1. Project timeline;
2. Project milestones and associated Implementation tasks and activities;
3. Project deliverables;
4. Quality assurance measures; and
5. Knowledge transfer and training.

#### Specific Implementation Example

Respondents shall also provide, by way of example of Implementation Approach, a description of how Project Accounting would be implemented for the County.

### Project Management Expectations

Complete Attachment 14 – Project Management Expectations.

### Deliverable Expectations

Complete Attachment 15 – Deliverables Expectations.

### Data Conversions

Respondents should provide their approach to data conversions, including completing responses to the conversion requirements Attachment 10 – Data Conversions.

### Interfaces

The County has provided anticipated interfaces in Attachment 11 – Interfaces. Respondents should describe generally their approach to interface development. The interface plan proposed by the Respondent shall be included in the price proposal. The County acknowledges that additional interfaces not included in the attachment may require a change order and an additional fee.

### Reporting

Reporting is a key component of County management, and the County will rate favorably systems that have an intuitive, no- or low-code report design. Respondents shall provide narrative on their experience in report development on similar projects, as well as the Respondent’s approach to facilitating report development for clients.

Additionally, the County has identified critical reports important to the organization. Using Attachment 12 – Reporting, respondents shall identify if the reports identified by the County are in scope, as well as provide detail on additional “standard” reports available from the software. Respondents should also include the complexity of developing the report using the guide in the table below.

### System-Wide Capabilities

Complete Attachment 16 – System-Wide Capabilities.

### SAAS Solution Information

Complete Attachment 17 – SaaS Solution Information.

### Proposed Service Level Agreement

Complete Attachment 18 – Propose Service Level Agreement.

### Key Contract Terms

Complete Attachment 19 – Key Contract Terms.

## Submission Package III – Price Proposal

Respondents shall submit price proposals using the format provided in Attachment 20 – Price Proposal to reflect the total price of software, services, and any other associated fees. To ensure proper evaluation and price comparison,

1. All pricing must be submitted as fixed fee by milestone. Costs listed as “to-be-determined” or “estimated” ***will not be evaluated***. All costs and prices shall be quoted in U.S. dollars.
2. Respondents should include all software modules and state any limitations on module use. If no limitations are listed, the County will consider that pricing is based on full enterprise-wide access for the County.
3. Identify major milestones as part of the project and the associated costs to be invoiced upon completion of each milestone. Please provide a schedule of all payments necessary to complete the proposed scope. Additional details may be provided to further explain deliverable or task costs.
4. Respondents must submit implementation costs as fully loaded rates that include all necessary travel or other expenses. By submitting a proposal, all proposers acknowledge that all pricing (including travel) must be a fixed fee or included in the implementation milestones.
5. Respondents shall include any assumptions made about the price proposal and provide clarity on what actions would cause an executed contract to be delivered and a price higher than that in the Price Proposal.

# Proposal Evaluation

## Evaluation Committee

An Evaluation Committee has been established representing various departments within the County and shall convene, review, evaluate, and score all valid and responsive proposals submitted based on the evaluation criteria.

## Selection Process

The County will use the following evaluation steps:

### Compliance

Upon the closing date, a preliminary evaluation by the County may determine whether each received proposal is complete and compliant with all instructions and/or submittal requirements in the RFP. Any incomplete or non-compliant proposals may be rejected and excluded from further consideration.

### Blind Review

The Evaluation Committee will review and score the Submission Package II – Submission for Blind Review. Prior to review, GFOA and the County’s procurement team will review and redact any identifying information Respondent has identified in their response. The Evaluation Committee will score these responses based on the criteria in Section 5.3 and without knowledge of the specific Respondent.

### Preliminary Interviews and Complete Review

All Respondents submitting a compliant proposal will be invited to an initial interview with the County’s Evaluation Committee. Presentations will last 45 minutes and be conducted remotely, allowing Respondents the opportunity to highlight key features of their proposal. The Evaluation Committee will also reserve time to ask questions. Performance during the initial interview will be included as part of the evaluation.

The County will complete evaluation of the Submission Package I – Primary Response according to the criteria outlined in Section 5.3. This score will be combined with the score of Submission Package II – Submission for Blind Review and Submission Package III – Price Proposal to reach a total score. The County will then elevate a limited number of Respondents for Software Demonstrations and Interviews (Short-Listed Respondents). If any Short-Listed Respondent is unable to participate in Software Demonstrations and Interviews, or the County feels it would serve the best interests of the County, it reserves the right to elevate additional Respondents at a later date.

### Software Demonstrations and Interviews

Elevated Respondents will complete software demonstrations and interviews with the Evaluation Committee and other County SMEs. Short-Listed Respondents will receive demonstration scripts in advance of the demonstrations These scripts will highlight the functionality the Evaluation Committee and other County staff would like to see for each functional area and process and will be substantively the same for each Short-Listed Respondent. Only proposed products may be demonstrated.

Demonstrations will be conducted over 3 weeks, with the first two weeks done remotely. In these weeks, each Short-Listed Respondent will have one full day of demonstrations during the week, with each Short-Listed Respondent demonstrating the same processes. In the third week, each Short-Listed Respondent is expected to be onsite for their demonstration and interview day.

Following the demonstrations, the Evaluation Committee will score the Short-Listed Respondents and elevate a maximum of two (2) Respondents to Discovery.

### Discovery

Each Respondent elevated to Discovery will receive a Request for Clarification (RFC) letter to clarify parts of the proposal where the Evaluation Committee may have questions or concerns. Discovery sessions will consist of one or two days of on-site meetings with Respondents to address any questions or concerns and to focus on implementation issues and development of an SOW. The County expects all key project team members will be available for the Discovery sessions. The Evaluation Committee will score the Respondents and elevate one Respondent to begin negotiations.

### **Contract Award**

Upon successful negotiations, the contract for this RFP will be approved and awarded by the Board of Utah County Commissioners. The County reserves the right to negotiate price and contract terms and conditions with Respondent determined by the Evaluation Committee to represent the best value for the County to provide the requested service. If a mutually beneficial agreement with the highest-ranked Respondent is not reached, the County reserves the right to enter into contract negotiations with the next highest-ranked Respondent and continue this process until an agreement is reached.

## Evaluation Criteria

Respondents will earn a score based on either (1) a raw number (e.g., cost of ownership) or (2) a qualitative rating.

For evaluations using qualitative ratings, a Respondent will receive a score based on the following criteria:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Description | | Rating |
| Excellent | Proposal exceeds the requirements to achieve the required scope and / or project goals in most aspects. | **5** |
| Above Average | Proposal more than adequately meets requirements to achieve the required scope and / or project goals. | **4** |
| Average | Proposal adequately meets the requirements to achieve the required scope and / or project goals. | **3** |
| Below Average | Proposal meets many of the basic requirements to achieve the required scope and / or project goals but is lacking in some essential aspects. | **2** |
| Poor | Proposal fails to meet the most basic requirements to achieve the required scope and / or project goals. | **1** |
| Failure | No or insufficient information / documentation was provided to achieve the required scope and / or project goals. | **0** |

### Blind Review and Written Proposal Evaluation

For the Blind Review and Written Proposal Evaluation, the following scoring criteria will be used.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Criteria | Submission Section(s) | Maximum Points |
| Blind | | | |
| 1 | **Financial Functional Requirements** | 4.2.1 | 25 |
| 2 | **HR / Payroll Functional Requirements** | 20 |
| 3 | **Implementation Approach** | 4.2.2 – 4.2.5 | 15 |
| 4 | **Technical Requirements** | 4.2.6 – 4.2.12 | 10 |
| Unblinded | | | |
| 5 | **Vendor Capability and Experience** | 4.1.1 – 4.1.11 | 10 |
| 6 | **Total Cost of Ownership** | 4.3 | 15 |
| 7 | **Preliminary Interview** | N/A | 5 |
|  | **TOTAL:** |  | **100** |

Please note for the Functional Requirements, each process area identified in Section 3.4 will receive a score, which will be aggregated to determine a total score for the Financial and HR / Payroll Functional Requirements, respectively.

### Software Demonstrations

For Software Demonstrations, the Evaluation Committee, with input from SMEs, will rank order the Short-Listed Respondents by process area (ties are allowed).

For example, Short-Listed Respondents A, B, and C will each demonstrate Accounts Receivable, and the Evaluation Committee may rank them:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Rank |
| Respondent A | 3 |
| Respondent B | 1 |
| Respondent C | 2 |

In which case, Respondent A would receive 1 point, Respondent B would receive 3 points, and Respondent C would receive 2 points. If the Evaluation Committee thought the Respondents were all equally compelling for the demonstrated process, each Respondent would receive 3 points.

For the Software Demonstration Evaluation, the following criteria will be used.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Criteria | Maximum Points |
| 1 | **Financial Software Demonstration** | 22 |
| 2 | **HR / Payroll Software Demonstration** | 18 |
| 3 | **Technical Requirements** | 15 |
| 4 | **Implementation Interview** | 20 |
| 5 | **Compliance with Key Contract Terms (4.2.12)** | 5 |
| 6 | **Total Cost of Ownership** | 20 |
|  | **TOTAL:** | **100** |

Please note for the Financial and HR / Payroll demonstrations, each process area identified in Section 3.4 will receive a score, which will be aggregated to determine a total score for the Financial and HR / Payroll Software Demonstrations, respectively.

### Discovery

For the Discovery Evaluation, the following criteria will be used.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Criteria | Maximum Points |
| 1 | **Financial Software Demonstration** | 15 |
| 2 | **HR / Payroll Software Demonstration** | 15 |
| 3 | **Implementation Team & Approach** | 30 |
| 4 | **Compliance with Key Contract Terms (4.2.12)** | 15 |
| 5 | **Total Cost of Ownership** | 25 |
|  | **TOTAL:** | **100** |

# Terms, Conditions, and Requirements

## General

The County will award a contract in reliance upon the information contained in proposals submitted in response to the RFP. The County will be legally bound only when and if there is a definitive signed agreement with the awarded provider.

It is vitally important that any person who signs a proposal or contract on behalf of a Respondent certifies that he or she has the authority to so act. The Respondent who has its proposal accepted may be required to answer further questions and provide further clarification of its proposal and responses.

Receiving this RFP or responding to it does not entitle any entity to participate in services or transactions resulting from or arising in connection with this RFP. The County shall have no liability to any person or entity under or in connection with this RFP, unless and until the County and such Respondent shall have executed and delivered a definitive written agreement.

By responding to this RFP each Respondent acknowledges that neither the County nor any of its representatives is making or has made any representation or warranty, either express or implied, as to the accuracy or completeness of any portion of the information contained in this RFP. The Respondent further agrees that neither the County nor any of its representatives shall have any liability to the Respondent or any of its representatives as a result of this RFP process or the use of the information contained in this RFP. Only the terms and conditions contained in a contract when, as, and if executed, and subject to such limitations and restrictions as may be specified therein, may be relied upon by the Respondent in any manner having any legal effect whatsoever.

## Conflict of Interest

The Respondent certifies, through execution of the contract, that no person in the County’s employment, directly or through subcontract, will receive any private financial interest, direct or indirect, in the contract. The Respondent will not hire nor subcontract with any person having such conflicting interest.

## Costs incurred

The County will not pay for any costs incurred by any Respondent. All costs incurred in the submission, interviews, presentations, or any other activities related to responding to this solicitation are the sole responsibility of the Respondent.

# Definitions

**County** shall mean Utah County, a political subdivision of the State of Utah, as directed and managed by a majority vote of the Board of County Commissioners of Utah County.

**Finalist** shall mean a Short-Listed Respondent from the Software Demonstrations stage identified in Section 5.3.2.

**Functional Requirements** shall mean the requirements identified in Attachment 9 - Functional Requirements.

**Primary Firm** shall mean the entity taking the lead role as a Respondent in the case of a joint proposal.

**Respondent** shall mean an entity or group of entities providing a proposal to deliver the Project Scope identified in this RFP. The term “Respondent” shall include the entities’ agents, officers, employees, and partners.

**Responsive Proposal** shall mean a Respondent’s proposal submitted in response to this RFP that has met all the proposal submission requirements identified in Section 4.

**Selected Vendor** shall mean the Respondent the Evaluation Committee has evaluated, scored, and determined capable of delivering the best value for the County for the Project Scope identified in this RFP. The Selected Vendor shall be asked to enter into negotiations to deliver the Project Scope.

**Short-Listed Respondent** shall mean a top-scoring proposal from the Blind Review and Written Proposal Evaluation stage identified in Section 5.2.3.

# Attachments List

## Attachment 1 – Submittal Checklist (Submission Package I)

Please complete the Submittal Checklist to ensure all RFP components are submitted for review.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Submittal Checklist** | |  |
| **Section(s)** | **Item** | **Submitted** |
| **Submission Package I** | | |
| **4.1.1 – 4.1.3** | **Introduction, Executive Summary, and Respondent Team** |  |
| **4.1.4** | **RFP Submittal Checklist**  Attachment 1 – Submittal Checklist |  |
| **4.1.5** | **Signature Page**  Attachment 2 – Signature Page |  |
| **4.1.6** | **Vendor Certification**  Attachment 3 – Vendor Certification |  |
| **4.1.7** | **Respondent Statement**  Attachment 4 – Respondent Statement |  |
| **4.1.8** | **Professional Services Background**  Attachment 5 – Profession Services Background |  |
| **4.1.9** | **Reference Form**  Attachment 6 – Reference Form |  |
| **4.1.10** | **Software Background**  Attachment 7 – Software Background |  |
| **4.1.11** | **Detailed Software Products**  Attachment 8 – Detailed Software Products |  |
| **Submission Package II** | | |
| **4.2.1** | **Functional Requirements Response**  Attachment 9 – Functional Requirements |  |
| **4.2.2 – 4.2.5** | **Implementation Approach**  Attachment 13 – Level of Effort  Attachment 14 – Project Management Expectations  Attachment 15 – Deliverables Expectations |  |
| **4.2.6 – 4.2.11** | **Technical Requirements**  Attachment 10 – Data Conversions  Attachment 11 – Interfaces  Attachment 12 – Reporting  Attachment 16 – System-Wide Capabilities  Attachment 17 – SaaS Solution Information  Attachment 18 – Proposed Service Level Agreements |  |
| **4.2.12** | **Terms and Conditions**  Attachment 19 – Key Contract Terms |  |
| **Submission Package II** | | |
| **4.3** | **Price Proposal**  Attachment 20 – Price Proposal |  |

## Attachment 2 – Signature Page (Submission Package I)

I acknowledge that I have read and understand the RFP documents.

I hereby certify that the information submitted by the firm in response to this RFP, including pricing and other information, is true and accurate.

I understand that Utah County has the right to reject any or all proposals and to waive minor irregularities when to do so would in the best interests of Utah County.

I hereby certify that the firm is legally registered to do business in the State of Utah.

I hereby certify that the firm has paid all real and personal property taxes owed to Utah County, if applicable.

I hereby certify that the firm is independent of Utah County and is unaware of any potential conflicts of interest if it were selected to perform the requested work.

I hereby certify that I am authorized to bind the firm in a contract.

The undersigned firm having examined this RFP and having full knowledge of the condition under which the work described herein must be performed, hereby proposes that the Respondent will fulfill the obligations contained herein in accordance with all instructions, terms, conditions, and scope of requested services set forth; and that the Respondent will furnish all required products/services and pay all incidental costs in strict conformity with these documents, for the stated prices as proposed.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Submitting Firm: | | Click to enter text. | | | | | | |  | | Primary Firm | |  | | |
| Address: | | Click to enter text. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| County: | Click to enter text. | | |  | State: | Click to enter text. | |  | | Zip: | | Click to enter text. | |  |
| Authorized Representative: | | | Click to enter text. | | | | Title: | | Click to enter text. | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | |  | | Click to enter date. | | | | | |
| Signature | | | | | | |  | | Date | | | | | |

**Primary Contact for Firm**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | Click to enter text. |  | Title: | Click to enter text. |
| Email: | Click to enter text. |  | Phone: | Click to enter text. |

## Attachment 3 – Vendor Certification (Submission Package I)

*Complete 1 Vendor Certification Form per firm*

To receive full consideration, submitted proposals must contain responses to all questions. Failure to respond to all questions may result in exclusion from participation in this RFP.

STATE OF UTAH )

)SS

COUNTY OF UTAH )

Is your firm currently involved in arbitration or YES NO

litigation for any reason?

If “yes,” attach explanation.

Has your firm or any partner or officer ever been YES NO

involved in any bankruptcy action?

If “yes,” attach explanation.

Has your firm or any partner or officer ever been YES NO

listed on the Excluded Parties List System?

Are any of the Contractor’s owners, officers, employees, YES NO

or agents also employees of Utah County or related to

any employees of Utah County?

If “yes,” attach explanation.

**AFFIDAVIT**

The undersigned of lawful age, being first duly sworn, disposes and says:

That as a condition precedent to the award of the Utah County project as above captioned,

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| I, | Click or tap here to enter text. | of | Click or tap here to enter text. |

**(owner, partner, officer, or delegate)** **(firm)**

do solemnly swear that neither I, nor to the best of my knowledge any member or members of my firm or company, have either directly or indirectly restrained free and competitive bidding on this project by entering into any agreement, participating in any collusion, or otherwise taking any action unauthorized by Utah County, with regard to this contract or bidding process.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

(signature)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title: | Click or tap here to enter text. |

## Attachment 4 - Respondent Statement (Submission Package I)

By submitting a response, the Respondent acknowledges that all firms associated with the Respondent have acquainted themselves with the terms, scope, and requirements of the project based on the information contained in this RFP and any addendums. Any failure by the Respondent to acquaint themselves with available information will not relieve them from the responsibility for estimating properly the difficulty or cost of successfully performing the work available. The County is not responsible for any conclusions or interpretations made by the Respondent on the basis of the information made available by the County.

Proposals that do not acknowledge addendums may be rejected.

The following addendums have been acknowledged by the Respondent and reflected in our response.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Addendum | Initials |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Click or tap here to enter text. |  | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| **Authorized Agent Name** |  | **Title** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Click to enter a date. |
| **Authorized Agent Signature** |  | **Date** |

## Attachment 5 – Professional Services Background (Submission Package I)

Complete one form for each firm included in the proposal.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Respondent Background  Primary Firm** | | |
| Company name: |  | |
| Location of corporate headquarters: |  | |
| List location of other firm offices: |  | |
| **Firm History** | | |
| Years experience providing ERP services: |  | |
| Previous names and successor firms: |  | |
| **Current and Recent Projects** | | |
| List up to 5 current or recent projects that provided relevant experience: | 1 |  |
| 2 |  |
| 3 |  |
| 4 |  |
| 5 |  |
| What is the firm’s target market? |  | |
| What is primary lesson learned from recent projects you have adjusted for the County? |  | |
| **Size** | | |
| Number of current (new) implementation clients (past 5 years): |  | |
| Number of current upgrade clients (past 5 years): |  | |
| Number of current ongoing support clients (current): |  | |
| **Consulting Team** | | |
| Total size of consulting team: |  | |
| Proposed size of consulting team for this project: |  | |
| Average tenure with firm for proposed consulting team: |  | |

## Attachment 6 – Reference Form (Submission Package I)

Please provide at least three (3) references for past projects that include products and services similar to those proposed for this RFP and of comparable organizations. Each firm should provide one set of references.

In addition, each firm shall provide a list of all state and local government implementation clients in the last three (3) years, including client contact information.

*NOTE: Responses stating that references will be provided at a later time shall be deemed non-responsive.*

**Firm Name:** Click or tap here to enter text.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **References  Primary Firm** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reference #1** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Name of product: | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Name of client: | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Client’s employee count: | | |  | | | | | | | Client’s annual operating budget: | | | |  | |
| Contact name: | | |  | | | | | | | Contact title: | | | |  | |
| Contact email: | | |  | | | | | | | Contact phone: | | | |  | |
| **Project Scope *(check boxes for which implementation was conducted)*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Financials** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Accounts Payable | | | | |  | General Ledger | | | |  | Asset Management | | | |
|  | Accounts Receivable | | | | |  | Grant Accounting | | | |  | Inventory / Work Orders | | | |
|  | Purchasing | | | | |  | Project Accounting | | | |  | Treasury | | | |
| **Human Capital Management** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Human Resources | | | | |  | Benefits | | | |  | Time Entry | | | |
|  | Scheduling | | | | |  | Leave Management | | | |  | Payroll | | | |
| **Deployment** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | On-Premise |  | | Hosted Service | | | |  | Managed Service | | | |  | | SaaS |
| Implementation duration: | | | | |  | | | | Date of Go-Live: | | | |  | | |
| Current version of software: | | | | |  | | | | Upgrade date: | | | |  | | |
| **Describe Roll on Project:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Project Challenges:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Major Accomplishments:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **State and Local Government Implementations *(last 3 years)*  Primary Firm** | | |
| **Name of client** | **Contact name** | **Contact email** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

*Add more rows as necessary.*

## Attachment 7 – Software Background (Submission Package I)

Complete one form for each firm or major software product included in the proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Product Information** | |
| Software Product Name: |  |
| Firm Providing Software: |  |
| **Software History** | |
| Current Version of the Software: |  |
| Date of Release for Current Version: |  |
| Date of First Release of Software: |  |
| Identify any Precursor Software Products or Alternate Names for Software |  |
| **Current Version** | |
| What Were Top Five Enhancements in Current Version of the Software | 1  2  3  4  5 |
| How as Software Changed Over Previous Three (3) Years | *(Attach additional pages if necessary)* |
| Biggest Limitation of Current Software |  |
| **Third-Party Products** | |
| List any Third-Party Products embedded in the Software |  |
| List any Third-Party Products recommended for use along with the Software |  |

## Attachment 8 – Detailed Software Products (Submission Package I)

Include all software licenses proposed on the form below providing the following information:

**Software Product Name.** Provide the name of the software product as it is expected to appear on any license agreements or official product listings.

**Function.** Describe the function of the software product. If multiple software products share a similar function, be specific on role of the software and what is and is not allowed with each license.

**License Metric.** Define how the software product is licensed. If license is based on quantity, or if the cost of an enterprise license is based on metric, proposers must provide definition for the metric as it appears in contract documentation.

**Access Limitations.** Define any licensed quantities or access limitations to the proposed software.

**Dependencies.** Define any proposed or third-party products that are required to utilize the software product.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Software Product Name | Function | License Metric | Access Limitations | Dependencies |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

## Attachment 9 – Functional Requirements (Submission Package II)

(See Separate Excel Spreadsheet)

The table below defines the available responses for the requirements.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Available Responses | Definition |
| Y | Requirement met and proposed (Standard features in the generally available product) |
| Y-ND | Requirement met and proposed (Features that are not offered as a generally available product or require configurable development) |
| N | Requirement not met with proposal |

For all Y or Y-ND responses,

1. The Respondent shall indicate which module or produce that is required to meet the requirement; and
2. The requirement shall be considered in scope included in the cost proposal.

## Attachment 10 – Data Conversions (Submission Package II)

(See Separate Excel Spreadsheet)

The table below defines the available responses for the requirements. If the Respondent proposes additional items to be converted, please add them to the attachment.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Column | Available Responses | Description |
| Agree | Y / N | Respondent identifies if it can meet the conversion requirement requested by the County. Any affirmative response shall be included in the Respondent’s price proposal. |
| Estimated Consulting Hours | Number of Hours | Include the number of estimated consulting work hours to complete the conversion. |
| Comments | Text | Include any comments or assumptions relevant to the answers above. |

## Attachment 11 – Interfaces (Submission Package II)

(See Separate Excel Spreadsheet)

Respondents should indicate their plan for the interfaces using the response key below. If additional interfaces are proposed, please add them, and indicate how they will be implemented using the same key. The table below defines the available responses for the requirements.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Item | Response | Response Description |
| Interface Plan | Permanent, Temporary,  Go-Away,  Not Accommodate | Permanent – permanent interface, even after the complete ERP solution is installed.  Temporary – interface that is only required during implementation.  Go-Away – interface that is no longer required as a result of the new ERP solution.  Not Accommodate – Respondent will not accommodate this interface. |
| Experience | Y / N | Respondent should indicate if it has experience developing interfaces with the third-party solution or provider. |
| Type of Solution | C / P | C - Configurable Solution  P - Customized developed program |
| Type of Support | S  TPS  NS | S - Requirement and Feature Supported by Software Developer  TPS - Requirement and Feature Supported by Third Party  NS - Requirement and Feature Not Supported |
| Comments | Text | Include any comments or assumptions relevant to the answers above. |

## Attachment 12 – Reporting (Submission Package II)

(See Separate Excel Spreadsheet)

Respondents shall identify if the reports identified by the County are in scope, as well as provide detail on additional “standard” reports available from the software. Respondents should also include the complexity of developing the report using the guide in the table below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Item | Response | Response Description |
| Name / Description of Report | Text | Provide a brief name and description of the report if adding additional rows. |
| Standard Report | Y / N | Indicate if the report is standard to the solution (i.e., not requiring configuration or development). |
| Built Using System Reporting Tools | Y / N | Indicate if the report described can be built using standard reporting tools of the system. |
| Consulting Work Effort | High  Medium  Low | Report development / configuration (incl. testing):  High – exceeds 80 hours of work effort  Medium – between 10 and 80 hours of work effort  Low – is less than 10 hours of work effort |
| Client Work Effort |
| In Scope | Y / N | Indicate if the report development is in scope and included in the price proposal |
| Type of Support | S  TPS  NS | S - Requirement and Feature Supported by Software Developer  TPS - Requirement and Feature Supported by Third Party  NS - Requirement and Feature Not Supported |
| Comments | Text | Include any comments or assumptions relevant to the answers above. |

## Attachment 13 – Level of Effort (Submission Package II)

(See Separate Excel Spreadsheet)

Follow the instructions on the first tab of the attachment to complete the Vendor Staffing and Client Staffing tabs. For each row, please indicate the Phase, Resource Type, Role, and number of hours per week the resource is expected to be utilized during each month.

## Attachment 14 – Project Management Expectations (Submission Package II)

Please respond to each of the following questions and provide your proposed level of service and/or description of service included within your proposal for project management expectations.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Requirement** | **Response** | **Comment** |
| **Project Manger** |  |  |
| Vendor has identified project manager |  |  |
| Approximate hours/week from vendor project manager assigned to this project |  |  |
| Onsite % of project manager |  |  |
| Other projects the project manager would be assigned to |  |  |
| Typical role for project manager during project |  |  |
| **Project Plan** |  |  |
| Complete project plan is a deliverable for approval |  |  |
| Project plan includes work tasks assigned to County and/or Respondent |  |  |
| Project plan includes Project Resource Assignments |  |  |
| Project plan includes project deliverables |  |  |
| What system is project plan developed in? |  |  |
| Who has responsibility for updating project plan? |  |  |
| How is project plan status communicated? |  |  |
| **Project Meetings** |  |  |
| Frequency of project management meetings |  |  |
| Frequency of project team meetings |  |  |
| Frequency of steering committee meetings |  |  |
| **Status Reports / Issues Log** |  |  |
| Frequency of status reports |  |  |
| Tool for tracking issues / risks |  |  |

## Attachment 15 – Deliverable Expectations (Submission Package II)

Please respond to each of the following questions and provide more information about the scope of deliverables included in the proposal.

| **Requirement** | **Response** | **Comment** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Overall** |  |  |
| All deliverables will be formally approved by the County. |  |  |
| Respondent will track requirements throughout deliverables including design, test, and go-live. |  |  |
| **Knowledge Transfer** |  |  |
| Respondent provides training for project team members prior to implementation on system features. |  |  |
| Format of Respondent provided training (web, live, group, etc.). |  |  |
| Approximate length of training (per functional area). |  |  |
| Respondent provides system documentation. |  |  |
| **System Design** |  |  |
| Respondent documents business process decisions or configuration decisions as part of design process. |  |  |
| Respondent documentation includes recommendations for efficient system utilization. |  |  |
| **Build** |  |  |
| Respondent documents as-built configuration settings/code tables used in system. |  |  |
| Respondent provides use cases that can be used for testing configurations. |  |  |
| **Testing** |  |  |
| Testing plan provided as a deliverable during the project. |  |  |
| Respondent provides testing scripts during implementation based on County scenarios that can be used during upgrades. |  |  |
| Number of successful parallel payroll tests included in proposal. |  |  |
| **Go-Live** |  |  |
| Respondent provides end-user training materials. |  |  |
| Lead role (vendor/government) for delivering end-user training. |  |  |
| Format of end-user training (asynchronous, web, in-person, etc.). |  |  |
| **Project / Phase Closure** |  |  |
| Respondent provides UAT period of at least 30 days prior to go-live. |  |  |
| Length of final acceptance period after go-live. |  |  |

## Attachment 16 – System-Wide Capabilities (Submission Package II)

Please respond to the questions and statements below regarding general system capabilities.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Accessibility** |  |
| Please describe the system’s compatibility for use on mobile devices and tablets. |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Attachments** |  |
| Please describe the system’s ability to attach documents to business transactions. |  |
| Please describe the system’s ability to search for attachments within the application. |  |
| Please describe any OCR capabilities regarding attachments, including invoices. |  |
| Please describe the system’s ability to integrate with a third-party document management system to support attachments to business transactions. |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Audit** |  |
| Please describe a system administrator’s ability to select types of transaction activity to record for audit purposes. |  |
| Please describe how the system tracks transaction activity for audit purposes. |  |
| Please describe the security standards for the storage of data. |  |
| Please describe data purging capabilities. |  |
| Please describe the system’s ability to report security changes made (e.g., who made what change and when). |  |
| Please describe the system’s ability to report user capabilities (e.g., what users can enter requisitions) and status (e.g., inactive users). |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Data** |  |
| Please describe the system’s flexibility to add fields to records and transactions. |  |
| Please describe how the system supports future-dated and back-dated changes. |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Integrations** |  |
| Please describe the system’s ability to integrate and share data with other systems, including publicly available APIs (e.g., USPS address validator). |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reporting** |  |
| Please describe the standard public sector reports included with the system. |  |
| Please describe the system’s ability to develop reports from available data fields using no code/low code tools. |  |
| Please describe the system’s dashboard capabilities, including user’s ability to configure a “custom” dashboard for their view. |  |
| Please describe the system’s ability to drill down from dashboard data into detailed transaction data |  |
| Please describe the system’s ability to export reports in multiple formats, including Excel, CSV, and PDF. |  |
| Please describe any limitations in data availability for reporting (e.g., do reports use real-time data or is there a lag or delay?). |  |
| Please describe the system’s ability to share reports. |  |

| **Security** |  |
| --- | --- |
| Please describe how security / access is assigned to users. |  |
| Please describe the system’s access process (e.g., SSO, MFA, etc.). Do users need to log in multiple times to access different modules? |  |
| Please describe how the system supports the Principles of Least Privileges (PoLP) (e.g., masking social security number). |  |
| Please describe the system’s data encryption at the application level, as well as data that is at rest and in transit. |  |
| Please describe how a user’s security levels can change. Can this change be requested within the system? |  |
| Please describe how system health / availability is monitored. |  |
| Please describe how email delivery and sender confidence score is monitored to prevent system emails from being marked as spam. |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Tax** |  |
| The County collects multiple types of tax revenues and distributes all or portions of those collections to other taxing bodies. Please describe how the solution can support those efforts. |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Transactions** |  |
| Please describe how the system supports exporting, importing, and inputting of templates to enter routine, recurring, or frequent transactions, including export of template with pre-populated fields. |  |
| Please describe the system’s ability to support the uploading of transactions from third-party systems. |  |
| Please describe the system’s ability to save a transaction for later editing and posting. |  |
| Please describe the system’s ability to add notes / comments to transactions (e.g., vendor file, POs). |  |

| **Workflow** |  |
| --- | --- |
| Please describe how workflows are configured in the system, including based on transaction criteria (e.g., purchase type or amount) and the ability to set multi-level approvals. |  |
| Please describe how users are notified when an action is required of them as part of workflow. |  |
| Please describe the system’s ability to support communications within the system to reduce emails. |  |
| Please describe the system’s ability for users to view workflow status. |  |
| Please describe the system’s ability to support alternate / temporary designated approvers. |  |
| Please describe how the system supports the continuation of workflow when an approver is not responsive. |  |
| Please describe the system’s ability to send reminder notifications due to inaction of user. |  |

## Attachment 17 – SaaS Solution Information (Submission Package II)

\*Attach additional pages if necessary

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Updates** |  |
| How often is solution updated? |  |
| How much advance notice are customers provided for new updates? |  |
| How long do customers have to test new update? |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Authentication** |  |
| Does the solution support single sign on or LDAP authentication? |  |
| Does the solution support multi-factor authentication (please explain)? |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Data Center** |  |
| Where are data centers located? |  |
| Are any third-party providers used to deliver PaaS or IaaS services? If so, please list. |  |
| How many environments are proposed? |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reporting** |  |
| Does the solution contain a report writer? |  |
| Does the solution allow third party report writer access? |  |
| Does County have access to all data contained in the solution for report writing? (please list any limitations) |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Data and Security** |  |
| Please describe your information security management systems (ISMS)? |  |
| Is the solution ISO 27001 certified? |  |
| Please describe the rights and responsibilities of both parties regarding the data input, generated, or processed by the software application, including how the software provider can use the customer's data, including who retains ownership of the data entered into the system. |  |
| Data portability is important to the County to prevent data lock-in. Please describe the system’s exportable data formats, including CSV (Comma-Separated Values), Oracle, SQL, Excel spreadsheets, JSON (JavaScript Object Notation), XML (eXtensible Markup Language), or other standard formats that can be easily read and interpreted by various software applications? |  |

## Attachment 18 – Proposed Service Level Agreement (Submission Package II)

If hosting services are proposed, please complete the following table identifying proposed service level guarantees. For each service, please indicate the metric used to measure the service quality, the proposed requirement (target for service), and the proposed remedy/penalty if guarantee is not met.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Proposed Service Level Guarantees** | |  | |
| **Service** | **Metric** | **Requirement/ Guarantee** | **Remedy if Not Met** |
| System Availability (Unscheduled Downtime) |  |  |  |
| System Response (Performance) |  |  |  |
| Issue Response Time |  |  |  |
| Issue Resolution Time |  |  |  |
| Recovery Point Objective (RPO) |  |  |  |
| Recovery Time Objective (RTO) |  |  |  |
| System Data Restore |  |  |  |
| Implementation of System Patches |  |  |  |
| Notification of Security Breach |  |  |  |
| Please list other proposed service levels |  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Proposed Service Level Guarantees** |  |
| Please provide definition of metric used to calculate availability contained within contract SLA |  |
| How is performance against service levels reported to the County? |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Cyber Liability** |  |
| In the event of a cyber-incident, please define liability for the County and vendor including any proposed mitigation services provided by vendor |  |

## Attachment 19 – Key Contract Terms (Submission Package II)

Respondent shall respond to each of the following and identify Respondent’s ability to comply with the following contract terms.

| **Contract / Proposal Requirement** | **Response** |
| --- | --- |
| **Key Personnel -** The County requires assurances as to the consistency and quality of vendor staffing for its project. The County shall have the ability to interview and approve key personnel proposed by the vendor and the vendor key personnel may not be removed from the project without the County’s approval.  ***Note: This requirement only applies to consulting services.*** |  |
| **Warranty –** The Proposer will warrant that all work will be performed by an adequate number of qualified individuals with suitable training, education, and experience and that all work performed and all deliverables, including the system itself, will conform to the scope and specifications as stated in the eventual SOW, including the vendor responses to the functional requirements for a period extending no less than 45 days after final acceptance.  ***Note: This requirement only applies to consulting services.*** |  |
| **Acceptance –** Selected Vendor shall provide final acceptance period after go-live of not less than thirty (30) days to confirm that the project meets all SOW requirements. Milestone payment for final acceptance is no less than 5% of the total implementation fees for the phase.  ***Note: This requirement only applies to consulting services.*** |  |
| **Hold Harmless –** Selected Vendor shall hold harmless, defend, and indemnify County and its officers, employees, agents, and volunteers, from and against any and all liability, loss, damage, expense, costs (including without limitation costs and fees of litigation) of every nature arising out of or in connection with Selected Vendor’s performance of work hereunder or its failure to comply with any of its obligations contained in this Agreement, except such loss or damage which was caused by the sole negligence or willful misconduct of County. |  |
| **System Configuration Limits –** Selected Vendor shall consider the scope of the project defined by the County’s business process goals, functional requirements, and desire to implement the licensed software to best meet the needs of the County. The scope shall not be constrained by any configuration limits that would be necessary to achieve the project scope. |  |
| **Service Level Agreements – Selected** Vendor shall identify clear service level objectives for availability. Please refer to Attachment 15 – Proposed Service Level Agreement. |  |
| **Service Level Agreement Remedy –** Selected Vendor shall provide remedies for failure to meet service levels that includes but is not limited to refund of fees paid for service periods where the failure to meet service level objective is met. |  |
| **Fixed Fee Pricing Based on Milestones –** Selected Vendor shall provide fixed fee pricing based on milestones for all implementation services. Fixed fee pricing shall not be further limited by an hours cap on select services. |  |

## Attachment 20 – Price Proposal (Submission Package III)

(See Separate Excel Spreadsheet)