

RFP: 2024-0816

Enterprise Resource Planning Software and Implementation Services

All interested parties had the opportunity to submit questions in writing by email to Thuch.Mam@federalwaywa.gov by August 28, 2024. The answers to the questions received are provided below and posted to the City's website at www.federalwaywa.gov/bids. This information IS NOT considered an addendum. Respondents should consider this information when submitting their proposals.

QUESTION 1: Where can I obtain a copy of the main RFP and the rest of the attachments for the project?

ANSWER 1: The RFP and accompanying documents can be found at www.federalwaywa.gov/bids.

QUESTION 2: You listed the need for 130 named users and 85 Concurrent Users. We have several user types and to provide the most appropriate and accurate cost information, having quantities for each of the user types listed below would be very helpful.

General Users

Payroll Users (which include Self-Service User functionality)

Planning & Budgeting users

ANSWER 2: General Users: 85
Payroll (Timekeeping) Users: 744
Payroll (Processing) Users: 10
Planning & Budgeting users: Approximately 50

QUESTION 3: Would the City consider a due date extension of two weeks for proposals?

ANSWER 3: No

QUESTION 4: In reading the bid description, it sounds like we would complete the requirements template in Section 6 for the relevant functionality and submit per the instructions contained in Section 5 of the RFP?

ANSWER 4: Response should include two documents; the first is a pdf file that contains all sections as outlined in the Vendor Instructions of Section 5, page 9. The second is a completed ERP Software Requirement in MS Word format which can be found at www.federalwaywa.gov/bids.

QUESTION 5: As we assess the City's needs and consider preparing a proposal, we believe that implementing SAP software would be the most effective solution to replace the multiple systems currently in use. SAP offers a comprehensive, scalable, and robust platform that aligns well with the long-term goals of the City. However, we understand that this would require the City to purchase the SAP software as well as the necessary licensing. Once purchased, we would be able to help implement the systems and provide support/maintenance.

Before we proceed with a formal bid, we would like to confirm whether the City is open to this approach. Understanding your position on this matter will help us tailor our proposal to meet the City's expectations and ensure we provide the best possible solution.

ANSWER 5: This approach can be considered; all bids will be scored as outlined in RFP.

QUESTION 6: Does the City prefer either/or

- a. Centralized cashiering process where all payments, like Amanda, are made through one software with real-time, bi-directional integration back to other software
- b. Decentralized where each department/software records their own payments and updates the financial system? If the City would like to move to a centralized cashiering approach, can you list the applications that you would like the new cashiering application to take payments for.

ANSWER 6: The City is open to either approach as long as the centralized method includes development support for the integration for each of the applications. The applications needed are: AMANDA, RecTrac, PetHealth/PetPoint, CLASS (Active Networks, NOT ActiveNET, the old on-premise version), NCR Silver, MyBuildingPermit (PayPal PayProFlow), Municipal Court Applications (JIS – Washington State AOC & ACI Payments).

QUESTION 7: Would the City provide us with the total number of users, including supervisors, that will be accessing only the new Cashiering/POS module? This would be based on receiving payments for the Financial A/R system, miscellaneous payments and any users associated with the answer above. (Note that read-only users and daily departmental revenue submitters are no charge).

ANSWER 7: In the City's current decentralized structure, there would be a total of 15.

In a centralized cashiering approach, there would be considerably more, upwards of around 50.

QUESTION 8: Can the City list the current POS equipment and model you would like the Cashiering solution to integrate with or would the City like additional POS equipment to be included in the RFP response (receipt printers, scanners, cash drawers, check imaging/MICR devices, encrypted credit card swipe and EMV/chip/tap-to-pay devices)?

ANSWER 8: The City is looking to replace all existing equipment with new, **fully supported**, equipment from the selected vendor.

QUESTION 9: What credit processors is the City currently using?

ANSWER 9: Elavon, ACI Payments, CardPointe Card Connect, PayPal PayFlowPro, Bluefin.

QUESTION 10: Would the City like the new cashiering solution to become the City's Online Customer Payment Portal? If so, what applications would the City like to take online payments for?

ANSWER 10: This would be a nice to have, but probably out of scope for the current project. This would be a phase 2 if considered.

QUESTION 11: Would the City like the cashiering solution to create an Image Cash Letter (ICL) containing check images for deposit, and send it to your bank? If so, what bank?

ANSWER 11: Yes, KeyBank.

QUESTION 12: Does the City have a multi-check scanning process in place for recording checks and invoices in batch? If not, should this be included in the response? What is the annual volume that the City would scan using this process?

ANSWER 12: We don't currently. This is not a requirement, please include as an option if you wish. We believe this is a low volume.

QUESTION 13: Does the City have scenarios where different departments/agencies need to submit end of day receipt summary information? If so, would the City like to automate that?

ANSWER 13: Yes, and yes.

QUESTION 14: Are you interested in considering options for CIS, a customer engagement portal, and field service? Our API-first approach means that while we often partner with Workday for ERP implementations, we also can integrate easily with any VOC for the City of Federal Way.

If not now, do you have plans in the future to modernize, streamline, and futureproof on the utility billing side?

ANSWER 14: The City would need additional information in order to determine whether this would be included in the scope of this project per the RFP.

Utility billings are performed by King County and that service will remain with the County.

QUESTION 15: Could you indicate what your budget range is for this project?

ANSWER 15: The City does not yet have a firm budget for this project as the cost will be one of many factors that will be considered.

QUESTION 16: Will the vendor's proposal response be considered final, and non-negotiable, or will there be opportunity to discuss the contract with the city, and negotiate, upon short-listing or award of the bid?"

ANSWER 16: Yes, there will be opportunity to review/redline documents provided by vendors as part of the contract package. Additionally, vendors maybe asked to provide any exceptions to what has been provided in the RFP.

QUESTION 17: Would the City consider extending the question period by one week?

ANSWER 17: The questions deadline will not be extended in order to meet the timeline in the RFP.

QUESTION 18: Pricing should be comprehensive including all taxes and available discounts. Please confirm the pricing needs to include taxes.

ANSWER 18: Pricing can either include or not include taxes. We ask that respondents are clear on their preferences in their proposals.

QUESTION 19: Does the City prefer a Fixed Fee or Time & Materials contract for implementation?

ANSWER 19: The City is open to either options, but ask that respondents be clear on their preferences in their proposals.

QUESTION 20: Based on your timeline, we understand you intend to start March 2025 and want all systems live by 1/1/2027. Does the city have a preference for HCM or Financials to be live first?

ANSWER 20: The City does not have a preference, but Financials must be live on January 1, 2027.

QUESTION 21: Has the City been in contact with other vendors prior to the release of this RFP? If so please list.

ANSWER 21: No, the City had not been in contact with vendors prior to the release of the RFP.

QUESTION 22: Can the City provide the number of users broken down:

Advanced Users – Those that would have admin rights

Core Users – everyday users

ANSWER 22: Advanced Users: 15

Core Users: 85