EMPORIA STATE UNIVERSITY

ADDENDUM

Addendum Date:	**December 21, 2018**
Addendum Number:	**1**
RFP Number:	**007-19**
Closing Date:	**January 11, 2018**
Procurement Officer:	Debbie Redeker
Mailing Address:	Emporia State University Purchasing Office
	1 Kellogg Circle, Box 4021, Plumb Hall 103M, Emporia, KS 66801
Telephone:	620-341-5134
E-Mail Address:	dredeke2@emporia.edu
Fax:	620-341-6770
Item:	**Budget System**
Agency:	Emporia State University (ESU)
Location(s):	Emporia, KS 66801

Questions received prior to the deadline of December 17, 2018 2:00 p.m. CST:

Question: How many users will have full access to planning capabilities and visualizations including the ability to read and write data, enter comments & annotations, upload supporting content, run actions, approve process steps, and participate in collaborations? Of those, how many focus exclusively on capital projects?
Answer: Full access to the system would be 5 Budget Office Users. Read/write access with some security parameters for High Level End Users is minimum of 60. Reporting access with some security parameters for Low Level End Users is minimum of 60. Capital projects would be the Budget Office Users and an additional 5 at max.

Question: Please elaborate on your needs for 2.2, hierarchies and validation tables.
Answer: Example: An additional department is added to banner table FTVORGN and subsequently will need to be added to the budget data tables as a valid department.

Question: Please elaborate on requirements for an integration with Cognos.
Answer: Currently our data resides in SQL server relational database and this information is reported thru Cognos using the live data or the ODS.

Question: Please elaborate on requirements for a nightly or on demand integration with your data warehouse.
Answer: We want it to run nightly or on demand to refresh data in the ODS for reporting.

Question: What integration do you anticipate being done hourly?
Answer: Example: As we process budget transfers (temporary or permanent) in the budget system we run a process in UC4(appworx) which creates GURFEED records to be posted in Banner. The goal is to only key the transfer or other salary data once in the budget system and then automatically transfer data to our ERP system (Banner).

Question: If the vendor's staff who will provide services for this RFP is located outside the US, will that preclude the University from selecting the vendor? If not, will it be a factor in vendor selection? If so, what are the considerations – time zone, US ally?
Answer: No, the location of the vendors' staff will not be a factor in our selection.

Question: How many users will view results and reports, with the added capability to explore details, approve process steps, and participate in collaborations?
Answer: Reporting access with some security parameters for High Level End Users is minimum of 60.

Question: How many of these users only require read only and/or the ability to participate in workflow (i.e. approvals)?
Answer: Read/write access with some security parameters for Low Level End Users is minimum of 60.

Question: What is the structure of the project team, specifically from business and IT perspectives?
Answer: Project team will be Budget Office Users with a max of 5, IT support 1-2 people, and the High Level End Users 2-4.

Question: What are the roles / number of team members that will be part of the project?
Answer: Project team will be Budget Office Users with a max of 5, IT support 1-2 people, and the High Level End Users 2-4.

Question: What is their anticipated level of engagement (i.e. full time, part time)?
Answer: Budget Office Users will be full-time, with part-time IT and High Level End User participation.

Question: What is the desired date for which the completed solution should be in production?
Answer: May 15, 2019 for Budget Office Users and July 1, 2019 for High Level End Users.

Question: Please describe the drivers and complexity used to determine tuition and fees.
Answer: Please refer to Section 4 item 2.9 on page 27 of the RFP with the main drivers being rates, head count, and credit hours.

Question: How many entities/departments, accounts and other business dimensions will be planned?
Answer: Approximately 250 departments; approximately 1,000 account numbers; approximately 2,250 business dimensions with multiple budget lines.

Question: Does prior year budget need to be exported from "Homegrown" system and imported into this solution?
Answer: Yes.

Question: How are expenses budgeted?
Answer: In addition to the information in Section 4 item 2.1, the University also budgets by fund position, funding source, department, natural program classification, Hegis, and expense type (account).

Question: Will this tool perform capital expense planning, and if so, are all assets loaded into planning?
Answer: We want the system to perform capital expense planning but do not plan to house our assets in the selected system.

Question: Is a balance sheet planned?
Answer: No.

Question: Is cash flow planned?
Answer: It would be a desirable component of the forecasting option.

Question: Does the university leverage rolling forecasts? If not, do you wish to?
Answer: No, but that would be a desirable option.

Question: What data / business processes currently reside in Hyland OnBase that would need to be integrated with the future Budget System?
Answer: Appointment process.

Question: How are new initiatives planned / requested during the budget process (e.g., timing of requests, types of requests)?
Answer: It is ongoing throughout the fiscal year.

Question: What is the anticipated timeline with regard to desired go-live dates?
Answer: May 15, 2019 for Budget Office Users and July 1, 2019 for High Level End Users.

Question: Is a phased go-live approach possible for the different planning processes?
Answer: Yes.

Question: Are there any competing projects/implementations that would delay either IT or Budget Office support of this project?
Answer: Nothing significant anticipated at this time.

Question: Are you anticipating including a dedicated project manager or project lead to provide consistent and constant contact throughout the project?
Answer: Yes.

Question: With new initiatives, is the desired behavior to roll budgets into the operating budget planning process? Are multi-year initiatives intended to impact multiple budgets, or would they be incorporated into a forecasting process instead?
Answer: Yes to all.

Question: Would departments be submitting initiative requests throughout the year or just during the budgeting process?
Answer: Throughout the year.

Question: Can you explain "automatic temporary journal entries between particular accounts without approval or end user action" in great detail?
Answer: For example, we have a pooled salary position available to hire temporary employees and/or pay overloads to permanent employees. The pooled salary position budget is established on an account code for temporary employees. If used to pay an overload for a permanent employee the account number would need to be changed. Currently this transfer occurs automatically and does not flow through our formal transfer process.

Question: Can you elaborate on the desired behavior with encumbrances as listed on page 25?
Answer: The available balance should be the net of encumbrances for all expense types, and when an encumbrance is paid it is removed.

Question: What is the current state of your position control, and will that management be changed in any way by the chosen solution?
Answer: The Budget Office maintains position control and we do not foresee this changing.

Question: Can you explain "ability to track and monitor overtime" as described on page 26 in the HR section? Is this a reporting desire?
Answer: Currently we do not have a mechanism to track overtime usage by departments. This is a feature we want to see in the system.

Question: When looking at multi-year forecasting, is it intended to be a driver-based expansion of the budgeting process or a standalone module?
Answer: The optimum solution would include a driver-based expansion of the budgeting process.

Question: Contract Materials. The successful supplier will be required to enter into a written contract with ESU. That contract must contain the terms and conditions in ESU-146a, which can be incorporated or attached to the contract. Can the bidder submit a template of its standard contract for ESU review? Or does ESU prefer redline edits to the terms and conditions found in the Proposal?
Answer: ESU has a standard contract template which incorporates the RFP, addendums, and the supplier's proposal. The ESU-146a provisions are not negotiable. The bidder may submit a template of its standard contract for ESU review if it wishes clauses to be included in the negotiation of a contract.

Question: <u>Proprietary Materials and Submission of Response</u>. The RFP instructions state that all information requested to be handled as "Proprietary" be submitted separately from the main proposal and clearly labeled, in a separate envelope or clipped apart from other documentation. Our company provides proprietary software solutions. Our RFP response contains substantial proprietary information and trade secrets. As such, it will be difficult for us to segregate the Proprietary information from the RFP response in a way that let's ESU review our response in a fluid, streamlined, and cohesive way when compared to other bidders who may not disclose trade secrets (or proprietary information) in their RFP responses. What recommendations or best practices can ESU recommend or provide for similarly situated bidders?

Answer: If the proprietary information included in the response is clearly indicated, it does not have to be provided as a separate proposal. If proprietary information is included in the technical response, please mark the pages which contain proprietary information as "Proprietary." In the case that someone requests copies of the proposals under the Kansas Open Records Act, the proprietary information will be excluded from the response. Please note in Section 1 - Instructions in the 2nd paragraph of item 11., the cost proposal is not considered proprietary, nor can the entire proposal be marked as proprietary.

Question: <u>Response Submission</u>. Could you please verify the type of response submission that is required?

Answer: Please refer to Supplier Response Checklist on page 7 and Section 2-Proposal Response located on pages 12-13. First preference would be to submit through ESU's e-Bidding Portal (Vendor Registry). If the submission does not work, it can be emailed to purchaseorders@emporia.edu or sent hard copy (1 original and 4 copies) through the mail. If the response is mailed, allow ample time for delivery as late proposals are <u>not</u> considered.

Question: <u>Tax Clearance Certificate</u>. We are not registered to charge or collect State of Kansas tax. So, we believe that we are not required to submit the Tax Clearance Certificate because it's not applicable to us. Can you please confirm?

Answer: Please refer to Page 5 of the RFP document. Due to the projected proposal cost, a Tax Clearance Certificate will be required. Failure to provide this information may be cause for rejection of supplier bid or proposal.

Grants: Section 4 item 2.11 states that the University <u>requires</u> a grant management system. Instead the University **prefers** a grant management system. Absent a formal grant management system, we answered the questions below to the best of our ability.

Question: Do you currently have a grant management system in place? If so, what do you use and how is grant funding currently being managed?

Answer: We do not have a formal grant management system in place. Currently grant activity is managed using EXCEL spreadsheets.

Question: How are grants currently being tracked? One grant per project? Do multiple grants support a project? Does one grant support many projects?

Answer: One grant per project.

Question: Where are grant budgets being tracked at this time? Excel? Another source?

Answer: EXCEL.

Question: How much funding is being managed as a grantee? As a grantor?

Answer: Approximately $1,800,000 as a grantee, $50,000 as a grantor.

Question: How many awards are being managed as a grantee? As a grantor?

Answer: Approximately 40 as a grantee, and 10 as a grantor.

Question: Is the desire to plan and create pre-award activities, budget tracking for post-award, or both pre-award and post-award?

Answer: Post award (some pre-award activities planning could be useful).

Question: Would you like your grant management system to identify new funding opportunities?

Answer: We would be interested in knowing more.

Question: Can you describe the current process for managing projects over fiscal years?
Answer: Annual budgets are established, expenditures and revenues are tracked, and appropriate reports made. At the end of the grant year, the accounts are balanced and any funds not spent are carried over to the next grant year, if allowable. New EXCEL sheets are started for each new grant year.

Question: How are grant revenues and expenditures currently tracked?
Answer: They go through an approval process through OnBase, then recorded in EXCEL files in the Research and Grants office.

Question: What system, if any, are you using to track sub-awards/programs?
Answer: None other than EXCEL.

Question: How many sub-awards/programs are released throughout the year?
Answer: ESU is the sub-awardee on four grants currently.

Question: Is there a standardized intake process/application across them all or are they each unique? If unique, would you consider standardizing for efficiency?
Answer: They are essentially standardized.

Question: How many internal users do you anticipate?
 Answer: 2-3 internal users for grants, not including PI's.

Question: How many of these users will also be using the budget system?
Answer: 2-3 internal users for grants, not including PI's.

Question: How many departments will use the system?
Answer: Reporting access with some security parameters for Low Level End Users is minimum of 60.

Question: What is the timeline to have the grant management system live?
Answer: Grant management system is not the priority, it could be delayed in implementation.

Question: When will the first application for sub-awards be released for programs managed under the new grants management system?
Answer: Grant management system is not the priority, it could be delayed in implementation.