

**ADDENDUM 1**  
**Issued May 14, 2019**  
**To**  
**State of Washington**  
**Office of Financial Management**  
**One Washington**  
**ERP Expert Advisor Services**  
**OFM 19-400**

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

The following questions in this document were received on or before the due date and time for submission of written questions related to the ERP Expert Advisor Services competitive procurement.

1. Question: What is the estimated cost of the Enterprise Resource Planning project?

Answer: Since program inception in the 13-15 biennium, and in making assumptions about total cost of implementation for a SaaS ERP tool through the state's FY26, we have estimated costs to be approximately \$500mm. Note that this is not inclusive of agency costs for preparedness activities. Also note that some budget estimates do not factor in recent efficiencies in the ERP market. To sum up, the state is highly interested in reviewing previous estimates based on what is currently happening in this space and how the state should calculate any ROI.

2. Question: Has the Department allocated funding for the ERP yet? If so, through which source (budget, CIP, state/federal grant etc.)?

Answer: Funding has not been allocated for the ERP solution at this time. One Washington is in planning and readiness stages to better ensure that the state of Washington reaps the benefit of the solution chosen. The recently concluded Legislative session did result in approximately \$18mm being provided for One Washington readiness activities.

3. Question: What is the estimated time frame in which the selected vendor would release the solicitation for the ERP solution?

Answer: While there are plans to release a procurement for an ERP solution in the next biennium, the contractor that is awarded a contract from this procurement will not conduct that procurement. Rather, they will provide expert advice to the One Washington Program as it prepares to acquire an ERP solution.

4. Question: Can the Department elaborate on any additional drivers behind this acquisition that may not be addressed in the RFI?

Answer: To clarify, this is a competitive procurement (CP) which will result in a contract award rather than an RFI (Request for Information) which would not result in a contract award. The drivers behind the acquisition are articulated in the CP document and on the One Washington website at <https://ofm.wa.gov/about/special-initiatives/one-washington>.

5. Question: Who is the technical contact and/or project manager for the ERP?

Answer: The contact for the ERP is Matthew Meacham, One Washington Program Director.

**Reminder:** Any questions related to this procurement, regardless of the nature, should be sent to the CP Coordinator set forth in Section 2.1 *Competitive Procurement Coordinator*.

6. Question: Does the Department anticipate any professional or consulting services may be needed to accomplish this effort? (i.e. project planning/oversight, PM, QA, IV&V, staff augmentation, implementation services etc.)? If so, what services does the Department desire and how do they anticipate procuring?

Answer: Major activities for the 2019-21 biennium are described in Section 1.4.1 Future Planned Activities of the CP. Known procurements are noted in this section. One Washington currently has contracts in place for Quality Assurance and for IT Project Management services. It is possible that One Washington will need any or all of the services noted in the question. Exactly what and when is to be determined at this time. All procurements are subject to, and OFM will follow, Washington state procurement law and policy when procuring any goods or services.

7. "Only Proposals where Bidders certify leadership of at least three ERP implementations, preferably including an enterprise level deployment for ten or more departments or agencies, in the last ten years will be eligible for evaluation."

Question: Please clarify your definition of implementation. Do you consider upgrades of ERP applications as implementations since many of the upgrades have many elements of an implementation?

Answer: Yes, we will consider large scale upgrades as implementations, provided that the bidder can demonstrate a level of complexity that applies to what Washington will be doing. For example, upgrading an enterprise's core HR and Finance functions to a new/significantly enhanced platform may be applicable. Primarily, we are looking for significant, specific experience with large, complex implementations.

8. Question: Any references provided going forward, would they need to be from the 3 implementations described or can they be any related customer reference?

Answer: Bidders are encouraged to provide references that can speak specifically to their relevant experience providing services described in the CP.

9. Question: Was there a vendor that assisted you with the development of this RFP? If so, is that vendor able to respond to this RFP?

Answer: This competitive procurement was not developed by a vendor.

10. Question: Is there an existing vendor that is providing you with any kind of ERP implementation related services at the moment?

Answer: No. An ERP solution has yet to be procured therefor, ERP implementation services will be acquired at a future date.

11. Question: What ERP is the state currently using now? Which vendor is the ERP from?

Answer: The state's current infrastructure is described in Section 1.6 *Legacy Systems and Process Environment* of the competitive procurement.

12. Page 37, Section 4.1, Minimum Qualifications of the ERP Expert Advisor Services Firm, note that only Proposals where Bidders certify leadership of at least three ERP implementations will be eligible for evaluation. However, Section 4.2.1 Bidder Overview, states the bidder should include "... A description of the ERP implementation or advisory services offered...", which appears to recognize that advisory services experience or implementation experience would be of equal value. The requirement in Section 4.1 may exclude bidders with substantial executive level ERP advisory experience who have provided services similar in scope to those requested by OFM.

Question: Would OFM consider altering the requirement in section 4.1 to state: Therefore, only Proposals where Bidders certify having provided leadership or executive advisory services for at least three ERP implementations, preferably including an enterprise level deployment for ten or more departments or agencies, in the last ten years will be eligible for evaluation.

Answer: No, we will not alter the requirement, however, OFM is seeking advice from an individual or individuals who have practical, on the ground experience in implementing ERP solutions and providing expert advice based on that experience. The advisor must be able to provide insightful, guidance on the fundamentals and nuances of ERP implementations to ensure that, wherever possible, the process of procuring and implementing an ERP Solution for the Washington enterprise is as streamlined and effective.

13. **Page 5 Section 1, Introduction**, notes that "... The ERP Expert Advisor Services firm must be an independent consulting firm that does not sell hardware or software, and does not represent ERP vendors in any way". This requirement may exclude bidders who sell software not related to the ERP, Accounting or HCM market space and who have provided services similar in scope to those requested by OFM.

Question: Would OFM consider altering Section 1 to state: The ERP Expert Advisor Services firm must be an independent consulting firm that does not sell hardware or software related to the ERP market space or Accounting / HCM solutions, and does not represent ERP vendors in any way"?

Answer: Thank you for pointing this out. Yes, we will make this modification. Please refer to Addendum 2 to this competitive procurement for the specific change.

14. Question: Regarding RFP Section 2.26, Format of Proposals and Proposal Contents, can the State provide a list of the RFP sections that it expects to be included for each required separate submission as identified in Section 2.26?

Answer: Please refer to Appendix G Proposal Submission Checklist. This is a courtesy listing to support Bidder's in completing their response and should help with this question. To address how to separate documents the following is provided as guidance/clarification:

Hard Copy Submittal: All items listed, per instructions.

Electronic Submittal:

- 1) Administrative Requirements: Section 2. *Administrative Requirements*, provide answers to all items under this heading
- 2) ERP Expert Advisor Services Requirements Response: **for clarification**, include items in Section 3 *Scope of Work* and Section 4. *ERP Expert Advisor Services Requirements*
- 3) Price Proposal: Section 4.3 *Pricing Proposal*, as instructed in this section.

15. Question: RFP Section 4.2.6 states, “Bidder must respond to Appendix C, SOW 1: ERP Expert Advisor Services as part of its submission, to include the methodology and approach for each deliverable.” In addition the items denoted in red text within Appendix C, does the State also expect the bidder to include its methodology and approach within the response to Appendix C?

Answer: Yes, please provide the specific methodology and approach for the services proposed under SOW 1.

16. Question: Both Section 4.2.6 and 4.3.1 state that Bidders must complete and include Appendix C, SOW 1: ERP Expert Advisor Services to respond to those two sections, respectively. Does the State expect two duplicate versions of the Bidder’s response to Appendix C, SOW 1: ERP Expert Advisor Services since the price proposal is required to be separate from the rest of the RFP response (i.e., one version without pricing and a separate version with pricing included)?

Answer: Please provide the response to SOW1 in the ERP Expert Advisor Services Requirements Response (pricing may be deleted in this one) and separately in the Pricing Proposal.

17. Question: Within Appendix C, SOW 1: ERP Expert Advisor Services, regarding Contractor Staff Locations, any additional proposed staff appear to include the assumption that these staff will be “Collocated onsite with the One Washington project team in Olympia, WA for a minimum of four (4) days a week.” Will the State allow for the flexibility of additionally proposed staff and their roles to include either part-time (e.g., less than 4 days a week), periodic (e.g., 1 week per month), and/or offsite participation in SOW 1 activities to achieve economy in the delivery of SOW 1 services?

Answer: OFM has the option to negotiate this requirement on a case by case basis when it is in the best interest of the state’s business requirements. At this time, the requirement stands.

18. Question: Page 43 of 52; Section 4.3.2 Rate Card and Appendix G - Rate Card Response Template Offerors are required to provide an hourly rate for each position. For companies who do not serve clients on an hourly or cost reimbursable basis and do not have individual hourly rates available, can OFM please confirm it will allow offerors to propose alternate rate structures such as all-inclusive weekly team-based rates to support firm-fixed price projects for the work to be performed?

By allowing weekly team rates, OFM will be able to calculate the monthly cost of services requested for SOW1 and subsequent SOWs under this agreement.

Answer: No. Our evaluation method requires an hourly rate. In order to compare pricing during the evaluation process we will require hourly rates as indicated in the CP.

19. Question: Appendix B – Sample Contract, Appendix C SOW1; Pricing Details: Staffing

Can OFM please confirm it will allow a Firm-Fixed Price offered using weekly team rates (instead of individual staff hours and individual hourly rates) in the SOW1 Pricing Details for Staffing, and in subsequent SOWs under this Agreement? By performing on a firm fixed priced basis, this provides price certainty to OFM while guaranteeing performance and shifting risk to the contractor.

Answer: No. Our evaluation method requires an hourly rate. In order to compare pricing during the evaluation process we will require hourly rates as indicated in the CP. Further, the fixed monthly price noted in the SOW 1 is expected to be based on the hourly rates for staff at the requisite level of experience.

END OF QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS