



October 4, 2016

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Information Technology RFP 1702 PeopleSoft Time Card Project and Talent Acquisition Management Project

ADDENDUM #1

The City of Springfield is hereby amending the above mentioned RFP. The original document can be found on the City's website at www.springfield-or.gov. By selecting the hyperlink *Purchasing/Contracts* from the menu on the left side of the home page, interested parties will be linked to the RFP/ITB page.

The following are the questions asked and answered at the Optional Meeting held September 22, 2016 at 2:00 p.m.

1. **Question:** Is the Talent Acquisition Management /Candidate Gateway Module (TAM/CG) currently implemented?

City's Response: No, IT and Human Resource staff began the implementation process a few years ago but it was not completed. It currently is being built in a test environment. The city is looking for a supplier to help implement TAM/CG 9.1.

2. **Question:** Did the city use outside help to implement TAM/CG thus far?

City's Response: No.

3. **Question:** What is the city currently using for talent acquisition?

City's Response: The city currently uses "Project A" out of Ashland, Oregon.

4. **Question:** What are the main challenges?

City's Response: For the Timecard project, main challenges include adapting the timecard system to support actual accounting of Priority Based Budgeting and support recent changes to the general ledger account structure resulting from the implementation of a new budgeting system (BOARD). For the TAM/CG project, main challenges include improving the applicant's online experience when applying for a position at the City, providing enhanced means of tracking recruitment information within the city, and helping staff with the implementation

5. **Question:** For the Timecard project who will be making the decisions on replacement or update the module?

City's Response: Collaboratively both the city and the supplier will look at the functionality and then decide what is the best fit and value to the city.

6. **Question:** Is the city open to having a supplier to work remotely?

City's Response: Yes, so long as it provides cost efficiencies and adequately supports the project.

7. **Question:** Must the supplier be licensed to do business in the State of Oregon?

City's Response: If a proposer isn't registered in the State of Oregon to business when they submit their proposal that is ok but if selected they will have to be registered before the contract is executed.

8. **Question:** What is the level of PeopleSoft expertise amongst the IT staff?

City's Response: The city has been supporting PeopleSoft internally since 1998 in areas such as administration, programming and database administration.

9. **Question:** What talent does IT have available for support on these projects?

City's Response: IT has project managers, system administrators, database administrators, programmer analysts; network analysts and network security manager available for support. Outward facing security management for PeopleSoft TAM/CG is new to the City.

10. **Question:** What is the start date of the projects?

City's Response: The city lists in the RFP November 1, 2016 as the start date.

11. **Question:** What is the budget? Is there a budget range or cap?

City's Response: Not at this time is there a range or cap. Some funds have been set aside for the project's but not sure what is anticipated.

12. **Question:** Who wrote the original timecard code?

City's Response: A Lane County programmer developed the code for the county and then used it as a base to implement it at the city with customizations for our business needs.

13. **Question:** Are the staff employee's fulltime or do you use outside contractors for support of these projects?

City's Response: The staff is all fulltime employees and we do not use outside contractors to support these functions. This RFP is for those outside contractors to support these two projects.

14. **Question:** How is eLog integrated within the current PeopleSoft timecard implementation?

City's Response: eLog was written by a City of Eugene IT staff for firefighter's rosters. Currently, the city of Eugene exports information from eLog and the City of Springfield imports the data into the city timecard system.

15. **Question:** Does anything change with how eLog works for the timecard project?

City's Response: Yes, with the addition of the new budget structure the export and import routines will need to be modified to accommodate the new GL account string structure and changes to accommodate PBB. Eugene will be changing the export portion from eLog Roster.

16. Question: The PeopleSoft Financials upgrade from 9.1 to 9.2 or the HCM upgrade from 9.1 to 9.2 in 2017/2018 is not a part of this project?

City's Response: Correct.

17. Question: After today can we continue to ask questions?

City's Response: Yes, the RFP timeline provides questions to be asked until October 7, 2016 noon local time.

18. Question: Is there an incumbent PeopleSoft provider?

City's Response: No.

19. Question: For the timecard project with the PeopleSoft bolt-on tools could the budget range be \$150,000 to \$200,000 range for the replacement?

City's Response: No. The city's preferred option is to make changes to the current system to accommodate the general ledger account structure change and dependent interfaces. The City seeks the most economical path to implement the new business requirements, and considerations of a new system would be dependent upon overall cost to make changes to the existing system.

20. Question: Would the city consider a non-Microsoft SQL?

City's Response: The city will stay with Microsoft SQL.

In the event that it is necessary to further amend, revise or supplement any part this ITB, additional addenda will be posted on the City's website at <http://www.springfield-or.gov> (select the **Purchase Contracts** hyperlink and RFP 1702 PeopleSoft Timecard and Talent Acquisition Management Projects Addendum #1). As stated in the original solicitation, City will make a reasonable effort to provide the addenda to all Proposers to whom City provided the initial RFP. This addendum shall be considered part of the specification of the RFP. The City is not responsible for any explanation, clarification, interpretation or approval made or given in any manner except by written addenda issued by City.

ALL BIDDERS SHOULD ACKNOWLEDGE AND INCLUDE THIS ADDENDA #1 AS PART OF THEIR SUBMITTAL PACKAGE.