



CITY OF WORCESTER, MASSACHUSETTS



Administration & Finance
Purchasing Division
455 Main Street – Room 201
Worcester, MA 01608
(508) 799-1220
www.worcesterma.gov

October 2, 2020

To All Bidders:

Subject: RFP NO.: 7462-W1 Request for Proposals for Software and Implementation Services for an Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Software Systems Environment

ADDENDUM NO. 1

To Whom It May Concern:

With reference to our proposal request relative to the above subject, please refer to the changes/modifications/clarifications to the original request.

Please find below questions received prior to the September 29, 2020 Pre-Proposal Teleconference and responses from the City.

1. Question: How many employees will be using the timekeeping functionality of the new system, for licensing purposes?

City Response: The City Schools Department is currently in the process of deploying TimeClockPlus for Transportation staff, on a pilot basis, with the option of deploying this product more fully across other School Department staff. As part of this RFP process the City and Schools are interested in more fully understanding the available options in the marketplace, including solutions that may be available for both the Schools and general City Departments. If the City and Schools were to select a new system through this RFP process, it is estimated that approximately 7,500 employees would use timekeeping in a new system. If the City were to select a new system, and the Schools adopt use of TimeClocksPlus beyond a trial basis, the remaining City Departments would have around 2,900 employees using timekeeping functionality.

2. Question: How many employees will need advanced shift scheduling functionality (e.g. shift swaps, minimum staffing policies, rules-based hiring, etc.), for licensing purposes?

City Response: Please see also the response to Question #1 in this addendum for information related to the pilot of TimeClockPlus. The City would estimate that 500 staff in the School Department may use advanced shift scheduling, and 1,500 City staff from other departments may use advanced shift scheduling.

3. Question: Would the City sign a Non-Disclosure Agreement, allowing our firm to submit confidential information as part of the proposal?

City Response: Yes, the City will consider such requests. Please submit any such requests to the attention of the City Purchasing Director along with a justification in support of any such request for review.

4. Question: Would the City consider a six (6) week extension on the proposal submittal deadline?

City Response: The City is not willing to consider such a request at this time. The City remains committed to following a thorough process for the evaluation and selection of a vendor to partner with, and doing so with the goal of having a final executed contract in place this calendar year. In order to support this goal, the City is unable to grant an extension of six (6) weeks on the proposal submittal deadline.

A Pre-Proposal Vendor Teleconference was held on September 20, 2020 at 2:00 pm (EST). The Pre-Proposal Teleconference was facilitated by the City and the City's consulting partner, BerryDunn, and included participation by numerous City staff. The Pre-Proposal Vendor Conference was held via teleconference.

Attendance at the Pre-Proposal Vendor Teleconference was **not** mandatory.

The following vendors identified themselves as being in attendance via phone:

Accenture Consulting	GuideHouse	RE Partners
Applications Software Technology LLC (AST)	IBM	Tyler Technologies
CherryRoad Technologies Inc.	Kronos	WorkDay
Collaborative Solutions	Oracle	
GovSense	Phoenix Business Inc.	

Please find below questions received during the September 29, 2020 Pre-Proposal Teleconference and responses from the City.

5. Question (Pre-Proposal Teleconference): Will the City be releasing one addendum after the close of the question period, or, will there be interim addenda issued?

City Response: The City expects to release another addendum (or addenda depending on the volume of questions) following the issuance of this addendum #1. The timing of any such addendum #2 will be dependent on the receipt of any further questions.

6. Question (Pre-Proposal Teleconference): During the City's Project Introduction, it was mentioned that there are two other RFPs issued – one for Utility Billing and one for Tax – how are these two RFPs related to the ERP RFP?

City Response: The City has issued three separate RFPs, each of which will be evaluated independent of the other, related to upgrading the current City software systems environment. This includes RFP 7461-W1-RFP (ERP); RFP 7479-W1-RFP (Tax Billing); RFP 7480-W1-RFP (Utility Billing). The City primarily uses a single software solution (Hera) to support each of these functional areas. Through this ERP RFP, and each of the two other aforementioned RFPs, the City is looking to understand the ability of vendors to integrate with other software solutions to facilitate the exchange of information. Specific areas have been identified in the RFP Attachments for vendors to identify other software solutions they have previously integrated with, and to discuss the proposed overall plan to integration development.

Please find below questions received following the September 29, 2020 Pre-Proposal Teleconference and responses from the City.

7. Question: Attachment A, Tab 1, Section VI, Qualification iii. Is the City looking for at least two municipalities to be named **and** at least two school clients to be named, for a total of four? Or can it be any combination of municipalities and school clients?

City Response: No – the City is not looking for four (4) clients to be named – only two (2). The City will welcome a combination of City and School clients (e.g. one municipality, and one school, even if separate entities), for a total of two clients named to meet the minimum qualification.

8. Question: Under Minimum Qualifications section VI, is the City requesting a minimum of two municipalities (city, town, county, etc.) and a minimum of two school clients of similar scope and size within the past (5) years that are currently live on the proposed solution?

City Response: No. Please see the response to Question 7 above.

- a. Additionally, is the City requesting that the respondent for services served as the prime contractor for the implementation of the software that is being proposed?

City Response: The City requests that the prime contractor (providing the services, in the event of a value-added reseller, integrator, or consulting firm) provide the reference site for minimum qualifications. The City prefers that the prime contractor for services meet these requirements, and not any sub-contractors (e.g. third-party service firm providing a portion of the services such as training or change management).

9. Question: Section 1.3 states that the overall goal relating to the project is to take advantage of the newest technology, harness efficiencies and enhance business process. In reviewing your annual budget, we saw a line item in the budget to continue a pilot with Timeclock Plus.

- a. Would the City consider replacing TimeClock Plus at WPS Department of Transportation and not expanding the use to other departments?

City Response: Yes. Please see also the response to Question #1 in this addendum for information related to the pilot of TimeClockPlus.

10. Question: Are any of the requirements in attachment B tab 18 (Time Entry and Scheduling) related to WPS?

City Response: Yes. As part of this RFP process the City and Schools are interested in more fully understanding the available time entry and scheduling options in the marketplace, including solutions that may be available for both the Schools and general City Departments.

11. Question: Based on the statistics in the RFP, WPS makes up 4,589 of the total employee counts of 8,575. If attachment B tab 18 does not apply to WPS, then is it a correct assumption that pricing for Time Entry and Scheduling would only be for the City employee which would be 3,986 employees?

City Response: Attachment B, Tab 18, does apply to WPS.

12. Question: Attachment B Tab 18 - Time Entry & Scheduling Tab: Would the City please provide the use case, departments, unique locations within the department and employee count for the following requirements: TE35, TE83, TE109, TE110, TE112

City Response: The City does not deem it necessary to provide the use case, departments, unique locations within the department and employee count in order to respond to these requirements. Vendors should be able to respond to these requirements as-is.

Proposers are requested to acknowledge and/or include this addendum with proposal submission. All other terms, conditions and specifications remain unchanged.

Very truly yours,

Christopher J. Gagliastro
Purchasing Director