



# CITY OF WORCESTER, MASSACHUSETTS



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

October 13, 2020

To All Proposers:

Subject: **RFP NO.: 7480-W1 Request for Proposals for Software and Implementation Services for an Utility Billing and Customer Information System 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 and responses from the City.***

1. Question: Is there is any flexibility on the City's part to accept the proposals electronically vs. hard copies?

**City Response: The City is unable to accept electronic submittal of proposals.**

2. Question: Is the City open to extending the submission due date by two weeks?

**City Response: No. The City is not considering any extensions at this time.**

3. Question: The RFP says "Budget planning for this initiative is ongoing, and a specific amount for the software and implementation services portion has not yet been determined". Are you able to provide any more guidance on this; or will more information be made available during the RFP process?

**City Response: The City has developed preliminary budget estimates, at a high-level, for the overall initiative related to this RFP, RFP-7479-W1, and RFP-7462-W1. The amounts that will be programmed for each individual initiative will be reviewed and confirmed through the separate evaluation processes, and through contract negotiations the final project budgets will be set. The City has determined that this initiative is a high-priority, and intends to commit the necessary resources to ensure a successful implementation.**

4. Question: Attachment B – Tab 6. Interfaces, you indicate your payment processor is UniBank (INT.9). Are you open to replacing this payment processor?

**City Response: Yes, we would accept a proposal which includes options for an alternative payment processor or processors, provided the processor is able to provide the option for a**

convenience fee or not depending on the transaction type. Additionally, the payment processor must be able to accept ACH payments.

5. Attachment B – Tab 4. WebPortal – Please provide more detail on what you are looking for in terms of customization of the portal. Is it just a logo or are you looking to replace color scheme? And/or are you looking to have the same layout as well.

CC.3	The system has the ability to provide a citizen self-service portal that can be customized to have a similar look and feel as the City website.
------	---

**City Response:** The City’s goal would be to have a web portal that would appear as similar as possible to the existing City website, to help facilitate the end-user (customer) experience. The City would seek to avoid the appearance of a user being re-directed to third-party sites as much as possible when conducting business with the City.

6. In Attachment B – Tab 6. Interfaces: Interfaces 1, 4, 5, 6, & 7 indicate integrations with ERP. Do all of these need to read as integrating with Utility Billing (not ERP)?

INT.1	Productivity Tools
INT.4	User Authentication
INT.5	Document management software used by City
INT.6	Customer Service Request System - 311
INT.7	DPW&P Water Meter Software back and forth/meter reads /sequence# for next read

**City Response:** Yes, it should be Utility Billing and not ERP. Tab 6 has been updated to reflect these changes and the amended Attachment B has been included with this addendum.

7. Attachment B – Tab 6 Interfaces - INT 5 Laserfiche – you’ve mentioned a need here for an integration from Utility Billing to Laserfiche, your document management system. However in Attachment B – Tab 1. Technical – you’ve also mentioned wanting to be able to attach directly in the CIS application.

GT.33	The system has the ability to use "drag and drop" or file upload functionality to associate documents to transactions within the system.
-------	--

And Tab 5. Utility Billing

UB.70	The system has the ability to attach images and documents, in multiple formats, to a customer and/or account.
-------	---

Does this mean you want the ability to integrate to your document management as well as attaching documents inside you CIS?

**City Response:** The City is interested in understanding the inherent document management capabilities available in the Utility Billing system. Should the functionality not meet the needs of the City, there will be the need to integrate to the existing Laserfiche system.

8. Is there any sense of urgency to move off your current legacy system that may impact the project timeline i.e. end of contract, sunsetting of the legacy system etc.

**City Response:** No. The City provides internal support and maintenance of the software.

9. On page 15- Section 2.10 Budget of the RFP, you mention the setting of the budget for this project is ongoing. Can you provide a ballpark figure for this project?

**City Response:** Please see the response to Question #3 in this addendum.

10. On Tab 3-Cash Management of Attachment B, CM 127 through CM 144 contain questions around cash management Hardware/Technical. Can Worcester clarify if you are looking for the Utility Billing Software System to provide the physical cash register hardware – or are these questions anticipating the Utility Billing Software System will integrate to existing Worcester cashing hardware?

**City Response:** The City is interested in exploring the physical cash register hardware options vendors can provide. The City is requesting for proposers to describe available hardware options to support cash register/drawer functionality. The City will consider these on an optional basis as requested in Attachment A, Tab 2, and costs shall only be included in the designated optional areas of Attachment C1 (Cost Worksheet) and Attachment C2 (Cost Narrative).

11. Attachment B, Tab 2, Miscellaneous Receivables and Tab 5. Utility Billing, Refers to the Real Estate Module. Could you please provide more information for what you are looking for in the following requirements:

Tab. 2 Miscellaneous Receivables

AR.4	The system has the ability to transfer the delinquent accounts and associated amounts to the real estate module.
AR.5	The system has the ability to update the appropriate general ledger account(s) based on the liened amounts transferred to the real estate module.

Tab 5. Utility Billing

UB.3	The system has the ability to transfer the delinquent accounts and associated amounts to the real estate module.
UB.4	The system has the ability to update the appropriate general ledger account(s) based on the lined amounts transferred to the real estate module.
UB.135	The system has the ability to interface with the real estate tax module to identify exempt accounts.
UB.172	The system has the ability to integrate with the real estate tax module to roll over outstanding balances to a property lien based on a user-defined date range.

**City Response:** The City will place a lien on a property that is associated with a delinquent utility bill. The Utility Billing system would need to send information on the delinquent account to the Real Estate module in the Tax system in order to lien the associated property.

12. **Regarding section 1.7 Minimum Qualifications:** Section 1/7 item iii states that the Vendor has successfully implemented the proposed solution with a minimum of two municipal (city, town, county, etc) clients of similar scope and size within the past five (5) years.

Our proposed solution involves product software that can be deployed as a Software-as-a-Service (SaaS), or Vendor Hosted/Managed or installed on-premises.

If our proposed solution involves a SAAS deployment of the product and we have a minimum of two municipal (city, town, county) clients of similar scope and size within the past five (5) years

and they were deployed on-premises, will the City of Worcester count them as meeting the minimum qualifications?

**City Response:** The City will be evaluating each minimum qualification independent of the other. This is to say, the City will be reviewing if a proposing vendor is able to demonstrate that it has successfully implemented the proposed solution with a minimum of two municipal (city, town, county, etc) clients of similar scope and size within the past five (5) years separately from whether the proposed solution is a SaaS or Vendor Hosted/Managed deployment.

13. **Regarding section 1.7 Minimum Qualifications:** If a vendor does not have a minimum of two municipal (city, town, county) clients of similar scope and size within the past five (5) years will they be disqualified?

**City Response:** Vendor proposals will be reviewed for compliance with the minimum qualifications as a first-step in the review process. Any vendors not meeting the minimum qualifications will not be considered through the comparative evaluation process. The City recognizes that similar size may be measured by meter count, customer count, and population size, while scope would pertain primarily to utility types and the installation of comparable functionality (e.g. not just a web portal).

14. What mobile devices does the City of Worcester run in the field today?

**City Response:** The City provides iPhones and laptops for field work.

15. Does the City provide internet connections for those devices (i.e. are they connected throughout the day)?

**City Response:** The City provides internet connection via phone plan.

16. Item UB.32 reads “The system has the ability to provide functionality to meet UB 11-27 or integrate with a third party customer service application”. – is that meant to be read “meet UB.11 through UB.27”? Is it intended to say “UB.15 through UB.27”?

**City Response:** Yes, this requirement needs to be updated. UB.32 should read, “The system has the ability to provide functionality to meet UB. 15-31 or integrate with a third party customer service application.”

A Pre-Proposal Vendor Teleconference was held on October 7, 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:

Advanced Utility Systems	RedClay
CodeBuilder Software	RIA Advisory
Cogsdale	RosTech
Enterprise Solutions Consulting	Systems & Software
Hansen	Tyler Technologies
Informatix	Utility Solutions Partners LLC
Oracle	VertexOne

**Please find below questions received during the October 7, 2020 Pre-Proposal Teleconference and responses from the City.**

17. As to the City forms is the CORI Compliance form required to be submitted at the time of proposal submittal, or, upon selection as the preferred vendor? If a part of the proposal submittal, where shall we insert this (and other City forms) in the proposal?

**City Response:** A completed response to the CORI Compliance form is a required form to contract with the City, therefore it is recommended that it be completed and submitted at the time of proposal submission. This, as well as other City forms, may be inserted at the end of Attachment A, Tab 1.

18. In terms of the demonstration process, will the City be providing vendors with scripts or are vendors expected to develop and provide their own?

**City Response:** The City will deliver demonstration scripts/scenarios to vendors following the finalization of the demonstration scheduling process. The City will stagger the release of scripts to allow each vendor an equal amount of time to prepare based on the scripts.

19. As to the Web Portal requirements, these are all listed as Critical. Should we be including the pricing of proposed web portal functionality as in-scope or optional?

**City Response:** Yes, the web portal is in-scope and should be included in the pricing proposal.

20. Does the City have a preference on a cloud hosting provider, either as a future standard or as used to support current solutions?

**City Response:** No, the City does not have a preferred cloud hosting provider. Vendors should propose a provider that it feels best aligns with the City's requirements. Vendors can identify alternative providers, but be certain it is abundantly clear which provider is proposed in terms of technical specifications and pricing and which providers are listed as alternatives

21. Does the City expect that the selection of an ERP System (RFP-7462-W1) will be made ahead of this RFP?

**City Response:** The timelines for the two processes are closely aligned, with the ERP RFP being approximately two weeks ahead of this process. The City has a goal to identify, select, and contract for new systems in response to RFP-7462-W1, RFP-7480-W1, and RFP-7479-W1 prior to the end of this calendar year.

22. As it relates to City staff availability to support the implementation process, there is a statement in the RFP that the City will be unable to dedicate resources to the project full-time. Is a contributing factor in this the fact that the City is looking to implement three separate software systems at once?

**City Response:** The City does not have the ability to allocate 100% of staff time to the project, which is a result of general resource needs and not the number of projects the City is undertaking. The City anticipates that the vendor responses to the RFP, including anticipated resource level requirements of City staff, will be a factor in the staff resource planning the City conducts.

23. Does the City have the expectation that the vendor selected for award provide project management services, change management services, and business process re-engineering?

City Response: Vendors are directed to review the Comparative Criteria presented in the RFP to better understand how proposals will be evaluated. Beyond this, the City has questions in Attachment A requesting vendors to describe their approach to configuration activities, project management, and change management. The City would expect that, as with any project, there are certain levels of project management performed by the selected vendor to monitor project activities, progress, etc. as well as advising on change management activities.

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