Addendum #1 to Consulting Services for ERP Solution RFP

Responses to Questions

August 15, 2017

Addendum #1 shall be included in the RFP and this addendum shall be part of the RFP documents. All conditions not affected by this addendum shall remain unchanged.

1. Will answers to vendor questions be provided in a public forum, or as a reply to this email?
   Response: Questions will be answered by posting an amendment to the RFP publicly.

2. Please provide a link to the Minnesota State ERP Charter.
   Response: While not yet complete, the project charter, governance and structure will follow forms typical for higher education while taking into count the nuances of a system wide project vs a single campus project. These artifacts will be in place before any awardees are expected to begin their work.

3. Please describe the governance and project management structure Minnesota State will have in place for the project.
   Response: Please see the answer to question 2.

4. Who is the executive sponsor(s) of this project at Minnesota State?
   Response: Interim Chancellor Dr. Malhotra

5. You reference external stakeholders and subject matter experts. Please identify these. Do these include consultants and, if so, what is their role?
   Response: Campus Subject Matter Experts Staff & System Office Business Analysts

6. Do you have shared services organizations? If so, which colleges and universities and which functions do these organizations support? How well established is each of these shared service organizations?
   Response: System Office provides shared services for the development, support, & training of the current ERP to all Colleges & Universities. The system office has been doing this for the current ERP for 20+ years.

7. Will Minnesota State be willing to provide advance materials, transmitted securely, to allow the successful consultant to review documentation and make preparations prior to conducting on-site work?
   Response: Yes, depending on materials requested.
8. Do you desire the selected consultant to give and/or facilitate any presentations to Minnesota State project leadership and/or stakeholders during the course of the project? If yes, at what milestones and to what audiences?

Response:

Project A – No.

Project B – No.

Project C – Yes, presentations will be requested as needed. Audiences may include the Executive Sponsor, Minnesota State ERP Steering Committee and Minnesota State Leadership Council.

Project D – Yes, presentations will be requested as needed. Audiences may include the Executive Sponsor, Minnesota State ERP Steering Committee and Minnesota State Leadership Council.

9. Do you have a Change Management Office? Will the CMO participate in the organizational readiness assessment? If you have completed work related to this objective, please provide any associated report(s).

Response: No, Minnesota State does not have a CMO.

10. Has Minnesota State identified a team of internal project management that the consulting firm will work with throughout the engagement?

Response: Yes.

11. We understand you will assign a project manager to this project. Will you assign others (e.g., change management team member)? At what level of FTE commitment will these individuals be assigned?

Response: Please see the answer to Question 9. We have a project manager that is appointed at 1 FTE and plan to appoint additional coordinators and project managers in the future. The FTE commitment of these individuals is to be determined.

12. Please describe the decision-making process you plan to use regarding acceptance of the business process review deliverables. In particular, will you designate the project manager (or some other individual) as the person who will serve as the single point of contact for acceptance? If so, who will this person be and what is the acceptance criteria? If not, will acceptance by a majority of the members of the project Steering Committee be sufficient to achieve acceptance? If acceptance by a majority is insufficient, what criteria will you use for acceptance?

Response: Yes, we will have a designated project manager as the single point of contact.

13. What metrics will be used to measure Project success and ROI?

Response: We will evaluate success based on how well the outlined deliverables are met in this RFP.
14. Does Minnesota State currently have a preference for its future ERP platform, for example: hosted, SaaS, on-premise, etc.?

   Response: Software-as-a-Service (SaaS)

15. Will on-premise software be among the alternative solutions you consider, or will you only consider Software-as-a-Service? Platform-as-a-Service?

   Response: Software-as-a-Service (SaaS)

16. Please confirm the desire to harmonize, to the greatest extent possible, on a common set of practices in order to minimize ERP customization.

   Response: Please see Project A, B and C Scope of Deliverables in the RFP.

17. Is it your expectation that you will modify the software you select to meet the requirements of your future state business needs?

   Response: Please see Project A, B and C Scope of Deliverables in the RFP.

18. Do you use business process management software or do you have a preference for a particular BPM software? Would you anticipate licensing such under this agreement? If so, please describe.

   Response: No, Minnesota State does not use a business process management software. We do not anticipate licensing such under this agreement as Minnesota State is required to follow Board of Trustee purchasing policies to purchase any software associated with this project. All costs associated to BPM should be identified within the proposal.

19. Does Minnesota State seek to reduce the number of 3rd party software vendors it uses now to complete administrative tasks?

   Response: Please see the Scope of Summary section within the RFP.

20. Does Minnesota State have a preference for its future ERP to be a single vendor or best of breed?

   Response: Single vendor.

21. Do you anticipate updating the process maps in the future? If so, do you have preference for the format (e.g., Visio, PowerPoint)?

   Response: Yes, Visio.

22. Regarding Projects A & B (Business Process Reviews):
a. Has Minnesota State identified metrics (KPIs) that you would like to utilize to inform Minnesota State of efficiencies / inefficiencies in their respected processes? If so, can you share what these metrics are?

Response: No.

b. Are there specific process improvement goals during the future state process mapping component of Projects A & B--that are outside of identifying functional and technical requirements--that Minnesota State has defined pertaining to target efficiency gains or cost savings?

Response: There are no specific process improvement goals identified, but the overall goal is to work towards common business processes for each area of the ERP.

c. How many of the universities and colleges does Minnesota State expect the selected consulting firm to visit and to complete the Business Process Mapping reviews in Project A & B?

Response: Business Process Mapping sessions will be conducted from Minnesota State’s System Office and various regions.

d. Would Minnesota State allow the use of video conferencing for certain components of the Business Process review projects?

Response: Yes.

23. Do you have telecommunication capabilities that your consultant might use to link in participating campuses for business process and periodic status sessions?

Response: Yes.

24. In Project B, the ASA ERP Requirements are scheduled to be completed 8 months before the completion of the ASA business process review. As the ASA ERP requirements will be completed before the Business process review, does MNSCU see a risk that ASA ERP requirements will not be complete? Should this risk be addressed in the vendor response?

Response: Please see Section IV. Response Evaluation, item 2. Statement of Work of the RFP.

25. Is there a risk mitigation plan to finalizing the ERP requirements several months ahead of the completion of the Business Process Reviews? Would you be open to accelerating the Business Process Reviews for the ASA to coincide with the December 2018 deadline?

Response: Please see Section IV. Response Evaluation, item 2. Statement of Work of the RFP.
26. The ASA business process review is slated for completion after the creation and awarding of the Vendor RFP. In order to ensure that all ASA requirements are included in the ASA software and vendor RFP, would MNSCU consider posting the Finance/HR Business and ASA Software and Vendor selection RFP’s at different times?

Response: Please see Section IV. Response Evaluation, item 2. Statement of Work of the RFP.

27. We notice that while the dates for finalization of ERP requirements are the same (December 2018), the Business Process Reviews for the ASA will not be completed until July 2019. Is there a specific challenge requiring a different completion schedule? Colleges and universities (and, in particular, university systems) typically find there are many variations on business processes for any one process. Is it your expectation that the documentation of current state system-wide business processes will reflect all of these or is documentation that represents the principal business process with a brief description of variations sufficient? Or is there some alternative you will use as your standard for acceptance and, if this is the case, what is that standard?

Response: Please see Section IV. Response Evaluation, item 2. Statement of Work of the RFP.

28. Would you find it practicable to hold process and requirements sessions on a process-by-process basis for all colleges and universities? If not, is it acceptable to have a subset of representatives (e.g., representatives of universities, representatives of colleges) meet and represent the interests of their grouping? Please describe these subsets, if any, that you’ve traditionally called on. If it is not practicable to hold these sessions on a process-by-process basis for all colleges and universities, how many sessions would you estimate typically would be required for each process or set of processes?

Response: It is acceptable to have a subset of representatives during the sessions, but a high level of communication back to all campuses would be required. Subset would be defined by the System Office business areas with input from IT’s business analysts.

29. Is the notion of adopting a standard/common set of business practices across the colleges and universities generally accepted and promoted by the Steering Committee level? …throughout the college and universities?

Response: Yes.

30. Is there a common chart of accounts across the entire Minnesota State system or does each institution have their own? If each institution has their own, is development of a common chart of accounts included in the future state documentation?

Response: Yes, we share a common chart of accounts across the Minnesota State system.

31. You refer to “statistical models” when referencing business process documentation. Please describe the objectives you anticipate to achieve with these models?

Response: After further review, we have decided to remove “statistical models” from the RFP pages 6 and 10.
32. Documentation of current business process and future business needs can be prepared at different levels of detail. One level of detail is sufficient to differentiate among the software/solution offerings available in the market. This approach presumes that you will consider the capabilities of the software you select as you design your future state. Additional detail will be necessary if your objective is to identify a set of current system processes and envision a more complete future state that the selected software will be expected to support prior to making the software selection. Which level of detail will you consider sufficient to meet the requirements of this RFP?

Response: Additional detail will be necessary to identify a set of current system processes and envision a more complete future state that the selected software will be expected to support prior to making the software selection.

33. What percentage of time on-site does Minnesota State envision for the vendor’s Project Manager during implementation phase (Project D)?

Response: 50% of the time

34. We have the needed experience to provide Independent Validation and Verification (IV&R) using proprietary tools and methods that deliver an object assessment for major programs such as this. Normally, we do not provide program management services. Would we be able to respond to Project D, with a proposal for IV&V support and not the day-to-day Program Management?

Response: Please see the description, scope and deliverables of Project D within the RFP.

35. Project D: Strategic Implementation Leader Services, will begin in November 2019, more than two years into the future. Will the selected vendor have an opportunity to adjust its proposal after selection decisions have been made and additional information regarding the project become clear but prior to the start-up of the project? If so, please describe how you envision this process will occur.

Response: After the RFP is awarded, we will negotiate and award contract(s). Any changes in the future require a mutually agreed upon formal contract amendment(s).

36. Does Minnesota State currently have up-to-date process maps for the business processes identified in Appendix A?

Response: Minnesota State has high level Business Process Models and around 50% coverage on our versions of Use Cases (Business Stories) that varies between HR, Finance, & Student.

37. You request a current state assessment of all known systems to be replaced. Please provide an inventory of these known systems.

Response: Our ERP is a home grown system, see functions in Appendix A of the RFP.

38. In Appendix A, you list a set of business processes. Do you anticipate that your consultant will prepare one flow for each of these or do you anticipate that there will be additional level of detail needed (e.g., a set of flows for each process listed)? If additional, please describe.
Response: Please see the response to question 36. Our goal is to have a common business practice for each process.

39. You request that your consultant identify reports, interfaces, etc. Please describe the status of inventories of these items that you already have (e.g., how current are they? If there is a link to these, please provide. When were they last updated? Have they been consolidated to eliminate duplicates?). Assuming your consultant will be required to gather additional information regarding these inventories, will you find it sufficient to rely on local college and university representatives to provide this information regarding their campus?

Response: We have a current list of interfaces to outside products. System office will provide the information.

40. We notice the travel requirement being referenced in the RFP. What degree of travel do you anticipate to build the current state process documentation and requirements across the campuses?

Response: There will be some travel to regional locations.

41. The RFP mentions travel to the colleges, universities and System Office to solicit user requirements. Please describe your expectations regarding visits to participating campuses. Do you anticipate your consultant will hold business process and status sessions at various campuses on a rotating basis? Is it your expectation that your consultant will visit each campus? If so, do you anticipate your consultant will discuss the complete set of processes and requirements at each campus?

Response: There will be some travel to regional locations.

42. Do you expect that respondents will complete the Professional/Technical Services Contract?

Response: If a responded is awarded, yes.

43. Regarding Item #7 “Liability” on page 25 of the RFP: We may request a revision to this language. Is Minnesota State willing to negotiate mutually agreeable language?

Response: This is part of section V. and should be addressed in your RFP response as indicated on page 15 in the first paragraph of Section V. We will look at alternative language proposed in the RFP response only.

44. Regarding “Errors and Omissions Insurance” on page 17 of the RFP: Our deductible is higher than $50,000 and we are unable to change this on a project-by-project basis. Should we be awarded this contract, is Minnesota State willing to negotiate the deductible amount?

Response: We can give written approval on this exception if the conditions of that particular paragraph on page 17 are met. This is part of section V. and should be addressed in your RFP response as indicated on page 15 in the first paragraph of Section V of the RFP.
45. Are vendors required to obtain the insurance outlined within the RFP prior to contract submission; or, is it acceptable for vendors to obtain all required insurance after contract award and before the MN State’s scheduled contract execution date?

Response: Vendors do not need to have the required insurance at RFP submission or award; vendors will be required to have the insurance prior to the contract execution date.

46. MNSCU provided a sample contract. In the Sample Contract section on page 18, MNSCU states that many of the contract requirements are required by the state of Minnesota. Vendors are asked to indicate exceptions they may have to the clauses in the contract in their RFP response. Is MNSCU able to negotiate on any exceptions noted, or is MNSCU only able to negotiate on exceptions to clauses that do not conflict with the State requirements.

Response: It depends what the clauses are, some can be negotiated but as a state institution, we must follow state requirements. Vendors must respond whether they accept the following terms and conditions in Section V. and Appendix B, the sample contract, or propose alternative language. We will look at alternative language proposed in the RFP response only.

47. Our Contracts department has just started review of the sample contract. Their response will be a major factor in our decision on whether or not to pursue this opportunity. In order to give our Contracts department time to complete their review, is it possible to request an extension of the RFP due date?

Response: No, we are unable to extend the due date for the RFP response.

48. Does your selection of a consultant to perform one or more of the projects preclude the consultant from serving as an implementation/integration partner for the implementation of the selection software/solution?

Response: Please see the answer to question 49.

49. Will MN State allows vendors selected for projects A & B to submit proposals for the systems integration work to follow in a later RFP? We weren’t sure if MN State views the work in projects A and B as part of the RFP development process for the later SI work.

Response: The “Conflict of Interest” sections on pg. 19 of the RFP is standard in all Minnesota State RFPs. When responding to an RFP, the respondent must comply with these sections. We believe that vendors completing the work on projects C or D would be a possible conflict of interest for a future RFP for the ERP tool.

50. Is it permissible for the prime vendor to partner with another firm to execute a portion of the scope of this contract? If so, is there a minimum or maximum level of effort requirement for the partner/subcontractor?

Response: A vendor may subcontract, however, all subcontractors are required to agree to the same terms as the vendor.

51. Is Minnesota State looking for particular certifications from consultants?
Response: No.

52. The contract term states: “System Office desires to enter into a contract with the successful vendor(s) effective January 1, 2018”, but the BPR planning is scheduled to begin in November 2017. Please clarify.

Response: We hope to negotiate and finalize a contract by November 1, 2017, to begin planning stage. However the actual BPR sessions will not begin until January 1, 2018.

53. What is the budget for each project or this set of projects? We note that your 2017 Data Book includes a cost estimate and timeline (last four pages). We note reference to $25M and reference to a 50/50 split. Please describe the costs this $25M covers. Is the $25M prior to the split, making the total budget $50M, or is it $25M that will be paid 50/50? We also note the Board approved a Collaboration Initiative in November. Is this project funded by this initiative or otherwise related to it?

Response: The 2017 Data Book cost estimate was for the entire ERP project. The 2017 Legislature allocated $4M annually to Minnesota State for the ERP project. Additional project funding has not be determined. Re: Collaboration Initiative: If you are referring to the Minnesota State Transfer Guarantee project discussed at the November 2016 Board of Trustees meeting, it is unrelated to this project.

54. Does Minnesota State have a budget estimate or range for each project that you can share? If yes, please provide detail.

Response: No.

55. Does MN State have an allocated budget for each Project referenced within the RFP (Projects A-D)? If so, what is that budget?

Response: No.

56. We understand that you will review each project separately. Will you give preference to respondents that qualify for several or all of the projects?

Response: Please see the answer to question 61.

57. There is inherent risk in having Projects A, B, C delivered by more than one vendor. Does MNSCU have a preference for using one vendor to deliver all three of these projects?

Response: Please see the answer to question 61.

58. If we elect to submit a response for Projects A, B and C, should these be three separate responses, or should we submit one comprehensive response treating these three projects as one single engagement?
Response: Please see the answer to question 61.

59. Does the Minnesota State expect a single proposal clearly identifying the projects included/bid for or should a separate proposal be created for each project?

Response: Please see the answer to question 61.

60. Is there a specific order being requested for the RFP response, or is any logical order acceptable as long as all components are included?

Response: Please see the answer to question 61.

61. Do you expect a separate proposal for each project or may we present one proposal for all project requests to which we elect to respond? Is there a limit on the number of pages in a proposal for each project or for all projects?

Response: We will score based on section IV. of the RFP and Cost is 30% which includes Exhibit F. Respondents can submit one proposal for all project requests together, but per section IV. Response Evaluation, 2. Statement of Work, Each project (Project A, B, C & D) requires a response to this section separately. Any order in the response and any length is acceptable as long as all the required parts are included and acceptable.

62. Is it acceptable to assume that no more than three software/solution vendors will move beyond an initial review into demonstrations and other more detailed review? If not, what is the maximum number that you would consider moving forward beyond an initial review?

Response: We are unable to answer this question until responses are reviewed.

63. Regarding the “Human Rights Requirements” on page 15 of the RFP: The RFP states “For all contracts estimated to be in excess of $100,000 all responding vendors are required to complete the Human Rights Certification Information and Affirmative Action Data Page and submit it with the response.” Are these Appendices B and C? Please confirm or clarify. If these are not the correct forms, please direct us to the location of the correct forms.

Response: Yes, Exhibit B and C, pages 34-37, of the RFP.

64. “All responding vendors are required to complete the Human Rights Certification Information and Affirmative Action Data Page and submit it with the response” Where is this form located? Is it Exhibit B and C?

Response: Yes, Exhibit B and C, pages 34-37, of the RFP.

65. Is it a correct statement that since our firm does not have 40 FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES IN MINNESOTA OR Our PRIMARY PLACE OF BUSINESS that we do not need to submit Exhibit D, Equal Pay Certificate?
Response: No, that is not correct. Please review the form, your firm falls into a different category.

66. Exhibit F includes a request for a “Firm Cost per Hour” and, separately, Reimbursable Expenses. We are willing to assume the risk of reimbursable expenses. We would like to include expenses in our cost per hour in order to save both you and our company administrative burden of auditing individual receipts. Is this an acceptable approach to you? Will we be disadvantaged in terms of your scoring of our response if we adopt this approach? If so, please describe how. Please cite examples of expenses you might anticipate under “Other Costs.”

Response: Yes, this is acceptable. We will score based on section IV. of the RFP and Cost is 30% which includes Exhibit F. “Other Costs” is included to ensure that a vendor does include all costs with their proposal.

67. Please define what is required for “proof of authority of the person signing”. Is an executive level title satisfactory?

Response: Yes, the person signing must have the authority to legally bind the vendor.

68. For the 1 hard copy response; Minnesota State prefers an unbound copy (with no binder), correct?

Response: Please see the answer to question 69.

69. Can you confirm the number of submission copies required? Do you want one copy bound and one unbound with original signatures?

Response: Please see pg. 20, Section VI. of the RFP. We require 1 paper copy (unbound and signed by an authorized representative) and 1 by compact disc/flash drive. Proof of authority of the person signing must accompany the response.

70. Please describe (and ideally provide a representative sample of) current state documentation you already have. How extensive is it? How current is it? Should we presume that it is valid or will your consultant need to validate it?

Response: Please see the answer to question 36.

71. The current RFP was preceded by a 2015 project for an ERP Assessment and Business Case Development. What was the dollar value of the contract for this project?

Response: Please see the answer to question 72.

72. You engaged CampusWorks for a related project in 2015. Although we are not privy to the contract, the RFP included a project to perform “a needs/gap analysis of ISRS functionality, including the solicitation and documentation of future state business requirements and current ISRS capabilities from users throughout the MnSCU system.” Please describe the relevance of
this earlier work (across all three projects listed in that RFP) to the current project and, in particular any timeline and/or costs it sets out. Is the report something your selected consultant can/should rely upon? Is CampusWorks eligible to respond to this RFP? Please provide a copy of the CampusWork’s contract for the project in 2015 and the resulting report.

Response: Please see the attached CampusWork’s contract from the 2015 project. This is a public RFP that anyone can respond.

73. Has Minnesota State conducted any vendor discovery sessions with current ERP alternatives?

Response: No formal discovery sessions.

74. Have you been in discussions with other consultants regarding this project within the last year? If so, please identify them.

Response: Minnesota State has always intended to publish a public RFP for these services.

75. Have you engaged other consultants previously who have insight into this initiative? If so, please provide a copy of the related report(s). Are these consultants eligible to respond to this RFP?

Response: Please see the answer to question 72.

76. Are there initiatives underway that will or could impact the project and should be considered in developing the project plan?

Response: No.