REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS # 14-11
INTEGRATED WORKPLACE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM
UNIVERSITY OF MAINE SYSTEM
ADDENDUM #1

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

INQUIRIES (IN BLACK) RECEIVED NLT OCTOBER 25, 2011
RESPONSES (IN RED) TO BE SENT NLT NOVEMBER 1, 2011
A REMINDER – PROPOSALS ARE DUE NOVEMBER 8, 2011

Q1.   Page 3, last paragraph: Based on your desire to bring greater consistency to business practices, will all campuses be involved in a consolidated implementation where business processes across campuses will be defined? Will each campus have its own business process review task as part of the implementation?

Yes. The University will be relying on the selected provider to coordinate the business practice review process across the system. The University envisions a tiered set of practices such that all campuses will adhere to certain basic practices while those with more complex campuses or needs will have additional business practices and functionality available to them.

Q2.   Page 9, first paragraph: Regarding training, will 30-40 be trained or will a tier of technicians also be included? Can you estimate the number to be trained? Would you consider a train-the-trainer curriculum, in which we would train your trainers to train others?

The University is open to a train the trainer model for all training beyond the first tier of up to 40 individuals across the System at a location of the University's choosing in Maine. The University expects the provider to train the initial group of up to 40 individuals and to provide train-the-trainer training for at least 25 individuals. Beyond that, the University is open to the training proposals as providers may suggest in their responses.

Q3.   Page 9, Item 3.1.2.4: Is your Information Security Policy published at http://www.maine.edu/pdf/VI-CInformationSecurity.pdf?   If not, is it available for review?

Yes.

Q4.   Pages 11 and 12, 3.1.7 Integration: Are you wanting quotations for specifications for interfaces as part of this proposal, or are you just wanting to know if we can provide integration to the applications described in this section?

Yes. The selected provider will be responsible for the deliverable. Any work required of the University should be described in the response.

Q5.   Page 11, item 3.1.7.1.6.2: Can you provide an example of "other applications" – a scenario of what you are experiencing - is this referring to LDAP or SSO functionality?

We are interested in what possibilities exist to automatically have changes to roles, permissions and employee status data from our HR system and other databases that house security information affect access to the solution. LDAP or SSO technologies could be used to facilitate such a process.

Q6. Page 11, item 3.1.7.2.: If interfaces are wanted as part of this proposal, will there be individual campus interfaces, or one consolidated interface effort?

It is expected that each integration or interface would be common for all campuses and would use common business logic. If the integration/interface requires a user action to initiate it would be desirable to for users at each campus to have the ability to initiate the process and be limited to processing data for that campus.

Q7. Page 16, item 3.2.1.1.36: Are you looking for an RSS feed to a governmental permitting site, or an in-house permitting department? What do you do now?

This would be strictly an in-house permitting solution as part of a workflow. Currently this is entirely a manual process.

Q8. Page 16, item 3.2.1.1.41: Is the requestor here a customer who would use the customer service portal to request work?

Yes.

Q9. Page 17, item 3.2.1.2.5: Can you provide an example of this? Are you looking for a meter based PM?

The University expects meter-based PMs, calendar-triggered PMs, condition-based PMs and manual PMs.

Q10. Page 19, item 3.2.1.4.3: How are fuel charges entered into the system – manually, via interface, etc.?

Fuel charges are entered manually. Charges may in the future come directly from a fuel management system as a feed to the work management product, but there is no timeline for implementation of such a system.

Q11. Page 19, item 3.2.1.6.8: Can you please define "group" responsible?

Group is defined as the entity at that site which is responsible for that particular lock or mechanism, such as a Trade group, a department, an auxiliary program or another institutional entity.

Q12. Page 34, Facility/Building Inventory: Regarding the term "last inventory", please describe what you are looking for – is this a dollar amount equal to the value of the assets in the building, for instance, or a date when the assets were last inventoried?

Both the date of the last inventory valuation and what that valuation was in dollars.

Q13. Page 35, Cost Form for the CPPM module at the bottom of the table: If we are proposing both in-house and hosted options, can we expand this table to include both?

Please see the updated Appendix 8.2 that is part of this Addendum.

Q14. Page 35, Cost Form: Can you estimate how many records and what types you want converted?

No. The University expects the selected provider to be able to convert the amount of data and records commonly associated with an operation of the University's scale. That includes 7 campuses, records for 1,000 facilities, 33,000 spaces, 1,100 real estate entries and 5,000 employees.

Q15. General question: Can you share the budget for this project?

Assuming the University proceeds to award, the budget will rely on the outcome of this public, competitive process. Cost will be evaluated as described in the RFP.

Q16. Would you like the original Statement of Requirement to be included above the vendor response?

Yes, the University would like to see the original statement of requirement to be included above the vendor response in order to facilitate evaluation of the RFP.

Q17. Section 3.1.1.5 states - "The solution is standards-based and employs service-orientated architecture" can you define Standards-based?

In this instance standards based means web standards, such as published by the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C).

Q18. Section 3.1.3 Compliance Standards – 3.1.3.2 through 3.1.3.4 is for Certifications. Is this our readiness certification for the CMMS implementation including User acceptance testing? Or the ADA compliance test and certifications?

Proposals should indicate compliance with ADA as well as requirements for deployment.

Q19. Section 3.1.7.1.1. The solution provides for CAD integration - Is the requirements to allow read only viewing of CAD drawings for buildings and asset systems in the maintenance system or a fully integrated BIM solution?

The requirement is for more than read only, but not necessarily full BIM. The desired level is to be able to use for space management and visual reporting. Additional functionality such as being able to request work on a given asset from a graphic view and respond to space surveys and updates are also desirable.

Q20. With regard to the estimated number of users you state 30-40 full users and another tier of technicians estimated at 250-350. Please provide further detail regarding the technician's access and utilization of the system.

We anticipate that the technicians will mostly be accessing the systems for time entry and work order management, including via mobile devices. Supervisors may be doing some work assignment and resourcing.

Q21. What University resources do you plan to assign during the implementation and beyond?

This information is for the vendor to provide as part of its proposal. Please refer to Section 3.3 of the RFP, including sections 3.3.1.3 and 3.3.1.4.

Q22. Please advise of the overall procurement process and schedule of events including when you anticipate contract signing?

The University anticipates selecting top vendors during the month of November and inviting the selected providers to make in-person presentations as indicated in Section 2.12 of the RFP. Assuming the University decides to proceed, contract execution is planned by the end of 2011 with the project starting immediately or as soon as practicable thereafter. The University is seeking implementation, integration and data migration during the first six months of calendar year 2012 with training and launch of the solution thereafter.

Q23. Do you have a preference for University Hosted or Vendor Hosted solution? For a Vendor-Hosted solution, is it required to be hosted at a SAS 70 Type II data center?

Any preference for how the solution is hosted will be evaluated as part of the overall proposal. We would expect applicable financial controls to be in place. Please provide information to what level the proposed solution complies with a standard such as SAS 70.

Q24. Our firm would like to bid this via a certified business partner/system integrator. What information do you require to get them on the bidder's list?

The definition and requirements of bidders are described in the RFP, including in Sections 2 and 4. This publicly advertised solicitation is open to any entity wishing to submit a proposal.

Q25. Can you clarify which PeopleSoft modules (and version) are already licensed and which of those are currently being used by University?

For HCM we are currently on version 8.9 tools level 8.46, but are in the process of upgrading to version 9.1 at tools level 8.51. The modules we use are: Human Resources, Payroll for North America, Benefits administration and Time and Labor.

For Financials we are currently on version 9.0 at tools level 8.49. We have implemented General Ledger, Expenses, Purchasing and Payables. We are interfacing purchasing data from SciQuest's Higher Markets into the purchasing module. We are also licensed for Grants, Contracts, Projects, Billing and Accounts Receivables.

Q26. Of the modules being used in PeopleSoft, is the configuration consistent within each of the institutions?

Yes, the PeopleSoft modules are implemented with each university being separate business unit. A central IT group maintains and supports the PeopleSoft applications. A common set of business process standards are used.

Q27. This project will include a multi-campus configuration of the solution. Can you clarify your expectations with regard to the project?

 a. How each campus will be represented on the project team?

  Each campus will have a facilities representative that is part of the project team as well as possible subject matter experts and key users that participate in the project as necessary.

 b. Will the project team work centrally or de-centralized?

  The team will work both centrally and remotely on occasion as weather, time and issues dictate.

 c. How do you envision end-user training for the project?

  See Q2.

Q28. Can you give us an expectation of the System's project team as far as FTE, roles, experience, etc.?

See Q21.

Q29. Section 1.3 – the RFP makes reference more than 500 FTE. Do any of these employees perform work for more than one institution? Are these roles assigned to a specific campus, or can an employee perform tasks for multiple institutions?

Employees generally are associated with a single university of the system. There may be circumstances in which some employees may on occasion perform work at multiple institutions; however this is not the norm.

Q30. Section 1.3 describes a situation where "none of the current solutions is used uniformly by all campuses".

 a. Can you help us understand how the diversity within the legacy solutions could impact conversion? Are there significant data differences?

  The significant differences are not so much in data differences, since all enterprise applications are running off the same data schemas. The differences are more in data sufficiency, some campuses have elected to utilize and populate data systems at much higher levels that other campuses, yet others may populate baseline data only and others may not choose to utilize the solution at all.

 b. Can you discuss your expectations for retention of historical data?

  Much of the historic utility data would be migrated to assist with management activities. Capital planning data would likewise be migrated to a large extent. Work management historic data would largely be left in the existing system, which operates

on an Oracle DB. We anticipate that these historic tables will be flattened and retained as reportable information in that state. Space data will be migrated where appropriate and reasonable with the remainder of the data (also an Oracle DB) treated the same as the work management data listed above.

Q31. At the top of page 4, you describe a scenario where the solution will be configured using "a basic core that is common to all campuses", but you then mention that certain parts will be "discretionary for implementation purposes".

      a. Can you clarify your expectations for this?

      The University expects all institutions will use the new solution. Because some campuses are smaller and relatively less complex, while other campuses are larger and relatively more complex, the University is seeking a baseline of required core data and functionality that would be a benefit to and easily maintained by all campuses, and would be consistent across the system.   Beyond that, the campuses may choose to maintain additional data and access additional functionality as necessary to meet the needs of a more complex or larger institution or as may be desired at any of the institutions and, while discretionary, would again be consistent across the system wherever it is used.

      b. Can you possibly provide an example?

      For example, a campus may elect to track assets to the level of building systems, while others may do so to the level of individual pieces of equipment.   The first may be required, while the second may be discretionary, but both should be done consistently. Likewise, a few campuses maintain a motor pool fleet "for rent" to University affiliated persons that would necessitate a fleet management tool. Other campuses may not have this function and as such should not be expected to pay for or have access to such a tool.

Q32. In section 3.3.1.1 you describe a requirement to handle integration and data migration. Can you help us understand your expectations for migration of history? How many open work orders exist now? Etc.

      See Q30.

Q33. 3.1.7.3 - SciQuest Procurement Integration: The University currently uses SciQuest's Higher Markets solution for Requisition Management, Order Management and Settlement Management. Select Purchase Order and Payables data that originated in Higher Markets is also stored in our Financials ERP (PeopleSoft) Describe how the solution addresses the following:

      a. 3.1.7.3.1 - The solution allows for the following: cXML punchout interface to SciQuest; integration of Requisitioning process; integration of Purchase Order process; integration with Payables process; integration of receiving data; integration of payment data; integration of inventory data.

b. For these two points, can you confirm if all payments are made in SciQuest, and what "select" purchase order and payables data is stored in PeopleSoft.

c. Can you provide a process flow and explanation of the existing integration between SciQuest and any associated PeopleSoft modules?

The majority of payments are entered in the Higher Markets Settlement module and sent to PeopleSoft's Payables module for payment processing. Requisition data and receiving data from Higher Markets is not interfaced to PeopleSoft. With the exception of things like workflow approval data the majority of purchase order data (including distributions as custom fields in higher markets) are interfaced to the PeopleSoft purchasing. Similarly all settlement data (including distributions as custom fields in higher markets) are interfaced to PeopleSoft Purchasing.

The following integrations between Higher Markets and our PeopleSoft purchasing system are used:
Vendor/supplier

Chartfields (business unit, account, fund, project, class, program, operating unit, and speed type)
Combination editing
Purchase order
Invoice/Voucher
Payment status

Q34. 3.2.4.1.2. - Real estate management capabilities that allow for holdings to be managed for ownership, contract and regulatory compliance, lease management, net worth and depreciation.

a. Can you please clarify your level of lease administration activities?

Lease administration is relatively basic, we have holdings that we lease to others and that we wish to track the information stated in the RFP on. Additionally we lease from others holdings that again we wish to document and track the listed information on. Relative to the University's overall holdings it is a minor percentage of the space/land.

b. Do you have both tenant and landlord leases?

Yes, we serve both as Lessees and Lessors in various real estate relationships.

Q35. Can you clarify for us how many Space Manager Users would be required? These are defined as Power users who will need to edit and manage their floor plans, and perform advanced Space Management functions.

The new application should have not less than 8 Space Manager Users.

Q36. Please indicate how many users will need to initiate and manage Move, Change Adds (MACS) within the system.

See Q35.

Q37. Section 1.3 under General Information indicates that the organization has a portfolio of over 9.5 M sq ft. Can you provide additional detail on how much of this space is currently captured electronically in floor plans and what format they are in (i.e. DWG)? How much of the existing floor plans are polylined?

Currently, approximately, 98% of the total is in AutoCAD or Microstation electronic DWG format. And, approximately, 95% is 'polylined' in our current INSIGHT Space Management software, using an INS file format.

Q38. 3.1.7.2 – can you clarify your plans for the PeopleSoft upgrade to v9.2 and any plans for rollout to the various institutions?

We are currently using version 9.0. We understand that version 9.2 will be available from PeopleSoft in the fall of 2012. Any upgrade of financials would be rolled out simultaneously to all institutions as each university is implemented as a separate business unit with a single database.

Q39. Section 3.2.2 Space Management:

a. Do electronic drawings exist for all facilities?

Electronic drawings exist for approximately 98% of our facilities in DWG file format.

b. If yes, what percent are in a CAD format?

Approximately 98% of our buildings floor plans are in AutoCAD DWG file format

c. Is there correlation/integration between your current space management solution and PeopleSoft Asset Management (if implemented) or locations?

No.

Q40. Section 3.3 Implementation, Training, Maintenance, and Support:

a. Will the project team, including both University of Maine participants and external consultants, have a central work location or be distributed across all campuses for the bulk of the project?

See Q27.

b. Section 3.3.1.2 – can you clarify your deployment considerations in regard to the 6-12 month timeframe?

i. Does this timeframe apply for all campuses? Is there consideration for a phased rollout?

The University would consider whatever phased or other launch sequences are proposed by vendors within the timeframe described.

ii.   Are there external factors which would preclude deployment on a campus by campus basis?

There are no external factors that preclude a campus by campus approach.

Q41.   Does the University prefer a self-hosted or SaaS solution?

This will be assessed as part of the proposal. The University will determine what is most advantageous to implement at that time.

Q42.   Does the University have an estimated number of concurrent users that it would anticipate using the system from the various campuses?

See Section 3.1.1.9 of the RFP.

Q43.   Does the University plan to roll-out the system to all the campuses in a single effort or will this be a phased approach with the smaller campuses handled as a secondary phase?

See Q40.

Q44.   Does the University need the vendor to quote platform software costs (Oracle Technology stack) to support the solution or will the University be providing those licenses itself?

Licensing costs should be included in proposals.

Q45.   Will the University be providing a training team to help roll the solution out to the individual campuses or should the Vendor plan to quote the cost to implement and train at each campus?

The vendor should plan to quote the cost to implement and train each campus for the core initial training. A train-the-trainer approach may be implemented for sustainment and ongoing training with the solution.

Q46.   Is the cost proposal scored as lowest cost over five years or year 1? Is the end of year 5 pricing for the Capital Planning and Project Management module included in this scoring?

Please refer to section 2.11 of the RFP which states, in part: The University reserves the right to consider multiple cost scenarios as described further in the cost submission section of the document when awarding points for cost proposals….. The University reserves the right to reject any or all proposals, in whole or in part, and is not necessarily bound to accept the lowest cost proposal if that proposal is contrary to the best interests of the University. The University may cancel this Request for Proposals or otherwise choose to make no award, and may act as it determines to be in the best interest of the University.

Q47. Please provide an estimate of the number of total named users that will need access to the system by functionality. I.E. are the 30-40 full users plus another tier of technicians (estimated at 250-350) plus requestors the user count needed for the full IWMS system?

The 30-40 would need to be named users, 250-350 could be the count for mobile solutions or concurrent users and the balance would be requestors and perhaps reporting users only.

Q48. Is this initiative budgeted/funded? If yes, what is the budget amount?

The project has a commitment from University leadership to implement and a funding source has been identified. There is not yet a budget for the project.

Q49. Please advise of the anticipated/expected implementation timeframe.

See Q22.

Q50. Does the University expect to have resources to assign to the implementation?

See Q21.

Q51. Please advise of the overall procurement process / schedule of events including when contract signing / kickoff is expected to occur.

See Q22.

Q52. How is the University going to compare hosting costs of University-hosted proposals versus Vendor-hosted proposals?

As described in the RFP, including the updated Appendix 8.2 and the response to question 46 issued as part of this Addendum.

_____

Hal Wells
University of Maine System
Assistant Director of Strategic Procurement

November 1, 2011

Appendix 8.2

Cost form 8.2A

Cost Form 8.2A – Hosted by vendor	
Item	Amount
Initial purchase price (or licensing fee). This cell must exclude the Solution's capital planning and project management functionality or module, such as described in Section 3.2.4	
Year 1 maintenance and support	
Year 2 maintenance and support	
Year 3 maintenance and support	
Year 4 maintenance and support	
Year 5 maintenance and support	
Installation and implementation services, including all necessary integration, data conversion or data loading	
Other professional services, including all start-up and initial training	
Hosting and equipment costs, if any	
Other costs, if any	
Total 5-year costs (sum of all other cells)	

Cost Form 8.2A1	
Item	Amount
Purchase price for capital planning and project management module or functionality, such as described in Section 3.2.4, at the conclusion of the 5th year.	
Other costs associated with the purchase and implementation of capital planning and project management module	
Total cost for module	

Cost form 8.2B

Cost Form 8.2B – Hosted by University	
Item	Amount
Initial purchase price (or licensing fee). This cell must exclude the Solution's capital planning and project management functionality or module, such as described in Section 3.2.4	
Year 1 maintenance and support	
Year 2 maintenance and support	
Year 3 maintenance and support	
Year 4 maintenance and support	
Year 5 maintenance and support	
Implementation services, including all necessary integration, data conversion or data loading	
Other professional services, including initial and ongoing training	
Equipment and installation costs to meet recommended specifications of the solution.	
Other costs, if any	
Total 5-year costs	

Cost Form 8.2B1	
Item	Amount
Purchase price for capital planning and project management module or functionality, such as described in Section 3.2.4, at the conclusion of the 5th year.	
Other costs associated with the purchase and implementation of capital planning and project management module	
Total cost for module	