



MANDATORY PRE-PROPOSAL TELE-CONFERENCE

Consulting Services - PeopleSoft Campus Solutions 9.2 Upgrade Partner
RFP No. 624830

Tuesday, November 29, 2016
1:00 PM CST

TRANSCRIPT

The purpose of this meeting was to provide a forum for vendors to obtain clarification about the RFP prior to preparing their responses.

Participants:

	<u>Supplier</u>	<u>Contact Name</u>	<u>Email</u>
1.	HighStreet IT Solutions	Brett Miller	brett.miller@highstreetit.com
2.	Ciber	Gloria Kunik	GKunik@ciber.com
		Paul Strother	PStrother@ciber.com
3.	DLZP Group	Christopher Day	christopher.day@dlzpgroup.com
4.	Cognizant	Anthony DiSanza	Anthony.DiSanza@cognizant.com
5.	ERPA Group	Cory Drescher	cdrescher@erpagroup.com
6.	Lancesoft	Dennis Harkins	Dennis.Harkins@lancesoft.com
		Brian Byrne	Brian.Byrne@LanceSoft.com
7.	Addvantum	John Neita	john.neita@advantum.com
8.	Dimension Systems	Jem Cornish	JCornish@dsisys.com
9.	Sierra-Cedar	Walter Kisner	Walter.Kisner@sierra-cedar.com
		Laurie Schaffler	Laurie.Schaffler@sierra-cedar.com
		Sharon Green	Sharon.Green@sierra-cedar.com

UofA Team: Ron Neyman, Dave Dawson, Mary-Ann Bloss, Dennis Whatley, Allen Fields, Nick Daehn, Kim Gilbert
Procurement Coordinator: Whitney Smith, wesmith@uark.edu

Reminders / Clarifications

- **Be sure to sign all bid documents where required and submit with your proposal!**
- All participants on this call will receive the transcript which will include the information from the Q&A forum. Please make certain you have sent Whitney Smith an e-mail with your contact information (wesmith@uark.edu). Any questions related to this RFP that are received *after* the distribution of this Transcript will be addressed by Q&A Addendum and provided by email to all participants of the conference call of 11/29/16.
- **Arkansas Technology Access Clause:** As noted in the Standard Terms & Conditions Document for this RFP, found here <http://procurement.uark.edu/resources/documents/terms.pdf> (item #22 starting at the top of page 4), vendors are required to comply with this request by submission of a Voluntary Product Accessibility Template (VPAT) with their proposal.

Questions / Answers

- Q:** In section 10.2 of the RFP document, there's mention of an "interactive" version of the RFP document – is that in addition to the three files listed on Hogbid as of 11/18?
- A:** For clarity, the RFP document is provided in Word format which we consider "interactive" (versus a pdf file). Therefore, and as stated in section 10.2, "Bidders can insert responses into the document provided, or create their own response document making sure to remain consistent with the numbering and chronological order as listed in our RFP document. Ultimately, bidders must 'acknowledge' each section of our document in their bid response." All public information pertaining to this RFP will be posted to the Hogbid website accordingly.
- Q:** Whether companies from Outside USA can apply for this? (like, from India or Canada)
- A:** Non-US companies can submit RFP responses. The minimal expectation is that all communications occur in written and spoken English.
- Q:** Whether we need to come over there for meetings?
- A:** The expectation is that the consulting engagement will be an on-site event conducted at UA Fayetteville. If the respondent proposes an alternate venue they should indicate which activities will occur on-site and which activities will occur remotely.
- Q:** Can we perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside USA? (like, from India or Canada)
- A:** The expectation is that the consulting engagement will be an on-site event conducted at UA Fayetteville. If the respondent proposes an alternate venue they should indicate which activities will occur on-site and which activities will occur remotely
- Q:** Can we submit the proposals via email?
- A:** No
- Q:** Is UA interested in Organizational Change Management as well as Project Change control? If so, please describe the OCM services you are interested in receiving.
- A:** UA is interested in OCM services as they relate to Project Change control and Project Management. Respondents are encouraged to include those items of OCM they evaluate to provide the best overall engagement experience.
- Q:** Do you plan to use technical upgrade support from the vendor? If so, which of the following roles will be needed? Upgrader, DBA, PS System Administrator, Windows Administrator, Developer?
- A:** No.
- Q:** Does the University need extra processor or disk capacity of any sort during upgrade process?
- A:** No.
- Q:** If UA will require technical upgrade assistance, please complete the questions or validate any information we've already completed in the attached questionnaire.
- A:** N/A
- Q:** How firm is your intention to be live on 9.2 by October 16, 2017? What is your target date to begin the project?
- A:** Very firm go live date of October 16, 2017. Respondents should plan for March 1, 2017 start date.
- Q:** Is the University planning to perform the technical upgrade activities, or are you looking for the selected vendor to provide those services?

A: UA staff will perform the technical upgrade.

Q: Does the University plan to allocate internal staff to support testing of the upgrade?

A: Yes.

Q: Can the University share what internal staff levels they plan to allocate to the project?

A: Minimum 4 technical staff and at least one lead from each functional area – minimum of 5.

Q: The RFP talks about “Post-upgrade work to support the upgraded system.” Can the University elaborate on the expectations for this scope item?

A: UA anticipates provisional assistance from respondents for approximately 2 weeks post go-live of October 16, 2017.

Q: When would UArk be available to begin the project – January 3rd?

A: Respondents should plan to begin March 1, 2017.

Q: P13 – Goals and Objectives – please clarify this comment “Completed project with all deliverables by October 16, 2017 go-live”

- a. Is this intended to mean the Upgrade Planning effort to be completed by 10/17, then the upgrade to commence, or that the Upgrade be completed by 10/17?

A: UA expects to be fully functional/operational on October 16, 2017.

Q: Regarding qualifications regarding schools having implemented PeopleSoft Campus Solutions 9.2 – Is the University aware that there are schools in the process of upgrade, but there are no live qualifications? Can we submit schools that are live in PeopleSoft 9.2 HCM or FSCM?

A: Yes, we are aware that schools are currently performing the Campus Solutions 9.2 upgrade. Yes, respondents can provide information regarding their experience with upgrading clients to PeopleSoft 9.2 HCM and/or 9.2 FSCM.

Q: Please clarify P 13 – Scope section details a project that stops prior to commencing the upgrade – Performing Fit/Gap, planning the upgrade and the upgrade project plan. Deliverable #1 & #3 and #5 read as if UArk desires a proposal for an actual upgrade.

A: UA does desire a proposal for an actual upgrade – with local staff performing the technical aspects of the upgrade.

Post-Call Questions Received

Q: Which firm did the original implementation of PeopleSoft Campus Solutions?

A: Ciber

Q: Is that firm bidding on this upgrade as well?

A: Ciber representatives were on the pre-bid conference call. No assumptions can be made regarding an intent to bid.

Q: Will the project follow the vendor’s upgrade methodology or the University’s?

A: UA has requested respondents supply an upgrade “plan” per the scope defined in the RFP. UA will evaluate those proposals as part of the overall RFP evaluation.

- Q.** It is understood that the University is seeking primarily functional support during the upgrade. If following the vendors upgrade methodology, however, would the University also like a project manager from the vendor?
- A:** UA anticipates some level of project management services in order to clarify/interpret items on the requested project plan. The decision to provide a project manager is up to the respondent.
- Q.** Given that on today's call, the University confirmed that they would like a rate card from the vendors for technical roles, would the University like vendors to include offshore rates or just U.S. domestic rates?
- A:** Respondents are encouraged to provide as much information as they feel necessary to fulfill the RFP requirements. Rates can vary. However, expectations for the quality for work performed cannot vary.
- Q.** Will UARK accept electronic signatures on the documents?
- A.** Electronic and digital signatures are acceptable. Also, agencies must submit one (1) signed original, two (2) signed copies, and two (2) soft copies (on CD and/or USB Flash Drive) of your response to this bid. Submit bid to:

**University of Arkansas
Business Services
ADMN 321
1125 W. Maple St
Fayetteville, AR 72701**