

Addendum 3
ERP Implementation Services
RFP 654331

This document provides updated information and clarification pertaining to the above captioned RFP and will be updated as necessary.

REMINDER: It is the Respondent's responsibility to thoroughly examine and read the entire RFP document and any appendices and addenda to this RFP.

1. **Vendor Form.** In the Standard Terms and Conditions Signature Sheets, the Vendor Identification section says vendors should complete an online form and submit with the proposal. This form is different from the form included on page 11 of this document titled, "Office of Business Affairs Vendor Identification Information". Which form would you prefer vendors submit with the proposal?

Response: Please use the Vendor Identification Information Form on page 11.

2. **UA System Resources.** Has the System identified the resources who will be dedicated to this implementation and if so, can you provide the FTE count by type (HCM Functional, FIN Functional, Technical, etc.)?

Response: See Addendum 2, # 13. The UA System and its institutions have started the process to designate staff assigned to the ERP Project, and are looking to the proposal responses to assist it in determining ideal staffing levels. For purposes of this bid, the Respondent should operate under the assumption provided in Section 14.8, "The System will commit sufficiently skilled staff resources to the Project as reflected in an agreed upon work plan and staffing plan."

3. **Scope.** Can you please confirm which, if any, of these Workday functional domains are in scope: Advanced Compensation, Absence Management, Talent Management, Performance Management, Succession Planning, Career & Development Planning, Expenses?

Response: See Addendum 2, # 19. The UA System has procured all of the listed modules from Workday. It is not the expectation of the UA System that all of these would go into production at the same time. The target production dates given in the RFP are for the first phase in all major areas of functionality. It is not the expectation of the UA System that all procured functionality will be in production by those dates. For example, these areas could be good candidates for a future phase: Talent Management, Performance Management, Succession Planning, and Career & Development Planning. The System is looking to the Respondent to propose a timeline and set of production dates that make sense.

4. **Benefits.** Does Workday Benefit Administration need to be configured in Workday or will Benefits be administered via 3rd party and only appropriate Workday HR data needs to be sent to the 3rd party? Is Benefits Open Enrollment in scope?

Response: At this time, the UA System intends to administer benefits in Workday. Open enrollment would be in scope.

5. **Student Go-Live.** Are there specific go-live dates that must be achieved for specific student product areas and/or schools? (i.e. are there specific SIS approaching end of life)

Response: Other than the timeline guidance given in RFP Section 14.4, there are no known specific deadlines or events driving the student system production dates. The POISE system is an end-of-development product, and the community colleges using POISE were put in Cohort 1 due to that.

6. **Student Roll-Out.** Is there a specific type of roll-out the system would prefer to follow for the Student implementation? I.e. pilot, cohorts, etc. If so, what would these groupings look like?

Response: The UA System expects to deploy the student system in the same two cohorts as the other functionality. The UA System is willing to review alternative deployment strategies that would be advantageous to the System.

7. **Administrative Processing.** On the pre-proposal conference call, there was a reference made that not all entities do their own processing and that some of the larger ones perform the processing for some smaller ones - is there a mapping of this (who processes for whom, and for what functions/activities?)

Response: Currently, in Cohort 1, the institutions are:

University of Arkansas Division of Agriculture

University of Arkansas Community College at Morrilton (UACCM)

University of Arkansas Community College at Hope (UACCH)

Cossatot Community College of the University of Arkansas (CCCUA)

University of Arkansas Rich Mountain

The Winthrop Rockefeller Institute

University of Arkansas at Little Rock (UALR), which provides administrative processing for:

Arkansas School for Mathematics, Sciences, and the Arts

University of Arkansas, Fayetteville (UAF), which provides administrative processing for:

University of Arkansas System Office

University of Arkansas System eVersity

Arkansas Archeology Survey

Criminal Justice Institute

University of Arkansas Clinton School of Public Service

The institutions in Cohort 2 (not listed – unchanged) provide their own processing.

8. **Cohort.** Please explain how the schools were selected for each cohort.

Response: Primarily, the institutions with the most urgent need regarding administrative systems were put in Cohort 1. UAF, and the institutions for which it

processes, uses an aging mainframe system. The community colleges in Cohort 1 are using an end-of-development product for their primary administrative software.

9. **Cohort Collaboration.** Are there any data sharing or consolidating activities currently that would require possible integrations between cohorts?

Response: The UA System is in the process of deploying a new Identity and Access Management (IAM) solution across the institutions, with the target of this system being deployed prior to the first ERP production date. Currently, the only major cross-institution consolidation is the UA System office consolidating financials from all institutions for its financial reports. This is primarily a manual process, but the UA System is looking forward to automating this process as institutions come into production on Workday. Other than those examples, we offer this quote from RFP Section 14.3: The System expects that the Architect phase will include representation from all institutions from both Cohorts 1 and 2 so that all institutions have input in the initial design of the system. The deployment will be by cohort as specified in Section 14.1. The System also expects that any design considerations from inclusion of the Workday Student system will be considered during this initial Architect phase, although Student deployment is not part of the proposed project. In other words, the Workday Student software and its needs should be a factor in designing basic structures in Financials, Procurement, HR and Payroll, so no major re-design in these areas is required when the Student system is eventually deployed by the System.

10. **Software Version.** Would the system please provide the current software version for each institute and state if the institutions that are using the same vendor are operating on the same instance of software?

Response: The UA System does not have this information at this time.

11. **Off-Shore.** Are we permitted to propose off-shore resources and are there any restrictions to their use?

Response: See Addendum 2, # 1: The RFP language as stated stands.

12. **Updated Metrics.** In appendix 1, could the system please provide an updated “Key Metrics for the University of Arkansas System” and “Current Relevant Systems for the University of Arkansas System” tables to include all institutions and units listed on page 2 of the appendix?

Response: See response # 7 above. The UA System has provided all of the information it has at this time.

13. **LMS.** Is there an integrated learning management system (LMS) solution across the University of Arkansas system? If so, what system is currently deployed? If not, what are the different types of LMS systems that the University of Arkansas currently hosts?

Response: The UA System has standardized its student LMS on Blackboard. Although there is cooperation across institutions, the institutions have implemented separately.

14. **Shared Services.** Are any institutions currently using a shared services model? If yes, please state which services are supported and the associated operating model?

Response: See response # 7 above. Some institutions process for other smaller institutions. Other than that, there are no shared services currently across the UA System.

15. **Post-Production Support.** What is the system's vision for post-production support relative to shared services?

Response: The governance board for the ERP project has not finalized its design for post-production support. We expect that it will likely be a shared service. The UA System would like your recommendations and expertise regarding the best practices for post-production support.

16. **Cost-Saving Technology.** As part of your best value approach, the System is looking to reduce project costs during the implementation. One major cost savings factor will be the use of technology to use time more efficiently and reduce travel costs.

- Are there any particular technologies in use or preferred?
- Will key conference rooms at all/major locations be outfitted with high resolution screens and polycons?

Response: There is no preferred technology but Zoom and WebEx are widely used within the UA System. The Respondent should not count on any teleconferencing equipment other than desktop workstations with cameras and some conference rooms with a speakerphone. Most campuses will have a video conferencing room with equipment that could be available to the project on a limited basis.

17. **Off-Site Expectations.** The System project office will be based in Little Rock, AR and will be the primary site for on-site work when required; there are many activities that could be done by the Contractor off-site. Do you have a particular expectation of the on-site/off-site percentage?

Response: The System project office will be based in Little Rock, AR, and that will be the primary site for cross-institution on-site work (e.g., system design sessions, governance meetings, etc.) when required. The Contractor's work plan may also call for work done on-site at an institution, based on its knowledge of the best way to deliver its services. For example, there will likely be more on-site work at UAF and UAMS than other institutions due to their size and complexity. The UA System expects the Respondents to propose, based on their experience, the balance of off-site and on-site work that optimizes the UA System's best outcome, most engagement, least risk and lowest cost.

18. **Alternative Costing Strategy.** The implementation of the student system is an optional phase of this RFP and will not be part of the fixed-fee bid. Are you willing to entertain other costing strategies for the initial implementation project, such as "Time & Materials"?

Response: The requested services must be quoted as a fixed fee bid. In response to Section 15.7, # 14, Optional Products/Services, the Respondent may propose other approaches that would be advantageous to the UA System.

19. **Train-the-Trainer.** The Contractor shall provide a structured method and approach, guidance, and mentoring to support a successful transition to the new ERP-enabled business processes and related business processes impacted by the software. In the Table 2 RACI matrix on page 9, it indicates the contractor as the “primary” for Communications materials development, but indicates “assist” for the delivery. Alternatively, the opposite is shown for End User Training (EUT) in that it indicates the contractor as the “assist” for EUT materials development, but “primary” for the delivery. Do you plan to deploy a “Train the Trainer” approach or is the expectation that the implementer will deliver all of the training?

Response: Amend this section in Appendix 3, *Model SOW*, to read as follows:

End-User Training Delivery

The Contractor must provide a senior Training Lead who can plan, direct and execute end-user training for the System. The Contractor shall lead and provide resources for development of end-user training based on the Training Strategy and Plan. The System expects most end user training will leverage the Workday Adoption Toolkit and other Workday or Contractor online learning resources, but there may be customized curricula that require an instructor-led approach. The Contractor shall provide train-the-trainer support for System training resources of end-user training based on the Training Strategy and Plan.

Also, in Table 2, *Organizational Change Management Responsibility Matrix*, change the activity “Deliver End-User Training Events” to “Deliver Train-the-Trainer Support for End User Training”.

The Contractor is not shown as “assist” for EUT materials development, as asserted in the question. The matrix in Table 2 shows the Contractor as Lead for all activities other than “Deliver Communications” and “Manage evaluations of End-User Training Events” (including the amendment above). The UA System expects the Contractor to deliver training to the System training resources. The delivery of classroom training, other than during the train-the-trainer period led by the Contractor, will be done by System trainers.

20. **Integration Development.** Based on the Table 5 RACI Matrix on page 13, do you envision that the implementer will lead the development of all 437 integrations with knowledge sharing taking place at the end, or would this be more jointly shared with knowledge sharing taking place throughout?

Response: The UA System expects to have some involvement and knowledge transfer, but will be busy developing its part of the integrations for internal legacy systems. The Respondent should assume that it has primary responsibility for development of the needed integrations into Workday. Once all integrations are analyzed, we expect that the development list will likely include less than 437 items.

21. **Cohort Integrations.** Are there any special data sharing considerations, interfaces, conversions, and/or integrations that would require integrations between the go-live of Cohort 1 and Cohort 2?

Response: See response to # 9 above.

22. **Conversion Scope.** The RFP Model Statement of Work states that the Contractor shall provide the following data conversion services: Coordinating pre-conversion activities such as verification of data to be converted, archiving, purging, and cleansing of legacy data by System resources; and Developing programming specifications in accordance with the detailed data conversion plan that includes coding and unit and integration testing for the conversion programs. Do you plan to have dedicated resources that will develop the coding and perform the data extraction into the specified format and develop the crosswalks for the implementer to load into Workday?

Response: Building the crosswalks for data conversion is listed as a specific activity and deliverable for which the Contractor is responsible. See Section 3.3 of the Model SOW. The Respondent should assume that the UA System will have sufficient resources to extract the data in the formats provided.

23. **Data Cleansing.** For data cleansing issues, will you have resources that will be available to perform data cleansing in the source/legacy system in advance of successive tenant builds?

Response: The Respondent should assume that the UA System will have sufficient resources to cleanse the data as required.

24. **Other Systems.** What systems are you currently using for:

- Budgeting & Planning
- Inventory
- Learning Management

And are there any compelling reasons that may impact or drive the timeline for each?

Response: See response # 13 above regarding LMS. Otherwise, the UA System does not have this information at this time. Regarding timeline or drivers, the UA System is expecting the Respondent to propose a production timeline that makes sense. We expect that not all functionality will come into production at the same time. The listed modules could be good candidates for a later phase of deployment.

25. **Chart of Accounts.** Do you plan to undertake a substantial revision/simplification to your Chart of Accounts as you develop your Workday Foundational Data Model?

Response: See Addendum 2, # 5. The UA System has recently conducted a review and redesign of its system-wide chart of accounts. The design was independent of any software. The System believes that it has identified the necessary elements of a new chart of accounts, but there is likely to be some effort by the Contractor to fit this into the Workday structure.

26. **Methodology.** Will the System consider a different mix of “Leads” and “Assists” in support of the activities outlined in the Model Statement of Work that more closely aligns with the Workday methodology and the path to self-sufficiency?

Response: The UA System is not prepared to agree to take on significantly more responsibility than laid out in the Model SOW. In response to Section 15.7, # 14, Optional Products/Services, the Respondent may propose other approaches that would be advantageous to the UA System.

27. **Cohort Selection.** What was the selection criteria for Cohort 1 and Cohort 2? Was anyone deferred to Cohort 2 due to complexity and therefore needing more time for go-live? Was assigning schools to Cohorts intended to stagger the go-lives and minimize risk of everyone going live at once? The System intends for the community colleges within each cohort to deploy as a group in their cohort. What does this mean?

Response: See response to # 8 above. Regarding the community colleges, the UA System expects that these institutions will be able to use same configuration and require little to no customization of business processes. We have assumed that their implementations will look very similar.

28. **Single Tenant.** Is it correct to assume that all institutions will share a single production tenant?

Response: Yes, that is the UA System's assumption.

29. **Business Process.** Is the System's vision that most institutions will share business processes and that business processes will be simplified?

Response: See this assumption in RFP Section 14.8: The System is committed to changing business processes and requirements, and expects to use Workday's delivered Business Processes as the starting point for design/configuration activities. Deviation from the delivered business processes will not be an arbitrary action on the part of the System.

30. **Review of Current Processes.** Has there been an analysis or review of current business processes and policies to identify complexities, cross-institutional compatibility, or Workday product gaps? Or is this expected to occur during the design stage? Does the System expect individual institutions to adhere to unified standards regarding business processes and policies?

Response: The UA System is currently performing analysis to look at processes and policies across institutions to identify opportunities for alignment and/or simplification. Since the UA System has no expertise in Workday, specific product gaps have not been identified. Also, see response to # 29 above. Since the UA System currently has no common business processes, we expect to use the Workday delivered business processes as a common starting point.

31. **Governance.** Are there existing cross-institutional governance groups (e.g., Controller's, HROs, etc.) or will these need to be created as part of the project?

Response: In addition to the governance discussed in RFP Section 14.5, there are cross-institution groups already established such as CFOs, CHROs, CIOs, etc.

32. **Benefits Cloud Connect.** We see Cloud Connect for Benefits. Are you planning to maintain current benefits admin system and integrate that with Workday?

Response: See response # 4 above.

33. **Absence.** Did you purchase the Absence SKU along with Time Keeping?

Response: According to Workday, Absence is part of the HCM subscription, which is part of what the UA System is procuring.

34. **Academic Appointments.** Are you planning to include academic appointments in the HCM system?

Response: Yes.

35. **Train-the-Trainer.** Do you envision a Train the Trainer model? What will be your contribution of training resources in terms of FT resources?

Response: See response to # 19 above.

36. **Workday Adoption Toolkit.** Have you purchased the Workday Adoption Toolkit?

Response: The UA System expects to procure this product.

37. **Job Aids.** Are job aids an anticipated deliverable?

Response: Yes. We expect the templates from the Workday Adoption Toolkit to accelerate these efforts. See Model SOW Section 1.3: "As part of this effort, the Contractor shall develop materials appropriate for each training delivery channel to support training that has been customized to address specific software configuration and customizations made as part of the Workday project. Materials will vary by delivery channel, but may include instructor guides, learner guides, quick reference guides, job aids, and user exercise and engagement materials."

38. **Submission Format.** Please confirm if you require the Technical and Cost proposals to be submitted in a 3-ring binder, or if they can be bound otherwise and still be compliant? Also, please confirm that you are asking for four (4) total CD-ROMs or USB flashdrives (two each for both the Technical proposal, and the Cost proposal)

Response: Binding other than a 3-ring binder is acceptable. There is a preference that the binding method allows the material to lay flat. And yes, the electronic media for the Technical and Cost Proposals must be separate, so a minimum of four media is required.

39. **Administrative Sharing.** Which entities use other institutions for providing HR, Financial and/or Student services? Will each entity run their own payroll, have their own HR people, their own benefits, etc.?

Response: See response to # 7 above.

40. **Business Process Changes.** Since the System will be enabling Workday processes which will trigger a change in your operating model and roles, have you considered those implications in your business case? What is your vision/plan to address org. model and roles design? Will it be in scope?

Response: See response to # 30 above. To the largest extent possible, the UA System wants to start with delivered processes and roles in Workday. We expect that there

will be changes in current processes and current roles. Leading the design and managing these changes is within scope for the Contractor.

41. **Mandatory Requirements.** In the pre-proposal conference presentation one of the mandatory requirements was changed - what is the correct requirement?
In the RFP: "(1) that it has completed an implementation of Workday for a customer that is comparable in size and complexity to the University of Arkansas System"
In the presentation: "Completed an implementation of Workday for a HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION similar in size and complexity to the University of Arkansas System"

Response: The RFP language is correct.

42. **Workday Resource.** Are you looking for Workday Delivery Assurance Services to be a part of each bid presented, or would the UA System contract those after the vendor award (based on the final project plan and scope of the vendor selected)

Response: The UA System will procure these services as needed directly from Workday. They should not be part of the Respondent price quote.

All else regarding this RFP solicitation remains as is. Further questions concerning all matters of this RFP should be sent via email to:

Linda Fast, Procurement Coordinator
Office of Business Affairs
lfast@uark.edu