

Marin County Response to Questions

Please note that similar questions have been consolidated.

Question 1. Would the County consider looking at responses for just parts of the RFP or must it be a proposal for all components of services asked for in the RFP?

Responses should address all components of the RFP. Partnering is allowed.

- See Section C.2.2 regarding disclosure of subcontract relationships contained within the Response.
- If necessary, it is acceptable for a vendor to sub-contract consultants who have subject-matter expertise they do not have in-house. See Section C.5.3.
- Attachment 4 (Pricing Schedule) should include total price for all services, and additional costs of all services and deliverables referenced in the proposal, including any third parties. If third party services are included, do not provide separate version of Attachment 4 (Pricing Schedule) for each third-party product. See Section C.10.2.

Question 2. RFP Section A.1, About the County, Page 4, indicates that the Marin County Board of Supervisors governs several special districts and other agencies, in addition to the County's 22 departments. RFP Section D.2.3.1, Pages 15 – 16, indicates that the "As-Is" documentation should be documented at the individual department level for several business streams. Is it the County's expectation that the Contractor will document these business streams for individual special districts, or other agencies, in addition to the 22 departments? If so, please provide a list of the specific special districts and other agencies whose processes must be documented, and for which business streams.

No. Vendors should plan to document the business streams from the departments' perspectives. Vendors should also plan to work with County staff only, as special districts and other agencies interface with County departments. Most special districts, for example, will be studied as a part of the Department of Finance's processes. The County will look to vendors to recommend best practices related to business interactions with special districts and other agencies.

Question 2a. In theory, might the vendor need to interview 22 departments for 1 process?

It is possible for some Countywide standard business practices. However, we will look to the vendor to recommend specific departments where standard practices typically vary (i.e., timesheets for the Fire Department).

Question 3. Could you please distinguish how the “Operational improvements” in Phase 1 work differs from the “To-Be” work in Phase 4?

The detailed “To-Be” analysis and documentation will take place during Phase 4 as a part of systems implementation and will be specific to the software selected in Phase 3. The Operations Improvement Plan we are seeking as a part of this RFP is strictly in the interest of the business and should be considered software independent. The primary difference is that the degree of detail we are seeking in Phase 1 is much less than in Phase 4. For example, we would expect Phase 4 to include an extensive process redesign efforts with “To-Be” process maps and documentation. Additionally, we are looking for functional business improvement recommendations that may or may not be process specific. These may take the form of recommended policy changes or recommendations regarding by whom and how a specific business function is accomplished. Marin is interested in determining whether any of its business activities should be improved, and this will inform the software selection process.

Question 4. Has a high level “vision” statement and documented organizational direction been conducted with ALL the major stakeholders, including IST?

At the genesis of this effort, the County developed a Business Case and Charter. These documents are available for download from the County’s RFP website. Please see those documents for the County’s organizational direction.

Question 5. The County hired a new Human Resources Director in 2010, and the Gap Analysis was done in 2010. Was the new HR Director involved, and if so, will that person be involved in the project? Will the 2010 analysis be made available to the contractor?

The Gap Analysis was performed prior to the arrival of Marin’s current HR Director, Joanne Peterson. Joanne sits on the Steering Committee and is very involved with the project. The Gap Analysis, “Marin County Software Report,” is available for download from the County’s RFP website and is also available in the Board of Supervisors minutes from August 24, 2010.

Question 6. The County’s new Director of Finance has not yet been hired. Is there a possibility that a new Director of Finance may change the project parameters since this person is a key stakeholder?

No. A new director was selected who has been involved in the project as the Assistant Director for the department and is supportive of the project team’s approach.

Question 6a. What is his name?

Roy Given

Question 7. Is there a document that identifies the current problems surrounding the implementation and operational problems with the SAP product?

Yes. Some of the documentation is set forth in the SAP Gap Analysis report (see Question 5). Further detail is available in the “Production Assessment of Marin County’s SAP ERP System” report completed by Phoenix Business Consulting, which is available for download from the County’s RFP website.

Question 8. Would the Vendor Project Manager report in to the ATOM Executive Steering Committee generally, or to a specific person in Marin County? Please clearly define the structure that is already in place at the county for this project.

Section D.4 of the RFP shows the management structure in place to support the project. In addition, a team of key staff has been specifically formed to provide support to the ATOM Executive Steering Committee. This team includes the Project Director, Project Manager, Change Manager, Finance Manager, and Human Resources Manager. The Vendor Project Manager would report to the Project Manager and to this team as a Project Management Office (PMO).

Question 9. Can you quantify the number of “non-SAP systems, [and] “shadow” systems”? Can you also describe these systems and provide any technical documentation?

We do not have a specific inventory and expect Phase 1 to accomplish this as part of the “As-Is” documentation. Departments have numerous spreadsheets and offline tracking mechanisms that should be captured as a part of the “As-Is” documentation.

Marin County also has several large systems, in addition to SAP, that support administrative service:

1. CAMS (Cost Accounting Management System) supports the Department of Public Works’ project accounting and cost accounting.
2. The Department of Finance uses CaseWare to produce financial reports.
3. The Department of Finance uses an in-house system, TAPIS (Tax Assessment and Property Information System), to collect and record property tax payments.
4. The Human Resources Department uses the JobAps recruitment and applicant tracking system.

Question 10. Is the project governance structure an established group that has been regularly meeting for some time or is it specifically designed for this project? Will this governance structure be in place through all five phases?

The Executive Steering Committee has been meeting regularly since 2007, shortly after the County implemented SAP. Membership of this committee includes:

- Chief Assistant County Administrator
- Director of Finance
- Director of Human Resources
- Director of Information Services & Technology
- Chief Assistant Director of Public Works

This governance structure will remain in place through the retirement of SAP, all five phases of the project as well as ongoing maintenance of the new system(s).

Question 11. Is the County expecting the consultant to provide an on-site presentation of results to any/all of the groups identified in the governance structure?

Yes. In addition to a formal report, the County expects an executive-level onsite presentation to the Executive Steering Committee.

Question 12. Have County subject-matter experts (SMEs) been identified for all business streams/departments identified in the scope of work?

Subject-matter experts have not yet been identified, but the County expects the departments to identify its SMEs by the start of the contract, on or around December 12, 2011.

Question 13. Are travel expenses allowable, or should the proposer incorporate them into the fully loaded rate?

Proposers must submit costs as fully loaded rates which should include travel, meals, incidentals, and any other expenses. See Section C.10.4.

Question 14. What is the County's desired completion date for Phase 1 (assuming a December 12, 2011 start date)?

The County anticipates completing this work and having approved deliverables by the end of April of 2012. See Section D.1. Please note that this is our estimate; we will look to the vendor to propose a modified timeline if deemed necessary.

Question 15. What is the County's desired completion date for Phase 3 (through contract negotiations)?

The County estimates completion of Phase 3 in April of 2013.

Question 16. Is the County interested in proposals for Phases 1-3 at this time or only Phase 1?

The County is interested only in proposals for Phase 1 at this time. Please note that the vendor who performs the work for Phase 1 is not precluded from bidding on subsequent phases.

Question 17. Does the County have a preference for a Fixed Fee or a Time & Materials bid?

The County has no preference, but Fixed Fee bids must clearly be documented. The proposal should include a change management process for changes or overbids.

Question 18. What business streams have the most opportunities for improvements and business process?

"Hire To Retire" and "Finance and Cash" encompass the primary business processes for the departments of Human Resources and Finance, respectively, and we anticipate the most opportunity within these business streams.

Question 19. Will you distribute sign-in sheet?

Yes. The sign-in sheet is part of the public record, and it has been posted on our RFP website.

Question 20. Does the County need justification for departing from SAP as a part of Phase 1?

No. That decision has already been made.

Question 21. Are there any organizational constraints that proposers need to be aware of in making recommendations?

There are no constraints.

Question 22. How many have done this before on core group?

Members of the Steering Committee and the core project management team have been through similar implementations previously.

Question 23. What is your vision for the Phase 1 deliverables? Can you share any specifics on the “As-Is” process documentation you are expecting? Are you expecting process maps or metrics?

Part of the County’s evaluation will be the methodology, including standards for deliverables, that the vendor brings in the proposal. We anticipate process maps of some level of detail would be part of that methodology.

Question 24. Has the County made any decisions on software? Will the County be targeting Tier One or Tier Two vendors?

No. There have been some previous efforts to look at systems; however, the current project policy is to analyze the business process first. No decision has been made.

Question 25. Will the Phase 2 vendor be secured during Phase 1?

Yes. We anticipate developing an RFP for Phase 2 work during the first quarter of 2012. The Phase 1 vendor will not be precluded from later bidding.

Question 26. What is the role of the Change Manager across the 5 phases?

The specifics of the Change Manager role are currently being developed but the Change Management Plan will span all phases of the project. The County understands and recognizes that this is a critical role to the project.

Question 27. Are the outputs from Phase 1 the inputs for Phase 3?

Yes, the outputs from Phase 1 will be a part of the inputs into Phase 3. Included in several other phases is a third party Quality Assurance (QA) role. At the conclusion of Phase 1, the deliverables will be given to the QA partner, who will compare the deliverables from each phase to the recommendations from Phase 1.

Question 28. How can you have a clear business improvement plan without the knowledge of what software you are going to implement?

We expect a plan that includes for operations that don't rely on technology, and those that do rely on technology will be considered for implementation on a new system. Once we have a clear vision for how we do business, we can then procure software that will support it.

Question 29. Have you gone through this process before?

Yes, during the SAP implementation, but our intent for this part of the project (Phase 1) is solely based on the business (not technology) and this has not been done before.

Question 30. How much detail are you expecting in the Phase 1 recommendations? Are you looking for vendors to identify Chart of Accounts improvements and/or Reporting issues?

The County is looking for high-level recommendations from Phase 1. For example, Chart of Accounts issues may be identified, but we would not expect the entire Chart of Accounts to be redesigned. Similarly, high-level reporting issues may be identified at this stage.

Question 31. If a vendor wins bids in Phases 1-5, will that preclude them from being the QA vendor?

The Phase 1 vendor will not be precluded from consideration for the QA vendor role. However, the County's vendor(s) for Phases 2, 3, and 4 are precluded from being the QA vendor.

Question 32. Are Phases 1-5 sequential?

Yes. Please note that Phase 5 (Change Management) has already started and will continue for life of project.

Question 33. I have a few questions regarding the funding for the Business Process & Operations Improvement project. I was hoping for a breakdown for the estimated values of all five phases of the project, if it is available. I was also wondering which of the other phases (aside from Phases 1 and 3) will be competitively bid.

Our estimate for Phase 1 is \$300-500k, however we expect every proposal to be thoroughly substantiated. See Section C.10 of the Phase 1 RFP for details. Subsequent phases are not part of this current RFP process. We plan for Phases 1, 2, 3, and 4 to be competitively bid.

Last update: September 28, 2011