

**Proposers' Conference Questions and Responses**  
**Enterprise Resources Planning System Implementation Request for Proposals**  
**(RFP #10005-SCERP02)**

Attendees:

Patrick Johnson, Salvaggio, Teal & Associates  
Michael Goff, Geocent/Diamond Data Systems  
Mark Cohn and Richard Sandoz, ASP Web Solutions  
Charlie Leadbetter, Berry, Dunn, McNeil & Parker  
Nadeen Biddinger, Government Finance Officer's Association  
Joseph Booth, Northrup Grumman Information Systems  
Joseph Di Bartolomeo, Synthasis, LLC  
Hoda Tahlavani, Ark Solutions, Inc.

Terence Sims, Louisiana Supreme Court  
Peter Haas, Louisiana Supreme Court  
Anna Paxton, Louisiana Supreme Court  
Lauren McHugh Rocha, Louisiana Supreme Court

1. Where can we find the latest updates?

All updates can be found on the Supreme Court's website at  
[www.lasc.org](http://www.lasc.org).

2. Is there an incumbent system integrator or a consulting firm already engaged?

There is no incumbent System Integrator or Consulting firm already engaged by the Court.

3. What is the decision date for selecting the winning bid?

The decision date is going to be based upon successful negotiations with the two remaining software vendors, and we are currently in that process.

4. Will the minutes of the meeting and attendees list be made available to those seeking the information, and if so, how do we access that material?

The Court will post responses to questions and a list of attendees on its website at [www.lasc.org](http://www.lasc.org).

5. Is experience with one of the two vendors requisite for the winning bidder?

Experience with the two finalists is strongly preferred by the Court.

6. Has the customer finalized the duration of the project?

Currently, the Court expects to complete the project within an 18 to 24 month period.

7. Is there a specific budget being allocated for the project management office and the ERP implementation project?

The project is budgeted and allocated.

8. What is the role of Schafer Consulting in the project management ERP implementation project?

Schafer Consulting has no role in the PMO/ERP Implementation project at this point.

9. We assume that we will represent the Court's project management office's responsibilities as stated in Exhibit A, Section B (RFP 10005-SCERP01). Please validate our assumption.

Your assumption is correct.

10. Will the customer provide its own FTEs as stated in Exhibit A, Section B, in addition to the bidder's resources?

Yes, the Court will provide those resources as indicated in the initial RFP, in addition to the bidder's resources.

11. What role is the Independent Project Oversight Office expected to play? Coordination of business analysts in business process mapping or appoint resources for the same?

The Independent Project Oversight provider will be expected to provide both.

12. Please define the Independent Project Oversight scope in testing. What role is the PMO expected to play? Who will develop the testing plan and strategy—the ERP vendor or the PMO?

The Court expects the PMO to assist the Court in developing test scripts and strategies, review the results and provide opinions on the success/failure of the testing.

13. Regarding oversight of the extraction and conversion of legacy data, we assume either the ERP vendor or the Court will provide their own resources for this role.

The Court expects to use its own FTEs for data conversion, but would expect the PMO to supplement the staff when needed.

14. What role is the bidder for the Independent Project Office services expected to play in sizing, procurement, planning, and quality control for hardware for the same?

The PMO will be expected to review the vendor's plan for appropriateness, completeness and necessity. The PMO would be expected to provide oversight and review of procurement, planning and quality control.

15. We assume either the ERP vendor or the Court will be providing its own resources for assessing training requirements, content development and delivery.

No, the PMO will be expected to provide such support.

16. Please define the bidder's PMO role in establishing the production and technical environments and making sure the appropriate back-up and disaster recovery processes are in place.

The PMO will be responsible for assessing the risk and making the appropriate recommendations to the Court.

17. Does the customer have an Enterprise Project Management (EPM) or any other Project Management Tool which can be used by the Independent Project Oversight team? If no, is the bidder expected to bring its own tools?

No, the Court has no EPM tools. The winning bidder will need to bring its own tools unless the ERP vendor tools are sufficient.

18. One of your requirements was assisting with the integration of batches and real time data in assisting computer systems. Is that a technical requirement or just an oversight in looking over the way it's planned?

It could be both. It depends on the system and the resources that we have available. As indicated in the initial RFP, the number of FTEs is limited, so the Court may have to use the bidder's staff to provide some of that assistance.

19. Can you explain why the RFP has a requirement that the bidder's team members assigned to the project must be employees of the bidder on July 22, 2009?

The Court is looking for an organization that already has experience with these two particular vendors. We're not looking for an organization that is going to go out and shop résumés over the internet and bring people in that may come and go for the duration of this project. The Court is looking for that experience to already be in place and know that we can expect consistency throughout the project.

20. If a bidder frequently operates with independent contractors and has a relationship with an independent contractor on July 22, 2009, would that be acceptable?

Yes, if that's the way you normally handle business. But you would have to provide us some information showing that the independent contractors have a history of working with your firm as independent contractors in the past.

21. The RFP requests a fixed bid, am I correct in that assumption?

That's correct.

22. There will be different costs depending on which software vendor is chosen by the Court. How is the audience of vendors supposed to provide a fixed bid amount when we don't know who the software vendor will be?

The Court suggests that proposers provide their best estimate “not to exceed” price, because the Court has not completed negotiations with the vendors and cannot provide a final selection at this point in time.

23. Is it acceptable to give a range of final costs?

Yes, and your highest range would then constitute the “not to exceed” price. Also, proposers are permitted to give two scenarios: a cost for SunGard Software and a cost for Agresso Software. Proposers should give the Court the most information possible to allow the Court to evaluate the proposals.

24. Is the scope of the project limited to the HR/Payroll application, or is the Court considering any additional applications?

At this point, the scope is strictly HR/Payroll and finance.

25. Is it the intent of the Court to integrate the HR/Payroll application with other financial modules, such as accounting general ledger?

Yes.

26. How does the Court manage employee time tracking currently?

Manual time sheets.

27. Is the Court posting the data or considering an AFP data posting model?

Currently, we are posting that data into our current payroll software.

28. Okay, so you're hosting it on your own box or environment?

Yes.

29. Are you going to keep it in-house?

Yes.

30. Does the Court currently use any third-party reporting capabilities?

No.

31. Are there any point of sales terminals or processes currently?

Not currently, no.

32. Is this something the Court is considering as part of this project?

The Court has the Clerk's Office that receives payments for filings and the Law Library that sells photocopies and books, so it may be something that the Court will need at some point.

33. Is the Court giving preferences to web-based community interactive applications?

I do not know that we really have a preference, but we are looking for something that would keep us in business in the event of another disaster as we had a few years ago.

34. Does the existing legacy system have available support to answer questions and assist with technical problems during the migration and conversion?

Yes.

35. Does the Court have a baseline project plan at this point?

No. The Court would like the winning proposer to put together the project plan.

36. When would the project plan be developed: before or after vendor selection?

Preferably, the project plan would be completed before the Court enters into a contract with the software vendor, but we're hoping to get this project started October 1, so the time frame is very short.

37. Does the Court have a drop dead date for when it's going to select one of the two software vendors?

No.

38. Please clarify whether this project is focused primarily on project management or on independent project oversight/staff augmentation, or both.

Both.

39. On page 8 of the initial RFP, there was a list of items and services required. Item B on that list said independent project oversight to be provided by Schafer Consulting. Please clarify the role that Schafer Consulting will play on the project.

Schafer Consulting does not have the role of independent project oversight as indicated in that RFP. The Court determined that the projected cost of the independent project oversight contract required a competitive process.

40. Is Schafer Consulting permitted to submit a proposal in response to this RFP?

Yes.

41. With such limited information on the selected software vendor, how can a proposer determine the rates when the amount of staff augmentation necessary is undetermined?

We expect a vendor would use its experience on projects of this type with these software vendors to determine the number of FTE's needed to successfully implement the proposed ERP project. If a vendor has established rates for various levels of individuals, those rates can be applied to the number of FTEs at the various levels needed to augment the staff of the Court.

42. On page 3 of the RFP, Scope of Services, "managing vendor performance to the contract" is listed as one of the duties of the winning proposer. Would the winning proposer have access to that contract?

Yes.

43. Can we see currently the project organization chart?

The Court has a core committee that is reviewing proposals, and has asked directors of various departments to identify people that would be a part of the project. Individuals have not, however, been isolated into an official project group.

44. What is meant by the term "change management" as it is used in the RFP? Is it IT management, as in scope management change control? Or is it

business change management, as in stake holder management, organization, work, training and communication?

They both are necessary.

45. Since cost is probably going to be one of the key decision variables, how much time is the vendor you're selecting required to be onsite?

The evaluation criteria on page 6 indicate that cost is 20% of the overall weighting and therefore is not the only factor. The winning proposer will have to decide the need to have staff on-site at the Court, by phone or over the internet performing work.

46. On page 4 of Section 7, the RFP requires references from at least 2 comparable clients, but it doesn't say comparable projects. So is court experience or public sector/government experience required?

If you have court experience with a project of this nature, that would be a plus, but public sector experience with implementing an ERP project is more important.

47. If the PMO is only providing oversight and not integration, isn't the 10% hold back amount in the Form Contract included with the RFP a problem, because integration is outside the PMO's control?

No. The PMO is responsible for both oversight and integration, so the task of integration is not outside of the PMO's control.

48. Just to clarify, the Court is looking for an organization to come in and do oversight of the implementation vendor as well as the team that is put up by the state internally, and running both to insure acceptable project outcome. Correct?

Yes.

49. But the Court is not looking for the integrator to actually provide the resources necessary to do software configuration and hands-on testing and those types of activities. You're looking for oversight of those activities but you would expect that those activities would be carried out by the implementation vendor and when necessary, both. Is that accurate?

Yes.

50. With respect to the initial RFP (Exhibit B), my assumption is that it is a straightforward software replacement and no process change at all. Is that realistic and is that the Court's intent?

No, that is not realistic. This project probably will require a complete overhaul of our processes.

51. Is the PMO going to be responsible for that activity as well?

Yes, in the sense of making recommendations to staff for best practices, things of that nature. The Court is also working on some process changes at this time, but is looking for a third-party independent oversight person to come in and recommend what it thinks is a good direction to take.

52. The RFP indicates that the Court is not allocating many resources on this project. Can you quantify that for us?

The Court cannot provide an exact number of FTEs that it will be able to assign, but the current estimate is approximately 7.

53. On page 4 of the RFP, it states that a certification by the firm that it is independent of the 2 software vendors is required. What is the required form of this certification?

The certification can be a letter or a statement that an authorized representative signs, which sets forth the required information.

54. As to vendor registration for providing evidence of the firm's ability to do business in Louisiana, what is required?

If the proposer is a foreign corporation, it must be licensed to do business in the state of Louisiana and be in good standing.

55. If a proposer shows that it is going through the process to become licensed in the state, is this acceptable?

That would be acceptable.

56. Will the winning PMO proposer be brought on board before the finalization of the contract with either of the two products that you're looking at?

Yes, it is the Court's expectation that the independent project oversight vendor will come on prior to finalization of the contract with the software vendor so that it can review the software contract and make any recommendations to us for modifications that may be needed.

57. Which SunGard product is being evaluated?

IFAS - 7.9.