1. On page 11, you make reference to the State's planned upgrade to 9.2. The reference says "scheduled for 2015".

   a. Is there a more specific date?

      The upgrade is scheduled to be completed in October 2015.

   b. Can you discuss the timing of the University's migration per the RFP?
      i. Will it coincide with the upgrade?

         There will be some overlap, but this project will start on the HCM 9.2 code line.

      ii. Will there be a "waiting period" after the upgrade before the University can fully adopt v9.2?

         No, the upgrade will not affect the timeline of the project.

2. In section 1.4 you discuss the proposed scope and the role of the vendor.

   a. Can you describe the expected interaction between the University and the State to approve configuration changes, customizations, etc?

      The State will have one team comprised of University of Connecticut and Core-CT resources dedicated to this project. There is a project governance structure in place to review and approve all project designs and resolve issues that arise.

   b. Can you define the full team in terms of vendor, university personnel, and State personnel?

      The State resources are defined in section 1.4 on the top of page 12. The vendor should include their proposed team as part of the response to the RFP.

   c. What role will the State play in the design, approval process, testing, and knowledge transfer?

      The first part of the question is answered above in question 2a. The State's team will assist in testing and knowledge transfer.

   d. If there is a conflict between the current Core-CT configuration and the requirements for the University, how will that be resolved? The vendor will need to perform that analysis as part of the fit/gap and provide recommendations.

3. In section 1.5 you mention that the vendor may propose additional software or functionality not currently being utilized by Core-CT.

   a. Can you define the approval process for new software/functionality?

      Please see answer to question 2a above.

b. What role will the State play in the approval process for changes to Core-CT?

Please see answer to question 2a above.

4. Will the project team be based in a single location? If so, where?

The project team will likely be located at the Core-CT office in Hartford and the University of Connecticut Storrs campus. The project sites are approximately 30 miles apart.

5. Section 2.15.3 talks about System Acceptance. Can you describe the system acceptance process as it relates to:
    a. Project Team acceptance
    b. University acceptance
    c. Core-CT acceptance
    d. OSC acceptance
    e. Final acceptance

The State Project team working with the vendor will establish entry and exit criteria for each major milestone/phase for the project.   Once the exit criteria have been met the milestone/phase will be deemed accepted by the project team which includes OSC, University and Core-CT members.

6. Does the State currently own licenses for the Absence Management module within PeopleSoft HCM?

No.

7. Can the State provide a listing of the PeopleSoft HCM modules currently licensed by the state but not in use?

- Ebenefits;
- Eprofile;
- Eprofile Manager;
- Erecruit Manager Desktop; and
- Erecruit

8. If additional Oracle/PeopleSoft modules are proposed and the State does not currently have licenses for the modules, should software license fees be included in the pricing for this project?

No, The State will procure any required additional licenses separately.

9. On page 40 of the RFP, Section 3.1 Overview – the first paragraph includes the following statement "and integrating the State institutions of higher education into Core-CT Financials". Is this part of the scope for this project?

No, it is not part of the scope of this project. See the correction in amendment #2.
http://www.osc.ct.gov/vendor/rfps/2014/uconnrfp/Amendment2.pdf

10. On page 45 of the RFP, Section 3.3.5 Summary of Qualifications - Are the seven summary qualification bullet points correct?

    No, it is corrected in amendment # 1
    http://www.osc.ct.gov/vendor/rfps/2014/uconnrfp/Amendment1.pdf

11. On page 47 of the RFP, Section 3.3.7 – References - It states that "contract information" should be included for each reference. Should "contract information" or "contact information" be provided for each reference? If "contract information", please provide details on contract details that should be provided. If "contact information", please provide the types of contact information required.

    It should have read "contact" information – please provide the projects point person's name, telephone and email address.

12. Does the State have the appropriate infrastructure and hardware to support this implementation? Is analysis of the State's existing infrastructure and hardware in scope for this project?

    Yes the infrastructure is in place. No analysis is required.

13. Has the State given consideration as to how their complex security requirements could fit within the existing departmental security structure currently in place with CORE-CT?

    The University's security requirements were reviewed in detail during a fit gap analysis against the Core-CT PeopleSoft HCM v9.1 system. A solution that allows the University to use a more refined level of department security than what is currently being used by the State will need to be addressed in the design phase of the project.

14. Since CORE-CT is the application owner, how will gaps identified in the required UConn functionality be addressed and implemented?

    Please see answer to question 2a above.

15. Does the State have specific requirements related to remote work versus onsite or can we propose the mix that best achieves the project objectives with the lowest cost?

    The vendor may propose a mix of onsite and offsite.

16. Can you confirm whether or not all of the work completed related to this project must be performed within the United States or can work be performed outside of the United States?

17. Regarding Appendix C (Detailed Business Requirements spreadsheet) included in the RFP, could you provide additional background on how this information was generated and what the intent is for its use in relation to a vendor's response to this RFP? Is the expectation that this spreadsheet is completed by the vendor and part of their submission? (Also note that the document is labeled as Appendix B within the document itself.)

    The University's detailed business requirements were gathered as part of the fit gap effort against the Core-CT PeopleSoft HCM v9.1 system. A modified fit gap analysis will be need to be conducted against the State's upgrade v9.2 system to ensure that the proposed solutions provide the best means for meeting the University's business needs within Core-CT. The Detailed Business Requirements Spreadsheet was included in the RFP to give vendors better understanding of the University's complex requirements, and to assist them in providing an informed bid. Vendors are not expected to complete the spreadsheet as part of their submission.

18. Section 37(i) of the State's Information Processing Systems Agreement included with the RFP would require the selected contractor to provide to the State updates to Licensed Software Deliverables for 60-days at no cost. Systems Integrators may be unable to secure sufficient rights from the third party owners of such software to fulfill this requirement. In such instances, would the State be amenable to granting relief from this requirement.

    This is negotiable.

19. Section 37(l) of the State's Information Processing Systems Agreement included with the RFP would require the selected contractor to pay to the State a 40% royalty payment on any charges resulting from proprietary materials developed under the Agreement subsequently provided to non-governmental clients for a period of 5 years. During contract negotiations, would the State be amenable to alternative arrangements to facilitate the licensure of such proprietary materials to the selected contractor, such as a one-time provision of negotiated services by the contractor or a one-time payment of negotiated amounts to the State as consideration for such license rights?

    This is negotiable.

20. While we have not implemented an On Prem PSFT for a state govt or similar sized public body per the reference below:

    Vendors must provide a minimum of five (5) Client References. At least one (1) of the references must be a state government implementation or similar sized public body implementation where the Vendor was the Prime Vendor for upgrading, installing and implementing PeopleSoft ERP systems. Additionally, experience in higher education is mandatory; therefore one (1) of the references must be of an institution of higher education, preferably a public research university.

    We can use a State reference where we implemented an Oracle Cloud HCM Solution. Would this be sufficient?

No. The reference must be for an onsite PeopleSoft HCM 9.x implementation or upgrade project.