

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA – BUREAU OF FINANCE AND MANAGEMENT (BFM)

Request for Proposal (RFP No. 23RFP8794) for Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Project Management Services

Written Vendor Inquiries

Last Updated 06/14/23

1. Can the State remove the requirement for an “ink” signature since the Response is being submitted electronically?

BFM Response: *Per [South Dakota Codified Law 53-12-16](#), an electronic signature is acceptable and will meet the requirements of this RFP.*

2. Does bidding on this Project Management Services RFP preclude a Firm from bidding on the “RFP for Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) software and system integrations services”? Or can one Firm be the awardee of both RFP’s?

BFM Response: *Submitting a proposal for this RFP (No. 23RFP8794) would not preclude a firm from bidding on future RFP’s related to this project. However, the firm awarded a contract resulting from this RFP (No. 23RFP8794) would not qualify to bid on the forthcoming RFP for software and system integration services for this project. Additionally, the successful firm for this RFP (No. 23RFP8794) would not qualify to bid on the anticipated future RFP for independent verification and validation (IV&V) services for this project.*

3. Will the State please clarify the expected differences in the services to be provided on this Project Management Services RFP and the implementation services which will be provided by the selected vendor on the Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) software and system integration services?

BFM Response: *As stated in Section 5.2 (Project Management Responsibilities) of the [RFP](#) (No. 23RFP8794), “The selected project management firm will coordinate the overall project schedule and provide direction for State Project Team members and subject matter experts from State staff.” Additionally noted in Section 5.2, “The selected project management firm will serve as the primary point-of-contact with the to-be-awarded ERP solution’s project manager and the system integrator’s (SI) project manager...”*

It is the intention of the State that the successful firm for this RFP (No. 23RFP8794) provide project management and advisory services as it relates to the State’s responsibilities in the upcoming ERP implementation project. This service would

complement and work collaboratively with the project management services that will be provided as part of the System Integrator's scope of work.

4. The solicitation states “The State is currently engaged with a professional advisory firm for project management and consulting services for pre-implementation project activities. These efforts include RFP development for ERP software and system integration services, RFP proposal evaluation, and vendor selection services. Additionally, the advisory firm currently engaged will be assisting the State in pre-implementation organizational change management and implementation preparation efforts. The current engagement extends through the selection and award of ERP software and system integration contracts. The State anticipates the RFP for software and system integration services to be released in late Summer 2023, with vendor selection and contract award in Winter 2024.” Can the State of South Dakota confirm if the objective of this RFP is for offerors to bid a full ERP implementation or bid program management and consulting services before the actual ERP is selected?

BFM Response: *The primary responsibility of the successful firm for this RFP (No. 23RFP8794) is to provide the State with project management and advisory services during the forthcoming ERP implementation process. However, it is also the State's intent to begin the engagement with the successful firm to provide limited services during the pre-software acquisition period, as noted in Section 5.2 (Program Management Responsibilities) of the [RFP](#).*

5. A. The State notes that it, “is currently engaged with a professional advisory firm for project management consulting services for pre-implementation activities.” Can the State please now provide us with the name of the firm?

BFM Response: *Information Services Group.*

B. Can the State please confirm whether this firm is allowed to propose on this opportunity?

BFM Response: *Yes.*

C. Can the State please now provide us with an understanding of the scope of this firm's efforts to assist the State in pre-implementation organizational change management and implementation preparation efforts, so that our proposal for this opportunity does not attempt to duplicate these efforts?

BFM Response: *As noted in the State's response to Inquiry #4, the primary responsibility of the successful vendor for this RFP (No. 23RFP8794) is to provide project management and advisory services during the forthcoming ERP implementation process. As noted in Section 5.2 (Program Management Responsibilities) of the RFP, limited services may also be requested during the pre-software acquisition period, such as assistance in the drafting of the anticipated Request for Proposal for independent verification and validation (IV&V) services for the project.*

It is not the State's intent to seek potentially competing or duplicative consultation regarding the pre-implementation preparation efforts of the State. Upon award of this RFP (No. 23RFP8794), the State will communicate with the successful vendor regarding the pre-implementation efforts underway.

D. Can the State please indicate when the awarded vendor for this opportunity would begin?

BFM Response: *The State would anticipate the engagement to begin in late-Summer/early-Fall 2023. As noted previously, the activities performed during the pre-software acquisition would be limited. The State intends to make a selection for ERP software and system integration services in February 2024.*

6. The State notes it has “legacy Budget, Financial Management, Financial Reporting, and Procurement/Logistics systems.” Can the State please now share with us what systems are currently in place for each of these?

BFM Response: *The major existing systems that support these processes include the following:*

- *South Dakota Budget System*
 - *A client/server application that supports the statewide Budget Development processes. The system was developed by and is supported by the State.*
- *Central Accounting System*
 - *The State's accounting system of record that provides functionality to support the State's financial business functions (i.e., General Ledger, Accounts Payable, Budget Control, Procurement, Inventory). The software is E:Series from Infor. This is a mainframe system the State has used for 35 years.*
- *Financial Reporting System*
 - *The State uses Oracle Financial Consolidation and Close System (FCCS) to create accrual-based annual financial reports from our cash basis budgetary accounting system.*
- *E-Procurement System*
 - *The State uses EasyPurchase, a commercially available, standalone application from ESM Solutions that provides e-Procurement functionality.*

7. Can the State please provide further direction on its expectations for a detailed project plan, with hours per resource per task? The level of detail being requested might be difficult to provide at this point, absent the system integrator's project plan to align it with (e.g., we do not have insight into the length of the project or phases/milestones). Similarly, absent an SI project plan it will be difficult to complete the travel and expenditure table.

BFM Response: *The State recognizes that project plans submitted by Offerors for this RFP are preliminary and subject to change dependent on the system integration services vendor chosen for the project. The State is seeking project plans based on successful public-sector ERP implementations in which the Offeror has provided project management and advisory services. The State reasonably expects the system implementation stage of the project to be approximately 24 months in duration, following the generalized phased approach listed below:*

- *Phase 1: Project Kickoff*
- *Phase 2: Design*
- *Phase 3: Construction & Testing*
- *Phase 4: Deployment*
- *Phase 5: Post Go-Live Stabilization and Optimization*

The State would ask Offerors to apply data collected from past relevant engagements to develop projections for the project.

8. Can the State please provide the number of months (i.e., the now-estimated length of the project) Offerors should use to provide costs, so that the State receives comparable Offeror cost proposals?

BFM Response: *The State recognizes the length of implementation is dependent on the system integration services vendor (and software vendor to a lesser extent) chosen for the project. The State reasonably expects the implementation phase of the project (Implementation Vendor Kickoff through Go-Live) to be approximately 24 months.*

9. The State is requiring details about three (3) recent projects that Offerors completed that are similar to this project. Would the State allow Offerors to provide details about ongoing projects to fulfill this request?

BFM Response: *Yes, the State will consider ongoing projects eligible to fulfilling the minimum qualification stated in the RFP.*

10. Typically, an ERP core project team has the following main components: State Project Manager; Change Leadership and Communications Team Members; Functional Team Members, Technical Team Members. What is the core team?

BFM Response: *The State's anticipated core team structure is as follows:*

- *State Project Director/State Project Manager*
- *Functional Team*
 - *Finance Lead*
 - *SMEs in the following functional areas: General Ledger, Accounts Payable, Accounts Receivable, Asset Management, Grant Accounting, Project Accounting, Cost Allocation, Cash Management*
 - *Logistics Lead*
 - *SMEs in the following functional areas: Purchasing, Inventory*
 - *Budget Lead*

- *Budget Development SMEs*
- *Technical Team*
 - *Technical Lead/Development Manager*
 - *Developers, Security Analysts*
- *Organizational Change Management Team*
 - *Enterprise Readiness Lead*
 - *Staff focused in the following areas: Communications, Change Management, Trainers, Agency Support*

11. Please provide context on the complexity of involvement (*referencing Section 7.4G*).

BFM Response: *The State is attempting to garner data concerning any unique complexities that may have been present for Offerors in the relevant projects being listed in this Section.*

12. Will the State consider using the Federal Per Diem rate as the standard for hotel costs?

BFM Response: *The State intends to negotiate a travel budget to determine the maximum dollar amount the successful firm will be eligible to seek reimbursement for travel expenses against over the course of the project. Within that negotiated maximum travel budget, the State anticipates reimbursing the successful firm for “actual” travel expenses. The travel rate used would be an internal policy matter for each vendor. For projection purposes, federal per diem rates for Pierre, South Dakota can be found on the [U.S. General Services Administration website](#).*

13. Section 1.12 (Proprietary Information) references an executive summary and asks that the Offeror identify content that is marked as proprietary, but the format does not list an executive summary. Please identify the section that should contain the executive summary.

BFM Response: *Please include the information referenced in Section 1.12 (Proprietary Information) within the Statement of Understanding of Project (Section 7.2).*

14. Bureau of Information and Telecommunications (BIT) Standard Contract Terms and Conditions states that the Offeror must answer a list of technical questions, Security and Vendor Questions which is attached as Appendix B. Appendix B does not have a questionnaire attached, only a signature page. Can the State confirm the technical questions that must be included with our bid?

BFM Response: *Offerors of this Request for Proposal (RFP No. 23RFP8794) are not required to answer the technical or security vendor questions referenced. They are, however, required to complete and submit the Contractor Security Acknowledgement Form (Attachment B). This form references the Offeror’s acknowledgement of the Information Technology Security Policy (Attachment A).*

15. Is there an expected overall timeline and phasing of the ERP implementation documented and shared?

BFM Response: *The State anticipates the Request for Proposal for ERP software and system integration services to be issued in early August 2023. The State intends to make a selection for these services in February 2024. Upon completed contract with successful software and system integration vendors, the State reasonably expects the implementation phase of the project (Implementation Vendor Kickoff through Go-Live) to be approximately 24 months.*

A [Pre-RFP Issuance Project FAQ](#) document is posted on the Bureau of Finance & Management's website.

16. Is it intended that the ERP Project Management and Advisory Services firm would be in place through the entire implementation? We understand this is a one-year contract with four (4) one-year extensions.

BFM Response: *Yes, it is the State's intent to engage with the successful Offeror through the entirety of the project's implementation.*

17. Is the current professional advisory firm who is assisting the State allowed to respond to this RFP?

BFM Response: *Yes.*

18. Is there an approved budget for the services that can be shared?

BFM Response: *The budget for these services will be dependent on the cost proposals received through the RFP process and funded through appropriations already in place.*

19. Is there an estimated start date?

BFM Response: *As noted in Inquiry #5, the State would anticipate the engagement to begin in late-Summer/early-Fall 2023.*

20. Could the State allow us to submit three (3) similar engagements with commercial clients and remove the restrictions on the annual budget and the minimum number of full-time employees?

BFM Response: *Public sector ERP projects present challenges unique to governmental entities. It is the State's intention to engage with a firm that has directly relatable public sector experiences. As a result, the State will not be removing or amending the qualifications listed in the RFP.*

21. Can you confirm that a redacted copy should not be included with the submission?

BFM Response: *Per SDCL [5-18D-20](#), “Any professional service contract and the documentation that was the basis for the contract is public except for proprietary information which shall remain confidential. The qualifications and any other documentation of any person not issued a contract shall remain confidential.” There is no need to provide a redacted copy prior to a contract being issued.*