



**Judicial Council of California**  
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

Finance Division  
455 Golden Gate Avenue ♦ San Francisco, CA 94102-3660  
Telephone 415-865-7960 ♦ Fax 415-865-4325 ♦ TDD 415-865-4272

RONALD M. GEORGE  
*Chief Justice of California*  
*Chair of the Judicial Council*

WILLIAM C. VICKREY  
*Administrative Director of the Courts*

RONALD G. OVERHOLT  
*Chief Deputy Director*

CHRISTINE HANSEN  
*Director*  
*Finance Division*

April 22, 2003

RE: Request for Proposals for Implementation Services for mySAP Public Sector  
Court Accounting and Reporting System (CARS)

Subject: Addendum No. 2

**PROSPECTIVE PROPOSERS:**

This Addendum No. 2 is issued for the Implementation Services for mySAP Public Sector, Court Accounting and Reporting System (CARS) which was issued on March 26, 2003.

The following pages of the RFP are hereby replaced: 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 17, 24, 26, 27, 28, 31 and 32. Full replacement pages are included in this Addendum No. 2. Changes or additions to the text are indicated by a vertical line in the left-hand margin next to the change. Deletions are noted by strikethrough and additions to the text are noted by underlined for easy identification.

Please note that Addendum 2 also includes the answers to vendors questions submitted after the Mandatory Vendor Conference and Workshop held on April 3, 2003. The questions along with the answers are posted for your review. Also note that the replacement to Attachment A, Standard Terms and Conditions, will be made after the submittal of proposals but prior to the Second Elevation.

The AOC has issued each page in the addendum package to allow for full replacement of existing pages in the RFP Documents. If any pages are missing, please contact Grant Walker at (415) 865-7978.

Also attached to this transmittal is a revised Attachment C, in Excel format, which includes the previously omitted C-4 and the new C-5.

Sincerely,

Grant Walker  
AOC Business Services Manager



## 1.1 INTRODUCTION

The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) for the State of California requests proposals from integration firms with proven experience in implementing mySAP for the Public Sector (hereafter "SAP"). Only firms that have been certified by SAP to implement its software may submit responses to this RFP. The AOC will evaluate the proposals submitted on the basis of: ~~(1) the firm's experience in ERP integration (especially related to mySAP for Public Sector); (2) experience of staff proposed; (3) cost schedule; (4) implementation methodology; and (5) utilization of AOC's pre-configured SAP design the criteria stated in Section 3.3.~~

In 2002, the AOC selected SAP as the Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) software standard that would be used in California's Trial Courts. Once the software was selected, the AOC worked with an SAP implementation partner to develop a general design, configure, and test SAP Financials (ISPS version 4.6c). This design is referred to as the "Pre-Configured SAP Template" in this RFP. It then successfully implemented the Pre-Configured SAP Template at Stanislaus Trial Court and at an Accounting Processing Center (APC). The APC is a business unit of the AOC's Finance Division that provides "shared services" for meeting the financial management needs of the Trial Courts. Through this RFP, the AOC is now seeking to apply the Pre-Configured SAP Template for the remaining 57 Trial Courts and potentially two additional APCs.

All firms bidding on this project must recognize that the AOC requires that the firms utilize the Pre-Configured SAP Template in any proposed implementation strategy.

The AOC intends to implement the SAP solution at each of the State's Trial Courts in a series of implementation "rounds", in which teams (managed by the selected contractor) will be implementing SAP at multiple Trial Courts concurrently. For example, the first implementation round may consist of two small and one medium-sized Trial Court. The role of the selected contractor is to implement the Pre-Configured SAP Template throughout the Trial Courts within five years (entire project completed by July 2008).

It is important that proposals properly convey qualifications of the firm(s) that meet the objectives of this RFP. Qualifications for the integration firm must include: 1) integration experience in SAP for large and complex government entities; 2) capabilities to coordinate the migration of each implementation of SAP to an application hosting environment (AOC already has a hosting firm); 3) methodology to configure the software in a manner other than the ASAP framework; 4) project management skills to coordinate multiple implementation teams at different Trial Court sites; 5) ability to assist the AOC in designing and configuring additional SAP modules(as needed); and 6) ability to design an implementation plan for meeting the overall timetable specified by AOC.

## 1.2 BACKGROUND

The AOC is located in San Francisco and is the administrative body that supports the Judicial Council of the State of California, the policy making body for the California courts. The California court system is the largest in the United States. As the main administrative agency for the courts, the AOC is responsible for carrying out a number of



The scope of this project consists of the following:

- Continue the rollout of CARS financial system (Pre-Configured SAP Template) to remaining 57 Trial Courts and possibly two additional Accounting Processing Centers.
- Provide recommendations for configuration and implementation of mySAP for Public Sector that utilizes embedded best practices and other features of the software that improves the business processes of the Trial Courts.
- Retrofit any configuration changes in the system or any business process changes made in the future to prior Trial Court implementations.
- Design, configure, test, and train AOC functional specialists on two modules that are not part of the Pre-Configured Template (Treasury and Fixed Assets) and incorporate these modules in the next version of the Template.
- Migrate-Coordinate and facilitate the CARS production system to AOC Technology Center.
- Upgrade SAP to Enterprise Edition (FY 2004) in conjunction with the Technology Center vendor.
- Provide up to one month of post-production support for each Trial Court.
- Provide up to one accounting period of post-live support to AOC during each fiscal year close during the implementation rollout of CARS.
- Implement any additional SAP functionality as identified by AOC.
- Provide consulting services to analyze statewide Trial Court HR and Payroll needs using existing assessments and input from the AOC. Determine feasibility of using SAP software to fulfill these needs and provide recommendations for possible implementation.

**Note:** During design phase, the standard SAP implementation methodology, “ASAP” was used to design and build the pre-configured system. Due to the schedule and the substantial investment that went into building a pre-configured system, the AOC requires that firms use this design, rather than the full ASAP methodology. However, the ASAP methodology may be used for the design and implementation of additional SAP functionality.

### 1.3 VENDOR EVALUATION CONSULTANTS

To assist with the task of evaluating and contracting for SAP implementation services, the AOC has engaged the GFOA. GFOA’s role is to provide analytic advisory services to the AOC to help it select the implementation firm. GFOA’s role is solely advisory in nature; the selection of the implementation firm will be made solely by the AOC.

### 1.4 CURRENT AND FUTURE TECHNOLOGY

SAP infrastructure is currently being hosted and supported by AOC. The environment consists of SAP systems (DEV, QAS, PRD) along with a Documentation Server residing on a dedicated Trial Court Network. These systems share a network disk storage device from Network Appliance, which frequently takes snapshots of the database providing adequate backups. SAP systems are on SUN Solaris platform running Oracle 8.1.7. Current SAP Version is 4.6C with Industry Solution for Public

### Addendum No. 2



Sector (ISPS) version 4.62. AOC has no plans for an SAP Upgrade until FY 2004. Users currently do not use the Web front-end (ITS) hence the SAP GUI is installed locally on the desktops. AOC is currently using the SAP modules: FI, CO, MM, and PS – which incorporate the accounting functionality of General Ledger, Funds Management, Accounts Payable, Accounts Receivable, Materials Management, and Projects and Grants. AOC will transition its SAP Production environment along with some other IS services for the Trial Court to a hosted data center (AOC Technology Center). Once the Technology Center is on-line, the AOC will have four system SAP landscapes (DEV, QAS, STG, and PRD). DEV and QAS Systems will be physically located at the AOC in a dedicated network. STG and PRD Systems will be in the Technology Center. Unit testing of the configuration and the ABAP development work will be done in DEV. SAP transports will be done in QAS. Transports ready to go to Production will be migrated first to STG. If the transports are successful, they will be migrated to PRD. This-The Technology Center will also provide the support services for CARS. The CARS Help Desk will be one of the services provided by the Technology Center. The Technology Center is scheduled for go-live by June 15<sup>th</sup>, 2003.

## 1.5 GUIDELINES

By submitting a proposal, interested parties are acknowledging:

- 1.5.1 The AOC expects to enter into an agreement for the implementation of mySAP Public Sector. As part of the contracting process, the finalist is expected to work with the AOC to develop a detailed Statement of Work (SOW) that will be part of the Implementation Services Agreement. The implementation firm must work cooperatively and expeditiously with AOC in order to meet the dates in the schedule stated in this RFP.
- 1.5.2 This RFP limits each implementation firm and each sub-contractor to one proposal. The exception is that SAP Consulting and DVBE firms may be included in multiple proposals.
- 1.5.3 Bidders should present a proposal that contains a tailored implementation methodology that incorporates the use of the Pre-Configured SAP Template that has already been developed by AOC. Bidders will be provided the opportunity to ask questions about this project at the Mandatory Vendor Conference and Workshop. A copy of the completed configuration blueprints will be distributed on CD-ROM during the Vendor Conference and Workshop.
- 1.5.4 Vendors may use conventional ASAP methodology to design and configure the additional SAP modules that AOC is considering for rollout (currently defined as Treasury Management and Fixed Assets). However, once the new modules are configured and accepted by AOC, rollout of the new functionality must be incorporated into an updated Pre-Configured SAP Template.
- 1.5.5 The AOC expects to enter into a two-year Master Services Agreement, with three one-year options, with the selected implementation vendor. After the initial two years: 1) AOC will exercise the right to re-bid this project; 2) enter into a contract with any of the other Bidders proposing on this RFP; or 3) exercise the contract options with the selected contractor.
- 1.5.6 The selected firm must have the staffing resources to deploy multiple implementation teams that could implement up to 13 courts per year (based on current rollout schedule).

## Addendum No. 2



- 1.5.7 The selected firm must show proof that it has on the proposed implementation team a Certified Integration Specialist for mySAP Public Sector (SAP-Certified Integrator of mySAP Public Sector) at the time of implementation. Bidders may want to consider contracting with SAP if they do not have such expertise on staff. The responsibility of the Integration Specialist will be to participate in the review of the Pre-Configured SAP Template, provide periodic quality assurance review, identify and recommend process improvements by fully utilizing the software capabilities, and determine the optimal approach for adding additional modules or software functions.
- 1.5.8 The vendor must incorporate into its methodology a periodic review by SAP Consulting. The by-product of this review must be a written report to AOC management on the status of the project. Further details of the contents of this review will be specified by AOC in the Statement of Work. The implementation of any new modules will also require a review by SAP Consulting. The contracted firm will be responsible for scheduling the SAP resources and managing them while on site at AOC. Utilization of SAP Consulting services will be mutually agreed to by the vendor and AOC. Detailed work requirements will be negotiated as part of the Statement of Work.
- 1.5.9 The contractor must cooperatively share any necessary documents and/or information with the AOC's Technology Center hosting company in order to facilitate each Trial Court transition into production and assist with the on-going support provided by the Technology Center's Help Desk.
- 1.5.10 All documents, designs, templates, enhancements, testing information and any other materials developed as part of this project—including the Statement of Work—are the sole and exclusive property of the AOC.
- 1.5.11 AOC intends to develop a master Statement of Work (SOW) that will be used as a baseline for Trial Court rollouts. The master SOW will be tailored and updated for each individual Trial Court implementation.
- 1.5.12 AOC intends to develop a separate SOW that will be used for the design and configuration of additional SAP modules currently not installed at AOC.
- 1.5.13 AOC intends to develop a separate SOW that will be used for the statewide HR/Payroll analysis and feasibility assessment work.
- ~~1.5.13~~ 1.5.14 This procurement involves a-one or more negotiated professional service contracts. The AOC reserves the right to award the procurement in whole or in part or to award multiple contracts. As such, the AOC will negotiate with Bidders throughout the procurement to get the best price and business terms. It is anticipated that, once the AOC identifies two viable firms after implementation interviews and other evaluative processes, competitive negotiations will take place on costs of implementation and related services as well as other items that are critical to project success or mitigate risks. The AOC will consider all cost and business terms to be negotiable and not artificially constrained by a vendor's internal corporate policies. In short, firms that contend that they lack flexibility because of their corporate policy on a particular negotiation item will face a significant disadvantage and may not be elevated to interviews.
- ~~1.5.14~~ 1.5.15 Bidders are to propose a Cost Proposal (Section 8 of their response) that strictly adheres to the directions provided. The Cost Proposal must be comprehensive

## Addendum No. 2



(i.e., provide figures for all areas specified) and without overly restrictive assumptions. The format for the Cost Proposal must follow the directions and format specified in this RFP.

~~1.5.15~~1.5.16 Bidders short-listed for on-site interviews must be available on dates specified by the AOC. Failure to be available may lead the AOC to elevate another proposal.

~~1.5.16~~1.5.17 All firms submitting proposals agree that their pricing is valid for a minimum of six months from the date of submission to the AOC. Prices must include all applicable Federal, state and local taxes.

~~1.5.17~~1.5.18 All firms hereby certify that they have carefully examined all of the documents for the project, have carefully and thoroughly reviewed this RFP, and understand the nature and scope of the work to be done; and that this proposal is based upon the terms, specifications, requirements, and conditions of the RFP.

~~1.5.18~~1.5.19 Bidders are noticed that responses on how the software meets the AOC's detailed functional and technical requirements, for additional modules that AOC intends to implement, will be attached as a part of the Master Services Agreement and will also form the basis for the warranty provisions on such services.

~~1.5.19~~1.5.20 All Vendors certify that they meet the following minimum AOC contracting requirements:

~~1.5.19.1~~1.5.20.1 Be licensed as required by the State of California;

~~1.5.19.2~~1.5.20.2 Be knowledgeable of, and comply with, applicable local, state, and federal laws, regulations, codes and local ordinances;

~~1.5.19.3~~1.5.20.3 Comply and document compliance with AOC's insurance requirements, when so required; and,

~~1.5.19.4~~1.5.20.4 Meet and comply with all other requirements specified in this RFP.

*Note: When responding to this RFP, please follow all instructions carefully. Please submit proposal contents according to the outline specified and submit all hard copy and electronic documents according to the instructions. Failure to follow these instructions may deem the proposal to be unresponsive and may result in immediate elimination from further consideration.*

## **1.6 PROJECT SCOPE AND ANTICIPATED ROLLOUT**

### **1.6.1 Project Scope**

The AOC will be implementing the Pre-Configured SAP Template at each of the remaining 57 Trial Courts plus up to two additional APCs. The specific functions to be implemented are the following:

- General Ledger/Budget Control
- Accounts Receivable

### **Addendum No. 2**





- Accounts Payable
- Purchasing
- Grant/Project Accounting
- Funds Management

The AOC is also considering the addition of the following SAP solutions:

- Asset Management
- Treasury Management
- HR/Payroll
- SAP Enterprise Upgrade

### 1.6.2 Rollout Strategy

Implementation firms should recognize that the CARS rollout strategy for the Trial Courts involves more than the implementation of financial software. In most cases, since the Trial Courts will be discontinuing county provided financial support services and taking on new responsibilities in order to become a part of the statewide system, business process change and education will need to occur before a trial court plans to implement CARS. In order to ensure that a Trial Court is fully prepared to take on the responsibility of a new financial system, the AOC is implementing a three-step approach to implementation to assist each court: (1) Agreed Upon Procedures Review (Audit), (2) Accounting Preparation (Professional accounting assistance), and (3) CARS Implementation (services requested in this RFP). The implementation firm is only expected to provide services related to (3). The information below is provided for background to Bidders on the AOC's overall approach.

#### 1.6.2.1 *Stage I - Agreed Upon Procedures Review (Audit)*

An Agreed Upon Procedures Review (AUPR) audit will be performed by both internal and external groups to determine the financial accounting and reporting needs and capabilities of each Trial Court. The result of each AUPR will be a report produced for use by an Accounting Preparation group.

#### 1.6.2.2 *Stage II - Accounting Preparation (Professional accounting assistance)*

The Accounting Preparation groups will be composed of accounting consultants. The main purpose of the groups is to develop a customized transition plan based on each Trial Court's AUPR report from Stage 1 above, and help achieve the objectives as stated in each plan. During this step, Trial Courts will also be educated in financial procedures, business process redesign, and change management in preparation for the CARS system.

#### 1.6.2.3 *Stage III - CARS Implementation (SAP system implementation)*

Once the objectives of each transition plan have been achieved, the CARS Implementation team will implement the Pre-Configured SAP Template and perform post-production support, transitioning the on-going support over to the AOC's

### Addendum No. 2



1.6.3 Rollout Schedule

During the Summer 2002, the AOC engaged a consultant to survey the Trial Courts and collect information to develop a CARS rollout strategy. Over the past few months, the AOC has been reviewing and revising this strategy. The preliminary rollout schedule listed below is based upon several factors including a Court's size, its transaction volume, the status of its communications and technology infrastructure, and its relative needs compared to other courts.

		<u>Courts Installed by Size</u>			
<b>FY</b>	<b>GO LIVE</b>	<b>Large</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Small</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>2003</b>	Jul			2	2
	Aug		+		+0
	Sep		+2		+2
	Oct		1		1
	<u>Nov</u>			1	1
	Jan			2	2
	Apr			4	4
<b>2003 Total</b>			<b>3</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>112</b>
<b>2004</b>	Jul	2			2
	Aug			1	1
	Oct			3	3
	Jan			4	4
	Apr		1	2	3
<b>2004 Total</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>2005</b>	Jul	2			2
	Aug		1		1
	Oct		1	1	2
	Jan		2	1	3
	Apr			3	3
<b>2005 Total</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>2006</b>	Jul	2			2
	Aug		1		1
	Oct		2		2
	Jan		2	1	3
	Apr			3	3
<b>2006 Total</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>2007</b>	Jul	2			3
	Aug		1		1
	Oct		2		2
	Jan			2	2
	Apr			<del>32</del>	<del>32</del>
<b>2007 Total</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b><del>54</del></b>	<b><del>102</del></b>
<b>2008</b>	Jul	1			1
<b>2008 Total</b>		<b>1</b>			<b>1</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>9</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>57</b>





Bidders are specifically directed NOT to contact any AOC personnel for meetings, conferences, or technical discussions that are related to this RFP. Unauthorized contact of any AOC personnel may be cause for rejection of the Vendor's response.

If a Bidder's question relates to a proprietary aspect of its proposal and the question would expose proprietary information if disclosed to competitors, the Bidder may submit the question in writing, marking it as "CONFIDENTIAL". With the question, the Bidder must submit a statement explaining why the question is sensitive. If the AOC concurs that the disclosure of the question or answer would expose proprietary information, the question will be answered, and both the question and answer will be kept in confidence as permitted by law. If the AOC does not concur regarding the proprietary nature of the question, the question will not be answered in this manner and the Bidder will be notified.

If a Bidder submitting a proposal believes that one or more of the solicitation document's requirements are onerous or unfair, or that it unnecessarily precludes less costly or alternative solutions, the Bidder may submit a written request that the solicitation document be changed. The request must set forth the recommended change and the Bidder's reasons for proposing the change. Any such request must be submitted by no later than 5 p.m. on April 21, 2003 to the contact as stipulated in Part II, Section 1 of this RFP.

## 2.7 AMBIGUITY, DISCREPANCIES, OMISSIONS

If a Bidder submitting a proposal discovers any ambiguity, conflict, discrepancy, omission, or other error in this RFP, the Bidder shall immediately provide the AOC with written notice of the problem and request that this RFP be clarified or modified. Without disclosing the source of the request, the AOC may modify this RFP prior to the date fixed for submission of proposals by issuing an addendum to all Bidders to whom this RFP was sent.

If prior to the date fixed for submission of proposals, a Bidder submitting a proposal knows or should have known of any ambiguity, conflict, discrepancy, omission, or other error in this RFP but fails to notify the AOC within the time stated above, the Bidder shall submit its proposal at its own risk, and if the Bidder is awarded the contract, it shall not be entitled to any price or other adjustment to the contract for such reason.

## 2.8 WITHDRAWAL OF PROPOSAL

A Bidder may withdraw its proposal, either personally or by written request, at any time prior to the date and time that this RFP is scheduled to close.

## 2.9 ADDENDA

Any addendum issued by the AOC during the RFP process shall be acknowledged by Bidder ~~(see Addendums)~~ in its transmittal letter. The requirements of all AOC-issued addenda to this RFP ~~shall~~ may be made part of the agreement between the AOC and the selected Bidder.



**Possible Interfaces**

(Implementer may be responsible for developing an interface between SAP and these applications)

Function	Product
Jury System	Jury Plus Ejuror
Case Management System	Various
Payroll System	Various and/or spreadsheet
Banking and Treasury System	TBD (AOC is developing RFP for banking services). Interface will be required when Treasury module is installed.

*Note: It should be assumed that electronic data will not be extracted from the current Trial Court or County financial systems. The selected Bidder will be required to present a detailed project plan as part of the Statement of Work development process. The project plan shall be updated weekly for AOC Project Managers.*

Specific mutually agreeable criteria for successful system implementation at each trial court will be established during the contract negotiation process. The selected Bidder will be required to participate with the AOC in testing the processing capabilities of each implementation to ascertain conformance with the acceptance criteria before the AOC will accept the rollout to any trial court. The Bidder shall detail its approach to acceptance testing.

**2.24.5 Staffing Plan and Qualifications**

(Section 5) The Bidder must also provide a staffing plan for its staff showing (1) the position title and duties; (2) specific Key Personnel proposed for the two years of the project; (3) brief (1 page) resumes for each Key Personnel. Key Personnel are defined as the Engagement Director, Project Manager(s), Functional Leads, Technical Leads. Firms should propose the resumes of at least ten (10) Key Personnel for the Prime Contractor and Sub-Contractors. as well as consultants from SAP for the Quality Review. The resumes for the HR/Payroll individual and the consultants from SAP for the Quality Review will be required prior to beginning any work in those areas.

The AOC CARS implementation effort will be long-term in nature, requiring a significant amount of dedicated staffing resources. Throughout the process, unanticipated circumstances may arise that require teams to reallocate or increase their staffing resources to address short-term and long-term needs. For this purpose, prospective Bidders will be required to develop a staff contingency plan, which will explain their strategy for addressing staffing needs as they arise.

*Note: The AOC expects to devote seven full-time functional staff and two full-time technical staff to the project.*

**2.24.6 Post Production and Upgrade Support**

(Section 6) The AOC is requesting that Bidder proposals include at least one-month post-production support after CARS has been put into production, including support for the first month close at each Trial Court, support for the year-end close process, as well as the transition of on-going support to the AOC's Technology Center. In addition, the selected contractor must support the upgrade process. Please describe the type of activities that are included in the post-production support strategy.

**Addendum No. 2**



Management Module will be included in the base configuration (Pre-Configured SAP Template) once each module has been accepted by AOC.

- (2) Configuration of Fixed Assets Module-These tasks include all professional services related to designing, configuring, and testing the pre-configured SAP fixed assets module that will be installed at each Trial Court and the AOC Accounting Processing Centers.
- (3) Configuration of Treasury Management Module- These tasks include all professional services related to designing, configuring, and testing the pre-configured SAP treasury management module that will be installed at each Trial Court and the AOC Accounting Processing Centers.
- (4) Migration-Coordinate and facilitate the move of the CARS production system of each trial court to Hosting Environment-The cost estimates provided for this task address activities required to assist the AOC in migrating the current SAP production environment from AOC facilities to the hosted environment, identification of transports required to move data from the QAS to the STG landscape in preparation for go-live. Activities related to this task may include hardware sizing assistance, network tuning, SAP programming, interface testing, and software testing (functional, technical, and stress), and knowledge transfer to support the help desk.
- (5) Upgrade of SAP for Trial Courts-This task includes all professional and technical services related to upgrading MySAP 4.6c to the Enterprise Edition. Note: AOC has not made a definitive decision on whether it will choose to upgrade the software prior to Fiscal Year 2004.
- (6) Retrofit of Updated Pre-Configured Template to Prior Implemented Courts-Costs for this activity should address all tasks related to implementing any configuration changes, module/functionality additions, or software upgrades to any prior implementations of the pre-configured SAP template at the Trial Courts or the Accounting Processing Centers.
- (7) Consulting services to analyze statewide Trial Court HR and payroll needs, provide feasibility assessment of using SAP software to fulfill these needs, and provide recommendations for possible implementation.

### 2.24.8.3 Directions for Cost Proposal

Attachment C contains Schedules C1-~~C4~~C5 that must be thoroughly completed by Bidders.

C1-Rate Schedule By Year-Bidders must provide a rate schedule for personnel for each FY 2003-2008. Since AOC anticipates contracting only for a two-year period, the bidder is required to commit to the rates provided for FY 2003-2004; rates for FY 200~~65~~-2008 can be considered estimates. Note: The AOC uses the State of California definition for fiscal year, which is to use the first calendar year in the fiscal year designation, i.e., fiscal year 2003 is defined as July 1, 2003 – June 30, 2004.

Bidders must (a) determine a rate for each of their personnel using the provided categories in Schedule C1, (b) weight these rates against the number of hours for the personnel for each year (determined in Schedule C2 below); and (c) provide a single *Weighted Average Blended Rate for Professional Services*.

Next, bidders should provide a single rate that serves as the *Travel Cost Loading Rate* for each year that will be applied to hours worked on-site.

The addition of the Weighted Average Blended Rate for Professional Services and the Travel Cost Loading Rate should result in the *Fully Burdened Rate* for each year.

The Fully Burdened Rate is the rate that should be used to calculate total project costs (Schedule C3 below).

## Addendum No. 2



C2-Hours by Major Task by Year-Bidders must provide estimated work effort based on hours (not days) for each year for all contractor personnel. Again, because of the anticipated length of the agreement, the bidder is required to commit only for the hours provided for FY 2003-2004; hours for FY 2005-2008 can be considered estimates. For each FY a *Total Hours Per Year* must be provided.

C3-Total Estimated Project Cost-Bidders should provide estimates for the Total Project Cost and FY Project Cost by multiplying the Fully Burdened Rate (determined in Schedule C1) and the Total Hours Per Year (determined in Schedule C2).

The AOC and the successful bidder will negotiate a final contract amount—based on the most accurate information available during the contracting process regarding the scheduled rollout—and will also negotiate the basis for each cost figure (e.g., fixed price, time and expenses with not-to-exceed). Vendors will be expected to adhere to the rates provided for FY 2003 and FY 2004 (defined as July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2005—as well as a few months beyond this for post-production support). AOC will negotiate these rates based on the quality of personnel proposed and prevailing industry standards.

C4-Assumptions-Bidders must list all of the assumptions related to the cost proposal, staffing estimates, or any other aspect of this RFP.

C5-HR/Payroll Rate Sheet-Bidders must provide job classification/title and hourly billing rate of individual proposed for this task.

2.24.9 Responses to Functional/Technical Requirements

(Section 9). The Bidder shall implement the features and functions specified in the Requirements Matrix as indicated in Attachment D (Existing Business Requirements). These features were installed and tested by AOC during the development Pre-Configured SAP Template. The AOC is attaching the requirements by module to this RFP. Implementation firms must validate each and every response and list each exception using a comment field in the spreadsheet. These requirements will be used to as part of the warranty for implementation services for each SAP implementation in the CARS project.

Response	Definition	Response	Definition
<b>F=</b>	Fully Provided "Out-of-the-Box"	<b>C =</b>	Customization (requiring changes to underlying source)
<b>R =</b>	Provided with Reporting Tool	<b>NV =</b>	Provided in the Very Next Version
<b>M =</b>	Modification/Configuration (without source code changes)	<b>NA =</b>	Not Available
<b>TP =</b>	Third Party Software Required		

**Note:** Bidders must use one code only per requirement. Any requirement that is answered in any other way will be treated as a negative/non-response. The selected implementation consultant must warrant that the content of its proposal accurately reflects the software's capability to satisfy the functional requirements as included in this RFP.

2.24.10 Other Functionality

(Section 10) The AOC will be implementing Fixed Assets and Treasury Management as part of the first year of implementation. This will be a brand new installation since neither of these functions were designed and configured in the Template. Please indicate your ability to meet these business requirements, as listed in Attachment E.

Bidders must use the codes below to indicate their ability to meet AOC requirements.

Addendum No. 2



Response	Definition	Response	Definition
<b>F=</b>	Fully Provided "Out-of-the-Box"	<b>C =</b>	Customization (requiring changes to underlying source)
<b>R =</b>	Provided with Reporting Tool	<b>NV =</b>	Provided in the Very Next Version
<b>M =</b>	Modification/Configuration (without source code changes)	<b>NA =</b>	Not Available
<b>TP =</b>	Third Party Software Required		

Notes: 1) Bidder is required to work with SAP to complete the requirements presented in Attachment E. 2) Bidders must use one code only per requirement. Any requirement that is answered in any other way will be treated as a negative/non-response. 3) The selected firm must warrant that the content of its proposal accurately reflects the software's capability to satisfy the functional requirements as included in this RFP.

#### 2.24.11 AOC'S Major Contractual Terms/Exceptions to the RFP (Section 11)

Disabled Veterans Business Enterprise (DVBE). Bidders must submit completed DVBE form (Attachment F).

Base Services Contract. To expedite contract negotiations, AOC will require that vendors adhere to the base contract terms and conditions presented in Attachment A to Bidders no later than at the Second Elevation. ~~The text contained in Attachment A is not all-inclusive and does not represent the final format for the AOC contract. The terms and conditions presented in the attachment represent the minimum requirements for all contracts related to this project.~~

Exceptions to RFP. Bidders may take exception to certain requirements and conditions in this RFP. All exceptions shall be clearly identified in this section and written explanation shall include the reason for the exception. At its sole discretion, the AOC may reject any exceptions or specifications within the proposal.



process, the AOC reserves the right to proceed with the remaining Proposals or elevate a Proposal Team that was not elevated before.

Selection of a contractor will be based on the following areas:

- Qualifications of the prime contractor and sub-contractors.
- Experience in implementing SAP for Public Sector.
- Implementation strategy, staffing and plan.
- Costs of services and any other costs.
- Ability to meet general procurement requirements.
- Ability to meet AOC's contract terms and conditions.
- Recent references at other public sector entities where SAP is installed.
- On-site interviews.
- Site visits (optional).
- Quality of the Statement of Work (for finalists).

### 3.3.1 First Elevation

All proposals received will be inspected for compliance with the general RFP requirements. The AOC may contact Bidders for clarification or correction of minor errors and submissions. Upon such a request the Bidder must furnish any requested information to the AOC within 5 business days or the proposal will be evaluated as originally received. Major errors or omissions, such as the failure to provide a cost schedule, may result in a declaration that the proposal is non-conforming, and may cause proposal to be rejected. Bidders will be evaluated as follows: Bidders that do not meet the AOC's procurement requirements will not be elevated. The AOC reserves the right to elevate those bidders that have taken exception to the AOC's procurement requirements, if the exceptions are considered minor. Elevation of the firms however, does not constitute the AOC's acceptance of the exceptions.

The goal of the First Elevation is to identify no more than three (3) Proposal Teams for elevation to the next level.

### 3.3.2 Second Elevation

The Proposal Teams elevated to this level will be invited to AOC for on-site interviews. The main objectives of the interviews will be to assess the extent to which vendors understand the AOC project, to determine the vendor's knowledge of public sector issues, and to assess the proposed methodology for implementing SAP. Members of the Evaluation Team will interview each selected vendor. Interviews will last no longer than one day and vendors will be required to have their Engagement Manager and proposed Project Manager present for the interviews. AOC reserves the right to invite vendors, including key personnel, back for further interviews.

The AOC will also conduct reference checks for each vendor elevated to this stage. Reference checks may include site visits to and discussions with other public sector entities where the vendor has implemented SAP for Public Sector.

The criteria used to elevate vendors during the Second Elevation are (1) cost, (2) methodology, (3) proposed staff/vendor team, (4) public sector experience, and (5) contract terms and conditions – all weighted equally.

### Addendum No. 2



### 3.3.3 Third Elevation

Two proposals will be selected for contract negotiations. This phase begins with a one to two day, on-site meeting with the AOC and its consultants to discuss the implementation strategy, costs and the components of the SOW in detail. A series of memos (Request for Clarifications (RFCs)) may be issued at any time following the Second Elevation to clarify information presented to date. The RFCs are used to negotiate implementation rates, project scope, warranty requirements and other items related to meeting the business requirements for the project.

The criteria used to elevate vendors during the Third Elevation (descending order of importance on weighted scale) are (1) Proposed Staff/Vendor Team and (2) Interviews – items (1) and (2) weighted equally; (3) contract terms and conditions; and (4) Cost, (5) Methodology, and (6) Public Sector Experience – items (4), (5), and (6) weighted equally.

### 3.3.4 Final Elevation

The AOC will use competitive negotiations to decide on a finalist. Under this approach, negotiations will take place between the two highest-ranking bidders after evaluation of all information submitted, on-site interviews, and other activities. After the negotiating process, the ESC will meet to elevate a single Bidder to establish a Statement of Work (SOW) and formal contract. If a formal contract is not established with the first Bidder elevated, the AOC reserves the right to resume negotiations with the second Proposal Team and/or any of the other Bidders that have submitted proposals. Should the ESC determine that only one proposal is most closely meets the requirements of this RFP, a contract may be negotiated and awarded to that Proposal Team without the process described above (i.e., AOC may negotiate directly with only one vendor).

The criteria used to elevate vendors during the Final Evaluation are (1) cost, (2) methodology, (3) proposed staff/vendor team, and (4) contract terms and conditions – all weighted equally.



**Response to Questions Received After Vendor Conference  
as of April 22, 2003**

**General Questions**

G1. What is the schedule for stage 1 and stage 2 completion for each court?

**Answer: The projected schedule for Stage 1 (AUPR) and Stage 2 (Accounting Prep) completion varies from court to court depending on the size, complexity, and current fiscal accountability.**

G2. For each county, are the user located in one court location? Or multiple? If multiple, please provide a list of locations by county requiring on-site support.

**Answer: Based on a recent survey of the trial courts, the majority of courts have financial system users at one location within each county with the exception of the following courts:**

<b>Trial Court</b>	<b># Financial Locations</b>
Alameda	10
Humboldt	2
Kern	10
Lake	2
Los Angeles	55
Merced	3
Monterey	4
Nevada	2
Orange	7
Sacramento	5
San Bernardino	14
San Diego	11
San Francisco	2
San Luis Obispo	3
San Mateo	5
Santa Barbara	6
Shasta	2
Solano	2
Ventura	2

**It should be noted that the number of CARS user locations will be validated through Stages 1 and 2.**

G3. Is the existing documentation of business process procedures adequate for the July 1, 2003 go-live?

**Answer: Yes, the Blueprint documents provided at the April 3, 2003 vendor conference are adequate for the courts going live on July 1, 2003.**

**Response to Questions Received After Vendor Conference  
as of April 22, 2003**

G4. Please clarify if the AOC wishes a legal review (redline) of the terms and conditions beginning on page A-1 to be submitted with our initial response to the RFP.

**Answer: No. The Terms and Conditions issued with the initial RFP will be replaced after the proposal submittal due date. Only vendors that are elevated will be required to provide a redline of the terms and conditions prior to their on-site interviews during the Second Elevation.**

G5. Page 15 of the RFP states that all electronic files should have the company name and address on them. Is AOC referring to each individual file or the outside of the CD?

**Answer: The vendor's name and address should be on both the electronic files and the outside of the CD.**

G6. Do functional and/or technical specifications exist for the template design?

**Answer: Yes. The functional requirements (RFP Attachment D) and Blueprints (Blueprint CD provided during Vendor Workshop and Conference held April 3, 2003) exist for the template design from Phase IIIa.**

G7. In addition to the blueprint documentation and configuration made in the pre-configured system, are there any other deliverables such as Business Process Procedures (BPPs), training materials, etc. that can be made available to the consulting partner?

**Answer: BPPs and training materials will be made available to the selected vendor.**

G8. Should it be assumed that the pre-configured system (base configuration) has been completely configured and tested (unit test and integration test)?

**Answer: Yes.**

G9. Does the AOC have any other CO reporting requirements? Is the AOC planning on expanding CO reporting capabilities?

**Answer: There currently are no other CO reporting requirements defined at this time. However, the AOC plans to expand reporting capabilities in the future as more courts are rolled out.**

G10. Is there a formal change control process (approval for change requests) for the base configuration rollout template?

**Answer: Yes.**

**Response to Questions Received After Vendor Conference  
as of April 22, 2003**

G11. Is the Engagement Director the individual responsible for the contractor's overall service delivery and also serve as the point of contact with the AOC for contractual, staffing and delivery matters? Does the AOC expect the role to be full-time, part-time, or left to the discretion of the bidder?

**Answer: Yes, the Engagement Director is responsible for the contractor's overall service delivery and also serves as the point of contact with the AOC for contractual, staffing, and delivery matters. The time required for the role is left to the discretion of the bidder.**

G12. Does the bidder need to supply 3 references for SAP, as a subcontractor, who will be providing the QA consultants and where applicable the ISPS certified consultant?

**Answer: No.**

G13. Will SAP be the "system of record" for all finance and accounting functions?

**Answer: The CARS SAP system will be the "system of record" for all finance and accounting functions for the trial courts.**

G14. Page 23, section 2.24.7 denotes "The AOC considers both client and Key Personnel references to be important". What are the "Key Personnel" references?

**Answer: During the vendor selection process, vendors will be asked to identify their proposed implementation team and level of effort for each team member. After a review of the team and effort proposed, the AOC will determine which members it considers key personnel. In preparation for this, vendors should be prepared to provide references for each member of their proposed implementation team.**

G15. Regarding document format for submission, will the AOC accept the document on PowerPoint as well as Word?

**Answer: Yes. The vendor may submit any data documents in PowerPoint or Word with the exception of any Attachments that were provided to the vendor in Excel. All Excel attachments distributed in the original RFP must be resubmitted in Excel.**

G16. Please provide the pool of hours for SAP QA and their rate.

**Answer: The number of hours comprising the pool of hours for all SAP work will be assessed during Statement of Work (SOW) development. The vendor should work with SAP to propose a rate for these services.**

**Response to Questions Received After Vendor Conference  
as of April 22, 2003**

G17. In the Shared Services environment, the AOC preferred to have dollars spent for services stay within the California state borders. Does AOC also prefer to keep ABAP development work in state?

**Answer: The AOC does not have a preference regarding keeping ABAP development work in state. However, it should be noted that since the ABAP work is on an as needed basis, the vendor will need to ensure availability of the resource throughout the contract.**

G18. Per our conversation with SAP, they are not allowed to quote rates or provide resumes for the QA positions stipulated in the RFP (Section 2.24.5, page 24 & Schedule C-1, from Attachment C). This seems to be contradictory to the requirements in the RFP. Please advise on how to satisfy the RFP requirement.

**Answer: Resumes for SAP consultants will not be required at this time. Vendors should work with SAP to propose rates for the 5 years.**

G19. If SAP is proposed as a subcontractor, would it be required to submit three additional SAP client references?

**Answer: No.**

G20. Page 17, section 2.9 Addenda indicates that Bidder must acknowledge any addendum issued by the AOC during the RFP process. An attachment is referenced but there is not attachment in the RFP for acknowledging any addenda. Please advise how the bidder should respond to this requirement.

**Answer: On page 17, section 2.9, the phrase "see Attachments" has been changed to "in its transmittal letter". This is now included as a replacement page in Amendment 2.**

G21. Does Stage II work culminate in end-user approval of new business processes and procedures in SAP?

**Answer: No. During Stage II, the court will be educated in the trial court financial policies and procedures, business process redesign, and change management in preparation for CARS. Courts must follow the existing trial court financial policies and procedures, which is the foundation of the current CARS design.**

G22. Are accounting employees the only users of CARS or will other Trial Court employees also use CARS? (For example: reporting, budgeting and/or purchasing functionality).

**Answer: Accounting employees will not be the only users of CARS. Non-accounting will include but not be limited to trial court management and staff involved in the purchasing/receipt of goods.**

**Response to Questions Received After Vendor Conference  
as of April 22, 2003**

**Data Conversion Questions**

DC1. Will the selected vendor be responsible for interface/conversion development for July 1, 2003 go-live? If so, please provide a list of interfaces and estimated number of transactions to be converted.

**Answer: The vendor will not be responsible for interface development prior to July 1, 2003 for the two courts scheduled for July 1, 2003 go-live. However, the AOC will determine whether or not any interfaces are still required for the two courts and may require the vendor to develop these interfaces after go-live.**

**The AOC will be responsible for gathering and completing the conversion data. The vendor will be responsible for co-leading the data load and conversion process and providing guidance to the AOC if data problems are encountered. If data problems are encountered, the vendor will assist the AOC in determining the cause of the problems and recommend solutions. The AOC will be responsible for providing error free data to the vendors.**

DC2. What are the number of transactions for conversion and number of interfaces for a small, medium, and large county?

**Answer: The number of transactions for conversion for small, medium, and large trial courts varies greatly depending on the size of the court and date of implementation. The AOC has developed a rollout schedule which includes implementation of large and medium sized courts as close to the beginning of a fiscal year (July 1) as possible in order to minimize the number of transactions. The AOC will be responsible for gathering and completing the conversion data, primarily in the form of data templates. These templates were developed in Phase IIIa and used for Stanislaus. The vendor will be responsible for co-leading the data load and conversion process and providing guidance to the AOC if data problems are encountered.**

**The number of new interfaces, if any, will be determined through Stage 2 for each court, prior to the development of the Statement of Work for that court rollout.**

DC3. What tools, if any, is the AOC using for conversion?

**Answer: During Stage 2, the AOC will review each trial court's legacy system and assess whether or not conversion data can be extracted. If the data can be extracted, it will be extracted by the AOC. Any missing data or data that requires mapping will be the responsibility of the trial court and AOC to complete, and will be completed prior to turning over the data to the vendor for the data load processes. If data can not be extracted from a trial court's legacy system, it will be manually entered into data files by the courts with the assistance of and review by the AOC. The courts will be responsible for validating the accuracy of all data. The vendor will be responsible for co-leading the data load and conversion process and providing guidance to the AOC if data problems are encountered.**

**Response to Questions Received After Vendor Conference  
as of April 22, 2003**

DC4. Does the AOC have legacy system consultants available to the project team for data conversion purposes?

**Answer: No. The AOC does not have legacy system consultants. The AOC will be responsible for dealing with any legacy systems.**

DC5. Describe the vendor's responsibility for data cleansing.

**Answer: The AOC will be responsible for gathering and completing the conversion data. The vendor will be responsible for co-leading the data load and conversion process and providing guidance to the AOC if data problems are encountered. If data problems are encountered, the vendor will assist the AOC in determining the cause of the problems and recommend solutions. The AOC will be responsible for providing error free data to the vendors.**

DC6. Does a list of the systems that will be replaced for each rollout exist?

**Answer: Yes. However, it is important to remember that the majority of systems that are being replaced are county owned systems, not court systems, and vendors will not be responsible for data conversion from any legacy systems. The vendor will be responsible for co-leading the data load and conversion process and providing guidance to the AOC if data problems are encountered. If data problems are encountered, the vendor will assist the AOC in determining the cause of the problems and recommend solutions.**

DC7. On page 23 of the RFP, it is mentioned that "all fiscal year transactions will be converted (when the implementation involves mid-year 'go-live' date)." Does the AOC mean the individual documents would be converted, or only the ending and opening balances converted? If individual documents are to be converted, then the volumes could potentially be high and would require an automated conversion with an electronic extract of data from the existing systems. Is this correct?

**Answer: During Stage 2, the AOC will review each trial court's legacy system and assess whether or not conversion data can be extracted. If the data can be extracted, it will be extracted by the AOC. Any missing data or data that requires mapping will be the responsibility of the trial court and AOC to complete, and will be completed prior to turning over the data to the vendor for the data load processes. If data can not be extracted from a trial court's legacy system, it will be manually entered into data files by the courts with the assistance of and review by the AOC. The courts will be responsible for validating the accuracy of all data. The vendor will be responsible for co-leading the data load and conversion process and providing guidance to the AOC if data problems are encountered.**

## **Response to Questions Received After Vendor Conference as of April 22, 2003**

### **Fixed Asset Questions**

FA1. Has the AOC purchased bar coding software? Has the AOC planned for the integration/staffing/purchasing of software and hardware to support bar coding? Or has the AOC already purchased this?

**Answer: No, the AOC has not purchased bar coding software. The courts that will be implemented during the first fiscal year have very few fixed asset items (> \$5,000). The AOC intends to develop the fixed asset module with the ability to accommodate a statewide standard bar coding software and hardware for courts that desire to use this feature.**

FA2. What courts are currently using bar coding and are they using different systems or a standard system?

**Answer: It is unknown what courts are currently using bar coding, if any. Currently, there is no standard system for bar coding for the trial courts.**

FA3. How many different legacy asset systems are being used? Are there any courts using manual ledger systems?

**Answer: It is unknown how many different legacy asset systems are being used. Yes, the AOC is aware of some courts using manual ledger systems.**

FA4. Who will be responsible for carrying out the extracts from the legacy assets system(s)?

**Answer: The AOC will be responsible for extracting legacy asset system data, if available. The vendor will be responsible for co-leading the data load and conversion process and providing guidance to the AOC if data problems are encountered. If data problems are encountered, the vendor will assist the AOC in determining the cause of the problems and recommend solutions.**

### **Technical Questions**

T1. Will AOC be responsible for the security role mapping, user set-up and authorization assignments?

**Answer: Yes.**

T2. Will AOC/Siemens be responsible for disaster recovery?

**Answer: Yes.**



## **Response to Questions Received After Vendor Conference as of April 22, 2003**

T3. Can the AOC confirm that the security roles and authorization design work was completed as part of the development of the initial templates/blueprints?

**Answer: The AOC is currently refining the security roles and authorization design work completed during Phase IIIa. It will be tested and completed during the next month.**

T4. Will the AOC be responsible for the GUI installation on each user's desktop/laptop? Will these machines be upgraded (if necessary) by the project team or the AOC Technology Center?

**Answer: The AOC will be responsible for oversight of the GUI installation on each user's desktop/laptop. The actual responsibility for the installation will be the trial court or Siemens, if desktop support services to be performed by the Technology Center are selected by the court. Each trial court will be provided the minimum requirements for desktop/laptops and will be required to meet these requirements for CARS users prior to GUI installation.**

T5. Once the Technology Center is online, what will the network landscape look like as it relates to SAP transport communication between the AOC servers and the Technology Center servers? Please confirm which environments will exist on which networks (DEV, QAS, Staging, PRD)?

**Answer: Once the Technology Center is on-line, we will have four system SAP landscapes (DEV, QAS, STG, and PRD). DEV and QAS Systems will be physically located at AOC in a dedicated network. STG and PRD Systems will be in the Technology Center at Siemens data center facility. Unit testing of the configuration and the ABAP development will be done in DEV. SAP Transports will be migrated from the DEV to QAS. Integration Testing will be done in QAS. Transports ready to go to Production will be first migrated to STG. If the transports are successful, they will be migrated to PRD.**

### **Transition and Support**

TS1. What level of support does the AOC require from the project team and consulting partner during the first month after go-live? Will the "AOC Technology Center" help desk be up and running?

**Answer: The AOC will require at least one member of the AOC's project team to be available on site at each court site during the first week of go-live and during the 3-5 days for the court's first month pre-close preparation. The consulting partner will be expected to have at least one Functional Lead (GL, AP, MM, etc.) available on site at each court during go-live and during the week of the court's first month close preparation. It is assumed that all other consultants not on-site will be available to answer questions to assist the consultant that is on-site.**

**Yes, the AOC Technology Center help desk will be up and running at go-live to assist with support that can not be answered on-site.**

**Response to Questions Received After Vendor Conference  
as of April 22, 2003**

TS2. How long is the typical month-end accounting cycle? How long is the year-end closing cycle?

**Answer: The typical month-end accounting cycle at the trial court is 3-5 days for pre-close preparation and 4-5 days at the APC for the actual close. It is estimated that the year-end closing cycle would take the same amount of time as a month-end closing cycle; however, this is an estimation since a year-end close has not been completed yet. The vendor will be responsible for supporting the APC only (not trial courts) during the year-end closing cycle.**

TS3. Does the RFP require that the project team and consulting partner provide training to the "AOC Technology Center" resources?

**Answer: The project team and consulting partner will need to provide training and knowledge transfer to the AOC Technology Center if new design features are added or configuration has been modified.**

**Attachment Questions**

A1. In Attachment D of the RFP, what does the blank mean in the SAP response column? What is the difference between the Consultant Response and Consultant Response submitted column?

**Answer: A blank in the SAP Response column indicates that the requirement is a "Header Requirement" and does not require a response. The "Consultant Response" column is for data entry only and can be edited by the bidder. The "Consultant Response Submitted" is for reporting purposes only and cannot be edited by the bidder. The latter column contains a formula that prohibits bidders from entering responses that do not fall within the requirements submittal definitions. The data in the "Consultant Response Submitted" column is the only data that will be analyzed by the AOC.**

A2. RFP page 26. "Bidder is required to commit to the rates provided for FY 2003 – 2004, rates for FY 2006-2008 can be considered estimates." What about FY 2004-2006? In Attachment C, it appears as though these are estimates. Please confirm.

**Answer: Amendment 2 clarifies and changes this section. It now reads "Bidder is required to commit to the rates provided for FY 2003 – 2004, rates for FY 2005-2008 can be considered estimates."**

**Response to Questions Received After Vendor Conference  
as of April 22, 2003**

A3. Section 2.24.8.3 (Directions for Cost Proposal) states “Attachment C contains Schedules C1-C4 that must be thoroughly completed by Bidders.” Attachment C does not include a Schedule C4, Assumptions form. Does the AOC require a specific format or is the bidder permitted to present assumptions in their own format?

**Answer: Amendment 2 includes a new Schedule C4 for Assumptions.**

A4. Where should forms provided in Attachment F of the RFP be included in the proposal response?

**Answer: Section 2.24.11 AOC’s Major Contractual Terms/Exceptions to the RFP (Section 11) has been expanded to include the submission requirements of the completed DVBE form (Attachment F).**

A5. Please provide additional detail regarding requirement question TE 96 of Attachment D. This question states “System will provide usage statistics on staff time spent on each project by division and activity.” Is the term “project” meant as a project within the SAP project system or is this a more generic term used to refer to individual user’s time logged into SAP for a particular activity? Is the term some other meaning specific to the AOC?

**Answer: The term “project” is a project within the SAP project system.**

**Functional Blueprint**

FB1. Could you clarify which vendors would be created using the Trial Court account groups versus the APC account group: Will common vendors, such as vendors used for central procurement be created within the APC account group? Are the individual Trial Court account groups meant to cover non-procurement type payments, such as Court interpreters, reporters, arbitrators, appointed counsel, and mediators?

**Answer: The AOC considers questions regarding the configuration and other data in the Blueprints as background information only and this information should not be necessary for proposal preparation. Detailed Blueprint discussions between vendors and the AOC will occur during the elevation process.**

FB2. Please clarify if the Functional Area is used in the SAP base configuration template for Funds Management.

**Answer: The AOC considers questions regarding the configuration and other data in the Blueprints as background information only and this information should not be necessary for proposal preparation. Detailed Blueprint discussions between vendors and the AOC will occur during the elevation process.**

**Response to Questions Received After Vendor Conference  
as of April 22, 2003**

FB3. Could the AOC clarify what it means by “accumulated as part of the Fund Balance” as it relates to unused budget?

**Answer: The AOC considers questions regarding the configuration and other data in the Blueprints as background information only and this information should not be necessary for proposal preparation. Detailed Blueprint discussions between vendors and the AOC will occur during the elevation process.**

FB4. Is the Payroll interface automatic or manually posted and is it different for each trial court? Is it posted at the Cost Center level?

**Answer: The AOC considers questions regarding the configuration and other data in the Blueprints as background information only and this information should not be necessary for proposal preparation. Detailed Blueprint discussions between vendors and the AOC will occur during the elevation process.**

FB5. Is there a need to report CO totals at the consolidated level, i.e., cost/plan reports for all Operations Cost Centers across Trial Courts?

**Answer: The AOC considers questions regarding the configuration and other data in the Blueprints as background information only and this information should not be necessary for proposal preparation. Detailed Blueprint discussions between vendors and the AOC will occur during the elevation process.**

FB6. In the CO blueprint there is a reference to manual cost/expenses allocations. What is the volume of these allocations in terms of line entries?

**Answer: The AOC considers questions regarding the configuration and other data in the Blueprints as background information only and this information should not be necessary for proposal preparation. Detailed Blueprint discussions between vendors and the AOC will occur during the elevation process.**

FB7. Has the AOC considered using the consolidation module?

**Answer: The AOC considers questions regarding the configuration and other data in the Blueprints as background information only and this information should not be necessary for proposal preparation. Detailed Blueprint discussions between vendors and the AOC will occur during the elevation process.**

## Response to Questions Received After Vendor Conference as of April 22, 2003

FB8. Please clarify the organizational structure as there appears to be some inconsistencies between the organizational structure outlined in the CO blueprint and the other financial blueprints.

**Answer: The AOC considers questions regarding the configuration and other data in the Blueprints as background information only and this information should not be necessary for proposal preparation. Detailed Blueprint discussions between vendors and the AOC will occur during the elevation process.**

FB9. In the CO blueprint documentation, there are several TBD processes mentioned (i.e. use of CC planning, stat key figures, automatic overhead rates, allocation, etc.). Are these in the current base configuration? In which rollouts do you anticipate using these processes?

**Answer: The AOC considers questions regarding the configuration and other data in the Blueprints as background information only and this information should not be necessary for proposal preparation. Detailed Blueprint discussions between vendors and the AOC will occur during the elevation process.**

FB10. Is there a need to report CO totals at the consolidated level, i.e., cost/plan reports for all Operations Cost Centers across Trial Courts?

**Answer: The AOC considers questions regarding the configuration and other data in the Blueprints as background information only and this information should not be necessary for proposal preparation. Detailed Blueprint discussions between vendors and the AOC will occur during the elevation process.**

FB11. Are the enhancements and user exits referenced at the end of the Project and Grant Accounting blueprint included in the Pre-configured SAP Template?

**Answer: The AOC considers questions regarding the configuration and other data in the Blueprints as background information only and this information should not be necessary for proposal preparation. Detailed Blueprint discussions between vendors and the AOC will occur during the elevation process.**

### **Training**

TR1. Does the AOC have a list of lessons learned relating to training and change leadership from their pilot project?

**Answer: No, a list of lessons learned relating to training and change leadership does not exist. Instead, the final training plan developed in Phase IIIa was revised to include lessons learned and change management strategies learned during the pilot project.**

**Response to Questions Received After Vendor Conference  
as of April 22, 2003**

TR2. Was a training plan and training materials developed as part of the Pre-configured SAP Template? If so, what kind of training was used: instructor led classroom, CBT, online or print-based self study. Also, was training developed for all functionalities?

**Answer: Yes, a training plan and materials were developed as part of the Pre-configured SAP Template. Instructor led classroom training was used and reference guide documents distributed to all trainees. Training was developed for all functionalities.**

TR3. Was the training material developed by the project team, or purchased from and developed by a third party?

**Answer: The training material was developed by the project team. Each AOC functional lead developed the training material for his/her corresponding module.**

TR4. Does any currently developed training include new or changed processes and procedures or just system transactions?

**Answer: The currently developed training includes just system transactions. A separate manual for trial court financial policies and procedures exists and will be updated as needed for any process or procedure changes that result from changes to CARS.**

TR5. Does the AOC or the Trial Courts have designated training resources? How many of these resources are available and for what durations?

**Answer: The AOC functional project team members will train the trial courts. Six resources will be available for the duration of the project.**

TR6. Will the Training/Change specialist be devoted full-time to this project for the entire life of the project?

**Answer: The Training/Change specialist will not be devoted full-time to this project. Currently, this person will also be the AOC's functional lead for Fixed Assets when this module is implemented.**

TR7. Was a change plan developed as part of the Pre-configured SAP Template that addresses communicating, informing and bring about the needed acceptance and behavior changes among users to ensure appropriate usage of CARS?

**Answer: Yes.**