



**DATE:** October 27, 2022

**TO:** Prospective Proposers

**FROM:** Joe Benjamin, NIGP-CPP, CPPO, CPPB  
Director of Purchasing

**SUBJECT: ADDENDUM NO. 1, ENTERPRISE RESOURCE PLANNING SOLUTION (ERP)  
RFP NO. 23-208-066**

***NOTE: THIS ADDENDUM SHOULD BE SIGNED AS ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF ITS  
RECEIPT AND RETURNED WITH YOUR RESPONSE TO THE RFQ.***

---

**SIGNATURE**

---

**COMPANY NAME**

The following should be recognized as **Addendum No. 1** to the **ENTERPRISE RESOURCE PLANNING SOLUTION (ERP) RFP NO. 23-208-066** dated **October 10, 2022**, and due **November 15, 2022**.

***PLEASE NOTE THE FOLLOWING:***

**The due date for proposals has been changed to December 14, 2022 not later than 3:00 PM.**

***THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ARE FOR INFORMATION PURPOSES ONLY:***

1. When is the district's intended go-live date?
  - Answer 1: The District has not established a go-live date. Proposers are encouraged to propose an implementation timeline that includes a proposed go-live date but, establishing a go-live date will be negotiated as part of the contract negotiation phase.
2. Is the district looking for written responses to all of the items outlined in Section 5.4.2 System Objectives?
  - Answer 2: Yes. See section 5.4.8 "All requested information in this RFP must be supplied."
3. The RFP requires a bid and performance bond. Recent public sector solicitations for cloud solutions have moved away from bond requirements to other more software project specific and cost-effective implementation/payment requirements that achieve the same purpose, including fixed fee, deliverable based implementation methodologies and a retainage % to be paid upon successful go live. Would Pinellas County Schools accept these or other alternatives in lieu of the bond requirements?

- Answer 3: The District will negotiate a progressive milestone payment schedule as well as retainage % paid upon successful go-live, with the successful firm, as part of the contract negotiations. Proposers may disregard all references to payment and performance bond requirements in the RFP.
4. Do you have a System diagram or schematic of existing system & interfaces?
- Answer 4: Unfortunately, we are unable to provide system diagrams or schematics. The legacy ERP (TERMS) was implemented over 27 years ago and extremely customized by the District. Any originally diagrams or flow charts are vastly out of date.
5. Will the County (District) be evaluating point/best of breed solutions? i.e., Finance only, HCM only, etc. or would each proposal be required cover all functional requirements?
- Answer 5: The District is looking for a comprehensive solution that would minimally include all functionality listed within the Core Financials and Core Human Resources headings within the Scope in section 3. The District would ideally like the solution to include all areas listed in the Scope section. Proposer's solutions can be a single software product or multiple integrated software products that meet the overall District's functional requirements.
6. Are we allowed to use our own proposal format, or we must use format provided by Pinellas County Schools?
- Answer 6: No, please use the proposal format and outline referenced in the RFP.
7. How many ERP licenses do we need to consider in the proposal?
- Answer 7: A user count estimate by functional area has been provided on the ERP Planning Solution Cost Template Addendum 1. Please note that individual users who access multiple functional areas have been added to the count in each of area.
8. How many users or licenses do we need to consider for HR and Payroll module?
- Answer 8: A user count estimate by functional area has been provided on the ERP Planning Solution Cost Template Addendum 1. Please note that individual users who access multiple functional areas have been added to the count in each of area.
9. Will Fearless Tech serve as extended internal Project Management through ERP Project Go-Live?
- Answer 9: The District engaged with Fearless Solutions through the RFP preparation process and has the potential to continue to utilize their expertise after the selected solution has been approved for project management and implementation. As of now, no definite decision has been made to the extent of their participation once the bid has been awarded.

10. RFP Section 5.4.5 notes historical conversion for a 'minimum of 10 years data' while Cost Template, Tab 7 - Data Migration suggests conversion pricing shall be based on 'minimum of 3 years historical data'. Please clarify.

- Answer 10: Tab 7 of the Cost Template Excel spreadsheet has been corrected. The District is requiring a minimum of 10 years of historical data be imported from the legacy system (TERMS) to Proposer's solution. Costs should be based accordingly in the attached Cost Template - Addendum No. 1.

11. You mention your current Timekeeping solution. Is Timekeeping in scope within the RFP?

- Answer 11: The Timekeeping relates to the ability to track time and attendance, report absences, track and report overtime and calculate adjusted salaries accordingly. The district is seeking a Core Human Resource solution which incorporates these features.

12. If the new system does not require the total # of years of data you would like to retain, would you allow an archive data solution to store your historical data for years not required to be converted to the new system?

- Answer 12: The District is requiring that the new system import a minimum of 10 years of historical data from the legacy system (TERMS). If this is accomplished, the District does not require an archived data solution for additional years.

13. Is replacement of cafe Point-of-Sale equipment part of the scope of the project or integration of old POS info to the ERP system?

- Answer 13: Replacement of the existing Food Service Point-of-Sale equipment or integration of Point-of-Sale information is not part of this project.

14. Is there a list of existing hand-held or mobile data collection devices and are they are slated for reuse or replacement?

- Answer 14: Reuse or replacement of existing hand-held or mobile data collection devices is not part of this project.

15. Page 31 and page 36 provides details and scoring matrix for total 5-year cost of ownership. The ERP 23-208-066 Cost Template excel document, on tabs 8 and 9, provides only 5 years of support and maintenance and hosting are requested. However, box A13 describes a total 10-year costs but is only calculating years 1-5. If you could provide further clarification on if vendors should only provide years 1-5, and change the total to 5 years? Or further details on how PCS would like vendors to provide a total 10-year cost estimate it would be greatly appreciated.

- Answer 15: The District is requesting a 5-year total cost of ownership. Cell A13 of Tabs 8 and 9 of Cost Template Excel spreadsheet has been corrected to read a total of 5 years in the attached **Cost Template - Addendum No. 1**.



16. Section 6.13.2 on page 31 of the bid document states that proposals will be reviewed on a pass/fail basis based on the proposer's financial stability and viability. Would the district like the proposer's financial statements to be submitted separately from the rest of the RFP response?

- Answer 16: Yes. The Cost Proposal Form on page 35 of the RFP, the Cost Proposal Excel Template and any associated documents related to Volume II: Cost proposal, should be submitted as a separate document/s from your main proposal response covering Volume I and Volume III.

**NOTE: Any questions pertaining to this addendum should be directed to:**

---

**Joe Benjamin**

**Phone** (727) 588-6146

**E-mail** [benjaminst@pcsb.org](mailto:benjaminst@pcsb.org)

---