



**State of Oklahoma  
Office of Management and  
Enterprise Services  
Information Services Division**

**Amendment of Solicitation**

Date of Issuance: 07/12/2013 Solicitation No. 0900000751

Requisition No. \_\_\_\_\_ Amendment No. One

Hours and date specified for receipt of offers is changed:  No  Yes, to: \_\_\_\_\_ CST/CDT

Pursuant to OAC 580:15-4-5©, this document shall serve as official notice of amendment to the Solicitation identified above. Such notice is being provided to all suppliers to which the original solicitation was sent. Suppliers submitting bids or quotations shall acknowledge receipt of this solicitation amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation as follows:

- (1) Sign and return a copy of this amendment with the solicitation response being submitted; or,
- (2) If the supplier has already submitted a response, this acknowledgement must be signed and returned prior to the solicitation deadline. All amendment acknowledgements submitted separately shall have the solicitation number and bid opening date printed clearly on the front of the envelope.

**ISSUED BY AND RETURN TO:**

Office of Management and Enterprise Services  
ISD Procurement Attn: Gary Rowland  
3115 N. Lincoln Blvd.  
Oklahoma City, OK 73105

Gary Rowland  
Contracting Officer  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Phone Number  
Gary.Rowland@omes.ok.gov  
E-Mail Address

**Description of Amendment:**

a. This is to incorporate the following:

The State is responding to the following 23 vendor questions posed by the deadline stated in the solicitation. These responses amend and clarify the solicitation.

**Question 1:**

**RFP Clarification Requested:**

Page Number: 17 of 29

Section C.1.4 - Mandatory Experience

**RFP Language:**

*"The Vendor must have completed by the Offer Due Date, as the primary provider of implementation services, a state or local government implementation of Hyperion Budgeting and Planning software. The referenced client must be in production. The purpose of this requirement is to ensure that the Vendor possesses the experience and lessons learned associated with public sector Hyperion implementations. The State's determination of compliance with the mandatory requirement shall be final."*

Supplier Company Name (**PRINT**) \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Authorized Representative Name (**PRINT**) \_\_\_\_\_ Title \_\_\_\_\_ Authorized Representative Signature \_\_\_\_\_



**Vendor Question Seeking Clarification:**

As the stated purpose of this mandatory requirement is “to ensure that the Vendor possesses the experience and lessons learned associated with public sector Hyperion implementations,” would the State of Oklahoma accept completed U.S. Federal Government implementations of Hyperion Budgeting and Planning software as meeting the public sector experience requirement?

**Response 1:**

The State will allow a federal project to satisfy this mandatory requirement. The state reserves the right to favor state or local experience during evaluation.

The State has amended the language for Section C.1.4 – Mandatory Experience to the following:

The Vendor must have completed by the Offer Due Date, as the primary provider of implementation services, a state, local or federal government implementation of Hyperion Budgeting and Planning software. The referenced client must be in production. The purpose of this requirement is to ensure that the Vendor possesses the experience and lessons learned associated with public sector Hyperion implementations. The State’s determination of compliance with the mandatory requirement shall be final.

**Question 2:**

Regarding Page 20 of 29, Section C.4. - System Requirements, this section refers to Attachment 1 and is later referred to as "Attachment 1 - System Requirements" in Section E.9.12 on Page 26. Attachment 1, however, is the "Oklahoma Hyperion Business Processes" according to the filenames on the Wiki site. Please provide the System Requirements document.

**Response 2:**

Section C.1.8 of the solicitation refers to Appendices A through H. These appendices were published to the web site as Attachments A through H, but these are the correct documents as referenced in C.1.8.

Attachment 1, System Requirements, was not published originally to the web site. It has now been posted to the RFP web site as Attachment 1.

**Question 3:**

How many users will be processing data in the proposed system?

- Budgeting and Planning
- CAFR

**Response 3:**

The current budgeting system has approximately 450 users. The current CAFR system has approximately five users, but the State expects that the number of users will increase when agencies can access the new solution to submit more information electronically.

**Question 4:**

How many environments are expected? Developments, QA, Test, Production?

**Response 4:**



**State of Oklahoma  
Office of State Finance  
Information Services Division**

**Solicitation**

During previous software implementations, the State has used three environments: Development, Test and Production. If there are valid reasons for additional environments, the State expects the Vendor to recommend in its proposal the environments needed based on its past experience and knowledge of best practices.

**Question 5:**

When are books closed for actuals (monthly, quarterly)?

**Response 5:**

The State closes its actuals yearly. For example, the actuals ledger for FY2013 was closed on July 2, 2013, but will be closed again when some outstanding entries are posted.

During the fiscal year, the State maintains two open periods at a time – current and previous – and does a “soft close” on the previous period when it opens the next period.

**Question 6:**

How many historical years of data are anticipated to be available in Hyperion?

**Response 6:**

The State expects that the number of years of historical data to be made available will be a design issue to be resolved during the project, based on past experience, best practices, available system resources and user needs. In general, the State would like at least five years of summary level (budget line) history.

**Question 7:**

Regarding Section C.1.7, can the State provide and explain the roles and FTEs you plan to commit to the project? How many technical FTEs including infrastructure, DBA, application support, etc.? How many functional FTEs and their roles? Do you plan to commit any FTEs from an ERP perspective?

**Response 7:**

The State is committed to a successful project and, as stated in the solicitation, “will commit sufficiently skilled state staff resources to the project for needed periods of time during the implementation.” As part of its response to C.3.4, the Vendor is expected to describe “proposed roles and responsibilities for Offeror and State, including estimated level of effort (i.e., hours, duration) needed from State by role.” The Vendor should describe the resources needed from the State in its response, based on a reasonable split of duties and adequate knowledge transfer. If the State is not comfortable with the Vendors’ request, the issue can be resolved during contract negotiations.

**Question 8:**

Does the State budget by person, position or both?

**Response 8:**

As stated in the solicitation materials, the option to use position budgeting in PeopleSoft is currently not being used. Regarding the development of agency budgets that roll up to form the statewide budget, the agencies likely use a variety of methods to calculate budget requests. There is no functionality in state budgeting



systems currently to support budgeting by person or position, so there is little visibility into how agencies internally develop their budgets.

The State expects to configure PSPB to use both employee and position based budgeting. To transition to position/employee-based budgeting, the State has considered using PeopleSoft features that support that. Therefore, the State requested in Section C.1.6.f that the "Awarded Vendor shall provide initial analysis and assessment of anticipated internal process changes in two critical areas: (1) chart of accounts changes in PeopleSoft to support program (cross-organizational) and capital budgeting; and (2) PeopleSoft configuration changes to support position/employee budgeting." Any additional effort to implement the results of that assessment is not intended to be bid as part of the response to this solicitation, since the results of the assessment are unknown. If efforts are required, the State may choose to provide internal resources for this potential additional effort, or may choose to acquire it through a change order to the Vendor contract or through another means.

**Question 9:**

How many decision packages did the State have for FY13?

**Response 9:**

The State does not use the "decision package" concept in its current system.

**Question 10:**

When will the State provide answers to these questions?

**Response 10:**

Responses to all questions posed by the deadline will be posted by July 12.

**Question 11:**

Is the State willing to provide a one week extension?

**Response 11:**

There is no change to the solicitation due date at this time.

**Question 12:**

RFP Section: Attachment A, Page 14

Will revenue estimates be input into the planning application via webforms or is the intention to interface them?

**Response 12:**

This will be a design decision. The State expects the Vendor to recommend the proper method based on past experience and best practice, taking into account the efficiency and cost effectiveness of the recommended solution.

**Question 13:**

RFP Sections: C.3.10 (Page 20) & Attachment A (Page 6)



Are federal funds separately authorized based on grant awards and what is the process to reauthorize federal fund carryovers at the end of the state fiscal year?

**Response 13:**

No, federal funds are not separately-authorized in the state budgeting process.

**Question 14:**

RFP Section: Attachment A, Page 13

Will changes to PeopleSoft need to be made to capture program and project master data and data? If so, will the State provide the resources to make those changes or will the State be looking to the Vendor to provide support?

**Response 14:**

To capture cross-organizational financial information, the State has considered using the "Program" coding element in PeopleSoft. Therefore, the State requested in Section C.1.6.f that the "Awarded Vendor shall provide initial analysis and assessment of anticipated internal process changes in two critical areas: (1) chart of accounts changes in PeopleSoft to support program (cross-organizational) and capital budgeting; and (2) PeopleSoft configuration changes to support position budgeting." Any additional effort to implement the results of that assessment is not intended to be bid as part of the response to this solicitation, since the results of the assessment are unknown. If efforts are required, the State may choose to provide internal resources for this potential additional effort, or may choose to acquire it through a change order to the Vendor contract or through another means.

**Question 15:**

RFP Section: Attachment A, Page 13

Will the State provide a rough order of magnitude on the number of programs and projects in a given year (or period), as well as how relatively detailed they are by providing an estimate on the number of levels they are broken down by?

**Response 15:**

At this time, the State does not plan to capture and track every program in the state. The cost would far outweigh the benefit. That being said, we anticipate that we will start with a few single agency programs and statewide programs in the first year as a pilot and then expand program budgeting and performance tracking over the next several years

Regarding the levels, there isn't a good estimate at this time since the State's current system does not budget by program. Programs can be contained within one agency or have several contributing agencies involved. An example would be tobacco related programs that may be functioning in OSDH, OHCA, DRS, SDE, and/or OID all for the purpose of reducing the use of tobacco in the state. The State would anticipate that agencies will budget by, track and report on their programs which may "roll up" into statewide programs.

**Question 16:**

RFP Section: C.1.3, Pages 16/17

Will the State please confirm which version of Hyperion is expected to be implemented?

**Response 16:**



**State of Oklahoma  
Office of State Finance  
Information Services Division**

**Solicitation**

The State would like to implement the most recent release of Hyperion based on the start date of the implementation. Currently, the latest release of Hyperion is 11.1.2.3.

**Question 17:**

RFP Section: Attachment D, Page 1

Will the State please confirm that the only GL trial balances that will be loaded via FDM to HFM will originate from PeopleSoft? If there are non-PeopleSoft sources, please specify the quantity and source system names/locations.

**Response 17:**

There are no sources for automated uploads of General Ledger information expected other than PeopleSoft.

**Question 18:**

RFP Section: C.1.3, Page 16

Is part of the scope of this project to define the KPI's, or will the State plan on using the standard "out of the box" KPIs provided by Oracle/Hyperion?

**Response 18:**

The State expects a solution that is customized to the needs of the State, and does not expect to be constrained to using delivered or pre-configured elements in any part of the system.

**Question 19:**

RFP Section: Attachment A, Page 14

What is the authority of Governor to use cash, both state and federal funds, absent the legislative authorization of new fiscal year funding, in order to continue all operation or operations deemed essential in the event of a budget impasse?" Absent such authority for the Governor, how does the state meet its statutory/mandated commitments for the current year until such time budgetary authority is in place via legislation?

**Response 19:**

The Governor has no authority to use cash absent legislative authorization. So far, Legislative approval for budgets to meet all State commitments is received by July 1<sup>st</sup>.

**Question 20:**

RFP Section: E.9.15, Page 26

In defining the content of the Sample Statement of work, the RFP references Section G.2 when discussing project scope or functional areas of the project. Since Section G.2 references Project Segment Costs, which is part of the Cost submittal, should the reference for project scope in Section E.9.15 be to Section C.2 Scope of Work?

**Response 20:**

The Statement of Work is expected to reflect the entire content of the Vendor's offer and, as stated in E.9.15, "should include a description of the roles and responsibilities for each of the services requested in this RFP in accordance with the vendor's proposed project plan and methodology, and descriptions of all deliverables to be provided."



The reference to Section G.2 in E.9.15 is to clarify that the Statement of Work should accommodate the potential delay or elimination of segments of the project scope. The three segments are defined in Section G.2. As stated in the solicitation, “to facilitate the delay or elimination of segments of the project scope as discussed in Section G.2, the Offeror should present the functional areas from Section G.2 in distinguishable sub-plans within the Statement of Work.”

**Question 21:**

RFP Section: C.1.6c (Page 17), C.2.2 (Page 19), E.9.16 (Page 26)

In regards to providing the startup environment and a potential hosted solution, can the state please provide information regarding the following items?

1. Security: What security considerations for external hosting options are required? Are there state-wide standards that vendors must meet, e.g. SAS Type II, SOC II, etc.?
2. Environments: Is the state considering hosting the PROD environment off-site? How many environments does the state envision will be needed for hosting, e.g. DEV, Test, Train, Prod, Disaster Recovery?
3. Architecture: Does the state have standards for architecture that must be met? Will the state dictate the physical environment to be used, e.g. physical or virtual, private cloud or community cloud, etc.? Regarding SLA's that vendors will provide, does the state have a standard up-time for hosted environments it will require?
4. Current State: Can the state advise as to any applications it is currently running in a hosted environment?

**Response 21:**

1. The vendor would have to show compliance with State Security policies as outlined in Section A.46.4 of the RFP. There would have to be an additional outside regular audit of the Vendor that demonstrates compliance at a SAS 70 (Statement on Auditing Standards No. 70) / SSAE 16 (the recent update to SAS 70), or a full COBIT 4 or 5 level audit. The State of Oklahoma would require two annual reports from the vendor that include the compliance with Oklahoma Security Standards in A.46.4 and an audit summary report by an external entity for SAS 70/SSAE 16 or COBIT 4 or 5 level compliances. Furthermore, before implementation, the Vendor must participate in a State of Oklahoma Risk Assessment process to review the Vendor's Physical, Administrative, and Technical Security controls, as well as Information Security Management and Governance prior to implementation. Where there are unacceptable risks to the State of Oklahoma identified, a remediation plan must be supplied by the vendor prior to implementation.
2. As mentioned in Section E.9.16, the State is considering off-site hosting of the State's production Hyperion environment. The State typically maintains at least three environments: Development, Testing and Production. If the Vendor has a recommendation regarding this, it should be described in its proposal.
3. There are not established standards within the State for the items listed. The State would recommend Oracle for the database. OMES utilizes AIX LPARs and VMWare for virtualization. If a cloud solution is proposed, the State would prefer a private cloud, depending on cost. A hosted environment would need to be justified by being able to provide a higher uptime than an on premise solution.



4. Currently, the State's PPM tool is being hosted by HP.

**Question 22:**

RFP Section: C.1.7.f, Page 17

Is there expected support from the bidder for legacy system support? When would the legacy systems officially be retired (immediate cutover or a phased transition)? Are the scheduling and disposal of legacy systems in scope?

**Response 22:**

The Vendor is not expected to provide any support services for existing budgeting and planning systems. The Vendor is expected to work with the State to design the transition off of these systems, based on the design and schedule of the deployment of the new solution.

**Question 23:**

Would the State consider extending the submission deadline for responses to August 14, 2013 to provide adequate time for vendors to comprehensively address the specifics of the RFP?

**Response 23:**

There is no change to the solicitation due date at this time.