

**STATE OF ALASKA RFP NUMBER 2008-0200-7480
AMENDMENT NUMBER FOUR**

RETURN THIS AMENDMENT TO THE ISSUING OFFICE AT:



Department of Administration
Division of Admin Services
PO Box 110208
Juneau, Alaska 99811-0208

THIS IS NOT AN ORDER

DATE AMENDMENT ISSUED: June 30, 2008

RFP TITLE: Time and Attendance Solution

DEADLINE FOR RECEIPT OF PROPOSALS: 1:30pm, Alaska Time, July 14, 2008

Important Note To Offerors: In order for your proposal to be considered responsive, this amendment, in addition to your original proposal and other required documents, must be signed, dated, and received by the issuing office prior to the time set for receiving proposals.

This Amendment is being issued to answer questions received from potential offerors and clarify elements of the RFP.

All terms and conditions not modified by this amendment remain in full force and effect.

STATE OF ALASKA RFP NUMBER 2008-0200-7480

AMENDMENT NUMBER FOUR

Summary of Questions and RFP Changes

The following table provides a cross-reference of questions and resulting RFP amendments, if any.

The value for **Question** is “none” if an RFP change was made that was not the result of a direct response to a question.

The value for **RFP amendments** is a dash (“-”) if the response to a question is adequate and does not result in a change to the RFP.

Some questions have an associated **Note** for additional detail. Refer to the Questions and Answers section of this amendment for full details.

Question	Abbreviated Question Title	RFP amendments	Note
1	Web Services	Att. F, Att. J	IDs 27 & 43 clarified.
2	Clarify concurrent users	2.08, Att. E	Reduce from 12,000 to 5,000.
3	Business Continuity Agreements	-	
4	AMHS number of employees	-	
5	Due date extension	-	No extension with this amendment.
none	Demo Script	7.05, Att. K	Delete obsolete reference to future amendment and add demo script to RFP.

STATE OF ALASKA RFP NUMBER 2008-0200-7480

AMENDMENT NUMBER FOUR

Questions and Answers

1. What web services will be needed? What systems will they be used to communicate with? What types of transactions?

Attachment F, requirements 43 and 162 reference web services. Attachment I – Interfaces contains the only other reference to web services, as the preferred interface method with the ETS SR system.

Currently, timesheet transactions imported to AKPAY from other systems are loaded as “certified” (i.e., ready for payroll processing). The State intends to redirect these interfaces to the new TAS so batch edits applied to timesheets before being interfaced to AKPAY are also applied to transactions interfacing from other systems.

Specific web services have not been identified. The State desires a solution supporting web services that can be utilized when interfacing systems have the ability to use them. Systems currently interfacing with AKPAY are required to do so in batch. Some systems will continue to interface in batch to the new TAS. However, other systems may use TAS in a more interactive way, posting and retrieving data. These systems could use the web service methods to interact with the TAS business logic layer and do a subset of the functions included in the TAS User Interface. Web services must include, at a minimum, the ability to upload time for a given employee. It is desirable to have the flexibility to upload one time entry at a time, an entire timesheet, or all of the transactions for an agency for a time period. It is presumed that the web services provided for importing timesheets would, as part of their functionality, have the ability to return edit errors to the interfacing system.

Requirements 27 and 43 have been modified to add clarification. Requirement 162 was not changed.

2. In amendment 2, page 20, item 5 talks about references. Item 1-b says that the listed references must have at least 10,000 employees. Item 2-a says the successfully implemented system must accommodate 12,000 concurrent users.

Item 2-a is a little cloudy to us. A 'concurrent user' in time and attendance software is typically a manager or supervisory type person separate from the employees that are referenced in item 1. Or, it could be an employee if the assumption that all 10,000 [sic] users would be logged in simultaneously using employee self service.

By “accommodate 12,000 concurrent users” does the State require:

- a) That the reference site is using software that will accommodate 12,000 concurrent users even if they aren't using it in that manner?
- b) Are you looking for a reference that has 12,000 supervisors/managers registered in the system?
- c) Are you looking for a reference with at least 12,000 employees and/or managers that can log into the system simultaneously?

And separately from a reference question:

- d) Do you want us to provide hardware that would accommodate 12,000 users?

In an earlier portion, you clarified capacities as being 16,500 employees and 3,500 managers.

The intent of the language in the “Minimum Experience Requirements for Offeror’s Organization” section of 2.08 is to demonstrate, using references to implementations for at least two organizations, the offeror’s experience implementing a system similar to the proposed Time and Attendance Solution (TAS).

Requirements a - d in the first list must be met for at least one of the referenced organizations. Requirements a - d in the second list must be met for both of the referenced organizations.

STATE OF ALASKA RFP NUMBER 2008-0200-7480

AMENDMENT NUMBER FOUR

Answers to the questions in a) through d):

- a) After further consideration, requirement 2-a has been changed from 12,000 concurrent users to 5,000 concurrent users.

If the reference site has been architected and configured to support at least 5,000 concurrent users, it is acceptable if the reference site's actual usage has not exceeded 5,000 concurrent users. Offerors must demonstrate within the proposal that the referenced systems accommodated 5,000 concurrent users as successfully implemented.

- b) The State considers "users" to be any person accessing the system. This includes employees entering timesheets, supervisors/managers entering/reviewing timesheets, central payroll administrators, and system administrators.
- c) The State seeks a system that can support at least 5,000 employees and/or managers who can log into the system simultaneously. "Simultaneously" and "concurrent" are considered the same. Attachment N - Glossary defines Concurrent Users as "The number of active users (active sessions) of the TAS. Active sessions end after 20 minutes without client activity."
- d) The hardware to support the TAS must be sufficient to accommodate both 5,000 concurrent users and 16,500 total employees.

See also: Amendment Two, questions 41 and 42.

3. Section 6.02.6.4 - Assurance of Business Continuity, item 4) states:

The planning, agreements, and preparations necessary to recreate a redundant site, assuming the structure in which the primary or backup site is located has been destroyed. Include in this discussion the timeframe during which the system would be running without redundancy and possible mitigating factors.

Is State of Alaska requesting us to provide the DRP environment itself, or should we assume that the State will provide this and we are just responding on the related Disaster Recovery Planning recommendations and processes? If the latter, please clarify what is referred to by 'Agreements' above.

The State will provide the physical location, power, connectivity, and environmental requirements of the redundant site "in Anchorage or another location acceptable to the State." The offeror must provide all hardware necessary to maintain data integrity and backup processing capability that satisfy the "Continuity" requirements in Attachment F.

During project implementation, the State will select a redundant site based on requirements. It is likely, though not certain, the redundant site will be in existing State premises. If this is the case, "agreements" would consist of service level agreements (SLAs) or memorandums of understanding that specify support obligations for other State agencies. If the redundant site is not on State premises, "agreements" would consist of contracts with a site provider. In asking offerors to discuss agreements in 6.02.6.4, the State expects a high-level discussion of content of such agreements, and not detailed SLA or contract language that might be developed during implementation.

STATE OF ALASKA RFP NUMBER 2008-0200-7480
AMENDMENT NUMBER FOUR

4. **Can you please confirm that there are about 910 employees in the AMHS? We found on page 33 of TAS RFP 2008-0200-7480 r1 lists 3 separate entities that appear to relate to AMHS. I copied the info below. Is my estimate of 910 employees correct?**

Nonlicensed Marine Vessel Employees (MM)	Nonlicensed vessel employees of the Alaska Marine Highway System who are represented by the Inland Boatmen's Union of the Pacific (IBU).	710
Licensed Marine Engineers (BB)	Licensed engineers working aboard the vessels of the Alaska Marine Highway System who are represented by the Marine Engineers Beneficial Association (MEBA).	90
Licensed Deck Officers (CC)	Licensed Deck Officers working aboard the vessels of the Alaska Marine Highway System who are represented by the International Organization of Masters, Mates, and Pilots (IOMMP).	110

Yes, the number of employees fluctuates, but there is typically at least 910 employees in the IBU, MEBA, and MMP bargaining units who work on the ships. About five employees covered under the MEBA agreement work on shore. All AMHS employees turn in vessel time sheets and are covered under the marine agreements.

5. **You said you were working on a third addendum. Given that it hasn't been released yet, can we expect another extension on the due date?**

Amendment Three was issued June 20, 2008 to respond quickly to a question about the format of RFP Attachments E and J and provide notice that the attachments had been published as MS Word documents. What had been intended as a third amendment is being published as this fourth amendment. The contents of this Amendment Four are not expected to affect potential offerors' ability to complete proposals by the July 14, 2008 deadline for receipt of proposals. If this assessment is incorrect, potential offerors should make their needs known by contacting the procurement officer.

STATE OF ALASKA RFP NUMBER 2008-0200-7480

AMENDMENT NUMBER FOUR

RFP Changes

Changes to the table of contents are a total replacement and not indicated as a change.

The “.doc” version of the RFP is published with tracked changes associated with this amendment; the “.pdf” version is published in with all tracked changes accepted. Because it is used as a model by potential offerors, Attachment E is published with all changes accepted. In Attachments F and J, accumulated tracked changes since the original April 10, 2008 issue date are published.

Added text is indicated in red underlined text, deleted text is indicated by ~~blue strikethrough~~.

1. **Section 2.08 on page 16 is amended by changing wording for clarification and by changing the number of concurrent users the system must support, as follows:**

Minimum Experience Requirements for Offeror's Organization

To be responsive, offeror must **demonstrate within its proposal** that its organization has successfully designed, developed, and implemented a human resources, payroll, or time and attendance automated application for two organizations, and meets the following minimum experience requirements:

1. ~~Offeror must have successfully designed, developed, and implemented a human resources, payroll, or time and attendance automated application for two organizations.~~ At a minimum, one organization must:
 - a. be a government organization.
 - b. have at least 10,000 employees.
 - c. have employees in at least ten geographic locations that use the solution.
 - d. be of comparable complexity to the State of Alaska with at least ten labor contracts, fifty pay types, five leave types, and seasonal workforce(s) of at least five-hundred employees.
2. The successfully implemented systems for both of these organizations must:
 - a. accommodate 125,000 concurrent users.
 - b. successfully interface with employees in remote locations.
 - c. have been fully implemented in a production environment within the past six years.
 - d. have operated successfully in a production environment for a minimum of two years.

2. **Section 7.05 on page 90 is amended to remove an obsolete reference to a future amendment, as follows:**

7.05 System Demonstration (10 Percent)

Scripted demonstrations will be evaluated and scored by the PEC. Each section of the demonstration script will carry a pre-assigned score that defines its relative importance to other sections within the demonstration. ~~The System Demonstration Script and Score Sheet will be provided in an amendment to the RFP.~~ Invitations to demonstrate will be issued to offerors who are determined to be reasonably susceptible to award.

STATE OF ALASKA RFP NUMBER 2008-0200-7480

AMENDMENT NUMBER FOUR

3. Attachment E, Organization Reference sheet on page E-2, is amended by changing the number of concurrent users the system must support, as follows:

Project Start Date	Original Planned:	Actual:
Project End Date	Original Planned:	Actual:
Minimum Experience Qualifier?	<p>The client organization:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. is a government. 2. has at least 10,000 employees. 3. has employees using the solution in at least ten geographic locations. 4. is of comparable complexity to the State of Alaska with at least ten labor contracts, fifty pay types, five leave types, and seasonal workforce(s) of at least five-hundred employees. <p>The solution used by the client organization:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. accommodates at least <u>125,000</u> concurrent users. 2. successfully interfaces with employees in remote locations. 3. was implemented in a production environment after May 2002. 4. was successfully operated by the client in a production environment for a minimum of two years. 	

4. Attachment F, ID 27 has been modified to clarify that the system must allow authentication for web services, as follows:

Authentication	27	<p>The system shall provide the capability for authentication-based access restriction. Examples include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • applications <u>(including Web Services)</u> • screens and tables • data elements • functions such as add, change, delete and inquiry • electronic documents (electronic approvals) 	Yes	5	14
----------------	----	--	-----	---	----

5. Attachment F, ID 43 is amended to clarify minimum web services functionality that must be provided, as follows:

Interface	43	<p>The system shall allow export and import of data using web services and XML documents. <u>Web services must include the ability to accept time for an employee.</u></p>	No	3	8
-----------	----	--	----	---	---

6. Attachment J, ID 27 is amended to correspond to changes noted in #4 above, as follows:

ID	Category	Priority	Mandatory?	Met?
27	Authentication	5	Yes	
Level of Customization				
Requirement Description	<p>The system shall provide the capability for authentication-based access restriction. Examples include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • applications <u>(including Web Services)</u> • screens and tables • data elements • functions such as add, change, delete and inquiry • electronic documents (electronic approvals) 			

STATE OF ALASKA RFP NUMBER 2008-0200-7480
AMENDMENT NUMBER FOUR

7. Attachment J, ID 43 is amended to correspond to changes noted in #5 above, as follows:

ID	Category	Priority	Mandatory?	Met?
43	Interface	3	No	
Level of Customization				
Requirement Description	The system shall allow export and import of data using web services and XML documents. <u>Web services must include the ability to accept time for an employee.</u>			

8. Attachment K – System Demonstration Script and Score Sheet is amended by replacement in entirety.

IMPORTANT:

This is a **mandatory return** Amendment because it constitutes a material change that requires interested parties to understand and acknowledge. Please complete the information below and return this document with your proposal.

Name of Company

Authorized Signature

Date

Staci Augustus, Procurement Specialist V
Phone: (907) 465-5656 TDD: (907) 465-2205
FAX: (907) 465-2189