

RFP 10616-18/DKK Questions and Answers

Dynamics Support Services

The purpose of this document is to provide questions and answers regarding this RFP. The following Q&A's are current as of 7/16/2018:

Q1. We understand that local resources are important for your Support. Would the City consider using a local Service Delivery Manager complemented with off-shore resources?

A1. It would really depend on the level of involvement from the local Service Delivery Manager. If the majority of our work was with that resource and he or she facilitated work of the other resources, we would not rule out the consideration of off-shore resources.

Q2. Can we provide the support from an offshore location, like from India?

A2. Please see Q1 and A1 above.

Q3. Regarding Section 3.2 “Work Items” (page 12 of the RFP) – will 1,000 hours of effort also account for the Transition Effort from the incumbent?

A3. Yes, it is the City's intention to accomplish this work within the scope of the support contract resulting from this RFP. If any one body of work becomes larger or is deemed more critical to operations than can be accomplished within the hours of the support contract, the City will either amend the support contract with an additional statement of work or issue a separate RFP soliciting proposals for a specific body of work.

Q4. Regarding Section 3.2 “Work Items” (page 13 of the RFP) – is there any code configuration tool in place? If so, then what is it?

A4. 2012AX - Team Foundation Server / D365 – LCS.

Q5. Regarding Section 3.2 “Work Items – Implement New Functionality” (page 13 of the RFP) – are we supposed to include this effort and plan too in our proposal?

A5. This RFP is specifically for 1,000 hours of support services that will include the type of work described in Section 3.2. It is not the intention of this RFP for you to propose on any of the specific implementation efforts. Instead, please use Sections 2, 3, and 4 of your response to describe any comparable and relevant work experience (see “Proposal Response Format” on page 18 of the RFP).

It is the City's intention to accomplish this work within the scope of the support contract resulting from this RFP. If any one body of work becomes larger or is deemed more critical to operations than can be accomplished within the hours of the support contract, the City will either amend the support contract with an additional statement of work or issue a separate RFP soliciting proposals for a specific body of work.



Q6. Regarding Section 3.2 “Work Items – Assist with Tier One Response and Provide Tier Two Support Desk Services” (page 13 of the RFP) – we understand this would be required on an occasional basis. However, it would help us to know what is the current support window and how many incidents (Priority 1 and Priority 2) are logged on a monthly basis?

A6. In 2017, the City’s Dynamics users collectively submitted approximately 250 tier one Dynamics related requests to the internal IS help desk. Of these, 45 were escalated as tier two requests to the current support services Partner. Tier one issues are typically handled internally by the existing analyst or IS staff, which will continue to be the case.

Q7. Regarding Exhibit C “Existing Roadmap – R3, CU12 Product Upgrade” (page 30 of the RFP) – would it be possible to let us know the specific reason why this is delayed?

A7. The City is currently working through a conflict between its Cashiering system and Dynamics which has delayed an upgrade to a more recent version of the AX2012R3 environment. This conflict will be resolved when the testing and deployment of the latest upgrade to the Cashiering system has been completed; that work is currently underway. The model files for the upgrade to CU12 will be provided by Tyler and deployed in-house. Testing and rework on the code will be supported by Tyler, as it will still contain TIE and other Tyler customizations. We anticipate completing this in the late summer / early fall.

Q8. Regarding Exhibit C “Existing Roadmap – Eliminate Dependencies on Current Customizations” (page 30 of the RFP) – is there any project running for this activity? Could we see the plan and would it be possible to share the reasons for delay?

A8. This is work that we would anticipate being accomplished within the Support Services contract. We do not currently have the resources to work through this with us.

Q9. Regarding Exhibit C “Existing Roadmap” (page 30 of the RFP) – are the ongoing projects part of the scope where we build a transition plan for these so that they can be taken over from the incumbent?

A9. For the most part, ongoing projects in relationship to our Dynamics deployment are on hold until we have engaged with a new implementation and support partner. It is the City’s intention to accomplish this work within the scope of the support contract resulting from this RFP.

Q10. Regarding Exhibit C “Existing Roadmap – Redeployment of Project Accounting” (page 30 of the RFP) – can we get the current plan and the latest status of this activity?

A10. This is a relatively urgent need and we are in the process of researching options to complete the work. It is the City’s intention to accomplish as much of this work as possible within the 1,000 support hours. If any single body of work becomes larger or is deemed more critical to operations than can be accomplished within the hours of the support contract, the City will either amend the support contract with an additional statement of work or issue a separate RFP soliciting proposals for a specific body of work.



Q11. Regarding Exhibit C “Existing Roadmap – Audit and Cleanup of Existing Configuration” (page 30 of the RFP) – can we see the Audit and Cleanup Findings? What is the latest status of this activity and when is it expected to get completed?

A11. For the most part, ongoing projects in relationship to our Dynamics deployment are on hold until we have engaged with a new implementation and support partner.

Q12. Regarding Exhibit C “Existing Roadmap – Deploy Travel and Expense Management, Deploy Fixed Assets, and Transition to D365” (page 30 of the RFP) – these have been planned for the future but is there any preparation work already done for these activities? If yes, then can you please share the plan with us?

A12. For the most part, ongoing projects in relationship to our Dynamics deployment are on hold until we have engaged with a new implementation and support partner. We are looking into the possibility of deploying either or both Travel and Expense and Fixed Assets in D365 in much the same manner we have deployed Budget Planning in D365 prior to a full transition.

Q13. For additional rates outside of the 1,000 annual hours, are you looking for a blended rate or a rate card by resource type?

A13. The City requests that you provide us with your most competitive rate to effectively perform the types of services that could fall into this category.

Q14. During the span of this contract, an upgrade to D365 will occur (Q1 2020). Can we assume that the various work requested will be split across versions, based on priority?

A14. Yes.

Q15. The RFP contemplates the review and evaluation of Tyler intellection property (Insight Extensions). Does the City of Redmond’s software license allow for the review of this code by a third party under the direction of the City?

A15. Yes.

Q16. Should the City award the contract for managed services to our firm, would an NDA be required between our company and Tyler?

A16. Tyler shall make reasonable efforts to provide “review” access to the code bundle marketed as Tyler Insight Extensions.

Q17. The City of Redmond prefers local Pacific Northwest resources, but should the need arise to involve remote resources, is the City open to providing VPN access for remote services where applicable?

A17. Yes.

Q18. You state “approximately 250 of those employees are active Dynamics users.” What type are deployed in the City (enterprise, functional, task, and self-service... and full, activity, team)?

A18. All but 30 AX2012 Enterprise User Licenses have been renewed as transitional licenses in D365; 30 Enterprise User Licenses remain in AX2012. 20 Enterprise transitional licenses and 225 Team Member transitional licenses allow 245 of our users access to both AX2012 and D365 environments.



Q19. Has the City deployed or will deploy encumbrance accounting?

A19. Yes, the City has encumbrance accounting deployed.

Q20. What is the current status of the D365 Budget Planning in terms of the bi-directional integration? When do you expect to resolve all other issues, as Exhibit C states it's still in process?

A20. D365 Budget Planning can be considered fully deployed. Bi-directional integration components are in place.

Q21. Documentation and Training Materials: To what extent does the City want these updated for a current/future process?

A21. The City desires to update training materials and system documentation as changes are made to existing functionality or new functionality is deployed.

Q22. Establish a Dynamics Vision and Roadmap – “Through analysis and observation of the City’s current Dynamics 2012R3 deployment along with an understanding of its desire to improve upon functionality currently in use and further deploy functionality that has not yet been implemented, the support Partner will work with the City to establish a short and long-term vision and prioritized roadmap for the continued update to and implementation of Dynamics components.” By short-term, does the City mean per Exhibit C Q4 2019? When you state long-term, does that mean the transition to D365 beginning Q1 2020 and Go-Live sometime in late 2021?

A22. The City desires to work with the selected Partner to redefine its Dynamics roadmap. The City envisions that short-term efforts will directly support the long-term goal for a full transition to D365 in 2020. Upfront analysis will determine if opportunities exist to deploy additional stand-alone modules in D365 prior to a full transition, and how further deployment of functionality that is critical to the City’s operations can be accommodated around the planned transition to D365.

Q23. When is the project scheduled to get started? Any tentative start date?

A23. The City anticipates negotiating a start date and finalizing the contract in September 2018.

Q24. What is the estimated/available budget for the work outlined in this RFP?

A24. While a budget is in place for ongoing systems implementation and support services, it is not being disclosed at this time so as not to influence the bidding process.

Q25. Can you please share the incumbent information?

A25. The Dynamics Support Services contract, resulting from this RFP, will replace the existing support service contract with Tyler Technologies. The City understands that there will be overlap between the two support contracts until which time the selected support Partner is able to either absorb or eliminate the Tyler Technology customizations that the City may be dependent on.



Q26. If the City of Redmond is looking for an onsite option only, then can we divide some resources onsite and the rest offshore?

A26. The City wants to know that onsite resources are available without incurring travel costs. We believe that while most development work can be completed successfully off-site, planning, analysis, and design work often benefit from being face to face with the user community. The City will consider any mix of local, onsite, and remote resources.

Q27. Is there any preference for a local vendor?

A27. The City wants to know that onsite resources are available without incurring travel costs. We believe that while most development work can be completed successfully off-site, planning, analysis, and design work often benefit from being face to face with the user community. The City will consider any mix of local, onsite, and remote resources.

Q28. Can you please provide any customizations done in Grant Management?

A28. The City is not currently aware of customizations to Grant Management. While a handful of grant records have been entered in Dynamics, grants are primarily being managed off-line. This is one of the business areas that the City desires to change as we move forward with a redeploy of the Project Management module.

Q29. How does the City of Redmond accommodate Grant Management?

A29. The City is not currently aware of customizations to Grant Management. While a handful of grant records have been entered in Dynamics, grants are primarily being managed off-line. This is one of the business areas that the City desires to change as we move forward with a redeploy of the Project Management module.

Q30. Can you please provide the Chart of Accounts details?

A30. ChartOfAccounts.xlsx has been provided as Attachment A, Chart of Accounts.

Q31. Do we need to submit the sample contract documents of clients or will white label suffice?

A31. The requested samples of contract documents do not need to disclose previous client information; they can be more boilerplate of what might be indicative of a contract with the City.

Q32. How is the budgeting module given the budget input? Please elaborate.

A32. A file of Budget Register Entries is generated from D365 and imported into AX 2012.

Q33. Can you please provide the process flow details with other third-party applications, such as Tyler Cashiering, Energov, Eden, Procard, and Positive Pay?

A33. The City believes that the level of process flow detail identified in Section 2.5 of the RFP is sufficient for submitting a proposal on work as defined. It's anticipated that the responsibility for the support and maintenance of the existing integration components would remain under existing support contracts and are not candidates for change at this time.



Q34. How are project budgeting inputs given to the system? Is it from a third-party application or from AX 2012 R3?

A34. Project budgets are entered directly into the Project records and are not necessarily reflected in the GL.

Q35. Please provide Project Management input and automation details.

A35. The City's use of the Project Module is currently inconsistent and minimal. Projects are set up, and transactions are posted in as much as the project number is entered on the AP, Procurement, AR, or GL transactions.

Q36. Extraordinary Circumstances: On page 21 of the RFP, it states that the terms of the Sample Consulting Services Agreement appended as Exhibit E to the RFP "can be modified only if extraordinary circumstances exist." Could the City please expand upon and/or provide an example or two of circumstances that it would consider "extraordinary" allowing for the modification of those terms set forth in the Sample Consulting Services Agreement?

A36. One example would be a request to modify the insurance requirements (Section 9 of the sample contract). Based on the type of service/industry, we may increase, reduce, or otherwise modify insurance provisions. Generally, however, we are open to considering any requests for changes that are reasonable to the specific service/product being provided.

Q37. Limitation on Liability: Would the City be willing to consider the inclusion of a reasonable limitation on liability provision in the Consulting Services Agreement?

A37. These details can be discussed with the finalist during contract negotiations.

Q38. Ownership of Work Product (Section 6 of the Sample Consulting Services Agreement, p. 36 of the RFP): Would the City be willing to consider modifying the language in Section 6 (Ownership of Work Product) of the Sample Consulting Services Agreement appended as Exhibit E to the RFP to accept a broad license for any Consultant proprietary material incorporated in or provided for use with the work product produced by Consultant in lieu of owning such Consultant proprietary material?

A38. These details can be discussed with the finalist during contract negotiations. It is likely we would substitute Section 6 with alternate language, but again, this would be discussed at the contract negotiation stage.

Q39. Indemnity (Section 8 of the Sample Consulting Services Agreement, p. 36 of the RFP): Would the City be willing to consider modifying the language in Section 8 of the Sample Consulting Services Agreement appended as Exhibit E to the RFP to limit Consultant's indemnification obligations to claims brought by, or losses or liability asserted by, third parties against the City resulting from Consultant's negligence or willful misconduct?

A39. These details can be discussed with the finalist during contract negotiations. It is likely we would limit the liability to the total amount of the agreement, but again, this would be discussed at the contract negotiation stage.



Q40. Insurance (Section 9 of the Sample Consulting Services Agreement, pp. 36-37 of the RFP): Would the City be willing to consider reasonable modifications to the insurance provisions set forth in Section 9 of the Sample Consulting Services Agreement appended as Exhibit E to the RFP which do not materially change the insurance coverage required? For example, would the City consider allowing the Consultant to: (a) grant the City additional insured status via a blanket endorsement as opposed to through an additional insured endorsement that names the City as an additional insured; and, (b) satisfy the General Public Liability and Property Damage insurance coverage requested by combining Consultant's Commercial General Liability insurance coverage with its Umbrella insurance coverage?

A40. These details can be discussed with the finalist during contract negotiations.

Q41. Tyler Technologies Responsibilities and Support: Please provide details on how Tyler Technologies codebase or modifications will be managed along with responsibilities or communications. Is Tyler Technologies responsible to upgrade their code or modifications for upcoming Microsoft Dynamics AX cumulative (CU) updates?

A41. The City's support contract with Tyler Technologies remains in place until such time that the City is no longer dependent on Tyler specific customizations in its Dynamics environment. This means that Tyler will continue to be responsible for assisting the City with upgrades along with Tier 1 and Tier 2 Help Desk Support Services. Those support services will gradually be transitioned to the selected Partner whose primary focus at the startup of this engagement will be on new deployment and cleanup of existing configuration.

Q42. Infrastructure Support: Will support hours be used for physical infrastructure support? Please provide details or processes on control of physical environments, system down events or other infrastructure related issues for Dynamics AX 2012 install.

A42. Physical infrastructure support and maintenance is provided by internal staff in conjunction with Microsoft Premier support services as necessary. Model files for deploying AX2012 upgrades are constructed and provided to us by Tyler Technologies and will continue to be for as long as they remain responsible for incorporating their customizations into the deployment package.

Q43. External Integrations: Please provide technical details of all integrations with Dynamics AX 2012 CU9. Details such as technology stack, tools or other technical details surrounding data flow.

A43. The City believes that the level of process flow detail identified in Section 2.5 of the RFP is sufficient for submitting a proposal on work as defined. It's anticipated that the responsibility for the support and maintenance of the existing integration components would remain under existing support contracts and are not candidates for change at this time. All integrations use Dynamics AX Application Integration Framework (AIF) or Excel.

Q44. Point of Sale: Please provide details or requirements of new functionality to be implemented for the point of sale along with details on a future point of sale roadmap for City of Redmond.

A44. The City receipts front counter and mailed payments in the form of cash, checks, credit card or electronic fund transfer in its current cashiering solution. The City is not intending to expand on this functionality but is interested in incorporating it into Dynamics when the POS module is able to be deployed in D365F&O.



Q45. Local Resource Requirements: Please provide details on the City of Redmond Partner's local resource requirements, such as onsite presence or local communication preferences.

A45. The City wants to know that onsite resources are available without incurring travel costs. We believe that while most development work can be completed successfully off-site, planning, analysis, and design work often benefit from being face to face with the user community. The City will consider any mix of local, onsite, and remote resources.

