1. What systems and enabling technologies (e.g., workflow, imaging) are included in the "go live" date of July 1, 2001? This is largely dependent upon the technologies and the recommended implementation schedule(s) offered within the proposal. At minimum, USNH expects to be live with general ledger, purchasing and accounts payable modules by July 1, 2001 (see RFP sections I.B and I.F.4). This could be altered if the proposed system(s) and schedules allow an alternative that provides for additional functionality in a similar time frame. Any recommendations for additional functionality or alternative implementation schedules should be detailed in the bidder's proposal as stated in the RFP section III.C.4.a.

2. Is assistance with workflow, imaging, and data warehouse inside or outside the scope of work? As stated in the RFP section III.C.4.a:

4. Provide a detailed plan for fulfilling the base proposal including recommended implementation schedule(s). Include a description of what the bidder views as its responsibilities and what it views as USNH responsibilities.

a. Provide detailed information about any optional items (See section II.D) being proposed. Note how these items would fit into the implementation schedule(s) requested above and any impact on USNH's responsibilities detailed in the base proposal.

b. The detail provided for the base proposal and any optional items should be sufficient for USNH to make an informed decision. The proposal should indicate a recommended schedule for implementation for the base installations. The proposal may then provide detailed information on the implementation of any proposed supplemental elements (see RFP section II.C. Supplemental Elements) or optional items (see RFP section II.D). USNH will determine whether or not to consider these additional items based on overall cost, added functionality and impact on the implementation schedule.

3. Please define the importance of "Supplemental Elements" (Section C - Expected System Components), as it relates to USNH needs. We are assuming that Basic Elements are "must haves".

The supplemental elements in section II.C of the RFP are additional and desirable, but the basic elements are necessary for us to continue critical functionality. We would be looking for a new system to provide many of these supplemental elements as "value-added" components. (See RFP section I.A).

4. The System noted "compatibility with USNH's existing and planned access control services (authentication/authorization) as an expected technical/common system component (page 9). What are USNH's existing and planned access control services? USNH has not completed the definition of its planned authentication/authorization scheme. The text below, excerpted from the USNH Long Range Technology Plan (v. 2.0) (which is available on the web at http://usnh.unh.edu/lrtp/), describes an active project anticipated to complete the definition and implement the solution. Currently USNH uses a combination of password security measures from applications, operating systems and networks. SSL is used to provide security for web-based applications.

   Project 6: Identify and Install Enterprise-wide Authentication and Authorization Systems

   Description: To provide a secure yet easy-to-use access to system-wide network related functions, a centralized client password authorization system is needed. This system would not only provide a 'one-stop-shop' for client authorization based on a user id and password, but would also allow encryption of the password. The system would then pass the userid/password combination to client applications that could then pass on the userid/password to the server application. This would eliminate the client having to manually login to each service. Current technology models include
DCE, Kerberos and digital certificates. These technologies need to be researched and a viable vendor solution embraced. Because of the current state of the technology, multiple standards, and applications vendor hesitation to embrace one or another of the standards, it may be January of 2000 or later before a workable solution is realized. This should not impede the establishment of multiple security models in order to continue to process the data in a secure manner. At such time that a solution is available, that solution should be integrated into the current model.

Time Line: Beginning January 2000, the search for vendors and applications would take place. The software purchase and installation would need to be completed (if technology solutions warrant) before September 2000. Enterprise-wide Authentication applications based on emerging technologies and/or standards would be ongoing in implementation through July 2001.

Tasks: Select Authentication applications from various vendors. Purchase and install these applications in the new Financial/Human Resources administrative systems environment as well as email, legacy, and LAN systems where applicable.

5. One of the expected technical/common system requirements is "Provisions for use of external management reporting/mining tools" (page 10). Does the System have any tools in mind? The RDBMS underlying the new HRS/financial applications should adhere to open systems standards, allowing access by ANSI SQL compliant tools such as BusinessObjects and WebIntelligence.

6. Who has authority to approve/ reject customizations to the delivered systems? The USNH Executive Steering Committee has the authority to accept or reject customizations as recommended by the project director.

7. Who are the sponsors for this project? Will sponsorship be managed on a centralized or decentralized (by campus/ entity) basis? This project is sponsored by the USNH Chancellor's Office through an Executive Steering Committee that comprises the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget, the Vice Chancellor for Financial Affairs/Treasurer, the Director of Human Resources, the Assistant VP for Computing and Information Services, and the Assistant VP for Finance/Controller. The project is fully supported by the USNH Board of Trustees (see the Long Range Technology Plan at the web site referred to in the RFP). The project is also fully supported by all levels of leadership at all USNH campuses via membership on the Administrative Board (all campus CEOs), the Information Technology Planning and Advisory Council (ITPAC), the Information Technology Coordinating Council (ITCC), the vendor selection and implementation teams, and various technology steering committees. The project will be managed centrally with significant involvement and input expected from each of the campuses.

8. What functions have already been redesigned? What functions still need major redesign work? USNH has significantly redesigned both the finance and the human resources transaction processes over the past four years. A prominent example is the recent completion of a three-year project at UNH called Administrative Services Redesign (see www.finadmin.unh.edu/asr/asr_main). ASR established 18 shared service centers responsible for all financial and human resource transactions and reporting.

We have empowered end users with significant authority to process personnel and purchasing documents at a decentralized level. At the same time our goal has been to maximize the use of current technologies in process redesign. Requisition/purchasing transactions have been fully electronic (no paper) for twelve years. All personnel data are available on-line and most transactions have been fully electronic for six years. USNH has a substantial purchasing card program in operation, with nearly 1,500 cardholders on all campuses processing approximately 70,000 transactions per year.

After a self-evaluation and re-engineering effort, the UNH grants management office streamlined operations to the research community by offering both pre- and post-award services through teams of grant and contract administrators.
We are currently in the process of rolling out a management reporting tool (WebIntelligence by Business Objects) to hundreds of department heads and end users so that they can access a recently-built financial datamart.

With a new system deployment, USNH hopes to utilize all existing and emerging technologies (e.g., web self-service, workflow, imaging, e-commerce) to further improve all business processes.

9. Has large-scale change occurred within USNH in the recent past? Have formal change management programs been utilized?
Yes. See the response to question 8 above and refer to the web site for Administrative Services Redesign.

10. What is the intended structure of the Program/Project Office? What role is desired/required of the implementation partner in this Office?

The structure of the project is depicted in Appendix A of the RFP and described in RFP section I.F.1 and in the response to question 7 above. The project director will be responsible for the day-to-day activities of the project with full-time support from a project assistant and three project team leaders representing finance, human resources, and information technology. The project director will develop the project plan with key milestones and deliverables, work in close coordination with the software vendor and/or external implementation partner, report frequently to the Executive Steering Committee, and be responsible for decisions, results, and communications relative to the project. As stated in RFP section II.B.7, USNH requests that the bidder identify and describe any consulting support required or recommended. As also stated in RFP section II.D, “bidders should feel free to provide other ideas and proposals, beyond the basic requirements, to meet USNH needs.”

11. What is the intended relationship between the implementation partner and USNH personnel on the functional/technical teams, and the Program/Project Office? Will there be joint teams? In general, will there be common or separate deliverables? Will USNH or the implementation partner be responsible for functional/technical team management?

USNH will be responsible for functional and technical team management, per Appendix A of the RFP. As the experts in systems implementations, bidders should recommend implementation strategies that will address the needs reflected throughout the RFP. USNH has purposely committed substantial internal human resources to this project in order to reduce the total cost of implementation (see RFP section I.F). USNH expects that by so doing, we will significantly reduce the requirement for external consulting, particularly in comparison with that recently experienced by higher education organizations of our size and complexity.

12. What type of physical accommodations will be provided to the project participants (centralized or dispersed workspace)?

The USNH project team has identified 2,600 square feet of space on the Durham campus to be used exclusively as the project operations center. As stated in RFP section III.C.6., USNH looks to the bidder to provide complete information for any services, information, equipment, or space to be provided by USNH.

13. At this time, does USNH plan to utilize student system application software from the same vendor supplying the new financial and human resources application software?
At this time, there is no plan to replace student application systems. As stated in RFP section I.E, the financial and human resources systems are USNH-wide, whereas the student, facilities management and alumni systems are campus-based. One or more of the campuses may be interested in implementing student, facilities management, alumni or other administrative systems from the successful bidder of the finance and human resources software. Any such implementation would likely not take place before the installation of software for finance, human resources and research/sponsored programs. Bidders should feel free to propose optional items such as student, facilities management or alumni software applications as described in RFP sections II.D and III.C.9. These optional proposals will be over and above the base proposal requirements and pricing.

14. Have any assessments been performed regarding the readiness for change from an infrastructure perspective (i.e., servers, desktop/client computers, network, etc.)? If so, what were the results of those assessments?
Client desktops and network infrastructure proposals are not being solicited as part of this RFP process. USNH does anticipate the need for additional database, application and web servers to support the new HRS/financial systems (see RFP section II.D). The technical support staff, in preparation for this implementation effort, has been involved in training and client/server application development projects for the last two years.

15. In the spirit of creativity, would USNH accept alternative bids (e.g., options) from the same bidder?
USNH specifically encourages bidder flexibility in responding to the RFP per sections II.D, III.C.4.a, III.C.9.b, and III.C.9.c. This flexibility does not remove the requirement to respond to the basic features per section III.C.4.

16. You have indicated you would be interested in potentially acquiring a complete turnkey system including hardware, operating system, database, application software etc. If you were able to also have the vendor provide for the complete operation, maintenance, software upgrades and all related technical services from the vendors site at a reduced total cost would you be interested in receiving a proposal for that type of off-site hosting?

No.

17. If you are interested in this type of proposal can you provide the following user count estimates:
   a. Number of Named Users- Assume named users are defined as people needing complete access to all system capabilities (i.e. Central Administrative).
   b. Number of Casual Users- Assume casual users are people needing just the ability to inquire and report (i.e. Departmental End Users).
   c. Number of Employee Users- Assume employee users are defined as people needing just access to the self-service capabilities such as expense reporting, requisitions, human resource transactions and updates (i.e. end-users).
   See response to question 16.

18. You have indicated that you are interested in a system that provides access anytime from anyplace. Does that imply that you would prefer an application that is 100% functional from just a web browser over a traditional client server application? Is an application that would provide complete transaction processing capabilities from remote or traveling employees to complete their daily work desired?

The chart of ‘Expected System Components’, section II.C in the RFP states that USNH expects the selected vendor to have a demonstrated commitment to web deployment. Support for all user application functionality including transaction processing across the web is desirable.

19. You have asked for an integrated data warehouse. Please describe the scope of your data warehouse by describing the goals, plans and vision for it.

The following text, from original planning documents for the USNH Long Range Technology Plan, describes the USNH vision for a data warehouse:

The information warehouse will be a virtual collection of many databases (DataMarts). These DataMarts will appear to the end user of the data as a single source, but the reality will be that the data and information will be stored across many data base servers throughout USNH institutions…

20. Of the 10 FTE’s you plan to assign to the project, what percent of those will be technical vs. functional experts?

Approximately 60% of the 10 FTEs are functional and 40% are technical.

21. Will there be an additional RFP for implementation services or will only respondents to this RFP be allowed to bid on implementation services?

We do not anticipate an additional RFP for implementation services. (See RFP sections III.C.4 and III.C.9).

22. What business areas do you expect will have or experience the most significant change with the implementation of a new system?

It is unclear where the most significant change will occur. (See response to question 8).

23. Do you desire the ability to process and report on activity using an Apple computer?

USNH prefers a system that is flexible and affordable in its deployment to the desktop. The USNH desktop environment is currently heterogeneous and we would like the bidder to recommend how best to deliver client services in such a mixed environment.

24. Do you desire to have a flexible chart of accounts that captures, consolidates and reports financial information - across all the campuses as well as individually?
Yes, this is a requirement. USNH is a single entity for financial reporting, audit and state funding. We require that data be consolidated easily, as well as available by campus, functional unit, department, etc., etc., etc.

Do you contemplate changing the COA structure with the new system?

USNH fully anticipates our current chart of accounts will be modified with the implementation of a new system. The extent of this change will depend upon the structure of the proposed system and attributes available to support reporting and budgetary control needs.

25. Do the campuses share one consistent, standard chart of account structure or all they all different?

Under our current system all the campuses share a single chart of accounts, coded in a manner that allows a user to identify campus ownership. Reporting hierarchies are associated with portions of the chart, allowing selection by specific campuses, functional units, departments, etc., etc., etc. Within each campus, significant flexibility is provided to allow individualized application of accounting attributes including expense/revenue codes and sub-codes, and budget controls within broad limits of authorization.

Is there a desire to standardize across campuses to improve reporting?

Because of reporting needs, USNH currently supports a single, standardized chart of accounts. The proposed system should support this requirement. USNH also expects a chart of accounts to be flexible and scalable in order to meet growing campus efforts and changes.

26. Please provide information or briefly explain how the budget process works? How are budgets developed? What is the approval process? Do you use historical information to build a budget? Is the process manual intensive and does it provide users the ability to work with spreadsheet applications?

Budget preparation at USNH is a decentralized process involving the University System Budget Office, campus central budget offices, departmental financial managers, deans and directors. Each campus determines the extent of decentralization within the campus. USNH provides on-line distributed query and/or real-time updating access through our budget development system (PREP) to approximately 80 people. PREP is generally available March through June, but has been available as early as January.

PREP is highly customized and fully integrated with the general ledger system and position control. The system is seeded initially with operating budgets from the CUF$ financial system and position budgets from the human resources/position control system, thus integrating operating budget and position data. Fringe benefits budgets associated with permanent positions are automatically calculated and seeded into PREP. Position data in PREP is refreshed in an automated manner from the position control system throughout the budget development process. Fringe amounts are recalculated, and likewise refreshed, in accordance with the PREP refresh schedule. This provides up-to-date information for budget balancing.

PREP is basically an accurate and effective data entry, recording and summarizing tool. After the initial seeding, budget adjustments for various categories of expense, other than permanent positions and fringe benefits, are manually entered by keystroke. Modeling and calculations are done outside the system using independent spreadsheet applications. Sophisticated modeling and analytic capabilities are desired in a new system.

27. We understand that budgetary controls are at the transaction level. At this level, are departments or offices allowed to overspend with an after the fact correction? Are there difference levels of severity, optionally assigned, for different departments, natural accounts or by funding source?

Yes, in certain situations. Currently, budgetary overspending is not generally allowed for accounts within the general operating fund but it can be applied selectively at varying levels. Budget control can be placed on the individual expense line or it can be placed on a user-defined grouping of lines. Payroll expenditures and encumbrances post to the general ledger without regard to available budget. Strict budget control is not currently required for accounts outside the general operating fund (e.g. gift accounts or internally designated accounts) but total expenditures versus receipts are controlled through a required fund balance. USNH may consider alternative solutions to existing budgetary controls when a new financial system is implemented.

28. Please discuss any special or State reporting requirements that you desire in your new system.

USNH maintains, separate from the state of New Hampshire, its own treasury, payroll, and accounts payable and receivable. The reporting requirements to the state are limited.

29. Is the purchasing function centralized?

The purchasing function at USNH is highly decentralized. Document entry, approval, and updating has been delegated to departments at varying dollar levels. USNH also has a significant deployment of purchasing cards, further delegating and decentralizing the purchasing and payables functions. In addition, each campus
has its own purchasing office. Policy and procedures established at the USNH level, as well as a shared, central purchasing system, impose some level of uniformity and consolidated management information.

Would cost savings be realized with improvements in information flow and access between the various campuses purchasing departments?

Without a clear understanding of what types of information flow and access is envisioned, it is not possible to answer this question. USNH anticipates any proposed system would support current capabilities and additionally provide opportunities for enhancement during implementation or beyond.

30. Would the ability to create standard government reports for grant activity be desired?

Per the RFP section II.C. "Research and Sponsored Programs", USNH expects the ability to do invoicing and financial reporting. Furthermore, we expect support for completing the A-133 schedule of federal expenditures, and the reporting requirements related to small business, minority-owned business enterprises (MBE) and women-owned business enterprises (WBE). In all cases, it would be desirable to have the system produce standard government reports directly.

31. Does the current system capture and report on grants terms and conditions, reference numbers, sponsor agency contacts?

Current systems capture and report on grant reference numbers and on some grant terms and conditions (start and end dates, financial requirements, cost-sharing requirements, small business and MBE/WBE requirements). UNH captures other reporting requirements in one general-purpose text field that is difficult to use for query or reporting purposes. We do not capture sponsor contacts.

32. Does the current sponsored programs system integrate with the financial and procurement system?

Yes. Systems have been developed to integrate sponsored programs data with financial and purchasing data and to provide reporting capabilities to grant and contract administrators as well as to grants managers. These reporting capabilities have greatly enhanced the basic information available in CUFS alone and have allowed UNH to generate standard financial reports, MBE/WBE reports and the A133 schedule of federal expenditures. The introduction of purchasing cards, with its limited access to vendor information, has created challenges to our reporting process on small business, minority-owned business and women-owned business.

33. Is effort reporting integrated with the grant, HR and payroll systems and required of the new system?

USNH has an effort reporting system that captures information directly from the payroll systems and the sponsored programs systems, allowing USNH to capture uncompensated faculty cost sharing on grants and contracts. USNH expects to maintain this level of functionality and integration. USNH desires the added capability of having these data flow into the facilities and administrative rate calculation.