



1112 Manatee Ave. West
Bradenton, FL 34205
purchasing@mymanatee.org

Solicitation Addendum

Addendum No.: 2
Solicitation No.: 20-R075104BB
Solicitation Title: Time & Attendance and Leave Management System
Addendum Date: September 28, 2020
Procurement Contact: Brooke Baker

RFP No. 20-R075104BB is amended as set forth herein. Responses to questions posed by prospective bidders are provided below. This addendum is hereby incorporated in and made a part of RFP No. 20-R075104BB.

CHANGE NO. 1 TO:

ADVERTISEMENT; DATE, TIME AND PLACE DUE

The Due Date and Time for submission of Proposals in response to this RFP is October 9, 2020 at 12:00 P.M. ET. Proposals must be delivered to the following location: Manatee County Administration Building, Procurement Division, 1112 Manatee Avenue West, Suite 803, Bradenton, FL 34205 prior to the Due Date and Time.

CHANGE NO. 2 TO:

SECTION A, INSTRUCTIONS TO PROPOSERS; A.01, PROPOSAL DUE DATE

The Due Date and Time for submission of Proposals in response to this RFP is October 9, 2020 at 12:00 P.M. ET. Proposals must be delivered to the following location: Manatee County Administration Building, Procurement Division, 1112 Manatee Avenue West, Suite 803, Bradenton, FL 34205 and be time stamped by a Procurement representative prior to the Due Date and Time. Proposals will be opened immediately following the Due Date and Time at the Manatee County Administration Building, Procurement Division, Suite 803.

CHANGE NO. 3 TO:

SECTION A, INSTRUCTIONS TO PROPOSERS; A.36, SOLICITATION SCHEDULE

The following schedule has been established for this Solicitation process. Refer to the County's website (www.mymanatee.org > Online Services > Bids & Proposals) for meeting locations and updated information pertaining to any revisions to this schedule.

Scheduled Item	Scheduled Date
Question and Clarification Deadline	September 16, 2020
Final Addendum Posted	September 28, 2020
Proposal Due Date and Time	October 9, 2020 by 12:00 P.M. ET
Technical Evaluation Meeting No. 1	TBA
Technical Evaluation Meeting No. 2	TBA
Interviews/Demonstrations/Presentations	TBA
Final Technical Evaluations	TBA
Projected Award	December of 2020

CHANGE NO. 4 TO:

SECTION C, NEGOTIATION OF THE AGREEMENT; C.04 AGREEMENT

The successful Proposer(s) will be required to enter into an agreement in a form and with the terms and conditions ~~the parties agree to contained in Exhibit 3, Sample Agreement, attached hereto.~~ The agreement may, or may not, include all elements of this RFP or the resulting successful Proposer's Proposal where alternatives provide best value, are desirable to the County, and the parties agree to such terms.

CHANGE NO. 5 TO:

SECTION A, INSTRUCTIONS TO PROPOSERS; A.03, SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS

The contents of the sealed Proposal package must include:

- a. One (1) bound original clearly identifying the Proposer and marked "ORIGINAL".
- b. Five (5) bound copies clearly identifying the Proposer and marked "COPY" with all required information and identical to the original.
- c. One (1) electronic copy clearly identifying the Proposer with all required information and identical to the original.

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES:

Q1. We are a Canadian owned and operated company. Will this preclude us from responding as a non-US based company? A.29, E-Verify: We typically provide our training and implementation services remotely from within Canada and as such do not typically require a US Work Visa however we are willing to comply with the E-Verify requirements if it's deemed necessary in order to progress through the selection process. Can you please confirm if this is acceptable?

R1. Proposers must submit their proposals in accordance with the RFP; Section A, Instructions to Proposers; A.29, E-Verify.

Q2. We are a Canadian owned and operated company. Will this preclude us from responding as a non-US based company? Exhibit 2, Tab 2: The Proposer must be registered with the State of Florida, Division of Corporations to do business in Florida. We are not currently registered with the State of Florida but will do so if it's

deemed necessary in order to progress through the selection process. Can you please confirm if this is acceptable?

R2. Proposers must be registered with the State of Florida, Division of Corporations to do business in Florida at the time of proposal submission.

Q3. Can you confirm if we need anything else other than the following four (4) documents?

- 1. 20-R075104BB_Request_for_Proposals**
- 2. 20-R075104BB_Attachment_J,_Fee_Forms**
- 3. 20-R075104BB_Attachments_A_through_E**
- 4. 20-R075104BB_Attachments_F_through_J**

R3. Refer to the RFP; Section A, Instructions to Proposers; A.04, Organization of Proposals and Exhibit 2, Proposal Response Requirements.

Q4. Do responses have to be sent in physically or is there also an electronic process?

R4. Refer to the RFP; Section A, Instructions to Proposers; A.03, Submission of Proposals.

Q5. Some of the architecture and technical questions require a Mutual Non-Disclosure Agreement (MNDA) to be in place in order for us to respond. I've attached our MNDA for your review. Can you please have this reviewed, executed and returned to me so that I can send you a counter-signed copy?

R5. No. The County will not sign any Non-Disclosure Agreement. If the Proposer considers the information a Trade Secret, refer to the RFP; Section A, Instructions to Proposers; A.27, Trade Secrets.

Q6. As a Canadian Company, is there a restriction for us in applying for this proposal?

R6. Refer to R1 and R2.

Q7. In order to release our SOC reports, we need to have an NDA in place. Will the County sign an NDA?

R7. Refer to R5.

Q8. Please confirm the submission of proposal for Attachment J, Fee Forms. Pages 3 and 4 of Section A.03, Submission of Proposals state to include Attachment J in Microsoft Excel with the Exhibit 2 electronic copy. Page 34 of Section 9, Fees Proposal of the RFP states the Proposer shall submit an electronic copy of Attachment J in Microsoft Excel, one (1) hard copy binder separately labeled "Fees" and include Attachment J with the original hard copy.

R8. Refer to the RFP; Section A, Instructions to Proposers; A.03, Submission of Proposals.

Q9. If additional content needs to be provided, does the County have a preference of tab label format?

R9. Proposers may submit additional content by adding a tab labeled “Additional Content” to their proposal and including their additional content in that tab.

Q10. If there are RFP exceptions, what Tab of the RFP would the County like these added to?

R10. Proposers may submit exceptions by adding a tab labeled “Exceptions” to their proposal and including their exceptions in that tab.

Q11. Page 17, C.04 Agreement references Exhibit 3, Sample Agreement. Please provide the referenced agreement for our review.

R11. Refer to Change No. 4 addressed in this Addendum.

Q12. Page 33, Tab 7(i) states that the Proposer shall “provide a statement of company letterhead, signed by a company official authorizing a County auditor and/or financial analysts access to your financial records, including all records prepared by an independent firm, or the financial records of other entities for which you have ownership interest.” In lieu of such letter, will the County accept an audited financial statement from Ernst & Young that includes an auditor’s opinion which would address any concerns around our financial position?

R12. Proposers shall conform with the requirements outlined in Tab 7(i).

Q13. Who is the Executive Sponsor of this evaluation? Is that person also the expected signatory?

R13. Refer to the RFP; Section B, Evaluation of Proposals; B.01, Evaluation.

Q14. Would the County consider accepting electronic responses via email? COVID-19 has altered business processes and our company currently has all of our employees telecommuting for safety reasons, as per the CDC guidelines and state mandates. Upon relaxation of distancing efforts, we can follow up with the hard copies if still requested.

R14. Refer to R4.

Q15. Is there a desired date in November for vendor awards?

R15. No.

Q16. What is the minimal number of references required for this RFP?

R16. Refer to the RFP; Exhibit 2, Proposal Response Requirements; 2.02, Proposal Format; 2. Tab 2, Minimum Qualification Requirements; b.

Q17. Will preference be given to vendors that have pre-built integrations with the County's other key systems?

R17. Refer to the RFP; Section B, Evaluation of Proposals.

Q18. How many employees will require advanced shift scheduling functionality such as E911 & Public Safety scheduling, shift swaps, minimum staffing requirements, etc.?

R18. Approximately 250 employees. The County currently utilizes Aladtec for our EMS/911/Marine Rescue advance shift scheduling. There is a desire from that Department to explore a fully integrated advanced scheduler system with time and attendance. The County would like to hear opportunities from Proposers and pricing with and without the advance scheduling.

Q19. How many time clocks would the County need?

R19. Less than five (5), but the County is more interested in other technology for tracking time (tabled, PC, mobile app, etc.).

Q20. What type of badges would you like to use at the time clock (i.e. mag swipe, barcode, proximity)?

R20. This is at the discretion of the Proposer.

Q21. Would the County like a biometric option at the clock, to clock in/out?

R21. This is at the discretion of the Proposer.

Q22. How many clocks does the county expect to purchase?

R22. This is undetermined at this time.

Q23. How many geofencing locations will you have?

R23. We have approximately 85 worksites that are entering time using mobile device, tablet or PC. The County will determine the method of time keeping upon review and selection of a vendor.

Q24. How many departments make up the organization?

R24. 12 Departments.

Q25. How many Pay Policies?

R25. The County has 10 different pay classes (exempt, non-exempt, elected official, part-time, OPS, extension agent, exempt doctor, 12-hr shift non-exempt, 12-hour shift non-exempt EMS, 24-hour shift non-exempt EMS) and have approximately 250 different hour codes.

Q26. It seems you have 10 Accrual Codes (Vacation)? How many different Accrual Policies for each code?

R26. For Vacation for most employees, the accrual rates increase based on seniority: 5 hours per pay period initially, after 5 years, the rate increases to 6 hours, and after 10 years the rate increases to 7 hours. (permanent part-time employees accrue at a pro-rated amount based on their FTE). For County Emergency Medical Services (EMS) employees (about 200 employees) they accrue at different rates based on their shift (12-hour or 24-hour) and based on their seniority: for the first year: they accrue 5.25 hrs on 12-hr shift and 6.72hrs on 24-hr shift, year 2 through 5 they accrue 5.71 hrs on 12-hr shift and 7.64 on 24-hr shift, year 6 through 10 they accrue 6.76 on 12-hr shift and 9.08 on 24-hr shift, and year 11 through termination they accrue 7.81 hrs on 12-hr shift and 10.48 on 24-hr shift. Sick has 2 different accruals: The sick time accrual rate for regular employees is five hundredths (.05) of an hour for each hour paid up to a maximum of 80 hours (.07 for Emergency Medical Services employees on 24-hour shifts).

Q27. We have four (4) Leave Types. Do we have the same policy for each type across the organization?

R27. Refer to R26.

Q28. Integration – Can you confirm the following interfaces?

- 1. Employee Demographics Import from Central Square into Kronos**
- 2. Pay Data export and Accrual Balances export from Kronos into Central Square**

R28. It is the Proposer's responsibility to detail the applicable interfaces.

Q29. Would flat files be acceptable for integration?

R29. The goal is to have API interface, however frequent flat file uploads/downloads could work if they occur frequently in an automated manner.

Q30. Will Public Safety be in scope and if so are there any requirements for shift swaps or shift bidding?

R30. Public Safety is in scope and currently using an independent system for shift swaps/bidding based on their requirements and policies. The County is interested having the Proposers respond to how they plan on accomplishing this.

Q31. In the desired state, it references a payroll interface to CentralSquare Finance Enterprise via API connection. In our experience, customers have found an interface via flat file exchange as an acceptable option. Would this be an acceptable alternative in this case?

R31. Refer to R29.

Q32. What types of employee badges are currently being used (i.e. proximity, bar code, mag stripe, etc.)? If Proximity is being used, please provide the type.

R32. Currently, badges used for access purposes are proximity cards. Convergint Technologies, Inc. is the County vendor for all video and card access hardware and software.

Q33. What departments and roughly how many employees will need the ability to swap schedules?

R33. If elected, one (1) department and approximately 250 employees.

Q34. As it pertains to scheduling the EMS/911 and other 24-hour operations, there is an option to scheduling where the system finds the best employees to meet a defined demand (employee type/date/time) based on qualifications, hours worked, availability, etc. to manage overtime while ensuring appropriate staffing levels. Is the county requesting this functionality as well for these employees? If so, roughly how many employees does this apply to?

R34. This shall be at the discretion of the Proposer.

Q35. Section J, Tab 4 – Implementation

1. Of the 400 exempt employees, will any report only exception time (i.e. PTO, approved OT, etc.)? If so, approximately how many?

R35. Yes, all exempt employees will report only exception time.

Q36. Today 26 employees use a time clock. Based on the COVID 19 and safe workplace environment options provided by the vendor's time clocks, will there be interest in more time clocks. If so, roughly how many?

R36. Refer to R22.

Q37. The system we are proposing meets all requirements except one (1), that being utilizing Active Directory for user logon. Is the inability to do that a disqualification?

R37. Active Directory for user login is preferred. Other options will be accepted for evaluation.

Q38. The requirement “support various integration methods and encryption for the protection and movement of data” is somewhat vague. For our proposal, the system data between the source and cloud server is encrypted. Is this sufficient?

R38. Yes.

Q39. Our proposed interface with CentralSquare Finance Enterprise Payroll System will utilize a time card export function which can be imported to the payroll system prior to every payroll. Is this adequate for an interface?

R39. Refer to the RFP; Exhibit 1, Scope of Services.

Q40. Is there a specific budget allocated for this system? If so, what is the budgeted amount?

R40. The specific budget for this project shall be determined through negotiations with the selected Proposer. Proposers are expected to provide their most competitive pricing for evaluation.

Q41. Is there an expectation that a new improved solution will be found for the same or less than the existing Workforce annual recurring fees?

R41. Proposers are encouraged to propose their most competitive price.

Q42. How will the County measure the success or return on their investment in a new Time & Attendance and Leave Management system? Are there specific metrics or KPIs the County expects to achieve? (productivity improvements, shorter cycle times, improvements in grant funding utilization, etc.)

R42. This will be negotiated with the Successful Proposer.

Q43. Is the County re-evaluating any internal Time & Attendance and Leave Management rules and policies as part of this technology change? If so, can you provide examples or details?

R43. Yes, re-evaluating standby policies, shift premium policies, additional/incentive/license pay policies; holiday pay policies; OT permission policies; military leave/call policies, and others - seeking more efficient policies throughout for cleaner, easier, less hands-on administration, policies that are easier for staff to understand, looking to align with best practices and open to input from vendor on how to best use the new software (less customization).

Q44. What department or business unit within the County will be tasked with implementing this new solution? Are there budget or specific resources pre-allocated to support this change? If so, please provide any details you're able to share.

R44. Human Resources and Information Technology. Resources will be allocated as required.

Q45. In the last five (5) years, what experience does the County have with moving other legacy on-premise platforms to the cloud? Can you provide examples of other solutions where you've successfully completed this migration?

R45. The County has successfully transitioned legacy on-premise platforms to the cloud. Other examples are not pertinent to this Request for Proposal.

Q46. Does Workforce have prebuilt integrations with your HRIS today, or are they custom integrations? Can you confirm the current ongoing cost and level of effort needed to maintain existing integrations or stand up new integrations?

R46. Currently there is a daily interface from ONESolution to Workforce that provides Employee census information and accrual balances and a pay period (bi-weekly) upload that provides the time details. The interface files are custom to BCC and the format does not change unless there is a change with ONESolution. There will be a need to have a new interface file developed, tested and implemented for Time & Attendance for ONESolution and will also need to be updated for Finance Enterprise (the upgraded version of ONESolution) in July 2021. The desire is to have an API for the Finance Enterprise integration.

Q47. What percentage of County employees enter their time and leave information via a smartphone or mobile device?

R47. This cannot be determined at this time.

Q48. Does the county issue devices to its workers?

R48. Yes.

Q49. Is broader adoption of mobile time and/or leave administration a goal of this change in technology?

R49. Yes.

Q50. Does the County see value in a new platform that will be easy to reconfigure or change as policies and requirements change? Or is the intention to set up your policies and leave them mostly static for an extended period of time? Any details you can offer on how often change occurs that requires updates to your existing configuration would be helpful.

R50. This is undetermined at this time.

Q51. In addition to grants, what other attributes (such as division, cost center, department) will time need to be charged against?

R51. Potentially projects in the future for budget/capital projects, emergency account keys.

Q52. Is Aladtec intended to be integrated with or replaced by new system?

R52. Refer to R18.

Q53. Would visibility into funding levels and grant balances remaining be valuable to the County? How do you view this information today?

R53. This is not applicable to the requirements of this Request for Proposal.

Q54. Can you provide examples of project-related time as specified in Line 44 of Attachment F - Capabilities Questionnaire?

R54. Allocating time to a specific job site or job or grant project.

Q55. Attachment F, please provide more clarity around Line 17 - Initiate what exactly?

R55. Disregard Question No. 17; it is an administrative error.

Q56. Does Manatee County anticipate any upgrades to any other Financial or HR platforms in the near future?

R56. Yes, the County will be exploring remaining modules of an HRIS system (Core HR, Performance Management, Learning Management) once Time and Attendance is procured. The ERP system ONESolution is being upgraded to Finance Enterprise in July 2021.

Q57. It is referenced in the RFP that integration with payroll is required. When will Manatee County be fully upgraded to Finance Enterprise?

R57. Refer to R56.

Q58. Does Manatee County wish for all employees to utilize the mobile application?

R58. Optional, but desired if feasible.

Q59. Should the mobile application be a true native app from the app store?

R59. Yes.

Q60. Does the County anticipate utilizing tablets or existing technology for the kiosks?

R60. Refer to R22.

Q61. Do all departments earn comp time instead of overtime?

R61. No.

Q62. Are there any complex scheduling requirements that were not mentioned in the RFP? Would the Public Safety Departments at the County be interested in an advanced scheduler for shift swaps, drops, and offers? If so how many employees would utilize this functionality?

R62. Refer to R18.

Q63. It is mentioned in the RFP that employees should have the ability to swap schedules with manager approval. Will all county employees need this functionality? How many employees will need this functionality?

R63. No, all County employees will not need the functionality; 250 County employees will need the functionality.

Q64. Is there a desired quantity of hardware that the proposers should reflect in their proposals?

R64. In Attachment J, the County indicated one (1) clock for the Convention Center. All other technologies can be a tablet, PC, mobile device to maximize options and cost and shall be at the discretion of the Proposer.

Q65. Is there a desired employee count that proposers should reflect in their proposals?

R65. Refer to the RFP; Attachment J, Fee Forms.

Q66. Would the County be interested in any thermal technology for physical hardware to take temperature for employees?

R66. The County is interested in learning what Proposers have related to thermal technology.

Q67. Will the hardware terminals require any power over ethernet, or wireless technology?

R67. This is at the discretion of the Proposer.

Q68. Will these terminals be located outside in hazardous conditions that may require them to have a cover or protection?

R68. Possibly, if elected.

Q69. The RFP mentions 2,025 employees. Is this all staff including seasonal and part time?

R69. Refer to the RFP; Attachment J, Fee Forms; Tab 2, EE Demographics and Data Files.

Q70. Does the County currently utilize a scheduling program or time keeping program? If so who?

R70. Yes, Workforce.

Q71. Has Manatee County had demonstrations of time keeping solutions prior to the RFP? If so then who?

R71. Yes, Workforce and TimeClock Plus also the demos from the HRIS vendors (iSolved, Ascentis, ADP and Kronos).

Q72. Has Manatee County utilized any automated time keeping programs in the past? If so then who?

R72. Refer to R70.

Q73. Are balances for leave accruals currently being held in the Finance/HR system?

R73. Yes.

Q74. Is it desired for the time keeping system to import these balances into the system therefore only having one (1) system of record?

R74. Yes, ERP is the system of record.

Q75. Will vendors be asked to demonstrate the software and hardware?

R75. Yes

Q76. Is it desired for the employees to review their time straight from the hardware terminal or will computer access be allowed for time review and leave requests?

R76. Computer access will be allowed.

Q77. If biometrics are required will the vendor be required to provide compliance information? Due to labor laws and upcoming changes to legislation we find this information critical in the process of determining biometrics as an option.

R77. Guidelines can be provided but it is the responsibility of the Proposer to understand and abide by the established laws and legislation.

Q78. From the hardware will any self-service options be applicable? For example, approving time, time off requests, checking schedules, and more.

R78. Refer to R22.

Q79. Is there a desired go-live date for a full software rollout? November is referenced in the RFP for bid award.

R79. The desired go-live date is June 2021.

Q80. How many locations does Manatee County currently have?

R80. Approximately 85 different physical locations/work sites where employees are entering time.

Q81. Does Manatee County wish for the time and attendance to also help facilitation and requesting of FMLA leave?

R81. Yes, desired.

Q82. Does Manatee County currently have a point system or occurrence tracking process that a time and attendance vendor would also need to be able to handle?

R82. No.

Q83. Is 24/7 Support a desired service from the proposers?

R83. Normal business support is expected. Considering we have a 24/7 operation, we would expect on-call support for a system outage. SLA's in the final contract will outline expectations.

Q84. Is Single Sign on or Active Directory desired functionality from the proposing vendor?

R84. Yes.

Q85. Is the Manatee County utilizing the same payroll and HR company or are you managing two (2) separate systems? If so then who?

R85. Payroll is Central Square and core HR is manual and Central Square. All other systems are separate. Refer to Attachment J.

Q86. If physical time clocks are required is it desired that the same vendor provide not only the software but also the hardware?

R86. The County would expect the same vendor provide the hardware and software.

Q87. Should the physical hardware maintain a real time connection with the database?

R87. Yes.

Q88. Is it desired for the proposers to also provide implementation services through the same organization and not an outsourced or third-party implementation?

R88. Yes.

Q89. Is it desired for the proposer to be single focused in time and attendance or will you also be considering firms that are owned by HR or other payroll providers?

R89. The County is open to single focused firms or HR/Payroll firms. System functionality will prevail.

Q90. Is a relationship/partnership with Central Square something that Manatee County would be considering in selection?

R90. Highly effective and efficient integrations with Central Square are a critical expectation of the County.

Q91. Is geofencing desired functionality from the mobile application?

R91. Refer to R23.

Q92. Should the mobile app be available for free for employees or does Manatee County anticipate for employees needing the app to pay for its services?

R92. No cost to the employees.

Q93. Please confirm the shipping address for the proposals. Page 1, Section Date, Time and Place Due of the RFP states: Manatee County Administration Building, Procurement Division, 1112 Manatee Avenue West, Suite 803, Bradenton, FL 34205. Page 4, Section A.05 of the RFP states: Manatee County, Procurement Division, 1112 Manatee Avenue West, Suite 803, Bradenton, FL 34205.

R93. Refer to the RFP; Section A, Instructions to Proposers; A.03 Submission of Proposals.

Q94. Our proposed interface with CentralSquare Finance Enterprise Payroll System will utilize a new hire import function that will import new hires into our program. Is this adequate for an interface?

R94. Refer to the RFP; Exhibit 1, Scope of Services.

Q95. Attachment F/General Section, Item 17: Does the system have the capability to initiate? Please clarify what you mean by “initiate.”

R95. Refer to R55.

END OF ADDENDUM

NOTE:

Items that are ~~struck through~~ are deleted. Items that are underlined have been added or changed. All other terms and conditions remain as stated in the RFP.

INSTRUCTIONS:

Receipt of this addendum must be acknowledged as instructed in the solicitation document. Failure to acknowledge receipt of this Addendum may result in the response being deemed non-responsive.

AUTHORIZED FOR RELEASE