

AOC Question Number	RFP Reference (Section, Page, Paragraph)	Submission Date	Bidder Question/Request	Response Date	AOC Response
1	General, no section or page number	1/17/2007	What are each of the courts using for payroll? Does AOC plan to have all of the courts migrate to SAP payroll eventually?	1/23/2008	The Courts are using SAP, county systems and third-party systems. The AOC plans to have all of the trial courts migrate to SAP.
2	Section 1.8, page I-9 RFP Key Action Dates Table 1.7	1/17/2007	Respectfully, we would like to request a two week extension of the proposal due date.	1/23/2008	No, extension to the Proposal Due Date will be granted. <i>This response has been updated, please refer to Question #30 below.</i>
3	Section V2.1 paragraph 3, page V-2, and Section, V.3.1, Administrative Requirements, page V-3, paragraph 2	1/17/2007	Does 20% for subs include the DVBE requirement? Or is the DVBE in addition?	1/23/2008	The DVBE is considered a sub-contractor and therefore included in the requirement. Also see the AOC Response to Question #4.
4	Section V2.1 paragraph 3, page V-2, and Section, V.3.1, Administrative Requirements, page V-3, paragraph 2	1/17/2007	Would you consider a greater sub participation per project e.g. Upgrade (a project), Additional functionality (another project) etc.	1/23/2008	Administrative Requirement 1 shall be changed to the following: Bidder must agree to accept full Prime Contractor responsibility for coordinating and controlling all aspects of the contract and any Subcontractors. The Bidder must certify that Subcontractor(s) shall not exceed 40% of the fees paid on a project basis, as stated in the Agreement (see Appendix H, Master Services Agreement (MSA) for specific requirements). The MSA will also be updated to reflect the change of sub-contractor participation to 40%.
5	Appendix C, pages C-16, and C-17	1/17/2007	Form 6.1 and 6.2 state the mandatory requirement/qualifications differently from section VI. 3.1 - please advise.	1/23/2008	The forms are incorrect and will be updated through Addendum 1 to the RFP.
6	Section 4, Page 17, Figure IV-2.	1/17/2007	In Section 4, Figure IV-2, Proposed Implementation Schedule for the Phoenix Program, indicates Wave 1 includes Accounts Payable, Accounts Receivable, Procurement, and Training and Events. By contrast, in Section 4, Figure IV-3, Functionality Waves for the Proposed Implementation Schedule indicates Wave 1 includes Asset Accounting, Treasury, and Inventory Management. Can you confirm the correct scope?	1/23/2008	Figure IV-2 is the correct scope.
7	Section 4, Page 18, Figure IV-3.	1/17/2007	In Section 4, Figure IV-2, Proposed Implementation Schedule for the Phoenix Program, indicates Wave 2 includes Asset Accounting Budget Preparation and Planning, Inventory Management, Project Systems, Recruitment, Travel Management, and Treasury. However, in Section 4, Figure IV-3, Functionality Waves for the Proposed Implementation Schedule indicates Wave 2 includes Grants Management, Budget Control System, Integrated Planning, and Position Budget Controlling. Can you verify the correct scope?	1/23/2008	Figure IV-2 is the correct scope.
8	Section 4, Page 17, Figure IV-2.	1/17/2007	In Section 4, Figure IV-2, Proposed Implementation Schedule for the Phoenix Program, indicates Wave 3 includes Benefits Administration, Learning Solution, Performance Management, Succession Planning. Whereas, in Section 4, Figure IV-3, Functionality Waves for the Proposed Implementation Schedule indicates Wave 3 includes e-Recruiting, Performance Management, Travel, Personnel Cost Planning and Simulation, and Learning Solution. Can you verify the correct scope?	1/23/2008	Figure IV-2 is the correct scope.
9	Section V.2.1	1/17/2007	Does the AOC consider partnering firms to be the same as a subcontracting relationship?	1/23/2008	Yes, partnering is the same as subcontracting.

AOC Question Number	RFP Reference (Section, Page, Paragraph)	Submission Date	Bidder Question/Request	Response Date	AOC Response
10	Section V2.1 paragraph 3, page V-2, and Section, V.3.1, Administrative Requirements, page V-3, paragraph 2	1/17/2007	ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENT 1: Bidder must agree to accept full Prime Contractor responsibility for coordinating and controlling all aspects of the contract and any Subcontractors. The Bidder must certify that Subcontractor(s) shall not exceed 20% of the fees paid on a project basis, as stated in the Agreement (see Appendix H, Master Services Agreement (MSA) for specific requirements). The Bidder must check "Yes" on the Matrix provided as Form 5.1 in Appendix C, Bid Response Forms, indicating compliance, or "No" on the Matrix indicating non-compliance with the requirement. Would the AOC consider changing the 20% to 35% percent?	1/23/2008	See the AOC Response to Question #4.
11	Phoenix RFP Section 1.doc, Section 1.4 Program Scope, Page 7	1/22/2008	Is it acceptable for the vendor to quote only for Upgrade Project and not the Optional New Functionality Projects and Optional Existing Functional Projects?	1/23/2008	No, the AOC is looking for a Bidder to propose on all components of the RFP.
12	Phoenix RFP Section 1.doc, Section 1.4 Optional Existing Functionality Projects, Page 7	1/22/2008	Has Business Process Re-Engineering been done on the Existing Functionality Projects or is the Vendor required to provide the same?	1/23/2008	If reengineering is necessary based on the changes proposed, the Bidder would be responsible for that activity during deployment.
13	Phoenix RFP Appendix B-02	1/22/2008	Will the upgrade environment be provided by AOC or is the vendor required to host it in his own environment till the deployment stage?	1/23/2008	The AOC will host the upgrade environment.
14	General, no section or page number	1/22/2008	Is AOC open to Offshoring/Nearshoring the RFP Project Work?	1/23/2008	See RFP Appendix H, Master Services Agreement, Section 4.1.
15	Section V, Paragraph v.2.2	1/22/2008	What is meant by "The Contractor must be certified with the California Secretary of State to do business in California."? We must have a valid CA Corporation Number or Business License...please define certified to do business.	1/23/2008	The text "The Contractor must be certified with the California Secretary of State to do business in California." means that the Contractor must have a license to do business in the State of California.
16	General, no section or page number	1/25/2008	Our assumption for the scope of Budget Admin and Control during the Upgrade Phase of the Phoenix program includes Budget Execution and not Budget Preparation. Budget Execution includes, Budget Adjustments, like amendments or transfers as well as the activation of AVC (Availability Control). Can you please confirm our assumption?	1/31/2008	Budget Administration and Control during the Upgrade Project includes Budget Execution (e.g. budget adjustments, AVC, etc.) and not Budget Preparation.
17	General, no section or page number	1/25/2008	Where there any significant changes in the Trust Accounting design identified after the completion of the Blueprint document on June 7 2007?	1/31/2008	No, there were no significant changes in the Trust Accounting design after the completion of the blueprint document on June 7, 2007.
18	General, no section or page number	1/25/2008	Is the deployment schedule with the PSCD module to be deployed in April 2008 on schedule?	1/31/2008	The deployment schedule for those courts scheduled to go live with PSCD by April 2008 is on schedule.
19	General, no section or page number	1/25/2008	What is the planned deployment schedule of the Trust Accounting functionality to the remaining courts?	1/31/2008	The deployment schedule for the remaining courts is to be proposed by the Bidders.

AOC Question Number	RFP Reference (Section, Page, Paragraph)	Submission Date	Bidder Question/Request	Response Date	AOC Response
20	RFP Section VII.1, page VII-1 ; Section VII.3.10, page VII-9	1/28/2008	<p>The instructions for preparing the Cost Workbooks require that costs be based on AOC's provided Master Services Agreement (MSA) terms and conditions and Mandatory Requirements of the RFP (not the Bidder's exceptions to the MSA).</p> <p><i>There are terms in the MSA to which Bidders may be unable to contract and would not be able to provide associated pricing for acceptance of that term. As a result, the price would not represent an assumption of no changes to the terms and conditions of the MSA. Instead, the price bid would represent the total price for evaluation purposes subject to successful negotiation of contract terms.</i></p> <p><i>Is the pricing approach described above acceptable?</i></p> <p><i>Additionally, will AOC confirm that both parties' obligations are subject to successful negotiation and mutual agreement of the MSA based on the exceptions noted?</i></p>	1/31/2008	<p><i>This response has been updated as of February 13, 2008:</i> The AOC needs to be able to compare and evaluate the Bidders' pricing and therefore has requested that Bidders price to the AOC's requirements and not to the Bidder's exceptions. However, the AOC is willing, with respect to Sections 9.6, Article 13, Section 19.1, Section 19.4, and Article 20 of the MSA, to consider pricing to the Bidder's exceptions if a Bidder is unwilling to agree under any pricing or cannot attribute a price to all or a portion of the provision (for the purposes of this Answer 20, an "Exception"). For Section 9.6, Article 13, Section 19.1, Section 19.4, and Article 20 of the MSA, Bidder should provide pricing based on the AOC's requirements or, if that is not possible, should provide pricing based on the Bidder's Exceptions to these Sections and Articles; however, Bidder must clearly note whether it has provided pricing for these Sections and Articles in accordance with AOC requirements or in accordance with their Exceptions to the AOC requirements.</p> <p>The AOC will evaluate the Exceptions raised by a Bidder and whether the AOC's requirements or the Bidder's Exceptions have been priced. Please note that Exceptions and issues with the terms and conditions of the MSA raised in a Bidder's Issues List will be part of the AOC's evaluation criteria. These Exceptions and issues will be discussed between the AOC and each Finalist Bidder during the pre-BAFO clarification sessions. All Exceptions and issues on the Issues List of the Bidder to whom the AOC ultimately decides to award the contract will be resolved before the AOC and such Bidder execute the Agreement.</p>
21	RFP Section VII.1, page VII-1	1/28/2008	<p>The RFP requires that the Bidders "Clearly identify and explain all of the pricing assumptions made, upon which pricing is predicated including the cost/pricing impact if the assumption turns out not to be valid."</p> <p>This level of detail is extremely difficult to determine at this phase in a procurement and is not likely to result in reliable guidance.</p> <p>Will AOC consider deleting or further clarifying this requirement?</p>	1/31/2008	<p>The AOC will not delete this requirement, but will clarify it further.</p> <p>The AOC realizes that a Bidder may find that there may be specific areas of the RFP that may not be clear enough or detailed enough. In these areas, the Bidder may need to make certain assumptions in order to put together its Proposal. If any of these assumptions are such that there would be a cost/pricing impact if the assumption turns out not to be valid, the Bidder should identify and explain these assumptions and provide the amount that the cost/pricing impact would be were it to turn out that the assumption was not valid. Further clarifications of any assumptions and pricing will be conducted with the Finalist Bidders during the Finalist Bidders Clarification Sessions before the BAFO Proposals are due.</p>
22	RFP Section VII.2.5, page VIII-4	1/28/2008	<p>The RFP states "Bidder must submit one (1) signed original copy of the Phoenix Program Contract and SOW in this portion of their response." However, if the Bidder is submitting Form 8.1 indicating exceptions to the MSA, the Bidder cannot submit a signed contract. Should the Bidder assume that submission of Form 8.1 and complying with the requirements of Form 8.1 is sufficient to meet this requirement?</p>	1/31/2008	<p>Bidders must complete and submit one (1) signed original copy of Form 8.1, Bidder's Acceptance of the AOC's Contract Terms as part of their responses. Form 8.1 has been modified and is part of Addendum 2.</p>

AOC Question Number	RFP Reference (Section, Page, Paragraph)	Submission Date	Bidder Question/Request	Response Date	AOC Response
23	RFP Section VI.3.3.1, page VI-7; Table VI-3	1/28/2008	The RFP instructs Bidders to complete Form 6.3 for each individual performing the roles specified in Table VI-3. However, some of these roles will not be filled until well after Contract inception, and some may not be filled at all, if AOC does not exercise its option for Optional Services. Therefore, for roles that will not be filled at project inception, may the Bidder offer representative resumes, rather than proposing specific individuals?	1/31/2008	For the Upgrade Project and Optional Services, Form 6.3 must be completed for each individual performing the roles specified in Table VI-3. The AOC understands the individuals proposed for the Optional Services may not be available when we exercise this option and an alternative resource will need to be proposed and approved.
24	RFP Section IV.6, page IV-17; Table IV-2	1/28/2008	Does the timeline presented in the RFP include stabilization and post go-live support?	1/31/2008	The Upgrade Project timeline does not include stabilization and post go-live support; however, proposals shall include stabilization and post go-live support for all waves.
25	RFP Section VI.4.2.1, page VI-19	1/28/2008	Can you provide current training curriculum, including the number of training courses, modules and delivery format?	1/31/2008	The AOC will look at this and decide in the next week what they may be able to publish. <i>This response has been updated. Please see Addendum 5.</i>
26	RFP Section IV.5.1.9, page IV-13	1/28/2008	Can you provide detail on how many of your 8 large courts that will have inventory management in the future?	1/31/2008	The AOC has had extensive discussion with one large court regarding the implementation of Inventory Management. Vendors should propose the implementation of one large court, and additional courts will be negotiated during BAFO.
27	RFP Section VI.4.2.1.h page VI-19	1/28/2008	In section VI.4.2.1.h in the RFP on page 19 instructs the bidder to provide DEDs and samples for each of the deliverables identified in the RFP Appendix A, SOW. In Appendix A, page 10, the RFP lists eleven (11) deliverables which the bidder has to complete a DED within the proposal. In section VIII.2.5 on page 4 the RFP instructs the bidder to NOT complete the DED until submission of the BAFO proposal. Can you confirm the required DED documents for the proposal submission?	1/31/2008	DEDs and samples shall be submitted for the 11 deliverables identified in Appendix A, Statement of Work, at time of Proposal submission. Note that the SOW does not have to be completed until BAFO. See the associated change to RFP Section VIII.2.5, Volume IV: Completed Contract and Statement of Work (SOW), in Addendum 2.
28	General, no section or page number	1/28/2008	One of the leading practices that system integrators use to reduce costs is to conduct a small portion of the consulting work off-site (but within the US) through Delivery Centers. Delivery Centers allow economies of scale/skill for tasks such as application development, data conversion, and interfaces (for example) where physical proximity to the client site is not necessarily required. Conducting some portion of the work off-site allows AOC to benefit from lower consulting labor costs and reduced consulting travel costs. <i>May a Bidder assume for the Proposal that AOC will allow the Contractor to conduct some of the consulting work "off-site" within the US (not off-shore or near-shore) (specifying the components, the estimated hours, and the rationale for off-site work clearly in the proposal)?</i> Preparing two prices, one with all on-site work, and one with some off-site, is very difficult for the vendor community given the short time frame.	1/31/2008	The Bidder may assume for the Proposal that AOC will allow the Contractor to conduct some of the consulting work "off-site" within the US (not off-shore or near-shore) (specifying the components, the estimated hours, and the rationale for off-site work clearly in the Proposal); however, the AOC may impose constraints on certain subsets of data being stored, accessed, or transmitted offsite. At the moment, the AOC does not know which subsets of data may be subject to these additional restrictions.
29	Appendix B-01	1/28/2008	In the Technical Requirements section Appendix B-01 under Bidder-Proposed Enterprise Technology Tools, line item numbers 29 and 31 can be addressed by SAP Governance Risk & Compliance (GRC), and Test Data Migration Server (TDMS) respectively. Should System Integrators include the software quotations from SAP in their proposal, and assume that if the AOC wishes to license the additional SAP modules they will do so directly from SAP?	1/31/2008	Bidders shall list all software quotations included in their Proposed Solutions. The AOC may procure and license the software from the Bidder or from another source at the AOC's discretion.
30	General, no section or page number	1/28/2008	We respectfully request a deadline extension of two weeks in order to allow time for our public sector references to complete the necessary forms required by the RFP.	1/31/2008	The AOC is extending the Proposal Due Date to 2/19/2008. The Key Action Dates will be revised in Addendum #2.
31	Bidder's Library	1/28/2008	My team has been unable to locate the following two bidder's library documents: 1003948 B-04 Upgrade Assessment Integration Plan 20070927 v1.0 (SAP).pdf and 1003948 B-04 Upgrade Assessment Integration Plan 20070927 v1.0 (SAP-2).pdf	1/31/2008	The documents have been added to the Bidder's Library.

AOC Question Number	RFP Reference (Section, Page, Paragraph)	Submission Date	Bidder Question/Request	Response Date	AOC Response
32	Appendix D and VII-9 Payment Schedule	1/30/2008	In the "Optional New Functionality Deployment Projects and Optional Existing Functionality Projects Payment Schedule" in the section beginning on row 200, there are cost categories for Project Preparation, Blueprint, Realization, and Final Preparation. However, in Appendix D, on the tab labeled "VII-4 Opt Existing Func Deploy" there are no cost categories for Project Preparation, Blueprint, Realization, and Final Preparation. Can we add lines for Project Preparation, Blueprint, Realization, and Final Preparation to tab "VII-4 Opt Existing Func Deploy"?	1/31/2008	Vendors can insert additional lines for the various phases of the project lifecycle for each court size; however, lines for court size cannot be removed from the spreadsheet. Be advised, to use the lifecycle phases identified in the RFP (e.g. Project Preparation, Business Blueprint, Realization, Final Preparation and Go Live and Deployment Support).
33	Section VII.3.3, paragraph 6 and Appendix D	1/30/2008	The paragraph begins with, "Although Costs are not detailed by deliverable in this worksheet," it is noted that some deliverables will be "completed once," while other deliverables will be completed "multiple times." The Appendix D Tab "VII-4 Opt Existing Func Deploy," does not have any provision for one-time costs.	1/31/2008	All Project Costs are considered one time costs. If Bidders are planning to provide an initial deliverable and subsequent updates to that deliverable for individual payments in the Payment Schedule, each of those deliveries should be listed separately within a Project. If an initial deliverable can be reused across Projects, Bidders shall consider that possibility in its assumptions for pricing subsequent Projects.
34	Form 6.3	1/30/2008	For Key Personnel for Optional Added Functional Requirements, do we need to provide a resume, and two references since these are classified as 'optional services'?	1/31/2008	See answer to question #23 above.
35	General, no section or page number	1/30/2008	What are the database sizes for the following SAP systems: Production, Test, and Development?	1/31/2008	Production = 300 GB; Stage = 300 GB; Training = 220 GB; Test 1 = 210 GB; Test 2 = 300 GB; and Development = 130
36	Figure IV-2, and Section IV, page 17	1/30/2008	Can you clarify what is meant by 'Budget Admin and Control' as shown in the "Upgrade project" Section Figure IV-2 Proposed Implementation Schedule for the Phoenix Program (Section IV , page 17) (as opposed to 'Budget Prep & Planning' in New Functionality Wave-2 Project in same Figure).	1/31/2008	See answer to question #16 above.
37	RFP Section IV, Page IV-4, Figure IV-1	2/1/2008	The AOC has provided the "Proposed Phoenix Program Organizational Chart" in Section IV of the RFP. Can the bidder assume that all of the "Deployment Support (Center of Excellence)" positions shown in the Organizational Chart define the number of fulltime dedicated resources that the AOC will make available to support the Phoenix implementation activities? Can the bidder assume that the AOC Deployment Support will provide the following thirty five (35) fulltime AOC team members: Twenty (20) Senior Business Applications Analysts Twelve (12) Business Applications Analysts Three (3) Education Specialists (II)	2/6/2008	Bidder should assume staff under the Production Support Manager are available to assist in the various waves. The Support Services & Change Management, and Education Support resources will be dedicated to supporting the courts on a day-to-day basis.
38	RFP Section IV, Page IV-4, Figure IV-1	2/1/2008	Can the AOC provide a mapping of skill areas to the staffing positions provided in the Organizational Chart? It would help the bidder to understand, how the thirty five (35) AOC resources map to the following skill areas: "Functional and SAP Configuration by SAP Module, ABAP Developer, BASIS Support, BI Developer, TIBCO Developer, and Training Development."	2/6/2008	The Business Process Management and Finance staff under the Production Support Manager have functional and SAP configuration knowledge across the FI modules. The Human Resources staff have functional and SAP configuration knowledge across the HR modules. Many of the HR positions are dependent on the budget change proposal being approved, so will likely not be AOC experienced staff. Technical staff were not displayed on organizational chart. They are on Tech Resources tab of this file.
39	RFP Section IV, Page IV-4, Figure IV-1	2/1/2008	Is the AOC intending to provide more than the above listed thirty five (35) resources, if yes what skills would these full time resources have?	2/6/2008	No.
40	RFP Section III, Page III-26, Table III-7	2/1/2008	What version of the Enterprise Portal (EP) is currently running? EP 6.0 Service Pack 2 or EP 6.0 with 6.40 WAS? The EP version affects the effort required for the portal upgrade.	2/6/2008	The AOC is running EP6.0 SP19 and the WebAS version is 6.40.

AOC Question Number	RFP Reference (Section, Page, Paragraph)	Submission Date	Bidder Question/Request	Response Date	AOC Response
41	RFP Section III, Page III-26, Table III-7	2/1/2008	What is the current hardware size (e.g., hardware model, CPU, memory) and configuration for the production environment for the SAP applications?	2/6/2008	The hardware information for 2 PRD environments include: SAP R/3 Production: 3 Application Servers. Each of them is SUN V240; 2 CPUs, 4 GB RAM 1 Database Server. SUN V490, 4 CPUs, 8 GB RAM SAP BW Production: 2 Application Servers. Each of them is SUN V490; 4 CPUs; 16 GB RAM 1 Database Server. SUN V490; 4 CPUs; 16 GB RAM
42	RFP Section III, Page III-34, III.4.6	2/1/2008	What is the size of the current production database for ERP 4.7 and the EP 6.0?	2/6/2008	The current production database for ERP 4.7 is approximately 230GB. Note: The reference to EP 6.0 in this question was not understood by the AOC. If the answer above is not what the Bidder was after, the question should be submitted again with clarification.
43	RFP Section VII, Page VII-8, VII.3.8	2/1/2008	What assumption should the Bidder make with respect to the duration of the AOC procurement process from issuing of a purchase order to the arrival of hardware at the hosting partner's datacenter? The time it takes to get new hardware installed impact the overall project schedule.	2/6/2008	The duration depends on the type of hardware and the manufacturer's lead time. An example, once the requirements are defined and validated, would be: Sun servers - 3-4 weeks PO to delivery with 3-4 weeks to complete installation and readiness check.
44	Section IV, Page 22, Paragraph 2	2/1/2008	It is stated that Tibco is used to perform ETL activities. Does this apply to ETL activities supporting SAP BI?	2/6/2008	TIBCO will be used for ETL.
45	Section IV, Page 22, Paragraph 2	2/1/2008	What technical adapter would they expect to use with SAP, i.e. BAPI, IDOC other?	2/6/2008	BAPI is used for interfaces with TIBCO today. Depending on the requirement, this may need to be different.
46	Section IV, Page 22, Paragraph 2	2/1/2008	Do you have a standard design in Tibco for interfaces (i.e. validate, map, standard error handling)?	2/6/2008	Yes. There is a project to define common reusable services that will be available to all projects.
47	Section IV, Page 22, Paragraph 2	2/1/2008	Is the interface design publish / subscribe, is this assured?	2/6/2008	Yes. The ISB (TIBCO) is able to handle publish/subscribe functionality. By "assured" we assume you mean "guaranteed delivery". This is an attribute of the messaging standard that includes publish/subscribe.
48	Section IV, Page 22, Paragraph 2	2/1/2008	How much logic would you expect in the middleware, i.e. if one message led to multiple SAP updates where would then expect to manage this?	2/6/2008	Depends on the business requirements. It is recommended to bracket multiple such updates within one API call in the application to guarantee transactional integrity. If a message resulted in 5 calls and during the 3rd call the API fails, then the application must provide facility to undo the 2 calls that were already made prior to the 3rd call. Due to complexity during exceptions and to assure transactional integrity, it is best handled within one API call exposed from application.

AOC Question Number	RFP Reference (Section, Page, Paragraph)	Submission Date	Bidder Question/Request	Response Date	AOC Response
49	Section IV, Page 22, Paragraph 2	2/1/2008	If you need more SAP data during the upload (i.e. checking to available SAP ref info), would you expect Tibco to re-read SAP to enrich data before passing onto SAP as a final update?	2/6/2008	Depends on the business requirements. TIBCO tools will be used to map and integrate with other systems. Option 1. Design-time resolution If more data is being looked up during an upload and if that data is fairly static and is known in advance, it is recommended to build it in during design/configuration time rather than trying to resolve during run-time (due to performance consideration). Option 2. Application Support If the data is being looked up resides within the same application where the data is being uploaded, it is best to resolve it within application - unless it is very expensive to change an existing application API. Option 3: Dynamic lookup This should be resorted when the data is being looked up in different systems or when an API change is expensive when the data being looked up exists within the application.
50	Section IV, Page 13, Paragraph 2	2/1/2008	Can you be more specific on the intention of modify AOC's chart of accounts to support all funds and all methods?	2/6/2008	The AOC expects to add accounts for asset accounting, and to support the "all funds, all methods" strategy for public sector.
51	Section IV, Page 13, Paragraph 2	2/1/2008	When is the start of AOC's fiscal year?	2/6/2008	The fiscal year begins on July 1 and ends on June 30.
52	Section IV, Page 13, Paragraph 3	2/1/2008	With the Funds Management upgrade, are you at present utilizing the "Former Budgeting" function and would want to upgrade to Budget Control System (BCS)?	2/6/2008	Yes, the AOC is currently using "Former Budgeting". The AOC would want to upgrade to BCS if that is the best solution to meet the stated business requirements.
53	Section IV, Page 15, Paragraph 1	2/1/2008	Do you do HR-PCP (personnel cost planning) for labor budgeting by position? If so, any changes to org structure may have impact on the HR-PCP planning ability.	2/6/2008	The AOC is not currently using HR-PCP.
54	Section IV, Page 17, Paragraph 1	2/1/2008	For the implementation schedule, are you open to alternative phasing approach?	2/6/2008	Yes.
55	Section IV, Page 17, Paragraph 1	2/1/2008	On the implementation schedule chart, deployment of "LA and PSCD" runs in parallel to the upgrade project. Does this mean some courts deployed will be on the existing 4.7 release while others will be on the new ECC 6 release?	2/6/2008	No. The parallel L.A. and PSCD deployment activities would be performed on ECC 6.
56	General, no section or page number	2/1/2008	Appears to be a mix of centralized and de-centralized processes in HR. Is there an overarching strategy to maximize the use of a shared services environment?	2/6/2008	Will continue to be a mix based on courts' ability/resources to support themselves.
57	General, no section or page number	2/1/2008	RFP references bargaining agreements. How many collective bargaining agreements are in effect? Are you currently negotiating any open agreements? How does this impact a potential upgrade or add-on project?	2/6/2008	The AOC estimates there are roughly 125-150 bargaining unit agreements within the 58 trial courts at this point in time. An individual trial court may have one or several bargaining unit agreements, depending on the size of the court and how the bargaining unit has been defined under the labor vernacular of "community of interest". There is no common standard dates or terms for these agreements, and at any given point in time, there are a number of them that will be in the process of renegotiation. While the AOC may provide bargaining assistance, these agreements are ultimately the responsibility of the individual trial court. The changes in agreements will have to be identified and incorporated into the Phoenix human resources - payroll deployments on a court-by-court basis.
58	Section IV, Page 9, Paragraph 2	2/1/2008	For the Learning Solution, will content be created during this project or will the content be integrated from a provider? If created, how many courses?	2/6/2008	This RFP anticipates the implementation of Learning Solution only. Content development will occur as a separate effort after implementation.

AOC Question Number	RFP Reference (Section, Page, Paragraph)	Submission Date	Bidder Question/Request	Response Date	AOC Response
59	Section III.2.2, page III-5, & Section IV	2/1/2008	The following 13 questions pertain to current-state user counts, and to future user counts. The current user counts speak to 2007 levels of activity. The future-state user counts speak to estimated 2012 levels of activity. For each of the following questions, can you estimate user counts for 2010? This is needed in order for us to calculate the HR/PR rollout effort, as it is effected by user counts.	2/6/2008	For general use, current levels are 2,200+ employees (ESS/MSS users) including 1,200 Professional/Ltd. Pro. Users on Phoenix. We expect this to grow to approximately 21,000 employees including 4,500 Professional/Ltd. Pro. users when fully deployed.
59.1	Section III.2.2, page III-5, & Section IV	2/1/2008	What are the approximate number of users for the Procurement (SRM) in the different courts?	2/6/2008	Procurement is currently done in the MM module. Currently 750 users; expect 1,200 when fully deployed.
59.2	Section III.2.2, page III-5, & Section IV	2/1/2008	What are the approximate number of users for the Travel Management in the different courts?	2/6/2008	Not currently in use. Assume approximately 20% of employees, or 4,200 eligible users when fully deployed; approximately 415 back-end users.
59.3	Section III.2.2, page III-5, & Section IV	2/1/2008	What are the approximate number of users for the Project Systems in the different courts?	2/6/2008	Currently 360; expect 750 back-end users when fully deployed (Grants and Projects are used interchangeably today).
59.4	Section III.2.2, page III-5, & Section IV	2/1/2008	What are the approximate number of users for the Asset Accounting in the different courts?	2/6/2008	Not currently in use. Expect 250 back-end users when fully deployed.
59.5	Section III.2.2, page III-5, & Section IV	2/1/2008	What are the approximate number of users for the Grants Management in the different courts?	2/6/2008	Currently 360; expect 750 back-end users when fully deployed (Grants and Projects are used interchangeably today).
59.6	Section III.2.2, page III-5, & Section IV	2/1/2008	What are the approximate number of users for the Training and Events in the different courts?	2/6/2008	Not currently in use. Assume all employees, or 21,000 eligible users when fully deployed; approximately 415 back-end users.
59.7	Section III.2.2, page III-5, & Section IV	2/1/2008	What are the approximate number of users for the Recruitment in the different courts?	2/6/2008	Not currently in use. Assume all employees, or 21,000 eligible users when fully deployed, plus external interviewees; approximately 415 back-end users.
59.8	Section III.2.2, page III-5, & Section IV	2/1/2008	What are the approximate number of users for the Treasury in the different courts?	2/6/2008	Not currently in use. Expect 250 back-end users when fully deployed.
59.9	Section III.2.2, page III-5, & Section IV	2/1/2008	What are the approximate number of users for Benefits Administration (COBRA) in the different courts?	2/6/2008	Currently 55; assume 415 when fully deployed.
59.10	Section III.2.2, page III-5, & Section IV	2/1/2008	What are the approximate number of users for Learning Solution in the different courts?	2/6/2008	Not currently in use. Assume all employees, or 21,000 eligible users when fully deployed; approximately 415 back-end users.
59.11	Section III.2.2, page III-5, & Section IV	2/1/2008	What are the approximate number of users for Performance Management in the different courts?	2/6/2008	Not currently in use. Assume all employees, or 21,000 eligible users when fully deployed; approximately 415 back-end users.
59.12	Section III.2.2, page III-5, & Section IV	2/1/2008	What are the approximate number of users for Succession Management in the different courts?	2/6/2008	Not currently in use. Assume 415 users when fully deployed.
59.13	Section III.2.2, page III-5, & Section IV	2/1/2008	What are the approximate number of users for Budget Preparation and Planning in the different courts?	2/6/2008	Not currently in use. Expect 250 back-end users when fully deployed.
60	Section 4, General	2/1/2008	What are the estimated data volumes for the proposed future environment?	2/6/2008	Please review the Technical Landscape Report in the Bidder's Library for assumptions on sizing and volumes. A sizing assessment is recommended in that report for the Upgrade Project.
61	General, no section or page number	2/1/2008	Can you describe the data sources to be used to load SAP? How many sources? What file formats? Estimated number of records?	2/6/2008	52 courts remain to be deployed on HR. Bidder should assume 1-2 data sources per court. Only Person's Job History and Pay, as well as, Position History, if available, will be converted.
62	General, no section or page number	2/1/2008	Has AOC validated all existing and optional requirements with SAP America and determined that existing licenses cover the required functionality and number of users? e.g. (but not limited to) Has SRM for Public Sector been licensed for Existing or Optional Functionality?	2/6/2008	The AOC has not validated existing or optional requirements with SAP, but the AOC does have an enterprise license with SAP that includes SRM.

AOC Question Number	RFP Reference (Section, Page, Paragraph)	Submission Date	Bidder Question/Request	Response Date	AOC Response
63	Addendum 2, Question 20	2/1/2008	AOC's response to question 20 in addendum 2, states that bidders must submit any issues pertaining to pricing and exception to AOC's MSA in the form of a question, in adherence to the bidder question process and deadline. Having received Addendum 2 late on the last day for question submission, we respectfully request permission to submit a response to this instruction after one business day but in a timely manner, prior to 2/4/2008.	2/6/2008	Refer to Addendum 3.
64	Appendix B-01 , Page 3, Item 29-33 Appendix D, Tab VII-7 Software	2/4/2008	Both sections of the RFP indicate AOC's desire to have bidder agree to include the 5 listed Software/Tools from a Software Licensing and Software Maintenance standpoint only. Is the AOC looking for User-Training and/or deployment services in addition and if so, to how many users in each case.	2/6/2008	Yes, the AOC is looking for deployment services and user-training. Bidder would be responsible for training 2-8 people per tool with training materials the AOC would use to train others. Bidder Pricing for these services shall be included in the Upgrade Project Costs.
65	Appendix D, tab VII-9 Payment Schedule, and Appendix H MSA, and addendum 3, question 20	2/5/2008	Will the questions that we submit denoting exceptions to the MSA, and the Payment Schedule (relative to addendum 3, question 20) be treated as confidential? If the bidder's questions in this area are posted in an addendum on AOC's web site, the bidders will see aspects of their competitor's proposed solution.	2/6/2008	Questions/requests that Bidders submit denoting exceptions to the MSA, and/or other parts of the RFP (relative to addendum 3, question 20) may or may not be treated as confidential. As mentioned in the Bidder's Conference, the AOC needs to provide Bidders with the same information to ensure a level and competitive field. The AOC is sensitive to Bidders' proprietary or confidential information as well as any unique approach to the project that they may propose; therefore, the AOC will attempt to make questions generic so that all bidders have the same information. If the AOC determines that it cannot answer the question for all Bidders, the AOC will decide whether an answer can be provided just to one Bidder.
66	Section 1, page 1-9, RFP Key Action Dates	2/5/2008	February 26-28 is noted as the scheduled timeframe for bidder presentations. Is AOC going to tell us what, if any, required format must be followed. And, in order to schedule staff, what team members/roles do you want to see present to AOC?	2/6/2008	As stated in Section II.2.4, Bidder Presentations, "Upon submission of the Proposal, the AOC will most likely invite Bidders who meet the Administrative Requirements for a presentation of their Proposal to include proposed methodology approach and timeframes. The presentation shall be delivered by the proposed Key Personnel at a minimum including the Program Director, Project Manager(s), Integration Manager, and Technical Lead." The AOC will provide format instructions if we elect to conduct the sessions.
67	Appendix B-02 , Page 28	2/5/2008	"provide Customer Support Plan that includes 24/7 support" - bidder is being asked to lead this activity . Is the bidder being asked to provide the services called for in the plan? If so what is the range of services covered "24/7" ?	2/6/2008	The Customer Support Plan as defined by the AOC is simply the ability for the AOC to reach Bidder M&O Support staff during off hours for P1 and P2 issues when necessary.
68	Section 6, VI.4.3, first paragraph	2/5/2008	What is meant by "staff due diligence"	2/6/2008	In this context, "staff due diligence" refers to the process the Bidder is recommending for the AOC to validate the qualifications of the Bidder's proposed staff.
69	Appendix B-02 , Section 1.0, 2.0	2/5/2008	What level of termination assistance from current Systems Integrator will be available?	2/6/2008	The existing System Integrator contract includes termination assistance up to 12 months at the AOC's request. AOC plans to work with both vendors to obtain appropriate levels of knowledge transfer and uninterrupted coverage of duties during the transition.
70	RFP Section VII.3.5 and RFP Appendix B-02, Section 2.0	2/8/2008	The RFP has conflicting information regarding the start of M&O support services. The Pricing proposal states, "M&O Support is required starting upon Agreement execution." RFP Appendix B-02 states, "Maintenance and Operation Support services for the system will begin following the Go Live and Deployment Support phase for a specific project or module." Can you please verify the correct start date for M&O support services?	2/11/2008	M&O Support Services for the existing Phoenix System starts upon Agreement execution. Note that Go-Live and Deployment Support services shall be included in each Project until Final Acceptance, after which the responsibility for the support of the Accepted Project's functionality will be transferred to the M&O Support organization.

AOC Question Number	RFP Reference (Section, Page, Paragraph)	Submission Date	Bidder Question/Request	Response Date	AOC Response
71	RFP Appendix C, Required Form 6.3	2/8/2008	Due to the short RFP response timeframe, it has been difficult to capture customer name and contact information for each key personnel position. Is it acceptable to supply contact information for the top 10 positions, and additional references would be provided prior to contracting for the remainder of the key personnel positions?	2/11/2008	No, customer name and contact information for each Key Personnel position shall be provided as part of each Bidder's Proposal. Evaluation of Key Personnel and their references is important to the AOC in the evaluation process.
72	RFP Addendum 4, AOC Bidder Question Response to Question 54	2/8/2008	Based on AOC response to a bidder's question (Addendum 4, Question 54), AOC confirms that bidders can propose an alternative phasing approach. However, if a particular module (e.g. grants) is sifted by a vendor from the Upgrade Project to either the Optional New Functionality or Existing Functionality Project accordingly, AOC will have difficulty comparing vendor proposals on costs across the three major types Projects. Would shifting modules to different Projects based on the preference of the vendor still be considered a compliant bid? Would AOC prefer that all vendors price their proposals according to the phasing strategy and timeline as stated in the RFP?	2/11/2008	Bidders shall not shift modules out of the Upgrade Project. However, Bidders may propose a different phasing strategy and timeline for Optional New Functionality Projects and Optional Existing Functionality Projects.
73	RFP Section VI, Page VI-11	2/8/2008	The RFP description for key personnel states that "The Project Integration Manager must be committed to the project, full-time from the contract origination date through the beginning of the Support and Transition activity of Initial Release." The same language is included for the Project Manager key personnel description. Can AOC clarify what it means and defines as "Initial Release"? Does this mean release of functionality at the end of the upgrade project (first release of the Phoenix Program)? Or, does it refer to the end of each functional (SAP Module) releases to production in all the projects from Upgrade, Optional New Functionality and Optional Existing Functionality?	2/11/2008	The Project Integration Manager must be committed to the Phoenix Program, full-time from the contract origination date through Final Acceptance of the last executed Project. Project Managers must be committed to a Project, full-time from the Project start date through Final Acceptance of that Project.
74	Section VI - Proposed Solution Requirements	2/8/2008	Please clarify definition of "Global Blueprint" vs. "Blueprint."	2/11/2008	The Global Blueprint addresses the integration points of various components of the Phoenix Program across all phases of the implementation. The phase Blueprint only addresses the components within the specific phase.
75	Phoenix-rfp-appendb-03a, page HR Organization Mgmt - 4 - Ability to identify PY(FTE) percentage for positions (7A/non 7A).	2/8/2008	What is 7A/non 7A?	2/11/2008	The 7A is a report including categories of positions, budgeted and non budgeted. Non-7A positions might include temporary or contract employees.
76	Phoenix-rfp-appendb-03a, page HR Organization Mgmt - 6 - Restrict ability to change basic pay based on user-defined criteria (i.e. not allow change if no pay range established).	2/8/2008	We do not understand requirement. Is AOC referring to implementing restrictions on info type 1005 (Planned Compensation)?	2/11/2008	Yes, restrict ability to change the basic pay within appropriate info types based on identified criteria (i.e. info type 1005, 8, etc.).
77	Phoenix-rfp-appendb-03a, page HR Personnel Admin - 5 - Process/configurations for retroactive transactions.	2/8/2008	Can AOC please elaborate on this requirement? Is AOC referring to the configuration and settings available to set the retroactive accounting attributes for employee master data info types?	2/11/2008	It is referring to all aspects of the retroactive process; configuration, settings and the processes associated with the results of retroactive accounting.
78	Phoenix-rfp-appendb-03a, page HR Time Mgmt - 3 - Usage of "clock-in/clock-out" functionality.	2/8/2008	When referring to the "clock-in/clock-out" functionality is AOC referring to extending the CATS timesheets to use start and end times; the "Clock-in/Clock-out Corrections" Iview functionality or implementing a clocking subsystem to interface with SAP?	2/11/2008	Bidders should assume changing the CATS timesheets which are accessed through an Iview.

AOC Question Number	RFP Reference (Section, Page, Paragraph)	Submission Date	Bidder Question/Request	Response Date	AOC Response
79	Phoenix-rfp-appendb-03a, page HR Time Mgmt - 11 - Ability to track leave requests by first, second, and third right of refusals, by user-defined criteria (e.g. court, unit), including ability to view calendar in ESS/MSS.	2/8/2008	Can AOC please provide more details on the leave request process as it relates to the first, second and third right of refusal. What information does AOC expect to see in a Calendar view for leave requests? Can AOC please provide more details on the leave request process as it relates to the first, second and third right of refusal. What information does AOC expect to see in a Calendar view for leave requests?	2/11/2008	This would be a function to track multiple leave requests that have been submitted for the same dates. Submission of the request can be up to a year in advance. The function would determine based on court specific criteria the first, second and third in line, or "right to refuse" to take the leave requested, if the first employee elected not to take the time off the second would move to the first position etc. The information to be viewed on the Calendar would be determined during blueprinting of this function, but would include all necessary data for a supervisor/manager to administer this process.
80	Phoenix-rfp-appendb-03a, page HR Time Mgmt - 13 - Notification to employee of approved leave. The standard ESS Leave Request functionality provides the capability to notify employees of leave records that have been rejected and/or approved. The standard report RPTARQEMAIL can be used to generate notifications associated with the leave request process. In addition the standard leave request functionality has a built in monitoring and tracking functionality where employees can review the status of their leave request.	2/8/2008	How should employees be notified? Via their email accounts, SAP universal wordlist in ESS etc?	2/11/2008	Current functionality is using email accounts to notify employees. AOC is looking for recommendations of best practice.

AOC Question Number	RFP Reference (Section, Page, Paragraph)	Submission Date	Bidder Question/Request	Response Date	AOC Response
81	Phoenix-rfp-appendb-03a, page HR Time Mgmt - 14 - Interface with time-keeping system (e.g. swipe cards). The HR-PDC (Plant Data Collection) is a standardized R/3 Time Management interface for connecting subsystems used to enter and record personnel times and employee expenditures to the R/3 System. To implement the standard HR-PDC interface without development the vendor providing the clocking subsystem must be certified via SAP's Complementary Software Program. A list of certified vendors can be found via SAP's market place.	2/8/2008	To provide an accurate estimate for implementing the HR-PDC interface we would need to know with what clocking subsystem is going to interface.	2/11/2008	AOC is expecting bidders to make recommendations for clocking subsystems, and to create proposal with an interface to that sub-system.
82	Phoenix-rfp-appendb-03a, page ESS/MSS - 7 - Direct Deposit Changes	2/8/2008	Does 'changes' mean enrolling in direct deposit or changing bank account details?	2/11/2008	AOC would want ability to do both enrollments and changes to direct deposit information.
83	Phoenix-rfp-appendb-03a, page ESS/MSS - 11 - Provide and track required employee notifications.	2/8/2008	What types of events trigger these notifications, how many are there, how should the employee be notified.	2/11/2008	This would be determined by the functionality implemented it would include, but not be limited to notifications to employees regarding approvals, rejections, notifications of limits being reached, changes processed etc.
84	Phoenix-rfp-appendb-03a, page ESS/MSS - 13 - Ability for alternate approval in MSS	2/8/2008	Does this mean alternate approvers? Will substitution work? Who needs to set up the alternate?	2/11/2008	Yes, this means alternative approvers, the process to be used should be determined during blueprinting based on requirements. The process used will determine who will be responsible for the set up of alternatives.
85	Phoenix-rfp-appendb-03a, page - 15 - Turnover	2/8/2008	Employee turnover or fiscal turnover? Per org-unit/cost center/department?	2/11/2008	This refers to employee turnover being reported by multiple selections.
86	General, no section or page number	2/8/2008	In some of my responses in the RFP I've used multiple response codes. For example sometimes I've identified that a requirement can be met using standard configuration [G] but depending on the exact requirements we might want to also implement a standard BADI [C] to fulfill the requirements. Question: Is this acceptable in the response?	2/11/2008	No, Bidders must use a single response code for each Requirement. See RFP Section VI.2.1.4, Response Code, which states the following, "The Requirements Response Matrices must be completed indicating the status of the requirement(s) at the time of submission of the Final Proposal, using a single response code that best describes how the Bidder's solution meets the requirement." If Bidders have an alternative approach, please provide that information in the Comments column, but pricing in Volume III, Cost Data, shall be in accordance with the Bidder's best-approach response code provided.
87	General, no section or page number	2/8/2008	I based my response for the requirements on the available blueprints for the HR components and the high-level scope for the project. Question: Am I missing anything or is this the only information available to try and understand the requirements in the appendixes? As mentioned above most of the requirements are not very descriptive.	2/11/2008	Requirements are supported by the blueprints; however, some of what is in the Blueprint is not what is in the currently configured implementation. Other supporting information includes Section III, Current Environment; Section IV, Proposed Future Environment; Appendix E, Reports, Interfaces, Conversions, Enhancements, and Forms (RICEF); and other documentation provided in the Bidder's Library.

AOC Question Number	RFP Reference (Section, Page, Paragraph)	Submission Date	Bidder Question/Request	Response Date	AOC Response
88	General, no section or page number	2/8/2008	Does AOC require a response from the SI in the comments section of the RFP?	2/11/2008	No, see Section VI.2.1.5, Comments, which states, "Any requirement may be explained by the Bidder, at the Bidder's option..."
89	General, no section or page number	2/8/2008	"The reference section asks for implementation references (which alludes to new implementation only) but does not mention ECC 6.0 Upgrade references that are similar in scope to the AOC (i.e. FM Profile Update, etc.). Will the AOC accept ECC 6.0 Upgrade references of similar size/scope in addition or in lieu of implementation references?"	2/11/2008	Yes, the RFP's definition for Implementation is inclusive of the ASAP lifecycle phases defined in Appendix B-02, Implementation and Support Requirements, that shall be used for the Upgrade Project as well as Optional New Functionality Projects and Optional Existing Functionality Projects.
90	Appendix D, tab VII-9 Payment Schedule	2/8/2008	Per Addendum #2, Question 20, bidder is required to propose an alternative payment schedule if the bidder takes exception to the AOC payment schedule as provided in the RFP.	2/11/2008	The AOC will not be granting requested modifications to the Payment Schedule at this time, and Bidders must price their Proposals in accordance with the current Payment Schedule. However, the AOC will allow Bidders to identify Payment Schedule exceptions as part of their Proposals to be addressed during Bidder Clarification Sessions.
91	Appendix H, Section 10.3A, Retention Amount	2/8/2008	[The prospective Bidder] respectfully requests that the retention percentage be changed from 15% to 10% in accordance to [The prospective Bidder's] standard retention with the State of California.	2/11/2008	The AOC will not be granting requested modifications to the retention percentage at this time, and Bidders must price their Proposals in accordance with the current retention percentage. However, the AOC will allow Bidders to identify retention percentage exceptions as part of their Proposals to be addressed during Bidder Clarification Sessions.
92	Appendix H, Section 10.3A, Retention Amount	2/8/2008	[The prospective Bidder] respectfully requests that the retention for the SAP upgrade be released after all upgrade deliverables are completed.	2/11/2008	The retention for the Upgrade Project shall be released upon Final Acceptance which follows the deliverables associated with Go-Live and Deployment.
93	Appendix H, Section 10.3A, Retention Amount	2/8/2008	[The prospective Bidder] respectfully requests that the holdback for the "optional phases" be released when each project is completed.	2/11/2008	The retention for each Optional Project shall be released upon Final Acceptance for each Project within a phase.
94	Appendix H, Section 10.3A, Retention Amount	2/8/2008	[The prospective Bidder] respectfully requests that the retention not apply to Maintenance & Operations invoices.	2/11/2008	Retention shall not apply to Maintenance and Operation Support invoices.
95	Appendix H, Section 10.2, Time of Payment and Detailed Invoices	2/8/2008	[The prospective Bidder] respectfully requests that the payment terms be changed from 60 days to 30 days.	2/11/2008	The AOC will not be granting requested modifications to the payment terms at this time, and Bidders must price their Proposals in accordance with the current payment terms. However, the AOC will allow Bidders to identify payment terms exceptions as part of their Proposals to be addressed during Bidder Clarification Sessions.
96	RFP Section 7, VII.3.5 M&O Support Cost Worksheet (form VII-5)	2/8/2008	Can Bidder assume that there will be a transition from the current contractor (BearingPoint) for M&O support to the new contractor upon agreement execution?	2/11/2008	See the AOC Response to Bidder Question/Request #69.
97	RFP appendb-02	2/8/2008	Can bidder assume that AOC will provide all workstations, network connectivity and infrastructure for M&O services?	2/11/2008	Yes.
98	RFP appendb-02	2/8/2008	Can bidder assume that AOC will provide bidder with training on their tools, methodology's, processes and procedures?	2/11/2008	Bidder shall supply consultant with SAP knowledge in the areas required. Training from AOC will be on AOC specific process and procedures.
99	General, no section or page number	2/8/2008	The AOC is planning to move its outsourced computing environment from Siemens to another outsourcing provider's environment. What is the expected date for that migration?	2/11/2008	The Transition Plan has not yet been finalized. Our best estimate for Phoenix production move is August 2008. The intent is to move the various environments with only weekend outages.

AOC Question Number	RFP Reference (Section, Page, Paragraph)	Submission Date	Bidder Question/Request	Response Date	AOC Response
100	General, no section or page number	2/8/2008	The response to one of the previous questions was all consulting work must be done in US (on-site or off-site, but NO offshore or near-shore). Does this apply to "Maintenance and Operations Support" work? Can some of the support work be done offshore to leverage the effective cost model?	2/11/2008	The response to Question 28 was written to respond to the specific question was asked, and shouldn't be interpreted that off-shore/near-shore work would not be considered. Any such proposals will have to comply with the data access and security restrictions included in the MSA. In regards to M&O work, these services will be mostly staff augmentation, so having the resources on-site will be preferred. Bidders proposing off-shore/near shore will have to demonstrate how they would successfully and cost efficiently coordinate activities between the AOC and bidder staff during AOC business hours.

Classification	Role
Sr. Manager	Phoenix Program Technical Manager - (50% to the program)
IS Manager	Manage Tech Team - Program Focus
Sup IS Analyst - A	Supervise Tech Team - Technical Process Focus
Sr. App Dev Analyst	ABAP - primary FI, cross train HR
Sr. App Dev Analyst	ABAP - primary HR, cross train FI
Sr. App Dev Analyst	ABAP - Workflow, portal backup
Sr. App Dev Analyst	BASIS
Sr. App Dev Analyst	BASIS
Sr. App Dev Analyst	BW
Sr. App Dev Analyst	Portal
Sr. App Dev Analyst	Security
Sr. App Dev Analyst	TIBCO
Sr. App Dev Analyst	TIBCO
Sr. Bus Sys Analyst	FI\Reports
Sr. Bus Sys Analyst	Interfaces
Sr. Bus Sys Analyst	Trust\BW