### RFP# 202110165 – Human Resources Management System (HRMS) System Integrator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Sections</th>
<th>Points Available</th>
<th>Accenture LLP</th>
<th>Alight Solutions</th>
<th>Collaborative Solutions, LLC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section I: Preliminary Information</td>
<td>Pass/Fail</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section II: Organization Qualifications and Experience</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>10.00$^{1}$</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section III: Proposed Services</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section IV: Cost Proposal</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>92.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>61.51</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^{1}$ Alight Solutions did not meet the point total required (18) to advance to Stage 3 of the evaluation.

$^{2}$ Refer to Collaborative’s Team Notes for how the cost proposal was calculated.
Award Justification Statement
RFP# 202110165 – Human Resources Management System (HRMS) System Integrator

I. Summary
Through RFP# 202110165, the Department of Administrative and Financial Services sought proposals for a Human Resources Management System Integrator. Bidders responding to this RFP include Accenture, Alight, and Collaborative Solutions. Through the evaluation process Accenture was determined to provide the best value to the State of Maine.

II. Evaluation Process
An Evaluation Team comprised of State employees, used a staged approach to evaluate and score the proposals and applied the consensus method in scoring the Bidder’s Eligibility to Submit a Bid, Qualifications & Experience, and Proposed Services. Scores for the Cost Proposal were assigned using a mathematical formula.

III. Qualifications & Experience
Accenture demonstrated deep expertise in performing HRMS System Implementation for other government entities, comparable in size and complexity to the State of Maine. This is highlighted by Accenture’s 60% share of public-sector Workday implementations and also being the second largest Workday customer, themselves. Accenture noted they have successfully implemented Workday for 13 other public sector entities, with over 10,000 employees. Accenture has experience with paused implementations in the public sector.

IV. Proposed Services
Accenture provided detailed project management, administration, and governance recommendations, in consideration of their analysis of previously developed artifacts and configurations. This, along with specific plans on requirements analysis, design review, configuration and development strategies provide the roadmap and project direction for the State’s implementation of a new HRMS. Accenture also showed an understanding of previous challenges the State faced and highlighted potential new challenges and their plan to address them directly applying previous lessons learned. Additionally, Accenture proposed a strong, experienced, and dedicated project team that will partner with the State and bring successful government HRMS implementation resources.

V. Cost Proposal
Accenture proposed a cost of $10,867,250, the lowest of the cost proposals reviewed in Stage 5.
VI. Conclusion
Out of 100 possible points, Accenture scored 92.00, which was the highest point total awarded by the Evaluation Team. The strengths of Accenture’s proposal include a strong organization with relevant experience, a comprehensive, relevant proposed scope of service and a detailed proposal of deliverables and the associated cost. The Evaluation Team has determined the proposal submitted by Accenture represents the best value to the State of Maine related to the services requested in this RFP.
February 18, 2022

Accenture LLP
Timothy P. Rogers, Managing Director
Coston Corp 888 Boylston
Boston, MA 02199

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 202110165,
Human Resources Management System (HRMS) System Integrator

Dear Mr. Rogers,

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Administrative and Financial Services for a Human Resources Management System (HRMS) System Integrator. The Department has evaluated the proposals received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFP, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award to the following bidder:

- Accenture LLP

The bidder listed above received the evaluation team’s highest ranking. The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidder soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract between the Department and the apparent successful vendor. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract services until a contract containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Department is executed. The Department further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.
Thank you for your interest in doing business with the State of Maine.

Sincerely,

Heather L'Hommedieu Perreault, CPA
Deputy Commissioner of Finance
Department of Administrative & Financial Services

STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Division of Purchases, Chapter 120, § (2) (2).
Good Afternoon,

Please see the attached letter in regards to the State of Maine, Department of Administrative and Financial Services RFP# 202110165 HRMS Systems Integrator.

Regards,

Brandon Martin, Procurement Planning Manager
Department of Administrative and Financial Services
Division of Procurement Services
Cell: (207)215-3169
Brandon.Martin@maine.gov
February 18, 2022

Alight Solutions
Steven Porter
4 Overlook Point
Lincolnshire, IL 60069

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 202110165, Human Resources Management System (HRMS) System Integrator

Dear Mr. Porter,

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Administrative and Financial Services for a Human Resources Management System (HRMS) System Integrator. The Department has evaluated the proposals received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFP, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award to the following bidder:

- Accenture LLP

The bidder listed above received the evaluation team’s highest ranking. The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidder soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract between the Department and the apparent successful vendor. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract services until a contract containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Department is executed. The Department further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.
Thank you for your interest in doing business with the State of Maine.

Sincerely,

Heather L’Hommedieu Perreault, CPA
Deputy Commissioner of Finance
Department of Administrative & Financial Services

STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Division of Purchases, Chapter 120, § (2) (2).
Please Note: This email is being sent on behalf of RFP Coordinator, Phillip Platt.

Good Afternoon,

Please see the attached letter in regards to the State of Maine, Department of Administrative and Financial Services RFP# 202110165 HRMS Systems Integrator.

Regards,

Brandon Martin, Procurement Planning Manager  
Department of Administrative and Financial Services  
Division of Procurement Services  
Cell: (207)215-3169  
Brandon.Martin@maine.gov
February 18, 2022

Collaborative Solutions, LLC
Tom McDermott
11190 Sunrise Valley Drive, Suite 110
Reston, VA 20191

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFP # 202110165, Human Resources Management System (HRMS) System Integrator

Dear Mr. McDermott,

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Administrative and Financial Services for a Human Resources Management System (HRMS) System Integrator. The Department has evaluated the proposals received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFP, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award to the following bidder:

- Accenture LLP

The bidder listed above received the evaluation team’s highest ranking. The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidder soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract between the Department and the apparent successful vendor. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract services until a contract containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Department is executed. The Department further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.
Thank you for your interest in doing business with the State of Maine.

Sincerely,

Heather L'Hommedieu Perreault, CPA  
Deputy Commissioner of Finance  
Department of Administrative & Financial Services

STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Division of Purchases, Chapter 120, § (2) (2).
Good Afternoon,

Please see the attached letter in regards to the State of Maine, Department of Administrative and Financial Services RFP# 202110165 HRMS Systems Integrator.

Regards,

Brandon Martin, Procurement Planning Manager
Department of Administrative and Financial Services
Division of Procurement Services
Cell: (207)215-3169
Brandon.Martin@maine.gov
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pass/Fail Criteria</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Fail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section I. Preliminary Information (Eligibility)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have successfully implemented within the last five (5) years the Workday</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modules listed in Part II. C for at least three (3) U.S. based Public Sector</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g., for Federal, state, or local government) governments or U.S. Public</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Institutions and at least one of those shall be comparable in</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>size and complexity (e.g. similar union/bargaining agreements, organizational</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structure, size, etc) to the State as also described in Part I. A of this RFP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Be a certified Workday system implementation partner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Be able to have all offsite work delivered by the assigned Project team within</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the continental United States (U.S.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Be able to provide Key Personnel that meet the criteria as specified in Part II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.2. These key personnel include:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Delivery Oversight Executive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o HRMS Project Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Lead Business Analyst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Lead Technical Analyst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Data and Analytics Lead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Testing Lead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Training Specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Organizational Change Management (OCM) Specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Sections</th>
<th>Points Available</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section III. Proposed Services</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section IV. Cost Proposal</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>92.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OVERVIEW OF SECTION I
Preliminary Information

Evaluation Team Comments:
- Met requirements
**EVALUATION OF SECTION II**  
**Organization Qualifications and Experience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Available</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>27.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

1. **Overview of the Organization**
   - 300+ government Workday certified consultants, 2000 total consultants working on Workday.
   - Workday consultant since 2008.
   - Successful experience working with Premier to assist with data.

2. **Implementation Experience**
   - Iowa – similar in size to State of Maine. Supported their labor cost distribution requirements. Used “big bang” implementation at least for payroll. Did not specifically say Accenture was responsible for payroll in the implementation.
   - The reference examples were all similar in size and complexity (Unions and Collective Bargaining Units) to Maine.
   - 34 government clients live with Workday (25 as prime contractor, 9 in other subcontractor roles).
   - Included a quote from a project-participant from each project/reference except for State of Iowa project.
   - Bringing on former State Controller who was involved with labor cost distribution in Commonwealth of Massachusetts.
   - Discussed pivot to remote training due to pandemic (remote implementation in some cases).
   - Award-winning Prism Analytics Accelerator
   - Experience with rapid-hiring process for seasonal type positions
   - Developed a scheduling system to accommodate law-enforcement type scheduling, which used integration with Kronos.
   - Prime or participated in 60% of all government deployments that included a Workday partner.
   - Experience integrating to multiple active directories.
   - City of Dallas – project was paused, Accenture recalibrated/rescued the project. Dallas is very similar in size to State of Maine.
   - Parallel payroll dress rehearsal – unique to City of Dallas. Validation of payroll results included active participation from departments.
   - 13 public sector implementations with over 10,000 employees.
   - Indicated having significant influence and access with Workday executive and product development.

3. **Product Experience**
   - Accenture uses Workday internally and is the second largest Workday customer.
   - Provided examples of software development capability and process.
   - Demonstrated experience with all applicable Workday modules.
   - Government implementations: 46 HCM (33 live), 38 payroll (27 live), 34 time tracking (26 live), 36 benefits (25 live), 32 absence (20 live), 28 recruiting (20 live), 23 talent and performance (15 live), 25 financials (16 live).
   - Experience with integrations with mainframe systems, US Bank, data warehouse, and time clocks.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Subcontractors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None proposed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Organizational Chart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included all positions required in the RFP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not every position identified was single threaded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not all positions/individuals described in implementation experience were identified in the Org Chart.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Litigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No pending or past litigation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Financial Viability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicated payment terms are not consistent with D&amp;B preferred methodology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-day payment practice (considered negative by D&amp;B).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate overall business risk.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Licensure/Certification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Platinum Workday Certified Partner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. Certificate of Insurance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Demonstrated significant experience of integrating payroll/accounting with CGI Financials.
- Legacy data – discussed experience working on data conversion, functionality, data quality issues.
- Reporting – dedicated library of dozens of custom report definitions and calculated fields to facilitate reporting development.
- Described deployment of Workday Mobile to various clients – referenced decentralized groups (transportation).
- Experience implementing Pre-65 and 65+ benefits plans in City of Baltimore and City of Denver.
EVALUATION OF SECTION III
Proposed Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section III. Proposed Services</th>
<th>Points Available</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation Team Comments:

Part IV. Section III. Proposed Services (File #3)
1. Services to be Provided

2. A. Project Management and Administration Requirements
   - Flexible approach to working with the State.
   - Focus on building a post-production support model throughout the implementation.
   - Dedicated PMP-certified project manager assigned to the project.
   - Proposing to utilize The Accenture Project Portal (TAPP) for documentation and general project tracking.
   - Proposing to start engagement with Business Process Alignment (BPA) to set expectations for project requirements, and a review of union contracts.
   - BPA will include a change management process for the State to understand, accept and embrace change.
   - Proposing a dedicated Quality Assurance Director.
   - Resource Capacity Tool to provide graphics to indicate where State staff are required.
   - Have a proprietary Risk Register, that is part of the TAPP, pre-loaded based on experience with other government projects.
   - Support both Kainos and Premier on government implementation.
   - Identified lessons learned from working with previous government partners.
   - References a separate project management office within Accenture that is separate from the implementation team.
   - Decision Papers outlining how client executive decision-making is conducted as part of the implementation.

B. Analysis and Design
   - Proposing Workshops for “Day in the Life” to align business processes with how they will work within Workday. This will allow a better understanding how the processes are currently performed.
   - References several decision points related to project change management.

C. Requirements Analysis
   - Did not describe a solution to meet the State’s requirements for scheduling and labor cost distribution.

D. Design
   - Response to this section met the requirements.

E. Configuration and Development
   - Indicated allocating a ‘Bucket of hours’ for custom reporting.
### F. Integrations and Interfaces
- Integration catalog of more than 4,000 integrations, including State-required interfaces.
- References shared-responsibility to develop State team skills.
- Accenture will assume responsibility for more complex integrations.

### G. Data and Analytics
- Offering a report repository with dozens of reports specific to government entities.

### H. Data Conversion
- Proposing a proprietary Data Conversion Accelerator Tool.
- Stressed the importance of the successful data conversion related to implementation.
- Offering to provide pricing to conduct a historical data service.
- Proposing to participate in 5 different tenant builds.
- Proposing to work with Premier to develop a data plan.

### I. Testing
- Identified a parallel payroll template.
- Proposing to coordinate testing by utilizing Kainos.
- Well-defined payroll parallel plan will document the path to achieve accuracy of payroll processing with financial posting.
- Shared responsibility with the State for smoke and unit testing. Recommend this testing should be done by the State.
- Propose test scenarios to be based on the Workday test scenarios.
- Reference a specific test scenario generator to support creation of State-specific test scenarios.

### J. Training
- Proposing proprietary content for training. ('Bytes of Knowledge Video Library')
- Did not address including Human Resources staff as part of in the training plan.
- Proposing an initial training assessment to get an understanding of State training needs.
- Proposing to provide a library of training content templates.
- Proposing various methods for training (e.g. Train-the-trainer, virtual, in-person, and self-paced).
- Knowledge transfer skills matrix for reporting on the comprehension for project team members.
- Indicated the State would be responsible for training content creation. Described the collaboration of cocreation of content and providing templates.
- Training document referenced in the configuration section, did not describe the update of documents in the following stages.

### K. Organizational Change Management
- Change Management program designed specifically for governments.
- Proposing to utilize change leaders and change ambassador team (State Resources).
- Detailed response related the conducting an Organizational Change Management readiness assessment.
- Strong executive and sponsor program to provide guidance on promoting change and readiness.
- Sustainability Plan to guide the State to provide future support need.
- Proposing an impact assessment of how business process changes would affect end users.
- Described tangible examples of addressing the challenges the State will face.

### L. Cutover and Final Acceptance
- Tentative go-live date and Workday annual release present a limited time constraint.
• No mention of backup and recovery details.

M. Warranty and Post-Production Services
• Did not respond to the 6-month warranty requirement.
• Met the 90-day post-production support requirement.
• Offered 1-year optional optimization services.
• Recommend a Workday Program manager post-go-live to ensure long term product success.

N. Requirements Matrix (Appendix G)
• Identified about 90% of requirements as standard Workday functionality.
• 24 custom reports that will need to be development.
• 31 requirements indicated as “Not Met with Workday Functionality” and indicated they would work with the State to meet those requirements.
  o Did not address how the 31 requirements would be met.
• Identified 136 items as ‘Additional information is needed by Accenture to fully understand the requirement’ which appears to have included the 31 requirements identified as ‘Requirement cannot currently be met as understood’. Therefore, the evaluation team cannot determine what items cannot currently be met as understood.

O. Deliverables
• Proposing an Executive Engagement Plan to determine solid project foundation exists.

P. Additional Licenses
• None proposed.

Q. Assumptions
• Project scope based on BPM and RTM documents.
• Project timeline to be developed at the end of the Business Process Alignment phase.
• The State’s acceptance of leading practice-based processes that are included in the software.
• The State provides a minimum of 6 FTEs for Change Management.

3. Implementation – Work Plan
• Business process alignment of 3-months with a 10-month deployment, for a total a 13-month implementation.
• Big bang implementation.
• Optional 12-month support for 4 years included in the work plan.
• Do not ramp-down staff during post-go-live support.
• Test activities begin in month 9 of implementation which is late in the implementation.
• Did not provided a detailed project plan, including implementation tasks, the month they will be carried out and the person or position responsible for each task.

4. Resources – Staffing Plan
• Identified all key resources required.
• Resources titled as leads are named but are not identified with a percentage assigned to the project.
• 30+ workday certifications in the key personnel positions.
• 58 combined government projects for key personnel positions.
• Some key personnel references are for positions that the proposed key personnel are not filling as part of this project.
• Proposed Project Manager has less than 2 years of experience with project management.
• Time tracking lead has less than 1 year with time tracking configuration and development, .25-year experience in analysis and design and is not Workday-certified for time tracking.
• BPA Project Manager is only assigned for the 3-month BPA phase.

5. Proposed Governance Structure
• Provided a breakdown of the quantity of decisions made.
EVALUATION OF SECTION IV
Cost Proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lowest Submitted Cost Proposal</th>
<th>÷</th>
<th>Cost Proposal Being Scored</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>Score Weight</th>
<th>=</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$10,867,250</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,867,250</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>25 points</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation Team Comments:

- Effort-based fixed pricing
- Reporting is based on a bucket of hours, not a set of deliverables.
- Price is based on the Bidder's interpretation of the RFP requirements.
- Additional integrations would be additional cost. Pricing is based on the integration identified through the RFP.
- Assumes a fully remote implementation.
- Indicated providing a 30-day warranty with 3 months of hyper care.
- Provided a price for OCM Execution and Post-Production Support.
- Included language stating the rates could potentially go up based on COLA adjustments.
- BPA PM rate not identified.
- Not clear what the delineation between Lead Business Analysts and Functional Consultants is. (C – Rates & Allocations)
- Additional position identified within C – Rates & Allocations; Delivery Lead.
- Cost for ‘Project Tool Mobilization’ (D – Other Costs) appears high.
RFP #: 202110165
RFP TITLE: Human Resources Management System (HRMS) Systems Integrator
BIDDER: Alight Solutions
DATE: January 18, 2022

SUMMARY PAGE

Department Name: Administrative and Financial Services
Name of RFP Coordinator: Phillip Platt
Names of Evaluators: Phillip Platt, Fred Brittain, Doug Cotnoir, Heather Perreault, and Breena Bissell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pass/Fail Criteria</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Fail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section I. Preliminary Information (Eligibility)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have successfully implemented within the last five (5) years the Workday</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modules listed in Part II. C for at least three (3) U.S. based Public Sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g., for Federal, state, or local government) governments or U.S. Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Institutions and at least one of those shall be comparable in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>size and complexity (e.g. similar union/bargaining agreements, organizational</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structure, size, etc) to the State as also described in Part I. A of this RFP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Be a certified Workday system implementation partner.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Be able to have all offsite work delivered by the assigned Project team within</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the continental United States (U.S.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Be able to provide Key Personnel that meet the criteria as specified in Part II</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.2. These key personnel include:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Delivery Oversight Executive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o HRMS Project Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Lead Business Analyst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Lead Technical Analyst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Data and Analytics Lead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Testing Lead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Training Specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Organizational Change Management (OCM) Specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Sections</th>
<th>Points Available</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section III. Proposed Services</strong></td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section IV. Cost Proposal</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Points</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Alight Solutions did not meet the point total required (18) to advance to Stage 3 of the evaluation.
STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202110165
RFP TITLE: Human Resources Management System (HRMS) Systems Integrator
BIDDER: Alight Solutions
DATE: January 18, 2022

OVERVIEW OF SECTION I
Preliminary Information

| Section I. Preliminary Information |

Evaluation Team Comments:

- Met requirements
EVALUATION OF SECTION II
Organization Qualifications and Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Team Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Overview of the Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Workday partner since 2008 – providing services since 2013 (unclear what the difference between dates is)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Company was formed as a divestiture in 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lack of specificity in overview, references</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Did not provide 3 references as requested in RFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 200+ public sector clients – did not specify Workday or implementation experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1330+ Workday certified consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Implementation Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Did not reference any specific implementations or connections with Workday and the public sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Examples of Workday configuration for unions, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Very short, vague responses. Provided no context or industry specific information to support claims of implementation experience in proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Response to identified functional challenges does not include any specific past implementation details to describe the Bidder’s experience to address those challenges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Response to this section addresses more approach/methodology than the requested organization experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Did not address experience with paused projects or complexities of law enforcement/corrections or other groups identified in the RFP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 25+ years partnering with 200+ public entities – not clear if this is Workday related. Implementation experience/services appear to be very broad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Product Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Note they have experience with all Workday modules but did not describe that experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reference collection of data from multiple countries and regions – not applicable to state government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Proposed reporting did not seem to include data warehousing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Response to this section again addresses more approach/methodology than the requested organization experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Subcontractors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- None proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Organizational Chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Not provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provided list of named resources and titles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Referenced resumes in another file.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Number of resources listed appears limited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Litigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Indicated pending litigation but did not provide supporting details as requested in RFP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Evaluation Notes

**RFP #:** 202110165  
**RFP TITLE:** Human Resources Management System (HRMS) Systems Integrator  
**BIDDER:** Alight Solutions  
**DATE:** January 18, 2022

| 7. Financial Viability |  
|------------------------|---  
| • Provided             |   
| • Low risk             |    
| 8. Licensure/Certification |  
| • Indicated staff are Workday certified, but did not provide documentation of Workday certification. |   
| 9. Certificate of Insurance |  
| • Provided             |   

SUMMARY PAGE

Department Name: Administrative and Financial Services
Name of RFP Coordinator: Phillip Platt
Names of Evaluators: Phillip Platt, Fred Brittain, Doug Cotnoir, Heather Perreault, and Breena Bissell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pass/Fail Criteria</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Fail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section I. Preliminary Information (Eligibility)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have successfully implemented within the last five (5) years the Workday modules listed in Part II. C for at least three (3) U.S. based Public Sector (e.g., for Federal, state, or local government) governments or U.S. Public Higher Education Institutions and at least one of those shall be comparable in size and complexity (e.g. similar union/bargaining agreements, organizational structure, size, etc) to the State as also described in Part I. A of this RFP.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Be a certified Workday system implementation partner.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Be able to have all offsite work delivered by the assigned Project team within the continental United States (U.S.).</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Be able to provide Key Personnel that meet the criteria as specified in Part II F.2. These key personnel include:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Delivery Oversight Executive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o HRMS Project Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Lead Business Analyst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Lead Technical Analyst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Data and Analytics Lead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Testing Lead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Training Specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Organizational Change Management (OCM) Specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Sections</th>
<th>Points Available</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section III. Proposed Services</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section IV. Cost Proposal</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Points</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>61.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OVERVIEW OF SECTION I
Preliminary Information

Section I. Preliminary Information

Evaluation Team Comments:

- Met requirements
STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202110165
RFP TITLE: Human Resources Management System (HRMS) Systems Integrator
BIDDER: Collaborative Solutions, LLC
DATE: January 18, 2022

EVALUATION OF SECTION II
Organization Qualifications and Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Points Available</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section II.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation Team Comments:

1. Overview of the Organization
   - Have been involved with multiple “rescue” projects
   - Founded in 2003
   - Longest tenured Workday partner (2007)
   - Globally deployed Workday HCM and financial management for 1000+ in 125+ countries with multiple implementations
   - Focus only on Workday
   - Use Workday financials internally
   - 55+ Workday payroll deployments
   - The three references provided did not appear to be public government or higher education entities similar in size and complexity to the State of Maine, as described in the RFP.

2. Implementation Experience
   - 100% Workday deployment success with over 1,000 clients (450+ Workday customers), 98% customer satisfaction
   - Provided examples for three rescued projects from failed deployments. One of the paused project examples was large and complex.
   - Collaborative was the lead implementor for all modules on the three projects provided as references.
   - Helped develop current Workday methodology – first partner in the Workday delivery assurance program.
   - Recommend Maine backfills positions to ensure dedicated project staff
   - Acknowledge that data conversion from legacy systems is high risk and may require additional time and resources
   - Extensive experience optimizing data schema solutions
   - Team of specialists with over 15 years of experience with over 7,000 integrations to date.
   - Claim to be the largest Workday implementation partner – definition of “largest” not provided

3. Product Experience
   - Significant experience with all relevant modules
   - Bidder has a dedicated team that focuses solely on Workday absence and time tracking
   - Has proprietary payroll comparison tool called Impact that highlights granular details.
   - Workday integration cloud platform – unclear if this is a separate fee/service to be purchased.
   - Training – developed a custom report that extracts details around configurations and security roles in order to develop tailored training programs.
   - Training methodology depends on the audience, multiple methods available.
   - Demonstrated knowledge of the product through proprietary solutions for reporting, others.

4. Subcontractors
   - None proposed.

5. Organizational Chart
STATE OF MAINE
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202110165
RFP TITLE: Human Resources Management System (HRMS) Systems Integrator
BIDDER: Collaborative Solutions, LLC
DATE: January 18, 2022

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provided titles and role descriptions, described roles and responsibilities of the State of Maine vs the Bidder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significant number of positions identified for change management roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Litigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicated parent company may be named in public filings but did not specifically address any open litigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Financial Viability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Licensure/Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicated that the Bidder is listed on the Workday website of certified partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Certificate of Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EVALUATION OF SECTION III

#### Proposed Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section III. Proposed Services</th>
<th>Points Available</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Evaluation Team Comments:

**Part IV. Section III. Proposed Services (File #3)**

1. **Services to be Provided**

2. **A. Project Management and Administration Requirements**
   - Proposing suite of proprietary tools:
     - Collaboration Suite for the sharing of information.
     - Project Management Tool Kit for project management
     - Customer Knowledge Transfer for ongoing knowledge transfer.
   - Did not describe the Program Operations Dashboard and the use related to the project.
   - Project management framework, Cynergy Methodology for project management. Was developed for larger enterprise implementations.
   - Proposing a ‘Phase 0 – Discovery Phase’ to review integrations and configurations.
   - Response related to unit testing does not indicate it will be compared against the State’s requirements.
   - Requires sign-off at the end of each stage.
   - Quality assurance program with delivery assurance checkpoints.

3. **B. Analysis and Design**
   - Proposing discovery assessment and a tenant assessment.
   - Any modifications to standard process, as configured, will be subject to review.
   - Proposing to utilize Workday Finance limited license and may recommend a scheduling tool after the requirements review phase.
   - Upon completion of the initial assessment phase, Collaborative is proposing to adjust the timeline for implementation.
   - Walkthrough of each ‘to-be-built’ process to determine if the modification can be built without configuration. Proposing the State to document the reason for not leveraging the standard functionality. Documentation will include ‘Why?’ and ‘What is the impact?’
   - State is responsible for design maintenance and changes to design document after the design sign-off period.

4. **C. Requirements Analysis**
   - Did not describe a solution to meet the State’s requirements for scheduling and labor cost distribution.

5. **D. Design**
   - Met the requirements of this section.

6. **E. Configuration and Development**
   - Proposing the State will leverage previous design and configurations.
   - Data will all be based on the discovery sessions and tenant assessment.
   - Given the size and complexity the design will include several parallel discussions and reviews. This could impact State resource capacity.

7. **F. Integrations and Interfaces**
• Proposed approach to integrations and interfaces could result in reduction of integration cost, delivery time and retesting efforts.
• Have a library of hundreds of integration templates.
• Team of specialist with an average of 15 years of experience with over 7,000 integrations to date.

G. Data and Analytics
• Cynergy report tracker tool
• Suggest utilizing advanced reporting dashboards and reporting through Prism.
• Proposing to help the State with walking through the advantages of a central reporting team versus a decentralized reporting team.
• Proposing to facilitate the review of current requirements and future requirements.

H. Data Conversion
• Collaborative is proposing to be the responsibility party for data conversion. Proposing proprietary tool for data conversion, Daytona.
• Indicated a simpler data conversion spreadsheet for the State to provide the required data for conversion into an iLoad file.
• Proposing a ‘Lather, Rinse, Repeat’ data conversion process.
• Proposing to assess what was done by examine existing auditing processes and identifying gaps.

I. Testing
• Parallel payroll will include the validation of payroll integrations.
• Proposing to bring government specific test scenarios to the table, setting the foundation for the State to build upon those scenarios.
• Proposing a testing manager to collaborate with the State.
• Proposing to perform unit and smoke testing.
• Proposal does not include the Bidder performing integrations testing to verify end-to-end operations.
• During the architecture phase, the Bidder will determine if performance testing is required by Workday.
• Indicated testing is built into deployment lifecycle methodology.
• Standard threshold for parallel payroll testing is 99.9%.
• Proposing to bring proprietary imPact Payroll Reconciliation Tool to the project.

J. Training
• Positive approach to the training audience proposal.
• Proposing various methods for training (e.g. Train-the-trainer, virtual, in-person, and self-paced).
• Proposing to develop facilitator and participant guides including specific scenario designed for the State.
• Proposing Training roles and responsibilities to be defined within the Statement of Work, which is inconsistent with the requirements of the RFP.
• Will build a custom report to extract details from the tenant around actual configuration and security roles in order to develop training.

K. Organizational Change Management
• Head, Hearts, and Hands Approach
• Indicated right size change approach includes access to data, pairs with the Bidder approach to reduce complexity.
• OCM staff certified in PROSCI and ADKAR.
• Proposing an adaptable OCM plan to be unique to the State.
• Response to this section focus more on guiding principles and less about the resources, methods and strategies to be utilized in the delivery of these services.
### STATE OF MAINE
### TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES

**RFP #:** 202110165  
**RFP TITLE:** Human Resources Management System (HRMS) Systems Integrator  
**BIDDER:** Collaborative Solutions, LLC  
**DATE:** January 18, 2022

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposing OCM roles and responsibilities to be defined within the Statement of Work, which is inconsistent with the requirements of the RFP.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L. Cutover and Final Acceptance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M. Warranty and Post-Production Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N. Requirements Matrix (Appendix G)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O. Deliverables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P. Additional Licenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q. Assumptions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Implementation – Work Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Resources – Staffing Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Proposed Governance Structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Proposing OCM roles and responsibilities to be defined within the Statement of Work, which is inconsistent with the requirements of the RFP.
- Cutover and Final Acceptance
  - Met the requirements of this section.
- Warranty and Post-Production Services
  - 90-day post-production support.
  - Did not propose providing a 6-month warranty following implementation.
  - Proposal did not propose the optional one-year extended support, as required by the RFP.
- Requirements Matrix (Appendix G)
  - Identified about 90% of requirements as standard Workday functionality.
  - 5 requirements marked as ‘Not Available’.
  - Provided a number of detailed comments to explain answers.
- Deliverables
  - Met the minimum requirements of this section.
- Additional Licenses
  - May recommend a scheduling tool after discussion with the State.
- Assumptions
  - State resource will be empowered with decision-making on behalf of the State. (Pages 17 & 18 of the Bidder’s Proposal)
  - State will lead the coordination with any 3rd party vendor involvement. (Pages 17 & 18 of the Bidder’s Proposal)
  - Collaborative project staff will utilize their own laptop devices. This would require compliance with State OIT policy. (Pages 17 & 18 of the Bidder’s Proposal)
  - Collaborative project staff will utilize their own Secure File Transfer Protocol. This would require compliance with State OIT policy.
- Implementation – Work Plan
  - Detailed 5-month assessment phase followed by a 16-month implementation phase.
  - Inconsistent post-production support period outline in the work plan. Work plan identifies a 10-week period, and the RFP requires 90 days.
  - Outlined 58 weeks of Continuous Value Services transition.
  - Did not provide a detailed description of project roles and responsibilities.
  - Roles and responsibilities of various parties are not clearly defined for all tasks.
- Resources – Staffing Plan
  - Staff references do not include 2 state or local governments comparable to the State and do indicate what software the engagements were for.
  - Did not provide any information on State resources that will be required.
  - Proposed Project Manager has ERP implementation experience.
  - Unclear if the proposed Project Manager has any experience with a completed Workday payroll implementation.
  - Proposal did not clearly identify a Testing Lead.
- Proposed Governance Structure
  - Provided an outline of how the proposed governance structure aligns with the State’s governance structure.
  - Did not include absence, time tracking, reporting and security in the proposed governance structure.
EVALUATION OF SECTION IV
Cost Proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lowest Submitted Cost Proposal</th>
<th>Cost Proposal Being Scored</th>
<th>Score Weight</th>
<th>=</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$10,867,250</td>
<td>$18,719,454*</td>
<td>25 points</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>14.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Collaborative Solutions, as part of their proposal to the RFP, proposed a Phase 0 – Assessment Phase. The cost for this phase was provided but was not included within the Proposed Cost. $1,422,344 was the cost identified in Collaborative’s cost proposal for Phase 0 and this cost has been calculated into the formula above. It appears there was an error within the cost proposal (line 39) that led to the totals not being calculated properly.

Evaluation Team Comments:

- Pricing is assumed on a “ground-up” implementation.
- Did not provide a price for optional 1-year Post-Production Support or Continuous Value Services.
- Unclear is OCM Execution is included in the OCM Plan deliverable price.
- Indicated resources would be predominantly remote with the option to travel, if needed. Did not indicate if this would be included or an additional cost.
Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part IV. Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience (File #2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Overview of the Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I: 300+ Workday certified consultants - Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Uses Workday for their HR needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Purchased Sierra-Cedar, a government and education focused team in 2020 – since acquisition, Accenture selected by 20+ public sector clients to deploy Workday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- P: 11 Years in government sector, 53 government Workday clients, 34 live (worked with 60% of Workday government clients, 6 government clients w/ 10,000+ employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I: City of Dallas – experience with Premier – data conversion and OCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I: State of Iowa – OCM/future state communication through Change Agents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I: City of Baltimore – time tracking and scheduling solutions for Fire and Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- P: Worked with City of Dallas on a recalibration phase, including bringing on specific resources to meet challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- References include government sector implementations with similar or greater employee size to the State of Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- City of Dallas – implementation included functional deployment, integrations, reporting, data migration, OCM, training and support services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I: State of Iowa – Implementation included integration work with CGI financial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- P: Primary contractor for City/County of Denver, CO &amp; City of Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- P: City of Baltimore – fully remote implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Implementation Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Implementor in 18 statewide ERP implementations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 52 Workday government clients, 34 live with Accenture the primary for 25; 15 with projects in process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- P – Public Sector – 9 large public sector clients including State of Iowa, City of Denver, City of Dallas and City of Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I – State of Iowa heavy of Change Management and Training details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I – City of Denver deployed HCM and Payroll together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- P – Multiple government sector implementations with similar number of collective bargaining agreements as the State of Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- P – Experience leverage native time tracking and third party software to meet scheduling needs for law enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I – City of Vancouver, Accenture has experience developing procedures to meet client needs not resolved through native Workday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- State of Iowa – developed schedules configured to allow for “Manager-Created Work schedules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Product Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Recognized market leader with 60% of Workday deployments in the government sector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
P: Team brings 90 years of combined Workday experience w/ all proposed team members having 20 or more years of experience
  • Provided Workday services for 14 years (2002)
  • P – Experience with integrations with mainframe systems, CGI Advantage Financials, US Bank, Data Warehouse, and Time Clocks
  • P – Accenture will include a Labor Cost Distribution Subject Matter Expert with experience developing solution for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.
  • P – Experience implementing pre-65 and post 65 plans for two clients live – City of Baltimore and City of Denver

4. Subcontractors
• Accenture does not plan to sub contract out work

5. Organizational Chart
• P – Shared responsibility with primary responsibility on Accenture in the beginning with a transition to State gradually to promote KT and “self-sufficiency” by go live
• I – Project Team includes resources in project management, sponsorship, quality assurance, functional/technical team members, testing, data and analytics lead, and change management/training team

6. Litigation
• Appendix B attests to no legal actions taken against Accenture
• Have not been debarred suspended, or declared ineligible to submit a bid
• No pending litigation nor threatened litigation that would affect Accenture’s ability to perform obligations

7. Financial Viability
• Dun & Bradstreet – Moderate to High Risk of severe payment delinquency
• Accenture has a 60-day term on vendor payment

8. Licensure/Certification
• Platinum Workday Certified Partner since 2008

9. Certificate of Insurance
• P: Provided

Part IV. Section III. Proposed Services (File #3)
1. Services to be Provided

2. A. Project Management and Administration Requirements
• Accenture will provide executive leadership guidance to identify mandatory configuration and to build a strong change management team with change agents
• Leveraging Accenture’s “The Accenture Project Portal (TAPP)” project management tool to track and manage all project communications, tasks, activities, workflows, issues, risks, and documentation
• State and Accenture will need to determine if TAPP will be used solely or in conjunction with the State’s SharePoint site – State access to TAPP in perpetuity?
• Dedicated Accenture Project Manager and engaged executive sponsors
• Accenture’s architects will work closely with each workstream team member
### Analysis and Design

- **Follows the Workday’s Deployment Methodology/Stages**
- Accenture and the State will formalize a communication plan during the BPA stage – outlining meetings, frequency, audience, expected results and ownership (Page 11)
- Weekly status reports by functional area
- Accenture Resource Capacity Tool – Short and Long term State staffing needs – Heat Map (Page 12)
- Executive Engagement Program will provide guided workshops for the State’s leadership team to focus on key areas of attention
- Accenture assigns a Quality Assurance Director to monitor project health
- Accenture Project Manager will meet regularly with Workday’s Delivery Assurance team

### Requirements Analysis

- Will start with Business Process Alignment with review of the State’s Business Process and Requirements Traceability Matrix documentation to determine if any of the existing configuration can be “reused” – Similar to the City of Dallas
- Accenture has identified from the RTM 1,710 requirements that can be met “out of the box”, 136 items needing more information, 31 that cannot be met with standard functionality, 24 custom reports, 9 reports/integrations to be developed, and 20 items requiring third party software

### Design

- Combined project team will refine the scope of the project, develop clear project boundaries for what is in and out of scope, and create a Project Charter
- Accenture’s technical consultants work with the State and Premier International to address the data migration and integration requirements.
- “Will work together” to create test plan for all testing phases

### Configuration and Development

- Customer Confirmation Sessions will be held for subject matter experts during Config Phase
- Accenture will provide a hands-on reporting workshop
- Accenture has included a bucket of hours in our proposal to both build identified reports for the State and provide knowledge sharing and support to State report writers.
- Accenture always recommends using the standard functionality over customization. If determined that customization is needed, Accenture will work with the State on impact on timeline and pricing
- Accenture would be responsible for reviewing new releases/new functionality and report to the project, identify required changes, determine impact and assist State with regression testing

### Integrations and Interfaces

- Shared responsibility between Accenture and State
- Familiar with CGI Advantage – implemented in City of Dallas and State of Iowa
4,000 existing integrations that can be leveraged if needed

G. Data and Analytics

- Reporting Repository and Developer Toolbox (Page 29) - helps to facilitate consistent report development, design, and governance standards.
- deliver a report development workshop
- Accenture will assist with developing some of the reports

H. Data Conversion

- Endorses the use of Premier.
- State should identify a resource who understands the legacy systems and how to extract data from it – Accenture will conduct data migration workshops
- Data Quality Platform will visualize quality, completeness, and conformity of data
- Accenture will provide overview of strategy and conversion plan – working with Premier and the State
- Data migration activities will be tracked and monitored in The Accenture Project Portal
- Accenture’s proprietary Data Conversion Accelerator Tool (Page 34)
- Experience – 7 weeks to build tenant from date of extraction
- Premier and Accenture will collaborate with the State project management to create a data conversion project plan.

I. Testing

- Accenture will help the State determine a strategy and plan for testing and provide guidance on their Test Scenario Generator
- Experience with clients using Kainos – will augment testing needs
- The State should have a qualified internal resource who can write or facilitate the writing of test scenarios and plan, schedule, and execute end-to-end and parallel testing
- advise the State on the content of test scripts
- Will leverage a testing tool kit includes a Testing Strategy template, Test and Validation Plan templates, Payroll Parallel Test Plan template, and baseline Workday test scenarios
- proprietary, user-configured online Test Scenario Generator (TSG) – Page 36
- Will conduct 2 payroll parallels with payroll integrations
- TAPP - define, coordinate, track, and record results

J. Training

- Accenture will help build a strong training team to help the State deliver training during the project and post go live – ongoing training
- Train the Trainer approach with virtual trainings, in person, self paced videos, written training, job aids, and help text
- For HR Staff - hands-on, instructor-led training and in-person post-deployment support is provided.
- Figure 19 & 20 (Page 39)
- Will deliver a “Training Needs Assessment”
- Will work with the State on the curriculum
- Four major user groups – Partners, Managers, Employees, Power Users defined in curriculum
- Accenture will provide their library of training content templates and support for the State’s training content development as part of their training offering
- State content developers will have ownership of the materials
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATE OF MAINE</strong>&lt;br&gt;INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RFP #:</strong> 202110165&lt;br&gt;<strong>RFP TITLE:</strong> Human Resources Management System (HRMS) Systems Integrator&lt;br&gt;<strong>BIDDER NAME:</strong> Accenture&lt;br&gt;<strong>DATE:</strong> 01/14/2022&lt;br&gt;<strong>EVALUATOR NAME:</strong> Phillip Platt&lt;br&gt;<strong>EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:</strong> Department of Administrative &amp; Financial Services/Maine IT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Experienced in remote training of government clients&lt;br&gt;• “Bytes of Knowledge” - Video Learning Library&lt;br&gt;• Knowledge transfer skills matrix will track project teams knowledge and assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K. Organizational Change Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will begin day 1 and set the foundation for decision making&lt;br&gt;• Life with Workday workshops at the beginning of each stage to help visualize what is coming in each stage/phase&lt;br&gt;• Change Management – Accenture will draft a Decision Paper that includes the options for considerations and their potential impacts to the project. The Decision Paper will be presented to the Steering Committee – Figure 10 (Page 19)&lt;br&gt;• Change Management activities – Page 22 ++&lt;br&gt;• How – Page 45&lt;br&gt;• Foundation - Five Pillars of Change (Page 46)&lt;br&gt;• Executive Engagement – Defines Role in change management (Page 47)&lt;br&gt;• Change Ambassador Team to assist with transition&lt;br&gt;• Accenture to provide impact assessment&lt;br&gt;• PACT surveys to determine change willingness&lt;br&gt;• Work with the State to develop a Sustainability Plan, which provides a roadmap to guide the State in planning for future user support needs including communication and training&lt;br&gt;• Communication strategy (Page 49 and 50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L. Cutover and Final Acceptance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Generally 3-4 weeks – depending on catch transactions and amount of data conversion of history&lt;br&gt;• Joint creation of a deployment/cutover plan&lt;br&gt;• During the life of the project, ownership/lead for tasks will shift from Accenture to the State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M. Warranty and Post-Production Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 90 days of hypercare support as part of proposal&lt;br&gt;• Support includes project management, all functional and technical areas in scope for the project, integrations, reporting, dashboards, change management, training, and supporting the State’s payroll runs during this period and month-end close&lt;br&gt;• one-year option of additional extended support, Accenture proposes their Optimization Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N. Requirements Matrix (Appendix G)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O. Deliverables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Table 2-9 (Starting on Page 54) outlines deliverables and owner/contributor roles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P. Additional Licenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No additional licenses proposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q. Assumptions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Project scope based on BPM and RTM documents&lt;br&gt;• Timeline based on: the State will accept the leading practice-based processes that are included within the software.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Accenture recommends that the State increase the number of change management FTEs to a minimum of 6 for this project. 
Both Premier and Kainos will have continued roles

### 3. Implementation – Work Plan

- Initial go live in April 2023
- Decision point at the end of the Architect phase to ensure alignment on the solution prior to moving into config and testing
- Business Process Alignment – 3 Months
- Deployment – 10 Months + 90 Day Support (for all workstreams)
- Optional 12-month support for four years following the initial support period
- Initial deployment timeline (Page 66)

### 4. Resources – Staffing Plan

- Table 10, Page 67 outlines State roles and responsibilities
- Table 11, Page 71 outlines Accenture roles and responsibilities
- Project Manager – 2.5 years of experience in Workday (20 years overall)
- Labor Cost Distribution role identified
- Time Tracking Lead – Certifications
- Finance Lead role identified

### 5. Proposed Governance Structure

- The Steering Committee and Project Managers will provide centralized and coordinated project oversight and management with activities that include establishing project vision, monitoring compliance with project standards, project health reporting, risk and issue management, resource management, coaching and mentoring, and quality management services.
- Accenture’s Organizational structure for the project aligns with State identified structure
- Figure 28 (Page 82)
## Demonstrations

- Team is dedicated to Workday implementations
  - Experienced Team
- 53 Government Workday Clients, 34 Live with Workday, 60% participation rate for Workday in the Government sector, State experience, CGI experience, and 13 public sector clients with 10K + employees
- Standardized statewide processes – State of Iowa
- City of Dallas – Payroll processing went from 3+ days to 1.5
- Implementation Approach:
  - Business Process Alignment – review requirements, plan of what needs to be focused on prior to the architect phase
  - Walk through the RTM
  - Standard Workday config ~1700
  - Where appropriate, recommends "reusing" prior configuration
  - Change Management – reengaging project team after a project pause
- Lessons Learned
  - Importance of Executive Alignment and Organizational Readiness
  - Visibility and Project Governance
    - Level 1 Project Team Lead
    - Level 2 Department/Agency Level
    - Level 3 Executive Level
- Key Issues and Risks
  - Supervisory Org Structure
  - Collective Bargaining agreements
    - Identify how legacy is paying today vs. what is included in the agreements
    - Strategy on how to move forward
    - Change management and partnership with the Unions
  - Benefits
  - Scheduling – conversation was around scheduling software rather than native Workday schedules and management of schedules
  - Labor Cost Distribution
    - Will be discussed in more detail during BPA phase
    - Avoid complexity
    - Understand use cases
    - Maintain integrity between time and pay
  - FDM – the State’s chart of accounts, dimensions – experience mapping them out from CGI to Workday
  - Reporting and Data Analytics – rather than reporting, it’s access to data

---
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### Operational Considerations
- City of Dallas restart – Day in the Life workshop – BPA process for understanding requirements and decision points
  - Team building
  - Listen to the project team
- Coordination with Workday and other 3rd Party vendors
  - 2nd largest Workday client
  - Provides a larger span of influence with Workday
- Organizational Change Management strategy
  - Readiness Assessment
  - Survey results that can be sliced and diced
  - Reenergize the project team/rebrand
  - Understand the “baggage” that people are carrying from the prior project

### Key Personnel Interviews
- **Question 1:** Accenture PM takes a deep dive into the artifacts
- **Question 2:** Accenture will be supporting through governance (end in mind). Each workstream lead will be supporting report development
- **Question 3:** Tenant Management – yes repurposing
- **Question 5:** State training material developers will be responsible, but Accenture will provide templates and support (e.g Bytes of Knowledge)
- **Question 6:** Yes
- **Question 7:** Dedicated, 100%
- **Question 9:** Default to 2, but sometimes use 3. Representative testing and should include seasonal and/or holiday pay
- **Question 10:** 2-3 cycles for each group, not just 2-3 cycles in total
- **Question 11:** If the time entry exists in legacy, Accenture will use that
- **Validation at the Individual earning and deduction by employee - results with an acceptable threshold.**
- **Question 11:** Workday Prism and Workday Extend and perhaps Workday Advanced Scheduling
- **Question 12:** Are there existing fields in Workday, if not custom objects
- **Critical Issue – We identify the issue, communicate it, and identifying mitigation**
Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

Part IV. Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience (File #2)

1. Overview of the Organization
   • Workday partner since 2008

2. Implementation Experience
   • 11 years gov’t, 53 gov’t clients, 34 live gov’t clients, 6 gov’ts w/ 10k+ employees
   • State of Iowa – go-live readiness? (No quote from Iowa)
   • City of Dallas – Broad services
   • State of Iowa – Benefits, time-tracking, absence management
   • City of Baltimore – Broad services across multiple modules
   • City & County of Denver – Broad services across multiple modules
   • Former State Comptroller with experience developing a labor cost distribution solution for MA
   • Parallel payroll dress rehearsal in City of Dallas.

3. Product Experience
   • Experience with all applicable Workday modules
   • Relevant integration experience

4. Subcontractors
   • None proposed

5. Organizational Chart

6. Litigation

7. Financial Viability
   • Payment terms not consistent with D&B methodology (60-day practice considered negative by D&B)

8. Licensure/Certification
   • Platinum partner

9. Certificate of Insurance

Part IV. Section III. Proposed Services (File #3)

1. Services to be Provided
   • Business Process Alignment (BPA) – p.3
   • Confirm requirements and configurations that are ready to deploy, then focus on remaining items – p.3
   • RTM ~ 90% out of the box (1710of 1910 requirements) – p. 3
   • Target go-live April 2023 – p. 5
   • Change management program designed specifically for governments deploying Workday – p.6
   • 90-day hypercare support post-go-live – p.6
## 2. Project Management and Administration Requirements

- Business Process Alignment to start – p.3
- The Accenture Project Portal (TAPP) for project management – p.9
- Dedicated Quality Assurance Director – p.17
- Final deliverable from BPA will dictate estimated effort, timeline and resource mix – p. 5
- Risk Register from prior government experience – p. 14,15
- Decision papers – p. 19

## B. Analysis and Design

## C. Requirements Analysis

- Foundation Data Model Workshops shouldn’t be applicable as we aren’t implementing financials – p.21

## D. Design

## E. Configuration and Development

- Test Scenario Generator – p.26
- Focus on opportunities for standardization rather than customization – p.27

## F. Integrations and Interfaces

- Integration catalog of more than 4,000 integrations – p. 28
- Integrated with CGI financials – p. 27,28.

## G. Data and Analytics

- Reporting Repository and Developer Toolbox – p.29

## H. Data Conversion

- Worked with Premier on Dallas, Baltimore and Iowa implementations – p.30
- Refer to 5 standard tenants – p.32,33. What do we have for available tenants?
- Data Conversion Accelerator Tool – p.34
- Historical data services offered – p.35

## I. Testing

## J. Training

- Bytes of Knowledge video learning library – p.43

## K. Organizational Change Management

- Propose using PACT for SaaS change readiness survey – p. 48

## L. Cutover and Final Acceptance
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RFP #: 202110165</th>
<th>RFP TITLE: Human Resources Management System (HRMS) Systems Integrator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIDDER NAME: Accenture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE: 1/17/22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVALUATOR NAME: Douglas Cotnoir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DAFS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### M. Warranty and Post-Production Services
- No mention of warranty
- 90 day post-go-live support – p.53
- Optional one year extended support “Optimization Services” – p.53

### N. Requirements Matrix (Appendix G)
- RTM ~ 90% out of the box (1710of 1910 requirements) – p. 3
- Can’t identify requirements that “cannot currently be met as understood” – p. 3

### O. Deliverables
- Foundation Data Model? – p. 55
- Executive Engagement Program – p. 60-61

### P. Additional Licenses
- None proposed – p. 62

### Q. Assumptions
- Project timeline to be developed at completion of BPA – p. 63
- Acceptance of leading practice-based processes – p. 63
- State minimum 6 FTE for change management – p. 64

### Implementation – Work Plan
- 13 months plus 90 day post-go-live support – p. 65
- Optional 12 month support for four years – p. 65
- Go-live April 2023 – p. 66

### Resources – Staffing Plan
- Bill Kilmartin, former Comptroller of MA as Finance Consultant – p. 77
- Optional additional change management resources – p. 83

### Proposed Governance Structure
- Quantity of decisions made does not equal 100% - p. 86
**Demonstrations**

- Integration with CGI Financials (Iowa, Dallas, Maricopa County, Denver Airport)
- 13 public sector clients over 10k employees
- Dallas, Iowa, Baltimore, Denver all have unions, 10k+ employees and used Premier
- Handpicked “team” according to Mary Sheffield
- This is truly an approach toward organizational readiness
- “Partnership” defined on your darkest day
- Summary RTM slide provided counts of requirements in each status category to be validated in BPA stage
- Prefer not to pick a go-live date until agreement on what needs to be done, when and by whom. Timeline is the start of discussion going into BPA
- Decision points: end of BPA, end of architect stage
- BPA process is the result of lessons learned on prior projects
- TAPP is not just a portal; it drives visibility, collaboration, transparency and accountability
- CBAs – interpretation into practice
- Understands that there is a delta in the product regarding LCD that Workday is working on
- Recognize that LCD is a foundational functionality required. Seek to better understand our requirements in BPA phase
- Principles RE: LCD 1) Avoid complexity to the extent possible; 2) Focus on business objectives and use cases; 3) Maintain integrity and symmetry between time collection buckets and rate of pay
- FDM = chart of accounts. How do we best move payroll accounting from Workday to the financial system. How do we keep system attributes in sync (current client on CGI building one-to-one relationships to COA – City of Dallas)
- Include a finance consultant in the project, even though financials are not in scope. Not done by HCM or Payroll consultant
- Reporting/Analytics – start with the end in mind. Access to data is different – determine what is a report vs what is information available in the system
- BPA starts with day-in-the-life sessions
- Build support model early on, not just before go-live
- Coordination with Workday – monthly cadence, project scorecard
- Accenture is second largest Workday client and has input/influence on Workday offerings. Workday’s go-to-market partner for government
- View IV&V as part of the team to ensure success
- Duration of BPA is somewhat driven by how to get the right people in the room at the right time to answer questions (can send a sample of those sessions and what the audience looks like)
- Organizational readiness is the extended audience, not just the project team. Rebranding and change champions to get people energized by acknowledging the past and understanding
what we will be doing differently this time. Messaging around why, what does it mean, how will daily life be different? Need to present this project as something different. Creating personas and messaging why it will benefit them to get on board this time. Will need to build in “value” snippets of progress and success. . .something tangible to make it real, not just lip-service
• Already taking a new approach by soliciting and engaging the very best partner we can to assist with implementation, based on thorough review and demonstrated history. Ask executives (cabinet, legislature, etc.) for their support as we carry this across the finish line
• Seen a variety of methods for LCD solutions, including external 3rd party integrations. Baltimore and Dallas capturing LCD at the timecard level
• Scheduling at Dallas – custom system to maintain fire schedules and 3x5 cards for police. Brought in Kronos Telestaff for schedule management, but the configuration to pay based on schedules resides in Workday. Baltimore went all-in on Time Tracking. On the cusp of release of Workday Advanced Scheduling.
• Key leaders to nominate change champions and make sure that they have sufficient influence to be effective, outside of project team to widen circle of influence. Mix of timekeepers, HR partners, trainers that are not intimately involved in the project. At least one per agency and ideally, a backup

Key Personnel Interviews

• Q1 - Deeper dive necessary on report artifacts. Need to assess the underlying requirement that resulted in the development of a report. Part of reporting workshops during BPA. Recognition of reports built as a workaround. . .they are almost always present. Conversation with functional teams to determine if something was missed in the configuration review. Have not had to do a lot of workarounds within Workday that would require a special report. Question whether or not there are “change” issues or if these are truly necessary validations. (Have seen very limited number of reports written as workarounds – “1 or 2”)
• Q2 – using State resources to build reports (after reporting workshops) using report development toolkit. Entire Accenture project team will support report writing within various workstreams
• Q3 – will use tenants we already own and repurpose through project. Will set aside the most recent tenant built for reference purposes. 6 implementation tenants, but post-go-live it’s 3 tenants. Accenture tends to lean towards a minimum number of tenants to have to manage. 7 week build periods
• Q4 – The State will generate blog content after implementation and that is part of the readiness planning work. Accenture will co-create during the project
• Q5 – Accenture will support the State’s training content developers and will bring templates to the table to assist. Accenture will provide “bytes of knowledge” (videos) that can be used right away
• Q6 – Accutime clocks will be in scope and are actually a preferred device
• Q7 – 100% Dedicated workstream leads
• Q8 – Knowledge sharing plans as a roadmap for learning. Everyday users will need new skills to work within the system, which is part of the training curriculum. Training material developers will also learn new skills around development tools
• Q9 – Default to 2 tests, but can add a third, if needed. Payroll lead and test lead will partner on parallel testing. Take representative scenarios in mind for testing (e.g., holidays, seasons, etc.)
• Q10 – For each pay frequency we have, we will perform 2-3 parallel tests. Formal parallel payroll strategy document with defined entrance and exit criteria, where inputs will originate
and how they will be entered into parallel environment (using time entry input vs pay input, unless pay input was used in legacy). Partner with Premier, using Premier’s comparison tool to validate individual and aggregate payroll results

- Q11 – Prism and Workday Extend. Prism is a have-to-have tool, according to Brad. Extend is becoming more mainstream – not a first-stop, but a valuable tool. Workday Advanced Scheduling may be of value and recommend that the State include this in negotiation with Workday. Also should ensure that Financials component continues to be included

- Q12 – Work to determine where these data elements can be stored in Workday. Use existing fields or custom objects, or use Prism. Data stored in Prism can be brought in real-time and used with reporting. Maintain manually if originating in Workday or through integrations if originating in an external system (APIs if needed real-time). Prefer to bring financial data into Prism rather than export Workday data to our data warehouse. More challenging to translate Workday data model to a star schema. (City of Dallas, most COA mapping was handled through account posting rules)

- Q13 – Accenture’s tool is another layer of validation on top of the Premier tool. Will need to look at how clean the data is to determine if this tool is necessary. No additional cost if it is determined to be used, just the extra effort to employ the additional layer

- Q14 – repeat of 12

- Q15 – repeat of 13

- Q16 - No ongoing licensing costs but there is a training need

- Definition of standard Workday functionality means a requirement that can be met with standard Workday configuration

- Melissa Flett – financial consultant (Baltimore, Denver)

- Not trying to reinvent the wheel; rather, trying to get the wheel back on track
Part IV. Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience (File #2)

1. Overview of the Organization
   - Leader in delivering Workday services specifically for public sector.
   - Recognition - Workday implementation leader; #1 Execution and Innovation for Workday HCM; winner Workday 2021 Partner Innovation Award for Government; Leader in Workday Services; Most Ethical Companies; Fortune’s Most Admire Companies in IT services
   - Depth – 2,000 consultants for Workday Business Group; Government and Educational Practice is approximately 300 individuals
   - 23 Workday go-lives with government clients
   - Dallas, TX – 14,000 users. Joined as subcontractor to workday mid-project 2019; live July 2020 – HCM, compensation, benefits, performance, talent, recruitment, time tracking, payroll
   - State of Iowa – 19,000 employees; 5,000 retirees. Subcontracted to Workday & provided 50% of resources. Accenture led deployment of benefits, time tracking, absence management. Led data migration, integration, and change management and training workstreams. 12/2019 start. Live with HCM, payroll 9/2021.
   - Baltimore, MD – 14,000 users. Prime contractor. Provided full implementation services including Business Process Alignment, change management, Workday deployment, project management, and support. HCM live in 10/2020; payroll and time tracking live 12/2020; workday financials anticipated 7/2022; Phase 3 deployment recruiting, learning management, talent, performance to begin now with planned go-live 7/2022

2. Implementation Experience
   - 18 Statewide ERP implementations.
   - Most government clients live with Workday of all Workday partners
   - Primed or participated in 60% of all deployments that included Workday partner
   - 52 government clients – 34 live or Workday (25 as prime implementation partner, 9 filling substantial roles as subcontractor); 15 with initial projects in process; 3 other (such as post go-live support or projects rollouts)
   - Pivot with remote training

3. Product Experience
   - 14 years; Workday certified partner in 2008
   - Government implementations: 46 HCM; 38 payroll; 34 time tracking; 36 benefits; 32 absence; 28 recruiting; 23 talent and performance; 25 financials

4. Subcontractors
- Does not plan to use subcontractors

5. Organizational Chart
   - Provided high level

6. Litigation

7. Financial Viability

8. Licensure/Certification

9. Certificate of Insurance

Part IV. Section III. Proposed Services (File #3)

1. Services to be Provided

2.

A. Project Management and Administration Requirements
   - P/N Change Management
   - N/? BPA – consider work done previously on business processes – redo or accept as is
   - Lessons from other government entities
   - P/N Review of BU contracts – interpretation dangerous outside of OER
   - ? project management office
   - ? Accenture Project Portal
   - Resource tool

B. Analysis and Design

C. Requirements Analysis

D. Design
   - straightforward

E. Configuration and Development
   - Standard functionality
   - Bucket of hours for custom reporting
   - Accenture responsible for new releases during implementation

F. Integrations and Interfaces
   - 4000+ integrations

G. Data and Analytics
   - Report repository specific to public sector entities

H. Data Conversion
   - Noted 67% of all data integrations cause implementation delays, overruns, or fails
   - “tough on data’ approach – start early, guide and support Maine through tasks, and tackle challenges as a team
   - ‘no substitution for experience’
   - Data Quality Platform to analyze data
   - Data Conversion Accelerator Tool
   - Propose Working with Premier

I. Testing
   - Kainos automated testing software
• Smoke, Unit, End-to-End, User Experiences, Payroll Parallel testing – all familiar
• Test Scenario Generator tool

J. Training
• Bytes of knowledge
• Templates provided
• Needs assessment
• N Assumption all HR involved in other work and do not need training
• Variety of training options
• Virtual training
• ? Blog

K. Organizational Change Management
• Process
• Resources

L. Cutover and Final Acceptance
•

M. Warranty and Post-Production Services
• Met 90 day post go live support
• ? warranty

N. Requirements Matrix (Appendix G)
• 1710 of 1970 requirements met out of box
• ? 31 items cannot be met with Workday

O. Deliverables
• ? Timeline

P. Additional Licenses
•

Q. Assumptions
• State has 6 people for change management

3. Implementation – Work Plan
• Aggressive proposed timeline
• 2 months BPA
• Testing begins month 9
• ? timeline alignment/consideration of State business operations schedule
• High level without detail

4. Resources – Staffing Plan
• Provided all requested information
• Some identified key team members have worked together on other government projects

5. Proposed Governance Structure
• Change management
• Charts from other governments
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### Demonstrations

- Staffing  
  - Team has worked together on multiple WD implementations  
  - 53 Govt WD clients; 34 live  
  - 60% participation govt sector  
  - Experience w States; 13 public clients w 10,000+ employees  
  - Examples provided in response  
  - State of Iowa  
  - City of Dallas  
  - Key Risks include sup org, cbas—interpretation or actual use, benefits, scheduling, LCD, reporting  
  - City of Dallas restart – team building  
  - Coordinate with 3rd party vendors  
  - 2nd largest client of WD  
  - OCM – readiness, surveys, excite team, rebrand  
    Focus on project team  
    we have already done change champions and personas – not different champions key  
  - Workday Advanced Scheduling not deployed yet

### Key Personnel Interviews

1. PM – artifacts will provide good info for jump start – or good questions  
2. support with end in mind. Leads support reporting. Have a good listing of reports.  
3. yes  
4.  
5. Accenture provides templates  
6. yes  
7. 100% dedicated  
8.  
9. 2 but sometimes 3.  
10. 2-3 tests per pay cycle (not total)  
11.  
12. 
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**Instructions:** The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part IV. Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience (File #2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Overview of the Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Implementation Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Product Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Subcontractors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Organizational Chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Litigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Financial Viability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Licensure/Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Certificate of Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• OK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part IV. Section III. Proposed Services (File #3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Services to be Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Project Management and Administration Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Appears to adapt to customer’s current circumstances and partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• BPA period to assess accuracy and completeness of current RTM, configs, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Propose a standard method for raising risks to leadership with recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bringing lessons learned from other complex, govt implementations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Analysis and Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have their own methodology for working with stakeholders to validate and generate requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Requirements Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Did not articulate a path forward with labor cost distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Configuration and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will review existing tenants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Integrations and Interfaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assumes integrations are functioning but will test during assessment phase. Will partner on new with the State and take the lead on more difficult integrations.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G. Data and Analytics</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Brings an existing library of reports that were built for government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H. Data Conversion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use a proprietary data conversion tool, if they were to do it. Do speak to working with Premier and recommend that continue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Testing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Was confused by number parallel payroll tests. Clarified as two or three runs for both A &amp; B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have a test scenario tool to help the State develop tests. Recommended varying responsibility roles for different tests,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J. Training</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bring a proprietary library of content and templates. State that an assessment needs to be done of various groups to determine best delivery mechanisms and timing. Will work with whatever delivery tools we already have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K. Organizational Change Management</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bring a robust and formulaic approach to OCM. I have some concern about State fatigue and what additional strategies can be brought to address it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L. Cutover and Final Acceptance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Timeline is based on BPA showing a solid foundation. Timeline is aggressive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M. Warranty and Post-Production Services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Did not see six-month warranty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Keep full staffing during the first 90-days of production. Might be an opportunity to negotiate a slimmer if it reaches contract phase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N. Requirements Matrix (Appendix G)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluated all items in the RTM with the majority identified as possible with out-of-the-box Workday. Some confusing language and indicators that bidder did not find some clear. To be fully addressed in BPA period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O. Deliverables</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P. Additional Licenses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q. Assumptions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• State resources need to be available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requirement that minimum percentage of decisions can be made w/o executive involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Scope is as we presented.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3. Implementation – Work Plan**

- Not proposing a phased implementation.

**4. Resources – Staffing Plan**

- Solid experience with oversight exec.
- Impressive combined government implementation experience

**5. Proposed Governance Structure**

- As expected
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrived late. Did leadership roles even introduce? Ie, Ryan Oakes and Rick Webb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments reflected an adaptive approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor cost distribution knowledge was extensive but didn’t hear much on successes in addressing complex issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like to have heard more from specific team leads – got enough in the interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bringing a team that has solid government implementation experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Personnel Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Six implementation tenants and then into three after go-live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledges this is difficult – specifically in tenant mgmt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The “on the ground” team demonstrated experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinforced we figure out what you need and adapt – in the context of training and materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oh, for each payroll process, do two to three parallels test runs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heard them talk about how they work with Premier and were complimentary. Good experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are pressing us to buy Prism and maybe Extend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAPP can be migrated into our Jira/Confluence after go-live if we desire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Part IV. Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience (File #2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix D notes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53 Workday government clients; 34 live (25 as prime implementation partner, 9 as subcontractor to Workday - File 2 p 12), 16 in process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have worked with governments with 10k+ employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Dallas - project paused &amp; &quot;recalibrated&quot;; engaged with Fire &amp; Police previous experience working w Premier for data migration - Dallas, Iowa, Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa - Provided Change Management lead and performed change readiness survey for 19k employees; integrated Workday with CGI Advantage Financials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTE: previous conversations with Iowa have indicated that they are doing a manual, labor intensive Labor Cost Distribution rather than trying to use Workday to do it; although it appears Iowa is now in the process of implementing Finance - will they be improving LCD when it goes live?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore - development of Time Tracking and scheduling solutions for Fire &amp; Police; staggered go-live: HCM, Benefits, Compensation &amp; Absences first; Payroll and Time Tracking a few months later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTE: Baltimore made headlines for massive payroll errors following go-live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver - Accenture led all areas of project; 2017 go-live; &quot;model&quot; for government implementations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File #2 notes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alliance with Workday began in 2008 - 14 years experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquired Sierra Cedar in 2020 - government focused business since 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workday Government practice has ~ 300 staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workday total practice ~2,000 staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platinum certified Workday partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forrester lists Accenture as a &quot;Workday Implementation Leader&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Dallas project paused and "recalibrated" - very similar to ME in size and complexity change management program is tailored for government organizations p4 |

| 18 statewide ERP implementations (Workday and other products) |
| Proposed staff for ME project include 16 consultants that worked on Dallas, Iowa, Baltimore, Denver |
| Dallas - payroll parallel performed 4x; validation included active participation from departments Iowa- developed training videos, newsletters, infographics; job aids, virtual instructor courses, training materials |
| Workday mobile deployed to multiple clients |

---

Rev. 2/4/2020
Public safety personnel (Dallas) - developed scheduling system to accommodate rapidly changing schedules - included integration with Kronos p16
Denver - developed "rapid hire" process to quickly hire a large volume of seasonal employees - this experience could be helpful for areas like Legislative and Parks p24
Experience includes law enforcement, military, corrections, hospitals, transportation p26
Many government clients with multiple unions from 4 to 18 p27
Experience with big bang and phased approaches
Experience integrating Workday to a data warehouse
Experience working with Workday product development team and Product Advisory Group to develop new/ improved functionality p33
Scheduling - developed within Workday and integrated to third party; developed in Workday Time Tracking "Manager-Created Work Schedules" so managers can edit within the system p34
LCD - will provide "Subject Matter Advisor" - Proposed team member- former State Comptroller who developed labor cost distribution solution for MA p34
Experience developing benefits solutions that retirees and dependents are enrolled in appropriate plans p35
Product experience - 33 live HCM, 26/27 live Payroll/ Time tracking p36; also Benefits, Absence, Recruiting, Talent, Financials
Integrations - with multiple Active Directory’s and CGI Advantage p36
Data - has worked with government clients on data conversion in conjunction with Premier, translating data and ensuring it functions in the new system, resolving data quality issues p37
Reporting - bring Reporting Repository and Developer Toolbox - library of dozens of custom report definitions and calculated fields p38
Org chart - p41

Part IV. Section III. Proposed Services (File #3)
1. Services to be Provided

2. A. Project Management and Administration Requirements

- P2 intro - talks about transparency, team dynamics, overcoming potential resistance to WD project
- Will use “Business Process Alignment”, change management and executive engagement services in addition to Workday methodology
- Will confirm BPs as currently performed in legacy, current WD config, and organizational readiness
- Will begin by leveraging BP documentation and RTM p3; Understand that we have indicated we are unlikely to repurpose existing configurations but will look for opportunities to take advantage of them where possible
- “If the configuration meets the State’s requirement, we will confirm the configuration and move the item to the next stage in the process. If the configuration does not meet the requirement, we will re-configure or develop a solution paper with options for the State team to decide.” p4
• BPA deliverable = confirmation of findings report on each business process that will identify the steps needed for completion.
• "Workday Technology Center" pool of experts
• templates and strategies used to develop a tailored approach to helping the State’s employees move past their prior experiences toward acceptance and enthusiasm for Workday
• TAPP The Accenture Project Portal project management tool p9 - If the State elects to use its SharePoint site and not the project portal, Accenture will work with the State to use SharePoint while maintaining compliance-related information in TAPP for purposes of PMO reporting.
• Q - since trying to maintain versions between Sharepoint and TAPP would be logistically difficult, how would we get the information out at end of project to meet State document retention policies?
• TAPP includes dashboards for project members
• Resource Capacity Tool p12 compares State staffing levels that will be needed for the project with the work schedules, availability, and planned time off of the State’s project team members. The tool produces a graph of staffing levels as well as a red/yellow/green view of State staff available and compares this information to project resource needs.
• Testing and data - Accenture supports and has experience with Kainos and Premier on government implementations
• Risk register - pre-loaded based on experience with government projects
• Quality Assurance Director assigned to every project
• Accenture PMO conducts weekly and monthly calls with all project managers; provides collaboration for issues, risks, and solution options p18
• All changes in scope resources or timeline will be documented p18 and subject to analysis - Accenture will draft a Decision Paper to present to Steering Committee, including options and impacts

B. Analysis and Design

C. Requirements and Analysis

• BPA process enhanced to meet needs of government; has been delivered to almost 30 public entities p20
• Key BPA activities includes reviewing business processes that are not aligned to Workday processes to determine reason; action plan will include change management approaches for each process change
• Data model p21 - discusses structuring data and building reports to meet GFOA financial reporting requirements such as fund type, activity, and function, so they can be derived through the account summaries, cost center and fund hierarchies, and other worktags if necessary
• Will review workflows and current configurations, including process documents and actual system configurations p21
• will document any differences between the Workday standard processes and current configurations or requirements to begin the refinement or reconfiguration that may be required to move forward p22
• Change management for Stakeholders - Accenture will lead the design of a Stakeholder Matrix that will outline the requirements for each audience type (stakeholder) and how the requirements will be achieved
• Did not provide recommendations for solutions for complex Labor Cost Distribution or scheduling

Rev. 2/4/2020
D. Design
- Throughout the Architect Stage, active participation by business process owners and business area experts, representing all areas of the State, will be important because each of these entities must approve the business process designs and resulting system configuration. P25
- Accenture will provide a hands-on reporting workshop that builds on the Workday training by developing actual reports needed by the State p25

E. Configuration and Development
- Test Scenario Generator tool to support creation of State specific tests p26
- Accenture strongly recommends using standard processes - If, during BPA, the State determines that additional solutioning is required, Accenture will provide guidance based on our knowledge and experiences with other government organizations and discuss impacts to timeline, pricing, and other project details p28

F. Integrations and Interfaces
- Experienced integrating w CGI Advantage financials for government entities
- Integration catalog can be leveraged > 4,000 integrations

G. Data and Analytics
- Report Repository - dozens of custom report definitions specific to public sector p29
- Did not address how they would help SOM determine whether reporting should be done within HRMS or from data warehouse

H. Data Conversion
- Data Quality Platform was designed to analyze and profile data and provide a visualization of quality, completeness, and conformity p31
- Data conversion dashboard in TAPP project portal p33
- Data Conversion Accelerator Tool loads data into staging environment for normalization and more complex validations; data is moved directly into Workday bypassing iLoads p34
- Accenture will collaborate with Premier to develop data plan p35
- Historical data - included is a workshop to evaluate how to effectively address data retention; will provide pricing for historical data services once the State has determined its desired approach p35
- Proposing builds of 5 tenants

I. Testing
- Accenture will coordinate with SOM including use of Kainos p36
- An additional payroll parallel plan will document the path to achieve accuracy of payroll processing with financial posting p36
- State will create State-specific test scenarios from baseline Workday test scenarios using Test Scenario Generator tool - which comes with a library of test scenarios developed from other projects
- Q - Payroll Parallel testing - reconcile results to legacy - how and to what level of detail?

J. Training
- Training Needs Assessment to understand the State’s audiences and what type of work they do today, then review in comparison to configurations and business processes p40
- Will provide library of training content templates - recommend collaborative development of training materials
- "Bytes of Knowledge" video library will be provided for training
- Q - will "Bytes of Knowledge" continue to be available after go-live and is there a cost?
K. Organizational Change Management

- Change management program designed specifically for governments
- model p46 includes strong executive and sponsor programming and workshops
- Q - how do they handle someone in a leadership position that is resistant to change, that we have limited influence over?
- will deliver an Impact Assessment to assess how business process changes that will affect end users p48
- Accenture will deploy a change readiness survey completed by State stakeholders; additional surveys will be done periodically to measure effectiveness of change management program
- Proprietary workshops that focus on change readiness p50

L. Cutover and Final Acceptance

- No comments

M. Warranty and Post-Production Services

- Post-production support for 90 days requirement met
- Optional one year optimization support services including continued access to TAPP project portal tool

N. Requirements Matrix (Appendix G)

- Chart on p4 RTM item status does not correspond to the comments on the RTM spreadsheet so it is difficult to trace from summary chart to spreadsheet details
- Have identified 31 items that cannot be met with Workday functionality and will work with SOM to develop a solution p3 -RTM spreadsheet response doesn't identify which items these are
- Q - Have identified 1710 RTM items that can be met with out-of-the box functionality - if this assumption is not met how will it affect timeline & cost?

O. Deliverables

- "Owner" role noted as shared in multiple places - need clarity on associated responsibilities
- Accenture is "owner" for all Executive Engagement and Change Management tasks/ deliverables except end-user content development and training p62

P. Additional Licenses

- None proposed

Q. Assumptions

- Scope is identified in Business Process Documentation and Requirements Traceability Matrix - doesn't reference functional requirements narrative in RFP
- assumption that the State will accept the leading practice-based processes that are included within the software
- Accenture recommends that the State increase the number of change management FTEs to a minimum of 6 for this project

3. Implementation – Work Plan

- Business Process Alignment - 3 months
- Deployment - 10 months + 90 day warranty
- Accenture built their project staffing to allow flexibility to extend go-live date to end of fiscal year

4. Resources – Staffing Plan
demonstrate extensive Workday and public sector experience although proposed roles don't completely match the references provided

Accenture will endeavor to staff this team on the State’s project, however, the final team will be confirmed based on final agreed start date.

Many of these individuals have worked together on other government implementations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Proposed Governance Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• No comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Demonstrations / Presentation

- 13 public sector Workday clients with >10,000 employees
- Change management – focuses on organizational readiness, not just communication and training
- Foundation data model – will review our CGI chart of accounts and align with key data elements in Workday – strong CGI experience
- Including finance workstream consultant rather than relying on HR or payroll consultants to do the foundational data work
- Accenture has significant influence and access with Workday due to being 2nd largest employer using Workday, and being Workday’s partner for developing government sector client base
- Accenture meets regularly with Workday executives to promote enhancing the product for government entities

Key Personnel Interviews

- Will provide & develop parallel payroll strategy document; default is 2 parallel tests for each cycle, with an option to add a 3rd if needed
**Part IV. Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience (File #2)**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Overview of the Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Q: Workday partner, deploying Workday since 2008 and providing services on Workday since 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• N: Documentation related to references was not made available at the time of the submission, but Bidder would coordinate reference calls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Implementation Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 1,330 Workday certified consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• P – Over 25 years of experience with over 200 government clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I – Alight’s approach to union and collective bargaining agreements is to “harmonize” processes whenever possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• P – Experience in the Workday Accelerated Deployment Methodology including Plan, Architect, Configuration &amp; Prototype, Testing phases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Q – Experience provided is high level and does not provide examples of experience around implementation methodology, implementing reporting functionality, or resolving challenges in implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Product Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I – Alight has deployment experience in all Workday modules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I – Alight has a repository of all client integrations in proprietary tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I – Experience in training consists of self service activities as well as embedded help options, step by step instructions, navigational demos, and instructor led training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Subcontractors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Alight does not plan on using subcontractors for this deployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Organizational Chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Alight proposed roles include Delivery Oversight Executive, Project Manager, Lead Business Analyst, Lead Technical Architect, Data Analyst, Testing Lead, Change Management Lead, Consultant and Trainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Litigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Detail could not be ascertained at the time of review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Financial Viability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• D&amp;B Viability Low Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Licensure/Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 1,332 employees who are Workday certified with over 3,600 certifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Certificate of Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- B. Analysis and Design
- C. Requirements Analysis
- D. Design
- E. Configuration and Development
- F. Integrations and Interfaces
- G. Data and Analytics
- H. Data Conversion
- I. Testing
- J. Training
- K. Organizational Change Management
- L. Cutover and Final Acceptance
- M. Warranty and Post-Production Services
- N. Requirements Matrix (Appendix G)
- O. Deliverables
- P. Additional Licenses
- Q. Assumptions

3. Implementation – Work Plan

4. Resources – Staffing Plan

5. Proposed Governance Structure
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Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

Part IV. Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience (File #2)

1. Overview of the Organization
   • Workday partner since 2008 (Deploying since 2008, services since 2013?)

2. Implementation Experience
   • No specific case studies or references provided
   • No State clients experience provided
   • Recommend big-bang (all modules and only stagger functionality)
   • No specific experience referenced in response to questions
   • Only reference post-go-live activities regarding labor cost distribution

3. Product Experience
   • “Alight has deployment experience in all Workday modules.” No specific references provided to support this statement.

4. Subcontractors
   • None proposed

5. Organizational Chart
   • No organizational chart provided. Named resources identified only.

6. Litigation
   • “range of pending claims and litigation in the ordinary course of its business”

7. Financial Viability
   • Low risk

8. Licensure/Certification
   • Employees who are Workday certified

9. Certificate of Insurance

Part IV. Section III. Proposed Services (File #3)

1. Services to be Provided

2.
   A. Project Management and Administration Requirements
   •
   B. Analysis and Design
   •
   C. Requirements Analysis
   •
   D. Design
   •
   E. Configuration and Development
   •
**STATE OF MAINE**
**INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202110165  
**RFP TITLE:** Human Resources Management System (HRMS) Systems Integrator  
**BIDDER NAME:** Alight  
**DATE:** 1/17/22  
**EVALUATOR NAME:** Douglas Cotnoir  
**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** DAFS

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>Integrations and Interfaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Data and Analytics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.</td>
<td>Data Conversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.</td>
<td>Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.</td>
<td>Organizational Change Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.</td>
<td>Cutover and Final Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.</td>
<td>Warranty and Post-Production Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>Requirements Matrix (Appendix G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.</td>
<td>Deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.</td>
<td>Additional Licenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Implementation – Work Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Resources – Staffing Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Proposed Governance Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part IV. Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience (File #2)

1. Overview of the Organization
   - Benefits administration on multiple platforms since 1988.
   - Payroll services provider since 2000
   - Workday partner, deploying Workday since 2008; providing services on Workday in 2013
   - One of the most experienced Workday partners in the world

2. Implementation Experience
   - Depth – 1330+ consultants certified for Workday with over 3600 certifications
   - 25+ years partnering with 200+ public sector entities
   - Examples of Workday configuration for unions, etc.
   - IQ - harmonize union agreements
   - N – no public sector experience named
   - N - specificity

3. Product Experience
   - Note experience in all Workday modules
   - “Alight has provided deployment, operations and ongoing support services to some of the largest, most complex and longest-tenured Workday customers to date. Some of the, will provide specific details, however, have strict policies pertaining to providing public information without approval.”

4. Subcontractors
   - Does not plan to use subcontractors

5. Organizational Chart
   - No organizational chart
   - Named 9 individuals with titles (resumes on file)

6. Litigation
   - Range of pending claims in litigation

7. Financial Viability
   - Provided

8. Licensure/Certification
   - Did not provide documentation of Workday certification

9. Certificate of Insurance
   - Provided

Part IV. Section III. Proposed Services (File #3)

1. Services to be Provided

2.

   A. Project Management and Administration Requirements
STATE OF MAINE
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<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Analysis and Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Requirements Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. Configuration and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F. Integrations and Interfaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. Data and Analytics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H. Data Conversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. Testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K. Organizational Change Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L. Cutover and Final Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. Warranty and Post-Production Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N. Requirements Matrix (Appendix G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O. Deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P. Additional Licenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q. Assumptions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Implementation – Work Plan

4. Resources – Staffing Plan

5. Proposed Governance Structure
STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202110165
RFP TITLE: Human Resources Management System (HRMS) Systems Integrator
BIDDER NAME: Alight
DATE: January 14, 2022
EVALUATOR NAME: Fred Brittain
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DAFS

Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

Part IV. Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience (File #2)

1. Overview of the Organization
   Company was a divestiture and formed in 2017. No red flags

2. Implementation Experience
   • No specific implementations referenced and no language that generically connect Workday implementations with public sector

3. Product Experience
   • Statements do reference Workday and HCM.

4. Subcontractors
   • N/A

5. Organizational Chart
   • Missing a data and analytics lead. Maybe that is what they mean by data analyst

6. Litigation
   • OK

7. Financial Viability
   • OK

8. Licensure/Certification
   • OK

9. Certificate of Insurance
   • OK

Part IV. Section III. Proposed Services (File #3)

1. Services to be Provided

2. A. Project Management and Administration Requirements

2. B. Analysis and Design

2. C. Requirements Analysis

2. D. Design

2. E. Configuration and Development

2. F. Integrations and Interfaces

2. G. Data and Analytics

Rev. 2/4/2020
**STATE OF MAINE**
**INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202110165  
**RFP TITLE:** Human Resources Management System (HRMS) Systems Integrator  
**BIDDER NAME:** Alight  
**DATE:** January 14, 2022  
**EVALUATOR NAME:** Fred Brittain  
**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** DAFS

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.</td>
<td>Data Conversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.</td>
<td>Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.</td>
<td>Organizational Change Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.</td>
<td>Cutover and Final Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.</td>
<td>Warranty and Post-Production Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>Requirements Matrix (Appendix G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.</td>
<td>Deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.</td>
<td>Additional Licenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Assumptions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Implementation – Work Plan**

4. **Resources – Staffing Plan**

5. **Proposed Governance Structure**
Part IV. Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience (File #2)

| Workday partner since 2008 for deployments; "providing services" since 2013? Not sure what that means |
| Runs a proprietary benefits administration platform; payroll service provider since 2000 |
| Alight established in 2017 from Aon Corporation; became publicly traded July 2021 |
| Did not provide reference projects, citing confidentiality |
| Could have anonymized projects |
| "significant experience with clients that have over 10k employees and complex benefits, payroll and time tracking requirements" - doesn't specify if they are governmental and/or Workday clients p3 |
| Public sector practice 200+ public entities - not specific to Workday or if they are related to implementations; doesn't cite any experience with law enforcement, corrections etc p3 |
| Didn't cite any specific implementation experience |
| Union experience - discusses using conditional parameters to meet specific union requirements; doesn't disclose any governmental union experience p4 |
| Leverages Workday deployment methodology, with generic descriptions of the stages p4-5 |
| Big-bang versus phased approach - discusses pros and cons but doesn't provide examples of their experience p5 |
| Data - says they have tools to accelerate data validation but no descriptions or examples p6; client is responsible for mapping data to Workday-specific values and providing to Alight in standard format p10 |
| Testing - uses automated tools that they claim no other partner can provide that will be tailored to SOM implementation p7 |
| Alight Quality Assurance for testing integrations is a separate service |
| Strategic Advisory practice builds in change management; four toolkits with activities and deliverables p8 |
| Scheduling - worker-specific scheduling to give managers control and flexibility in assigning unique schedules rather than having to select from a list of existing schedules; ability to make ad hoc changes p8 |
| "Expect minimal configuration changes or maintenance needs as part of the Labor Allocation" - as stated in the RFP, we were looking for evidence of experience configuring complex LCD p9 |
For retirees and benefits: just states that benefit plans are driven by eligibility rules and need to capture relevant data p10
Implementation experience - states that they have experience with all Workday modules, provides no information to support level of experience p10
Data warehouse - didn’t answer question; response was more relevant to data conversion question
Reporting - will review legacy reports and map to standard Workday reports; create custom reports if needed p11
Training - flexible approach, methods and materials vary by client p12

No mention of experience with a project being in a pause or reviewing work that has been done to date
No mention of experience with law enforcement, corrections, other public sector groups
Responses are generic and minimal; don’t demonstrate level of experience or experience in governmental industry
Vendor has not provided adequate information regarding some of the challenge areas we identified and requested them to demonstrate experience

Part IV. Section III. Proposed Services (File #3)
1. Services to be Provided
2.
   A. Project Management and Administration Requirements
      •
   B. Analysis and Design
      •
   C. Requirements Analysis
      •
   D. Design
      •
   E. Configuration and Development
      •
   F. Integrations and Interfaces
      •
   G. Data and Analytics
      •
   H. Data Conversion
      •
   I. Testing
      •
   J. Training
      •
   K. Organizational Change Management
      •
   L. Cutover and Final Acceptance
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.</td>
<td>Warranty and Post-Production Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>Requirements Matrix (Appendix G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.</td>
<td>Deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.</td>
<td>Additional Licenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Assumptions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Implementation – Work Plan

4. Resources – Staffing Plan

5. Proposed Governance Structure
**Part IV. Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience (File #2)**

### 1. Overview of the Organization
- **P:** Involved in multiple “rescue”/restart projects – Florida Institute of Technology, Caterpillar Inc.
- **P:** 100% deployment experience with over 1000 clients
- **I:** Workday only partner since 2007, Consultants have an average 30% more experience than other partners
- Helped design the current Workday methodology used by all partners
- **I:** 450 Workday customers, 87 Workday Product leads, 1,030 Workday certifications
- **I:** 55+ Workday Payroll deployments

### 2. Implementation Experience
- **I:** Key resources – “Ensure that proper resources are dedicated to the deployment...we recommend that you backfill the operational roles of resources that will need to pivot their time and skills to the project”
- **I:** Recommend a single phased approach for all functionality that is in scope
  - fewer integrations
  - Less “throw away” effort
  - Support one system vs. multiple
- Collaborative has built over 7,000 integrations with experience in data warehousing, financials and client systems
- **I:** Scheduling recommendation – for complex scheduling, Collaborative recommends using a third party software
- **Q:** Labor Cost Distribution – Collaborative experience with using Workday Projects

### 3. Product Experience
- **I:** Benefits experience – example outlines plans for employee under and over 65 with spouse plans for under and over 65
- **P:** Extensive experience deploying HCM and Benefits
- **I:** Recommends 3 Payroll Parallel cycles compared to the industry standard of 2
- **P:** Collaborative’s imPaCT Payroll Comparison Tool – validates each code and highlights exceptions, compares gross to net by employee
- **I:** Time Clocks – experience implementing AccuTime (ATS) and Kronos
- **I:** Collaborative has proprietary software to handle data conversion
- **P:** Training – multiple audiences, early training, with multiple methods used (e.g. Knowledge Transfer, Train the Trainer, Instructor led, videos, job aids, quick reference guides)

### 4. Subcontractors
- Does not plan to use Subcontractors

### 5. Organizational Chart
STATE OF MAINE
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- Collaborative team members to include: Portfolio Director, Functional Architect, Engagement Manager, Project Associate, Executive Sponsor, Test Manager, Functional Consultant(s), Integration Consultant(s), Data Conversion Consultant(s), Change Architect, Organizational Change and training Lead, Organization lead, Training Lead, Developers and Principals, Strategy Architect, and a Strategy Lead

6. Litigation

7. Financial Viability
   • Provided

8. Licensure/Certification
   • "Collaborative Solutions is the longest tenured Workday Services Partner, establishing our partnership in 2007"

9. Certificate of Insurance
   • Provided

Part IV. Section III. Proposed Services (File #3)
1. Services to be Provided

2.
   A. Project Management and Administration Requirements
      • Cynergy methodology – baselined with Workday deployment methodology along with Collaborative tool sets and best practices:
        • Collaboration Suite (SharePoint site) used to facilitate sharing of information between customer and Collaborative team members.
        • Project Management Toolkit which includes templates for weekly status reports, project plan, project charter, project financials tracking and architect workshop schedule.
        • Customer Knowledge Transfer ensure successful customer system operation at time of Go-Live.
        • Recommends one on one outreach to agency leadership
        • Weekly status meetings and reports, Internal biweekly meetings for Collaborative, interim deliverable acceptance from the State with formal sign off, issue management and resolution logs, issue escalation, risk mitigation, scope management, and participation in steering committee
        • Project tasks outlined on Pages 8-17 including roles and responsibilities
        • Payroll Parallel consists of 3 parallel runs
        • Assumptions:
          • The State will use Collaborative provided central repository solution for non-sensitive project document sharing.
          • Sign-off at the completion of each stage
   
   B. Analysis and Design
      • Discovery sessions to review challenges, requirements and details associated with the requirements traceability matrix
      • Tenant assessment – to identify remaining work/configuration needs (reconfig and net new config needs)

   C. Requirements Analysis
      • Conduct a meeting with key stakeholders from the State to share findings and recommendations to be the basis for the statement of work
STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES
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<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Design</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Look to optimize business processes and not just what the State does today</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Architect phase – walk through of each “to be built” process to determine in the process can be leveraged without modification – if modification is required, document why and impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design decisions will be configured and presented back to the State project team during Architect and Customer Confirmation stages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Customer confirmation is the stage where design decisions are finalized and agreed upon to ensure the Test stage focuses on testing production-ready configuration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>E. Configuration and Development</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Given the size and complexity of the State to be supported by Workday, the design of the system will involve several parallel discussions and reviews, all generating input to the configuration of the system. As a result, the team utilizes a structured process for capturing, reviewing, approving, and tracking configuration items throughout the project lifecycle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>F. Integrations and Interfaces</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborative’s integrations team uses a centralized model, where all the integrations are designed and delivered by consultants, who are a part of our Accelerated Cloud Deployment Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tools include Cloud Connect, EIB (for simple outbound integrations), and tools called Document Transformation and Workday Studio for more complex integrations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accelerated Cloud Deployment Center (ACDC) team is used in conjunction with the local project team; more complex integrations are assigned to the Collaborative team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“re-use of proven integration frameworks”; 30% savings in time and cost through use of ACDC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>G. Data and Analytics</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborative will facilitate reviewing current-state requirements and future-state requirements against Workday delivered functionality to determine what is a good fit as delivered versus what requires a custom solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Report Tracker will be established early in the project as a single source of truth for all report considerations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborative will help walk through the advantages of a central reporting team vs reporting resources at each Agency, and other ways to manage on-going reporting demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dashboards also discussed (Page 24)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>H. Data Conversion</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simplified Data Collection Files – State provides data in Excel files and Collaborative maps the data to the required Workday iLoad files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential for 2 tenants v. the 4 tenant builds for new projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Lather, Rinse, Repeat” method for data conversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Process recommended based on Collaborative having responsibility for data conversion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>I. Testing</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborative test templates refined through 100s of deployments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Testing Manager from Collaborative to work with the State Testing Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Testing responsibility and support outlined (Page 26-27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unit &amp; Smoke Testing performed by Collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborate guides and provides support in End to End, Payroll Parallel, Regression and Security testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Testing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **J. Training** |   |

Rev. 2/4/2020
**Collaborative approach** is to provide training tailored to end users and other stakeholders, dependent on the specific roles and business functions they perform. Based on size of implementation, testing would take several months. Begin training with centralized roles and departments toward the middle to end of the Test stage, and then expand training to reach the decentralized roles and areas of the organization. Training methods outlined (Page 28 and 29). Augment testing with assessments and evaluations.

**K. Organizational Change Management**
- I – bottom up v top down methodology to change management
- Transparency, simplify and streamline, limit complexity, design and build for the future
- OC&T scope and division of responsibilities are assigned in the statement of work for each project.

**L. Cutover and Final Acceptance**
- Cutover plan owned by the Engagement Manager and Maine’s Project Manager
- Planning begins towards the end of the Testing Phase
- Go/No Go Decision occurs after completing all testing and prior to deployment phase

**M. Warranty and Post-Production Services**
- thirty (30) days following the delivery of a particular deliverable (or the performance of a particular Service)
- 3 month post production support

**N. Requirements Matrix (Appendix G)**
- Provided

**O. Deliverables**
- Collaborative deliverables, by service, listed on Pages 33 and 34

**P. Additional Licenses**
- Complex Scheduling – Collaborative will work with the State and recommend (if required) an alternate tool.

**Q. Assumptions**
- Assumption around Advanced Compensation functionality that is under a separate SKU for automated merit and bonus processing

**3. Implementation – Work Plan**
- Detailed Project Plan Provided
- Assessment period of 22 weeks
- Deploy 11/6-12/17/23 (Go Live 12/18/23)
- CVS Transition (58 weeks) into Feb/Mar 2025
- RACI Model Provided

**4. Resources – Staffing Plan**
- Dedicated resources including Engagement Manager, Functional and Technical Leads supported by a staff of functional and technical analysts
- Provided as Appendix J

**5. Proposed Governance Structure**
- Provided (Page 39)
Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bidder’s Experience – First strategic Workday partner (in 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o First Partner in Workday Engagement Manager Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o 1,000 Workday Clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o 98% client satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Never removed from a Workday project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Workday customer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Have worked with Premier and Kainos in the past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o All resources identified are onshore resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Education/Government Sector clients – Jackson Co MS, Anoka Co, City of Ontario (CA), City of Gainsville and others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Cross Certified Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Experience in project “takeover” (paused and challenged)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Caterpillar – Workday SKUs – HCM, Comp, Benefits, Absence, Recruiting, US Payroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o 150+ Integrations, 340 BPs, 150 Core Team Members, 1.2 Million Data Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Florida Tech – Workday SKUs – HCM (Full Suite), Payroll and Financials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Filled resource gaps with CS staff augmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Strategic Partner, not just an implementor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Consolidated and Automated legacy reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Staff Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Relationship, Project Management, Post Production, Technical, OC&amp;T and oversight teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o HCM Functional Architect - ~8 Years WD Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o HCM Lead – 10 Years WD Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Benefits Lead – 15 Years WD Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Recruiting Lead – 6 Years CS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o TT&amp; Abs – 10 Years Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Payroll – 30 Years Experience (8+ Years in Workday)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Reporting and Analytics – 5 Years w/ CS 16 Years Experience in HR systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Implementation Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Follows Cynergy Methodology (built on WD methodology) w/ assessment phase in place of Plan phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Go through artifacts 1 by 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Asset library is built on SharePoint and will be transferred to State at the conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Proprietary Tools – enhanced data validation reporting, ImPact Tool (compare tool for payroll parallel), Integration Tracker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Items – tenant management, timeline, risk management, governance structure, lessons learned all covered

Key Issues/Risks
- Scheduling
  - Workday Advanced Scheduling is in beta testing (targeted for Summer of 2022)
  - CS experienced w/ 3rd party scheduling tools
- Labor Cost Distribution
  - Configuration options – Project Tracking
  - Project Groups, Project Hierarchies, and Worker Groups to group workers and avoid assigning individually
- Benefits
  - Experience w/ cross plan dependency rules
  - Plan Costs – Individual rates or calculated rates
- Reporting and Data Analytics
  - Myriad of reporting options in Workday including potentially the use of Prism to bring in additional data
  - CS recommends that they handle the load to Workday

Application Operational Consideration
- CS will want to go through their process assessment to

Support Structure
- Identify the different types of requests and delineate the types and stakeholders

FDM – Chart of Accounts and Org Structures
- Costing Orgs (Company, Cost Centers, Locations, Bus, Custom Orgs)
- HCM Orgs (Sup Orgs, Union, Retiree, Custom Orgs)
- Time Tracking Projects
- Job Data
- Bank Accounts

Warranty Period
- CS and SOM will establish a process for deliverable review and acceptance as well as change control procedures during the assessment phase
- CS proposing 90 days
- Original consultants will remain through duration of warranty
- Post Production vs Warranty Period?
- Post Production Support – Extended Period (12 Mos)
  - Can include staff augmentation
  - Can purchase consulting hours to be used for support, new functionality, reporting, kt, operations (lean on model)

Partnership – will manage relationship w/ Workday other than subscription contract with Workday and WD led training required

Delivery Assurance if State engages in DA w/ Workday

Key Personnel Interviews
- Hillsborough County – What makes them complex
  - Full Platform
  - Several Rules around time tracking/financial routings
  - Disparate systems
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time tracking inherit challenges with government clients – unified, cohesive system. Properly understand all requirements; ensure identification of key stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• OCM – highly engaged network, self-paced with monthly videos; the use of Prosci’s methodology is interwoven to go beyond other OCM activities in Cynegy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assessment = review of existing artifacts (RTM, Integrations, Reports)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Data handoff E&amp;T = State, L in ETL = CS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No special difference in development, testing or roles and responsibilities between inbound or outbound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leads are full time/architects are not (TBD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Delivery Assurance – Workday strongly recommends. Collaborative also has an internal QA team that provides delivery assurance at the end of each phase. They also welcome an external, independent review through IV&amp;V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advanced Compensation is part of the compensation SKU and not a separate SKU. CS also recommends not leveraging at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Question #6 – “People Experience” new home page, OC&amp;T “journeys” and “help” and stored knowledge/training materials. Core Financials for projects. Advanced Scheduling is in Beta. CS was part of the Beta for multiple clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assessment phase is 22 weeks (14 weeks to do the work and 8 weeks for CS to adapt/adjust)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Integrations (ACDC) resources are not shared and are dedicated; one caveat, during ramp up and ramp down periods, resources may not be dedicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Custom solution for reporting refers to custom reports and not custom solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Input for payroll parallel is time entry where applicable and pay input if source is pay input (i.e. MDOT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tools are provided to the project team for Prosci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have not collaborated with parent company re: Kronos implementations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part IV. Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience (File #2)

1. Overview of the Organization
   • “longest tenured Workday partner”

2. Implementation Experience
   • City and County experience referenced
   • “Rescued” projects from failed deployments at Caterpillar, Inc, Montgomery College, Florida Institute of Technology
   • Maryland Environmental Services – lead implementor for all modules
   • Washington University – lead implementor for all modules
   • Hillsborough County Sheriff, Florida – Lead implementor for all modules
   • No State experience referenced

3. Product Experience
   • Significant experience in all relevant modules

4. Subcontractors
   • None proposed

5. Organizational Chart
   • No organizational chart provided. Comprehensive listing and description of roles identified.

6. Litigation
   •

7. Financial Viability
   • Low risk

8. Licensure/Certification
   • Workday services partner since 2007

9. Certificate of Insurance
   •

Part IV. Section III. Proposed Services (File #3)

1. Services to be Provided
   • Cynergy methodology. Collaborative helped build Workday methodology, then developed Cynergy to accommodate large enterprise customers – p. 4
   • Collaboration Suite, Project Management Toolkit, Customer Knowledge Transfer tools – p. 4

2. Analysis and Design
   A. Project Management and Administration Requirements
      • Cynergy

   B. Analysis and Design
• Discovery sessions and tenant assessment – p. 18,19

C. Requirements Analysis

D. Design
• Build initial configuration after defining vision, guiding principles, goals & objectives, success criteria – p. 19

E. Configuration and Development
• Discovery sessions and tenant assessment – p. 19,20

F. Integrations and Interfaces
• Accelerated Cloud Deployment Center – p. 20

G. Data and Analytics
• Cynergy Report Tracker tool – p. 22, 23
• Advantages of a central reporting team rather than resources at each agency – p. 23

H. Data Conversion
• Assess what has been done by auditing data procedures, then identify gaps – p. 24
• Utilize proprietary Daytona tool for data validation – p. 24

I. Testing
• Separate Performance and Security testing – p. 27

J. Training

K. Organizational Change Management
• Head, heart, hands approach – p. 30

L. Cutover and Final Acceptance

M. Warranty and Post-Production Services
• 30 days following deliverable or service performance – p. 32
• Statement about 90 day post-go-live support – p. 33
• No statement of optional one year services

N. Requirements Matrix (Appendix G)

O. Deliverables
• Listed deliverables from RFP – p. 33

P. Additional Licenses
• Use Workday Finance limited license – p. 34
• May recommend a scheduling tool after requirements review – p. 34
**Workday Advanced Compensation** – does the State “now” or “not” own this? – p. 34

### Q. Assumptions

- No additional assumptions other than those listed in p above – p. 34

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Implementation – Work Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Go-live December 2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Resources – Staffing Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- No finance or LCD lead identified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Proposed Governance Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Demonstrations**

- Industry group covers education, government and not for profits. Significantly more higher ed than governmental
- Highlight paused/challenged projects: Caterpillar (100k+ employees in 25 countries); Florida Tech (started at config/prototype stage but completed in 10 months)
- Restart methodology only replaces Plan Stage with an Assessment Stage
- 900+ templates in Cynergy asset library, enhanced data validation, ImPact Tool (for payroll validation) and integrations tracker
- Critical success factors: resource consistency, communications, planning & monitoring, testing support, OC&T (no mention of trust, partnership or collaboration with State resources)
- Plan a go-live to be at the start of a quarter (in our case, start of calendar year).
- New tenant build at each stage (6 tenants displayed)
- Risk review and mitigation on a regular cadence throughout (RAID log)
- Workday Advanced Scheduling tool in beta with Collaborative participating (targeting Summer 2022 for availability). Cognizant, Collaborative’s parent company, is a leading Kronos solutions implementor
- Use project tracking and configure time entry to allow time block entry to projects. Configure project groups, project hierarchies and worker groups for maintenance. Use costing allocations with worktags and prorations. Project funding source configuration to reclassify expenses
- Recommends Collaborative’s Daytona tool for data loads; does not recommend Premier. Not afraid of bad legacy data; it is expected
- Extensive “testing” presentation during session related to key issues and identified risks when the State did not identify this as a key issue or risk
- Financials team involved from beginning
- Proposal to warranty 90 days post go-live (inconsistent with RFP requirements)
- CVS following hypercare. “Lean-on” services available to supplement support based on block of hours included in contract
- Collaborative handles all interaction with Workday except subscription to the Workday platform and Workday provided training
- No tangible examples of OCM activities designed to directly address prior failure concerns or project fatigue. Approach consistent with any project OCM effort
- Prior experience with coordination/cooperation with IV&V, auditors, QA teams and 3rd party vendors
- LCD question – Some functionality in core Financials SKU; Gainesville very complicated setup; 90% of government clients have had requirements for project accounting at some level; use calculated fields in time-tracking
CGI financials question – Gainesville required mapping to CGI financials for the utility division; Workday is fairly system agnostic when it comes to mapping COA. Use hierarchies for maintenance purposes, not to tie to COA hierarchies.

What government project was comparable to Maine in size and complexity? – WashU (size) and Hillsborough County Sheriff (complexity)

Warranty period for 12 weeks of post-production support. Took issue with 6 month period defined by State as they will stand by work done as long as they continue to be engaged. Want to clarify warranty expectation if selected

OCM - Not a traditional structure approach to the change network. Target our needs and our specific challenges through the strategy activities in the assessment phase. Identify what new roles look like through personas and identify what skills/training are necessary in the interim; Ia building blocks for change without too much specificity that might be retracted later (e.g., dates, etc.). Approach executives at an individual level, customize approach with unique WIIFM messages to each executive

Key Personnel Interviews

Hillsborough implementation – live 2 months ago. Complexity was full platform, several Time Tracking and Financials approval routing; old disparate systems being replaced (OCM impact); Autonomous time tracking groups with differing needs (requirements gathering from appropriate stakeholders)

Q1 – Integrate ProSci methodology into Cynergy (prepare, manage, reinforce). Assess, then adapt as necessary; will be unique to the State of Maine

Q2 – PM artifacts are useful, especially IJA assessment and recommendations. Perform discovery and assessment to build momentum in early stage as we develop statement of work

Role with Premier – Using Premier to do what? Extraction makes sense and maybe transformation (as they are customer responsibilities); hand-off for load to Workday as a Collaborative responsibility, including loading the data into the Collaborative tool

Q3 – use experienced Collaborative staff for complex, custom, inbound integrations, typically. Model can be adjusted based on experience of State resources

Key staff: Time Blake-PM (19 yrs gov't ERP experience; PMP since 2006); Jeff Horinek-Testing Lead (HCM certified, 25 years leading test teams, ISTQB certified); Jennifer Durrett-Finance oversight (CPA, gov't accounting 10 years, auditor, controller; Paul Nicotera-Lead Architect -HCM functional architect-coordinating other workstreams as cross-functional lead (8 yrs w/ Collaborative, previously with Peoplesoft, HCM/Benefits/Comp/Reporting certified); Dave Manke-Lead Technical Analyst coordinating data conversion, reporting and integrations leads as cross-functional lead (20 years in software development, 10 years with Workday implementations)

Team dedication – Tim Blake would be assigned F/T, Natalie-weekly, Leads F/T, other consultants-sporadic F/T, P/T as needed, Testing-assess expectations for Kainos (Jeff F/T after customer confirmation sessions), Dave F/T post-assessment, Daniel F/T along with a Build Manager

Q4 – Strongly recommended by Workday; however, Collaborative recognizes our situation so they have planned their own QA and DA resources for this project. A lot of experience with IV&V vendors as well. Coordinate with them at phase checkpoints – does not change Collaborative’s QA/DA process

Q5 – The State does own Advanced Compensation as part of current licensing based on size, which would allow the State to manage merit processing with spreadsheets. Recommend deferring this workstream until after successful go-live
RFP #: 202110165
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| Q6 | People Experience (PEX) for change management and adoption; Core Financials for Labor Costing; WD Scheduling and Labor Optimization (beta only in production, not generally available until Summer 2022) |
| Q7 | Assessment last 14 weeks followed by 8 weeks to complete and prepare, for a total of 22 weeks |
| Q8 | Integrations staff on one project at a time, no offshore resources planned, consultant stays with integration throughout entire lifecycle |
| Q9 | None planned |
| Q10 | No additional licenses required during the project. Sharepoint artifacts can be saved to State repository |
| Q11 | Entire solution. Collaborative will support the State to review and assess release notes |
| Q12 | All pay groups and cycles included in each parallel test, selected carefully (holiday, bonus, etc.) and processed chronologically. 3 for Maine (2 for clients using payroll interface) |
| Q14 | ImPact will be used by Collaborative to identify variances that the State will investigate/resolve. Acceptance threshold is 99.9% (not 95% Workday standard) |
| Q15 | Duplicative of Q14 |
| Q16 | Robust government entity test cases as a starting point, but add Maine-specific scenarios |
| Q17 | Kronos has not been deployed with Cognizant as a partner; consultation only |
| Q18 | ProSci woven into entire Cynergy methodology, ADKAR built into deliverables (Comm Plan, Change Network, Training Strategy) |
### Part IV. Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience (File #2)

1. **Overview of the Organization**
   - Since 2003
   - 100% deployment success and 98% customer satisfaction
   - Longest tenured Workday Partner
   - Globally deployed Workday HCM and Financial Management for 1000+ in 125+ countries with multiple implementations
   - 16 ‘samples’ of government customers
   - HCM, payroll and financials solutions to Buncombe County< NC; Hartford County, MD; and Maryland Environmental Services.
   - ? – size of entities above
   - Full platform implementations include City of Gainesville, FL and City of Port Orange, FL
   - ? – size of entities above

2. **Implementation Experience**
   - 450 employees averaging 30% more Workday experience than average
   - Workday’s most tenured implementer; partner since 2007
   - 450+ Workday customers; 87 Workday Product Leads; 1030 Workday certifications
   - Longtime Workday customer themselves
   - Deployed Workday solutions in 125+ countries to date
   - Customers with 200 to 200,000 employees, in over 100 countries, nearly all industries
   - Executed over 55 Workday payroll deployments with 100% success
   - Has ‘saved’ customers from failed implementations – Caterpillar, Montgomery College, and Florida Institute of Technology
   - ? – size of the entities above
   - Has built over 7000 integrations over the course of Workday deployments
   - Largest Workday global partner
   - Almost 8 million lives on our systems across successfully delivered Workday projects for 1000+ clients with a track record of 100% deployment success; client satisfaction 98%
   - I – recommends backfilling positions in SOM for those who will be dedicated to implementation
   - Scheduling solutions – recommend leveraging external solution

3. **Product Experience**
   - 80% of deployments are HCM; 1000+ Workday clients, includes 290+ unique HCM clients
   - 100% success rate deploying Workday Benefits – leader in ecosystem
   - 100% success rate deploying Workday Payroll – reputation highest payroll standards
   - Absence Management for 230+ clients; Time Tracking for 150+ clients; up to 23,000 employees
Timeclock integrations
195+ Workday Recruiting deployments
Training audiences – Central HR; HR Partners; Recruiters; Managers; Employees

4. Subcontractors

- Response does not include subcontractors; work with Maine and their contractors

5. Organizational Chart

- Provided titles with role descriptions
- No organizational chart

6. Litigation

- Vague

7. Financial Viability

- Provided

8. Licensure/Certification

- 2007 partnership – listed on Workday page (provided link)

9. Certificate of Insurance

- provided

Part IV. Section III. Proposed Services (File #3)
1. Services to be Provided

2. A. Project Management and Administration Requirements

- Cynergy
- Project Management Tool Kit
- Collaboration Suite
- Customer Knowledge Transfer
- Phase 0 discovery
- Quality assurance with tools including Delivery Assurance Checkpoints
- Introduce executive sponsor and engagement manager early in process
- Review/Approve Work Plan – once approved, move forward with project activities
- Communication with project stakeholders – effective, consistent, timely w regular status reporting/mts with ESs and steering committee members & user/focus groups
- One-on-one outreach to Agency leadership at specific junctures
- Weekly status meetings/reports; project support status meetings; interim deliverable acceptance; issue management and resolution; issue escalation; risk management; scope management; steering committee meetings – schedule to be designed
- Project task chart provided w Stage/Task, Description, Client Resources, Collaborative Resources – no time descriptor (schedule later in document)

B. Analysis and Design

- Discovery sessions for all in scope functional areas and meet with key functional leads from the State
- Tenant assessment
- Interviews w functional leads

C. Requirements Analysis

- (all info mixed together – sorry. See above and below)

D. Design

- Strategic planning first
• Work with executive leadership early to define strategic vision, guiding principles, goals and objectives, and success measures
• Leverage tenant during architect stage to show key data elements and walk through each process to be created
• Modifications require reason
• Design decisions finalized in Customer Confirmation stages
• ? Optimize business processes – not just what we do today

E. Configuration and Development

• Begin with assessment of existing configurations and integrations
• Discovery sessions
• Tenant assessments basis for statement of work for implementation and reconfiguration of required functionality
• Cynergy methodology for re-implementation
• Several parallel discussions and reviews

F. Integrations and Interfaces

• ? Assign a few integrations to State’s team for knowledge transfer (page 20 1st P under (f)
• Accelerated Cloud Deployment Center for best practices and deployment efficiency on integrations and data conversions. Leverages inventory of integrations frameworks and best practices
  - Team of specialists with ave over 15 years’ experience who have collectively completed over 7,000 integrations to date
  - Focus on integration types
  - Central resources
• Key benefits of Collaborative approach
  - Integrations jumpstarted w library of 100s of templates
  - Re-use proven integration frameworks
  - Best practices
  - Ability to scale
  - 30% reduction in integration cost, delivery time, and re-testing efforts
  - Optimizes ability to deliver SOM solution

• Chart of tools

G. Data and Analytics

• Begin discussing reports early.
• Not just duplicating existing reports – define needs for future state
• Meticulous tracking of report inventory
• Cynergy Report Tracker to organize, evaluate, and track each item for consideration during implementation and post go live
• Dashboards examples: headcount metrics, D&I, Compensation, turnover

H. Data Conversion

• Collaborative’s recommendation differs from RACI document – Collaborative using themselves vs Premier

I. Testing

• Test phase, but testing starts in plan phase and continues throughout deployment
• Unit, smoke, end-to-end, payroll parallel & interface, performance, security, regression, user acceptance

J. Training

• End user strategy serves as roadmap
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- Audiences: central HR, HR Partners, recruiters, managers, employees
- Several months
- Chart of training methods
- Training assessment sample methods provided
- Virtual training considerations identified as necessary

#### K. Organizational Change Management
- Prosci certified
- “head, heart, hands” approach
- Right-sized change approach includes ‘access to data’
- ‘just enough complexity’ – keep things simple

#### L. Cutover and Final Acceptance

#### M. Warranty and Post-Production Services
- 30 day warranty

#### N. Requirements Matrix (Appendix G)

#### O. Deliverables
- Realistic timeline

#### P. Additional Licenses

#### Q. Assumptions
- Resources available
- Resources able to make decisions

### 3. Implementation – Work Plan
- 5 mo assessment; 16 mo implementation
- Steps detailed for full plan

### 4. Resources – Staffing Plan
- Provided info
- Not sure their leads line up with function areas or request in RFP

### 5. Proposed Governance Structure
- Provided hierarchy
- Provided sme info
**Instructions:** The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

**Demonstrations**

- Tom McDermott – regional sales gov – Massachusetts
- Timeline of their history. 1st Strategic WD partner 2007;
- Over 1,000 WD clients; 100% deployment success; Customer of WD as well.
- Work with some 3rd parties – not necessarily the same we have used
- Avasant Leader for Workday Services
- Broc Zautner – national director of sales – 5 years with company. Culture attract/keeps him.
- Benefit realization – cross certified team; consistent/persistent comms;ROI from self-sufficiency
- Tiffany Palacz – global VP – examples for pause implementation. Caterpillar (18 brands under, so they had to operate under their needs). Caterpillar chose other big name implementors, but when went south, Collaborative came in. 14,000+ test scenarios; 1.2 million data points for parallel. Florida Tech – pause; CS in 8/2018. 10 months to go-live.
- We know complexity; strategic partner; approach risk; fun to work with!
- Paul Goliber – team chart – large scale ERP 25+ years. Gov focus building
- Natalie Foster –
- Tim Blake – almost 20 years all in gov and higher ed NY State Comptroller’s office
- Jeff Horinek – 20 years exp – worked as test mgr with Caterpillar project
- Chad Borton – consulting over 25 years
- Daniel Server – experience in HR
- Emily Templeton – OCM – over 5 years and has worked w many of the logos we saw
- Steph Mehmen – 15+ yrs exp – change architect
- Blake Williams – strategy architect
- Nick Paulo – HCM, payroll over decade in business
- Jennifer Durrett – financials govt – she was controller for county
- Paul Nicotera – HCM architect
- Mike Trotto – HCM lead 10 years w WD and CS 25+ w payroll City of Gainesville. Largo
- Natalie Gosejohan – 15 years 55 custmers Benefits Lead
- Brittany Ben-Simon – recruiting lead – govt educ
- Catherine Wolfe – TT & AB lead Largo, Ontario
- Jo Nading – Payroll Lead 30+ yrs payroll – all roads lead to payroll
- Jeff Jackson – Reporting & Analytics Lead 16+ yrs exp
- Though many under 10 years with CS, many years of experience
- Bringing the A team to the table
- 10+ years w 1000+ customers
- Implementation Approach – Cynergy
• If not a pause, we would start with Plan—with pause, start with Assessment
  Jeff – test manager; but he doesn’t do testing for us; SOM brings testers; 3 parallel cycles in
  this process;
  900+ templates, Asset Library
  Critical success factors
  Resource consistency; robust communications plan; focus on planning and monitoring
  progress; testing support; integrated OC&T (has to flow throughout)
• Testing one of most critical pieces
  Natalie – timeline: assessment-key; architect; configure; test; parallel; deploy; post production;
  3 sphere model—executive leadership, delivery leaders & enablers, master of daily moving
  parts
• Incorporated our vendors into their demo
• Risk Mitigation – inevitable – decision making; data quality; testing; change mgmt./adoption;
  program and resource management
• Sharepoint site for RAID log
• Lessons learned – effective decision making; never too early to start preparing test cases;
  lifting and shifting; current state to future state
• Catherine Wolfe – WD CAN handle a lot of schedules; CS has implemented with over 1,000
  schedules. WD has tool in beta testing that will allow shift swapping but still in infancy – CS
  has used 3rd parties for scheduling;
• Jennifer Durrett – financial – 10+ years govt finance & was controller in county with
  implementation of WD.
• LCD – have solutioned for LCD
• Natalie Gosejohan -Benefits – retirees and more – she seems to understand!
• Jeff Jackson – reporting assets – workbook for reporting
• Blake Williams – risk mitigation – examples of other customers – Louisville
• Empower team members, define guiding principles, establish clear escalation path
• Daniel Server – data conversion – Gainesville FL data q risk – use CS tools and start early,
  establish effective communication between tech and business. Templates and guides, etc.
• Data Conversion – with all due respect, we suggest a different approach to using outside party
  for data. CS does it exceptionally well. Use Daytona.
• Jeff Horinek – Kitsap Cty, WA – testing start early! Readiness assessment; test mgmt. tools.
  Seems quite knowledgeable and capable – wanted more than 5 mins to talk testing
• Steph – OCM – City of Kent, WA Risk from lack of trust. Communicate early and often;
  evaluate how absorbs new info; provide focused attention on areas resistant to change. Lift
  hood and look at it from culture perspective. Met wkly w most resistant groups. Heard and build
  solution. Used icons for communications – employee, manager, HR – different logo for
  audience.
• Blake – approach to implementing paused projects and assessment of previous work. Discover
  and align, review and assess, and recommend and execute.
• Jennifer- HCM, Financials, Payroll easily consumable info
• Mike Trotto –
• Natalie – post implementation hypercare support – 3 month period (?)
• Chad – flexible model for post production; help through updates and open enrollments, etc.
  (one-year optional post-production support?)
• CVS Lean-on services
### Key Personnel Interviews

**RE:** Hillsboro County – Natalie Foster - HCM financials payroll – just went live 2 months ago; complexity Nick Paulo – time tracking multiple groups that operate autonomously; build system that meets all their needs; hear all voices;

1. OCM Specialist – Steph Mehmen Prosci – video, self-paced strategic adapt to SOM
2. Project Manager – Tim Blake reviewed all artifacts IJS most useful - use statement of work

**New:** Data Conversion – Daniel Server – premier to do extraction and data co; best practice then file to CS; data workbooks, client fill in, file to CS, Daytona, load to WD – triage what doesn’t line up. Notes on sharepoint.

3. Integrations – Dave Manke – NEW
   PM Tim Blake 19 years govt, higher ed
   Testing Lead Jeff Horinek 12 implementations, 25 years leading teams, certified
   Finance Lead – Jennifer Durrett – director in practice – exp govt lead will be assigned to work with her CPA in NC, govt acting 10+ years, auditor, controller, 3.5 w CS has lead/overseen 90% of projects last 3 years
   Business Analyst – Paul Nicotera – he’d be in on workstreams with others for HCM,payroll, benefits, etc. Nick Paulo in place for oversight, too 10+ years
   Lead Technical Analyst – Dave Manke – role – ensure 3 foundational areas aligned data conversion, reporting, integration 20 yrs exp
   NEW dedication level for some of the teams – Natalie – Tim is fulltime, leads fulltime—100% dedicated; Natalie weekly; architects varies; security lead will ebb and flow (30 hrs/week); tech side Dave lead; Steph Change Architect 100%; testing manager Jeff

4. 

5. 

6. Paul Emily people exp PEX journeys and help, core financials, WD scheduling and Labor Optimization. CS is a beta implementer spoke to risk as beta

7. 

8. Dave ACDC staff one project at a time; do not hand off integrations

9. offshore – Dave - no
10. licenses and/or training – Tim -no
12. Release notes - Brittany Ben-Simon – not specific to reporting – for entire solution. WD 2 releases per year.
13. 2 parallel test cycle – Jo – would work with state on best dates – what makes most sense. Want to cover different types of payrolls. Each cycle goes through parallel all 3 times.
14. Parallel testing – impact payroll Reconciliation Tool – Jo – want all integrations to be used during parallel – parallel is #1 rehearsal for production. 3 dress rehearsals. So by time at 3rd, all running, with SOM doing everything and settlements. ImPact – CS drive tool, SOM drive WD. Set 99.9% accuracy goal and hit it – higher than 95% goal standard. Nick – external system goes in as external system.
15. & 16 – Templates yes – Jeff H
17. TTT – Steph – HS teacher 11 years, passionate about T. Make sure our Trainers are fully prepared: facilitator guides, participant guides, staged data, scenarios, etc.
18. Prosci ADKAR methodology – Steph – prosci during assessment; provide Prosci to project team; ADKAR build into deliverables

NEW:
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**Instructions:** The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is **required** that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

************************************************************************************************************************

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part IV. Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience (File #2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Overview of the Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• None of the references meet the requirement of govt or public higher ed of similar size and complexity. Needs to be confirmed that they have this experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Implementation Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Product Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Subcontractors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Organizational Chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No data analytics staff proposed and no named individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Litigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Financial Viability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Licensure/Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Certificate of Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• OK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part IV. Section III. Proposed Services (File #3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Services to be Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Project Management and Administration Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bringing a proprietary toolset. Will need to know if we have ongoing access after go-live.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Has a project methodology that was adopted by Workday and have since added a strategy phase. Cynergy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wants to assess current state and accuracy and thoroughness of docs and configs provided. RTM, etc. as the first stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Analysis and Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Working through assess stage will result in an updated project timeline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• State should document “why” when not using standard Workday functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Requirements Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• LCD was not addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Configuration and Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**STATE OF MAINE**

**INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202110165
**RFP TITLE:** Human Resources Management System (HRMS) Systems Integrator
**BIDDER NAME:** Collaborative
**DATE:** January 14, 2022
**EVALUATOR NAME:** Fred Brittain
**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** DAFS

- Based on assessment, suggest State will likely use existing configs

### F. Integrations and Interfaces

- Rely on a centralized team that focuses on integrations as opposed to named team members for the State. Staff are stateside so no concerns about timing and security that comes with offshore resources.

### G. Data and Analytics

- Have a process for governing report creation and management.
- Suggest purchasing and utilizing Prism
- Wish to discuss reporting team models

### H. Data Conversion

- Strongly suggests they do the data conversion and used the word “relegate” if we continue to leverage Premier.
- Will use a proprietary data conversion tool.

### I. Testing

- Propose three payroll parallel runs. Clarified that was three for each run type.
- Indicates Workday may be responsible for load tests.
- Mixed responsibility for other test types and misalignment with the submitted RACI

### J. Training

- Proposed a portfolio of delivery mechanisms.
- Want to work with staff groups to determine best methods for delivery
- Can use reporting to determine training needs and approach.

### K. Organizational Change Management

- Use standard methods and reference PROSCI.
- Spoke to morale and need to be adaptable in OCM strategy.
- Proposal was predominantly OCM philosophy and not actions. The asterisk in the Cynergy appendix indicated that OC&T would be worked out during SOW negotiation.

### L. Cutover and Final Acceptance

- OK

### M. Warranty and Post-Production Services

- Only reference to the requirement for extended support was an acronym in an image. Does not appear to be part of any of the narrative. Clarified during presentation that approach is flexible, but we will need to work with them in the SOW stage.

### N. Requirements Matrix (Appendix G)

- Did respond to all items in the RTM. Suggest the majority are handled by stock Workday
- Will need to be reviewed during the assessment stage.

### O. Deliverables

- OK

### P. Additional Licenses

- None suggested at this time

### Q. Assumptions

- State must coordinate any other vendor relationships.
- State team will be able to make most decisions to avoid delays of escalation

#### 3. Implementation – Work Plan

- A few inconsistencies in timing between docs and which phases actually apply.
- Lacking some clarity on responsibilities.

#### 4. Resources – Staffing Plan
RFP #: 202110165
RFP TITLE: Human Resources Management System (HRMS) Systems Integrator
BIDDER NAME: Collaborative
DATE: January 14, 2022
EVALUATOR NAME: Fred Brittain
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DAFS

- It appears project manager may have never provided oversight for a full workday implementation.
- Some positions not identified in proposal
- Not sure what percentage of staff time is dedicated to this project

5. Proposed Governance Structure
   - OK.
Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Pause examples – Catepillar. 104,000 employees with 36,000 contingency workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pause example #2 Florida Tech – private with 6500 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Brought their post-deployment guy. What is the proposal there?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cynergy diagram was different than what was in the bid. Changed to assessment instead of strategy and plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Timeline slide was diff. Post prod was 12 weeks instead of 10. Didn’t match the rest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Has Workday in strategic governance. Governance slide was new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Beta scheduling software may be generally available in summer of 2022. Claimed they implemented numerous times already?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parent company is leading implementor of Kronos. No connection to using them anywhere though.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Appreciate they bring a decision guide and process for managing reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Denigrates Premier and “not scared of legacy data”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Testing guy showing diff cynergy slide and talking about phases they said they are not doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• They want to redo the assessment done by IJA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Project roles has Workday and State owning training Collab only does project team training. Overall, substantive roles are with Workday and State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Heard more about CVS. The 98% satisfaction was for this. They do offer a flexible post-production portfolio that we can choose from.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No mention of data conversion partners in collaboration with 3rd party partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More disconnects on Cynergy. Blake mentions stakeholders work in the strategy stage that they eliminated in their presentation at a couple points.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Personnel Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• OCM person showing some flexibility and ability to adapt to circumstances. Gets change fatigue. And then goes back to strategy phase which they had said they had eliminated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Answer to the interpretation of artifacts – didn’t answer. Effectively said they will do it again as it is needed for a good outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Data conversion question – response was only how they work with us, when asked about Premier, still no direct answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tim Blake will be 100% and functional area leads will be 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Workday’s DA covers the work of IV&amp;V?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• They do think we have an advance comp in our large org SKU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• They do say they have implemented the beta scheduling. Risk answer was about whether it could fill the need, not buggy. Look to Workday corporate if things go bad. Including WD Prof Srvcs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Custom solution with reporting meant custom reports in WD, not a diff solution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rev. 2/4/2020
- Solid response to WD release notes and plans and testing when releases come out
- Parallel payroll testing is 3x for all cycles. Clarified.
- CS will develop facilitator guides for trainers. They also develop training materials.
- Has not used parent company, yet.
Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part IV. Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience (File #2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Founded in 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000+ Workday deployments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longest tenured Workday partner - 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix D:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Caterpillar - publicly traded manufacturer - 105k employees, &quot;rescue project&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Montgomery College - community college, no info on # employees - original deployment not done by Collaborative; Collaborative was hired a year after go-live to &quot;rectify the original deployment inadequacies&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• FL Institute of Technology - private university, no info on # employees - &quot;rescue project&quot; - project paused during testing (file 2 p4) - tried to start w Config/Prototype stage but ended up having to rework some business processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maryland Environmental Services - web says not-for-profit? Maybe a quasi-governmental - 1,000 FTE, diverse business processes and reporting requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Washington University - private university - 28k employees; complex data conversion and developed new approaches for supervisory-organization, academic appointments, position management; 3 cycles of payroll parallel for bi-weekly and monthly payrolls;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hillsborough County Sherriff - 4k employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File #2:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Founded in 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longest Workday partner From 2007 p10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholly owned subsidiary of Cognizant as of 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small firm focused solely on Workday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450 employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000+ Workday clients - but never says how many governmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290 Workday HCM implementations p22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discusses project takeovers and reviewing existing work and whether it can be utilized p4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6 government clients - Buncombe County, Harford Count, Gainesville &amp; Port Orange FL; also Orlando, Rochester, Ontario? Unclear if Collaborative was the implementation partner (see p14 where they list some implementation clients)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in-house Workday-focused OCM &amp; training practice p10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"some financials are needed to support grants & projects"
Helped develop the current Workday methodology used by all partners p11; served as first partner in WD Delivery Assurance
Cynergy methodology developed to enhance WD methodology p12
Talks about local governments having similar complexities to SOM like police, fire, legislative & judicial - but doesn't describe any actual experience with them p12
Unions - describes use of different workflows, approvals and notifications to meet CBA requirements p13
Acknowledges that data conversion from legacy systems is high risk, requiring extended time and resources p16
Data warehouse - extensive experience to optimize data schema solutions to ensure best data point synchronization; integration templates and accelerators available p17
Scheduling - have experience using third party tools for complex scheduling p19
Labor cost allocation experience developing custom validations to control pick lists p20
Retiree benefits - experience with developing plans for complex retiree/ dependent situations p20
Discusses understanding of unique government complexities around union versus non-union, position budgeting & management, law enforcement p22
Payroll testing methodology - exceeds industry standards with 3 parallels of two weeks each (instead of 2x 1 week each); payroll must be 100% accurate p24
Developed imPaCT payroll tool to compare gross and net pay per employee - can store explanations of variances across versions; summary results are provided by pay code p24
Integrations - inventory of frameworks and best practices so templates and codes can be reused p28
Q - Workday Integration Cloud Platform Integration - Platform as a Service - is this an additional service they are recommending we purchase? P29
Data - proprietary tools to validate and produce data loads p33
Reporting - some custom reports will be built p34 also have developed "Workday Advanced Report Dashboards & Analytics"
Training - uses a custom report in tenant to extract detail around configuration and security roles setup - used to inform detailed training plan - building and executing plan included in training services; discusses required timing and potential training delivery methods - some of which involve additional cost p35

Part IV. Section III. Proposed Services (File #3)
1. Services to be Provided

2. A. Project Management and Administration Requirements
   - Cynergy methodology p4-5 adheres to Workday requirements but goes several steps beyond
   - Q – what specifically will be included in scope for this project? Cynergy methodology attachment has a disclaimer that "all activities and deliverables may not be applicable to this project"
   - Q - Collaborative approach for project management p6 - "shared ownership of the project is different from other Workday partners" - in what way?
### Quality Assurance
- Collaborative has their own Delivery Assurance checkpoints - internal PMO reviews for adherence to methodology p7
- Q - Does Collaborative require SOM to use Workday Delivery Assurance as well?
- Scope management p8 requires use of change order for all changes
- Leadership alignment - with key stakeholders across SOM to align on vision, goals, objectives, success metrics - we have already done this
- Sponsor Engagement framework = key influencers to drive change in their agencies, in addition to "change champions"
- Configuration documentation - from output of architect sessions, to update requirements traceability matrix - performed by Collaborative
- Configuration tenant build p12 - 100% responsibility of Collaborative, no SOM responsibility indicated
- Q - Unit testing p13 - Collaborative responsibility "validating that the component functions as designed" - but is it compared to requirements?

### Analysis and Design

#### Assessment
- Assessment phase 0 - will conduct discovery sessions p3
- Upon completion of assessment will refine timeline and work plan
- Assessment p18-19
- discovery sessions and tenant assessment will be the basis for the statement of work for the implementation and reconfiguration of required functionality
- Any modifications to standard process as it is configured will be subject to review
- SOM responsible for design documentation updates after design sign off period

### Configuration and Development
- Assumptions p3 - that SOM will leverage previous design and configurations
- Will be based on the tenant assessment

### Integrations and Interfaces
- Recommend assigning a few integrations to SOM team for knowledge transfer
- all integrations are designed and delivered by consultants who are part of the Accelerated Cloud Deployment Center using proprietary and Workday tools
- Includes library of hundreds of integration templates from already developed integrations

### Data and Analytics
- understand desired future-state reporting and analytics to determine what can be met with Workday delivered functionality and what requires a custom solution
- "Report Tracker" tool and methodology for organizing and evaluating reporting needs
- They suggest using "Advanced Reporting Dashboard" library and Prism reporting - these are extra licenses we would have to purchase
- Recommending that SOM review release notes and assess impact on configuration; talks about regression testing but doesn't indicate who is responsible
- Collaborative will help walk through the advantages of a central reporting team vs reporting resources at each Agency, and other ways to manage on-going reporting demands p23
- Dashboards should be developed to target specific user groups
- doesn't mention Data warehouse

### Data Conversion
**STATE OF MAINE**  
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**RFP #:** 202110165  
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- Collaborative recommendation differs from RFP RACI - Collaborative would be accountable not SOM for data transformation  
- Recommend Collaborative be responsible for loading data and be consulted on conversion  
- will identify legacy data elements required for Workday and recommendations on how to handle elective data elements  
- Collaborative will do audit of existing data collection procedures to date  
- Will help SOM create repeatable data extraction and mapping scripts that can be used for all future tenant builds  
- Collaborative’s proprietary tool known as Daytona will be heavily leveraged to rapidly validate the incoming data from the State and provide feedback so that the data can be clean and able to load into Workday –  
  - Q - will this limit use of elective data elements?  
  - the State will hold responsibility for providing and validating all data  
- Assumption that there will only be 2 tenant builds before Gold versus standard 4 p25 -  
  - Q - how does this affect pricing if we need more tenant builds?  
- Q - Work plan p35 shows 4 tenant builds - what is actually included in scope?  
- Will provide proprietary tools and templates to streamline data conversion

**I. Testing**

- SOM will identify and execute test scenarios using templates and tools developed through hundreds of deployments  
  - Q - Are any of the templates specific to government entities?  
- Testing performed by Collaborative: Unit testing & smoke testing  
- Testing performed by SOM: End-to-End, Payroll Parallel, Regression, User Acceptance  
- Payroll parallel - per RACI attachment, 3 tests will be performed  
  - imPact Payroll Parallel Reconciliation Tool p4 – Validates all calculations, taxes, gross, net etc

**J. Training**

- build a custom report in the Workday tenant to extract detail around the actual configuration and security role assignments for each business process to derive a detailed Training Needs Assessment that aligns directly with SOM unique configuration and training needs  
- Recommend that we begin training with centralized roles and departments toward the middle to end of the Test stage, and then expand training to reach the decentralized roles,  
- Identified audiences: Central HR, HR Partners, Recruiters, Managers, Employees  
- Limited information on templates provided for developing training materials  
  - no provided content  
- Lists options for assessing success of training but doesn't indicate what is included in scope  
- Additional cost for any instructor led training

**K. Organizational Change Management**

- Leverages Prosci's research and certification  
- "Head, Heart, Hands" approach for managed behavior change  
- Will start with vision & mission for the project and build from there  
- User experience sessions p15 outreach/engagement event, test drive of training materials

**L. Cutover and Final Acceptance**

- No comments

---

*Rev. 2/4/2020*
M. Warranty and Post-Production Services

- 30 days following delivery of a deliverable
- Post-production support 3 months per deliverables table p34 but work program p35 indicates 10 weeks
- No overall warranty information
- No information regarding optional 1 year support services

N. Requirements Matrix (Appendix G)

- Completed the spreadsheet

O. Deliverables

- Duplicated table from RFP
- Stated that Cynergy methodology outlines deliverables

P. Additional Licenses

- Will utilize Workday Financials license that we already have
- not recommending an alternate scheduling tool yet, although uncertain if Workday can handle SOM scheduling complexity;
- Advanced Compensation license could be useful but feels they can develop a process within what we have

Q. Assumptions

- Collaborative resources will provide their own laptops p17
- SOM will use Collaborative’s Sharepoint and SFTP
- State will lead the coordination with any of the State’s third-party vendor involvement p18
- SOM will leverage previous design and configurations p3

3. Implementation – Work Plan

- 5 month Assessment phase but indicate could be completed in 14 weeks
- 16 month implementation
- Q - Work plan shows 4 tenant builds; but under data conversion section they stated there would be only 2? What is actually included in scope and pricing?
- Provided detailed sample project plan
- Subcontractors p36 - all staff are full-time employees of Collaborative or our parent company (Cognizant)
- Did not provide detailed description of project roles and responsibilities

4. Resources – Staffing Plan

- Staffing approach p3 “best practices not siloed within industries” - no consultants specialize in government implementations
- did not indicate % dedicated to project;
- Staff references do not include 2 state or local governments comparable in size to SOM nor indicate what software the engagements were for
- Did not provide any information on State resources that will be required

5. Proposed Governance Structure

- Q - Includes Workday Delivery Assurance - is this a required part of their program?
Demonstrations

- Extended post-production support – several options for level of ongoing support
- Under key issues section, they mentioned that Cognizant is a leading implementor of Kronos; however under interview section they acknowledged that no one at Collaborative has experience with this

Key Personnel Interviews

- Hillsborough County Sherriff complexity response focused on workflow routing, identifying stakeholders, and having several autonomous sources of time tracking that had to be coordinated
- Strongly recommend use of Workday Delivery Assurance; but don’t see an issue with having a different IV&V partner
- Asserted that they have strong relationship w Workday product development
- ImPact parallel payroll tool - will be run by Collaborative, output for SOM review - Comparison is at earning code level
- Parallel payroll pay inputs - If data is flowing from time tracking it will flow from that
- Collaborative develops the facilitator guides for train-the-trainer including scenarios specific to the state
- Resource plan was somewhat unclear – significant differences between RFP response and information provided for interviews
- Finance workstream consultant included
The following Individual Notes are from Subject Matter Experts (SMEs).
## Part IV. Section III. Proposed Services (File #3)

### 1. Services to be Provided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.</th>
<th>A. Project Management and Administration Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B. Analysis and Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C. Requirements Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **Requirement ID 1207:** Costing to multiple funding sources should be able to be updated on a per/pay/period cadence **Response:** Standard Workday or Met with configuration (no custom development)
- **Requirement ID 1217:** Ability to assign project and task availability by specific attributes, in masse or individually **Response:** Standard Workday or Met with configuration (no custom development)
- **Requirement ID 1198:** "The system should have the ability to have a secondary set of time sheet attributes for reporting that do not impact primary cost centers in accounting system (primary cost center = default org cost center AND fund, department, appr concatenation in costing allocations (modified default funding) and concatenation found on project) **Response:** "Standard Workday or Met with configuration (no custom development)"
- **Requirement ID 1324:** Pick list of assignable units should be restricted by the appropriation number in the budgeted allocation **Response:** Standard Workday or Met with configuration (no custom development)
- **Requirement ID 1245:** Depts should have the ability to change lower level funding. **Response:** Standard Workday or Met with configuration (no custom development)
- **Requirement ID 1246:** Depts should NOT have the ability to change the highest level funding. **Response:** Standard Workday or Met with configuration (no custom development)

### D. Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E. Configuration and Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F. Integrations and Interfaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Experience with Integrating Workday to CGI Advantage Financials (City of Dallas, TX and State of Iowa).

### G. Data and Analytics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H. Data Conversion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I. Testing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
RFP #: 202110165
RFP TITLE: Human Resources Management System (HRMS) Systems Integrator
BIDDER NAME: Accenture
DATE: 1/26/2022
EVALUATOR NAME: Jackson Smith (SME Labor Cost Distribution)
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Department of Administrative and Financial Services

- J. Training
- K. Organizational Change Management
- L. Cutover and Final Acceptance
- M. Warranty and Post-Production Services
- N. Requirements Matrix (Appendix G)
- O. Deliverables
- P. Additional Licenses
- Q. Assumptions
- 3. Implementation – Work Plan
- 4. Resources – Staffing Plan
- 5. Proposed Governance Structure
### Demonstrations
- Lead several project restarts for previously paused implementations.
- Key issues risks: Labor Cost Distribution – Background principles –
  - 1- to the extent possible, avoid complexity (particularly from end user perspective (timesheets, etc))
  - 2- Business objectives and use cases (ex. effort only project use cases)
  - 3- Maintain integrity and symmetry between collection of time and rate of pay for audit trail purposes.
- Multiple previous implementations integrating Workday payroll with CGI Financials (Dallas, Iowa, Denver International Airport).
- State of Iowa labor cost distribution (lcd) is accomplished via an integration
- Massachusetts’s lcd is via another application
- Dallas’s distribution is at the timesheet level (Baltimore as well)
- 2nd largest user of Workday
- FDM To be revisited as part of BPA.

### Key Personnel Interviews
- Most up-to-date tenant would likely be frozen during BPA time period. 5 or 6 implementation tenants (tenants can have multiple uses and be repurposed).
- AccuTime clocks in scope
- Leads 100% dedicated to project.
- Training templates provided as well as ‘bytes of knowledge’ video library (quick training videos).
- Payroll parallel tests would include two or three pay periods (per pay cycle a/b) to account for what needs to be tested (i.e. if something is different about the first/second/third payroll of a month). Ideally most complicated pay periods would be focused on for payroll to ensure all targets are hit.
- Question 11: PRISM is a SKU that is not owned by SOM that has been used in other projects to solution.
  Extend is another SKU that is used in problem solving/solutioning. Advanced scheduling may also be beneficial
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**Part IV. Section III. Proposed Services (File #3)**

1. Services to be Provided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.</th>
<th>A. Project Management and Administration Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Analysis and Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Requirements Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Requirement ID 1198:</strong> The system should have the ability to have a secondary set of time sheet attributes for reporting that do not impact primary cost centers in accounting system (primary cost center = default org cost center AND fund, department, appr concatenation in costing allocations (modified default funding) and concatenation found on project) <strong>Requirement Approach:</strong> Configuration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Requirement ID 1207:</strong> Costing to multiple funding sources should be able to be updated on a per/pay/period cadence <strong>Requirement Approach:</strong> Configuration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Requirement ID 1217:</strong> Ability to assign project and task availability by specific attributes, in masse or individually <strong>Requirement Approach (response):</strong> Standard Functionality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Requirement ID 1324:</strong> Pick list of assignable units should be restricted by the appropriation number in the budgeted allocation <strong>Requirement Approach:</strong> Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Requirement ID 1245:</strong> Depts should have the ability to change lower level funding, <strong>Requirement Approach:</strong> Configuration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Requirement ID 1246:</strong> Depts should NOT have the ability to change the highest level funding. <strong>Requirement Approach:</strong> Configuration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Design

|    |                                                       |
|    | E. Configuration and Development                      |
|    |                                                       |
|    | F. Integrations and Interfaces                        |
|    |                                                       |
|    | G. Data and Analytics                                 |
|    |                                                       |
|    | H. Data Conversion                                    |
|    |                                                       |
|    | I. Testing                                            |
|    |                                                       |
|    | J. Training                                           |
|    |                                                       |

K. Organizational Change Management
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L.</td>
<td>Cutover and Final Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.</td>
<td>Warranty and Post-Production Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>Requirements Matrix (Appendix G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.</td>
<td>Deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.</td>
<td>Additional Licenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Implementation – Work Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Resources – Staffing Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Proposed Governance Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

Demonstrations

- 1st strategic Workday partner
- 1000 Workday clients / 98% satisfaction rate /100% success rate (go-live)
- #26 Workday HCM Customer
- Cross Certified Team (OCM team is also Workday certified)
- Lead project restarts for previously paused projects (Florida Tech/Caterpillar)
- Three payroll parallel tests per cycle (a/b/dot)
- Collaborative has supported clients with over a thousand work schedules. Has also integrated multiple scheduling solutions for clients.
- City of Largo – used time sheet entry to projects, for reporting only, did not directly redirect expenses.
- Has done an implementation that required an integration with CGI financials (City of Gainesville-Utilities).
- Effective configuration of Worker Groups, Project Groups and Project Hierarchies can streamline assignment of workers to projects
- Project funding sources for reclassification of expenses to specified funding sources for the project.
- Finance lead will be assigned to the project
- Proposal is to warranty for 90 days post go-live
- Varying levels of post go-live support available (application managed services, continuous value services, etc).
- Financial Oversight Director is a CPA in North Carolina

Key Personnel Interviews

- State of Maine/Premier would still be involved/responsible for extraction from legacy systems (source systems), workbook populating, Collaborative Solutions would be responsible for the loading of data in to Workday.
- Key resource leads: **PM (Engagement Manager):** Full time assignment to project - 19 years government ERP experience, **Finance:** A finance lead to be assigned. **Lead Tech Analyst:** 20 years in software industry, ten years in Workday ecosystem as integration and technical lead. **Testing Lead/Manager:** 12 Implementations (HCM Certified), 25 years leading teams/test leading/test management. **Lead Business Analyst:** Oversees all other functional workstream leads. HCM, Benefits, Compensation and Reporting certified.
- All functional project leads would be assigned full time, additional resources may be brought in as needed.
- Integration resources are staffed on one project at a time.
- No plans to use offshore integrations resources.
• No additional licenses required to leverage Collaborative's suite of tools. (ex. Sharepoint, CIMS testing tool).
• Workday delivery assurance is strongly recommended. Provides independent feedback on project's configuration health.
• Collaborative has worked with IV&V companies on prior implementations.
• State owns Advanced Compensation SKU – if desired to be utilized, recommend deploying after successful go-live of phase 1.
• Planning/Assessment phase is 22 weeks - 14 weeks of assessment activities, remaining 8 weeks to complete the phase and prepare for transition to Architect Phase.
• Each parallel cycle would include all three pay groups (A/B/DOT) (three full cycles).
• As many integrations as possible to be used/tested during payroll parallel.
• Impact is a comparison tool used to compare payroll results from Workday and legacy system (generates variance reports) that would be reviewed by SOM.
• Additional SKUs that may be of benefit:
  PEX (People experience) – supports change management/ adoption (Journeys: guides end users through key processes. Help: stores knowledge articles/training guides.)
  Core Financials – labor costing particularly for project costing.
  WD Scheduling and labor optimization (collaborative has completed multiple beta implementations).
• Collaborative can assist in review of upcoming Workday release notes. Decision to adopt/implement would be state decision.
Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

Part IV. Section III. Proposed Services (File #3)
1. Services to be Provided

2.
A. Project Management and Administration Requirements
   • Has their own project management tool – will require training
   • High focus on risk
   • Includes knowledge sharing and percent complete as metrics

B. Analysis and Design
   • B&C Combined
   • High focus on aligning our processes with Workday’s standard processes
   • Review of contracts to ensure Workday’s standard processes cover the contract language
   • Will the be using the BPM work we already did?
   • Have they worked with unions before? Is the city of Dallas unionized?

C. Requirements Analysis
   • Combined with B

D. Design
   • Define scope and create a detailed blueprint – isn’t that already done?
   • Testing will be Shared Services?
   • What’s the project team training? What if we already have some experience with Workday?

E. Configuration and Development
   • Focus on changing practices to “adopting the standard processes” (pg 13)
   • Is the plan still to do ad hoc reporting through DAFS Analytics?
   • Will HR have some report-writing capability?
   • State personnel do the actual testing – concerns about who/time
   • Includes plan to incorporate updates
   • Notifications can be pushed to their email in boxes?? We were told they couldn’t be connected
   • Including representation from all the agencies can quickly become overwhelming

F. Integrations and Interfaces
   • Is this specific to finance?

G. Data and Analytics
   • Report “Toolbox”
   • Reporting workshops to allow us to create our own reports

H. Data Conversion
   • Has experience/relationship with Premier
   • Has a data extraction accelerator tool

I. Testing
   • Testing is the State’s responsibility to write, execute, oversee
• Does that improve buy in? Will they make changes based on feedback? Or are they just looking to see if it works the way it was designed?

J. Training
• Already has training videos prepared – how will that apply to what we do?
• “Partners – We assume most individuals within this user group will be sufficiently involved in the implementation to satisfy their training requirements to perform their role upon go-live.” STRONGLY disagree with this
• State expected to develop and deliver content

K. Organizational Change Management
• Two approaches
• “Change leaders” - will this be more successful than the last two times? Will we find volunteers?
• Each role will have specific training plan and criteria for competency

L. Cutover and Final Acceptance
• Will slowly shift responsibility to the State during the project, so that by cutover the State is leading and comfortable
• Provide 90 days support post-go-live

M. Warranty and Post-Production Services
• One year optional extended support

N. Requirements Matrix (Appendix G)
• Appears complete – I don’t know if it’s accurate

O. Deliverables
• Meeting to review State processes

P. Additional Licenses
• No additional licensing proposed

Q. Assumptions
• State commitment – to what staffing level?
• 6 FTE’s for change management? What level are they expecting for other areas?

3. Implementation – Work Plan
• 3 months for business process alignment – 10 months for creation
• Lot of people – lot of time

4. Resources – Staffing Plan
• All have a lot of experience, including experience with Workday and public sector employers
• Need more State staff
• One lead for each area, one SME for each area

5. Proposed Governance Structure
• Correlates with the State’s structure – contacts for each of the State’s areas
RFP #: 202110165  
RFP TITLE: Human Resources Management System (HRMS) Systems Integrator  
BIDDER NAME: Accenture  
DATE: 2/10/22  
EVALUATOR NAME: Lisa McGrotty  
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: DAFS/BHR

Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Staffing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Karen – HR experience, city of Denver – their implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 4 success examples – used in response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Team has worked together multiple times, in many government projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fatigue of a project pause - people are tired – need to rebuild energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Key Risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sup orgs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Contracts – implement the way it reads, or how it’s interpreted?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In Baltimore worked with the Unions to determine how to pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Scheduling is a risk – schedules come out of the woodwork – making sure understand the schedules – is time they will spend to make sure they have them right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Don’t need to have their own surveys – they understand survey fatigue – will try to use data we already have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Question – BPA Process – level of involvement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Whoever can provide clarity around RTM so they don’t make assumptions – and looking at standard Workday configuration to see if it will meet the need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If there are individuals on the team who can provide that info, fine – but if there are key people from the agencies who want to provide their voice, would want them to be involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Question – OCM – addressing beyond project team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Team champion – few hours a week, be a leader of change for their agency – absolutely key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understand what’s different this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Value snippets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Management of the schedules is outside the system, payment inside - Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Baltimore – has everything inside Workday for police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are on the cusp of “Workday Advanced Scheduling” – not deployed yet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• But mostly outside the system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Personnel Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Artifacts will give us good info to jump start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Worst case, artifacts give us good questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have a great listing of reports – so no reason to go back and ask what you need – so quite a bit for you to reuse – don’t throw away any of those</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Repurpose the tenants we have – freeze the most recent as a reference point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will need staff to help develop the training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Part IV. Section III. Proposed Services (File #3)**

1. Services to be Provided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.</th>
<th>A. Project Management and Administration Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality Assurance – delivery checkpoints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop a communication plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One on one Agency outreach? Separate from formal reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cynergy methodology with detailed chart of stages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.</th>
<th>B. Analysis and Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BCD Combined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agency alignment sessions align regulatory, compliance and/or mission-critical decisions that need to be differentiated from State-wide standardized decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Start with an understanding the tenant and where we are and what we do, to determine what in Workday needs to be configured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Optimize our processes to get the most out of Workday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ Very much a focused on what we do and making Workday work for us approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.</th>
<th>C. Requirements Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.</th>
<th>D. Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.</th>
<th>E. Configuration and Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cynergy methodology again – need a demo of it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not much detail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.</th>
<th>F. Integrations and Interfaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;predefined entry and exit criteria&quot;? &quot;assigning a few integrations to the state’s team&quot;? very vague…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tampa Bay Accelerated Cloud Integration Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overseas hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seems like a complete integration plan – with no specifics, and very little state involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>But is that bad? If it meets our needs…they deliver us a product…and it works…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.</th>
<th>G. Data and Analytics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot of info on dashboards – could be very helpful – didn’t have a lot of discussion around dashboards in previous project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.</th>
<th>H. Data Conversion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>They want to handle the full data conversion, without Premier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No discussion of how they would work with Premier</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.</th>
<th>I. Testing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---
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- Collaborative to handle all initial testing
- They walk the state through subsequent testing
- They lead the testing process with the state having ownership – but they do the prep work, and just ensure that we know how and are happy
- From a time investment perspective, this works well

**J. Training**
- Well laid-out training plan
- Identified the key groups who will require training
- Training provided in multiple formats

**K. Organizational Change Management**
- Head-heart-hands – top down
- Focused on the design transparency and access to data
- No specifics for how to communicate that information

**L. Cutover and Final Acceptance**
- Cynergy methodology
- Owned by Engagement Manager and Project Manager
- Cutover checklist

**M. Warranty and Post-Production Services**
- 30 day warranty

**N. Requirements Matrix (Appendix G)**

**O. Deliverables**
- Deliverables and dates all lined out

**P. Additional Licenses**
- Complex scheduling may require additional licensing, but without further understanding can’t recommend something (that’s good – it’s complicated)
- Can work something out with other licenses already possess

**Q. Assumptions**
- Workday has shared a limited license to Workday Finance

**3. Implementation – Work Plan**
- 58 Weeks

**4. Resources – Staffing Plan**
- Assigns resources with the intent to have them on the project through the life of the project

**5. Proposed Governance Structure**
-
Demonstrations

- 100% success – never been taken off a project
- Understand working with third parties
- Change management team is Workday certified
- Considers Cat similar to State of Maine
- Multiple years with this company and Workday for each team member
- They have worked together – is a team
- Want to go through the artifacts with people involved – all people, or just the project team?
- Realistic timeline, including tenant builds
- Timeline, for HR staff, is feasible
- Scheduling – Workday is in beta testing, may not meet all the needs
- Collaborative has implemented complex schedules with third parties
- Has a parent company with a timeclock system
- Has experience with projects for LCD
- Natalie (Benefits Lead) worked in Benefits plan, specifically with retirees – which is a significant area of complexity with SOM
- Look at “what happened” with empathy – why did people react the way to the pause that they did – that will show where need to focus for change management
- Success is about the people
- Team remains on the project for 12 weeks post go-live
- Items assigned to the state for ownership are still a partnership – but it’s the state’s data, the state’s test results – we have to be the ones to own/accept
- Have product leads for Workday – which are certified by Workday – within Collaborative
- Will consider implementation fatigue a major factor in the OCM
- Discuss during assessment – WIIFM as part of communication strategy

Key Personnel Interviews

- Leads are 100% - people under them will vary
- OCM – expectation is Steph would be 100%, would also bring a lead
- Training – come in later, so wouldn’t be full time across the duration of the project
- Testing – will depend, based on assessment of involvement of Kainos – based estimate of Jeff being full time once Customer Confirmation sets in
- Estimate set based on experience, including what has worked with other customers
- 3 payroll testing cycles – for each payroll cycle
### Demonstrations
- Risk issues identified as critical for the SOM—Sup Org, Collective Bargaining Agreements
- Explained additional work would be needed on reports
- Provided detailed work on the RTM
- Provided clarification regarding payroll parallel
- Labor cost distribution solution was not solidified
- Discussed the importance of the foundation data model workshop, dimensions, chart of accounts

### Key Personnel Interviews
- PM Discussed the artifacts and tying to risk. Start with a deep dive into the artifacts
**STATE OF MAINE**
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Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

**Part IV. Section III. Proposed Services (File #3)**
1. Services to be Provided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Project Management and Administration Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Risk issues identified as critical for the SOM– Sup Org, Collective Bargaining Agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collaboration with state testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Analysis and Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Requirements Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Configuration and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Integrations and Interfaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Data and Analytics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Data Conversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Work jointly with the state to conduct payroll parallel testing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Organizational Change Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Cutover and Final Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Warranty and Post-Production Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Requirements Matrix (Appendix G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reference – Page 37 Payroll Parallel Testing (two payroll parallels), Reference - Page 59 Table 6 Conduct Payroll Parallel Testing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please clarify “number of Parallel Test cycles” – The State has 3 pay groups included in two bi-weekly payroll cycles. Employees are split between the 2 cycles (Cycle A, Cycle B) and we process payroll weekly.

- How many parallel test cycles per SOM payroll cycle will be delivered?
- Please clarify the statement “two if payroll interface”?
- What is Accenture’s approach to validation and reconciliation of same period processing against legacy production data?

### 3. Implementation – Work Plan

### 4. Resources – Staffing Plan

### 5. Proposed Governance Structure

- Table on page 39 did not include time tracking and absence lead in the organizational structure.
Part IV. Section III. Proposed Services (File #3)

1. Services to be Provided

2.

A. Project Management and Administration Requirements
   - P-imPact Payroll Parallel Reconciliation Tool used for parallel payroll processing.
   - P-Enhanced data collection workbooks

B. Analysis and Design
   - Q-Majority of business processes are unapproved?

C. Requirements Analysis
   -

D. Design
   -

E. Configuration and Development
   -

F. Integrations and Interfaces
   -

G. Data and Analytics
   -

H. Data Conversion
   -

I. Testing
   - Q- Identified three payroll parallels – is this 2 per cycle or pay group?
   - Q-will parallel payroll include data validation of all payroll integrations.
   - Did not see a reference to the Payroll Parallel Reconciliation in the parallel testing section table mentioned previously in the document.

J. Training
   -

K. Organizational Change Management
   -

L. Cutover and Final Acceptance
   -

M. Warranty and Post-Production Services
   -

N. Requirements Matrix (Appendix G)
   -

O. Deliverables
   -
P. Additional Licenses

Q. Assumptions

3. Implementation – Work Plan

4. Resources – Staffing Plan

5. Proposed Governance Structure
   - Table on page 39 did not include time tracking and absence lead in the organizational structure.
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Demonstrations
- 1000+ workday clients
- 100% success rate
- Discussed Caterpillar implementation – 25 countries 500 locations. Provided Florida Tech as a paused project with significant issues with staff turnover and fatigue that they were able to assist with
- Clarified the payroll parallel process
- Provided a demo on the use of their payroll parallel reconciliation tool.
- State of Maine does own advanced compensation – recommend after deployment of phase 1

Key Personnel Interviews
- PM Discussed the artifacts and tying to risk. Start with a deep dive into the artifacts
- Data conversion work with Premier was not clear
- Unclear on labor cost distribution solution
- Discussed the importance of testing and testing prep – plan, prioritize and ensure there are mitigation plans. Test prep should start early.
**Instructions:** The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

---

**Part IV. Section III. Proposed Services (File #3)**

1. Services to be Provided

2.  
   A. Project Management and Administration Requirements
      - Project management tool and portal
      - Resource capacity tool – analyze resource availability – has assumptions
      - WorkDay Delivery Assurance – State can engage

   B. Analysis and Design

   C. Requirements Analysis
      - Some noted confidential
      - Both addressed by business process alignment
      - Acknowledge questions and answers – unlikely to repurpose so will start with standard configurations
      - Step by step methodology, enhanced for government, review current configuration, deliver report
      - Includes decision points to rightsize effort and timeline

   D. Design
      - Focus on configuration approach using Business process analysis – define scope and agreed functionality to be implemented. Create blueprint and update workplan. Collaborative.

   E. Configuration and Development
      - Assume use existing tenant
      - Standardize where possible; provide impacts to timeline and costs for additional solutioning

   F. Integrations and Interfaces
      - Shared responsibilities to develop skills

   G. Data and Analytics
      - Train then do approach – goal independence after go live
      - Toolbox of custom repots to compliment workday reports

   H. Data Conversion
      - Proprietary DCAT tool
      - Collaborate with Premier
      - Historical data pricing to be provided

   I. Testing
      - Help and advise State testers
      - Believe testing should be done by State
      - Use baseline workday test scenarios
      - Proprietary tool provided – consider after deployment
J. Training
   • Provide video learning library, train the trainer approach with pilot training, proprietary tools

K. Organizational Change Management
   • Use internal change agents / change ambassador team
   • Reference 2 proposals in pricing
   • Surveys , workshops, communications plan, impact assessment

L. Cutover and Final Acceptance
   • Lead shifts to State team for ownership after go-live
   • Joint deployment /cutover plan

M. Warranty and Post-Production Services
   • 90 days align with operational cycles?
   • One year option of additional extended support

N. Requirements Matrix (Appendix G)
   • P3 has narrative / summary
   • 20 items that need 3rd party software – marked out of scope in figure 1

O. Deliverables
   • Up to 3 parallel payment cycles – does this align with current operational need

P. Additional Licenses
   • none

Q. Assumptions
   • assume State accepts leading practice-based processes

3. Implementation – Work Plan
   • Very high level, may not address all RFP requirements
   • Policy and compliance

4. Resources – Staffing Plan
   • Advise interviews for key resources to clarify skills
   • Review years of experience for key resources to analyze risks
   • Role and recommendation for workday Delivery Assurance may need clarification and cross check with payment schedule
   • OCM Advisor as well as Lead

5. Proposed Governance Structure
   • Responsibility for implementation transitions to State, with support
   • Adds functional area leads
   • Recommend clear escalation path, assumes where decisions are made
Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Business outcomes similar in reference projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requirement Traceability Matrix categorization done, may leverage previous configuration – would like to confirm instead of redoing. Decision paper for options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prefer not to set date and drive to it. Could pull recruiting out. Discuss quick wins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• presented by Exec Sponsor and Lead Business Analyst, advisors present and supporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• risks aligned to lessons learned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Project Manager -experience righting projects, wait to see more in interviews, not a major presenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Change Management example of difficult conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Want to figure out 50% error rate on parallel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recommend a workday Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TAPP based on Jira and confluence, accessible from anywhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• References to project team changes, rebrand, focus on successes, get ownership, use design thinking tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Change management is about extended audience beyond project team – need a change champion eg timekeepers, HR partners,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Labor cost distribution approach unclear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Personnel Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• PM – planned activities come in business process as well as planning. Artifacts-noticed concerns are around stakeholder engagement. Covered in plan. Portal addresses transparency issues. Referenced comments from Heather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Past artifacts, redo or use – quickly figure out what has to be done. Depends where project is at. Deep dive into artifacts and use as much as possible. Refers to integrations, confirm requirements. Look at PM artifacts – most cases may not be ok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reports – developed because of deficiencies - want to confirm understanding, look for standard reports, look at configuration to see if requirements can be met, may have been workarounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pulled in other team members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reporting- Brad – help with governance, workshops, toolkit to increase knowledge, all of team will help, clarification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lead technical analyst -Brad answered – tenants -will be original – repurpose, freeze 1, 7 week build is standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Jim Walsh listed on proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wendy answered number of tenant clarification approach, and process clarification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- Kara – state does blog content – deciding who is part of transition to figure out role, includes all content. Co-create through project. Valuable to keep website after project

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Training – Amy – collaboration – support content developers. Bring templates, examples and tools

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Time clocks – Chris – Accutime preferred, integrates well

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- project leads – 100%

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Jane/Kara – knowledge sharing plans have roadmaps – to get team to be able to sustain workday. End users – need new skills – part of training curriculum for each type of users

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Test lead – Chris/ Lisa – default is 2 but can go to more – build into plan 3 tests. Partner leads in parallel, do dress rehearsals.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Jim – parallel – pick different scenarios to represent pay periods

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Cycles – for each of frequencies

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Strategy document – identify more complicated, entry/exit criteria for signoff, plan in advance

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Reconciliation – work with Premier – use their tool

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Time input if best source

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Skus- Mary - Prism and Workday extent – Brad - need prism for historical data for longitudinal data, extent helps solutioning. advance scheduling – evaluate against requirements

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Some grandfathering

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Required data needs – Jim – work for where data can be stored in workday, custom objects, prism

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Integrate into data warehouse - Brad – Prism paradigm shift - bring financials in and use workday Bi. Look at requirements. May be easier to go to Prism. But have done into customer warehouse – doable

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Integration with CGI for chart of accounts- Chris

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Premier tools -Brad -Accenture data quality platform – developed to address client pain points – ingest data, use business rules – another layer of validation. Leverage if needed if need another layer of evaluation.no additional costs

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Wendy – no ongoing licensing costs for training.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- May need Jira confluence to migrate all data to

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Wendy – missing requirements – work with governance team if and how to move forward

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- PM experience – 3 start to finish workday with Accenture

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Mary – flexible about architects, collaborate

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Ryan – team dedicated to government workday clients

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Part IV. Section III. Proposed Services (File #3)**

1. **Services to be Provided**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.</th>
<th><strong>A. Project Management and Administration Requirements</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Phase 0 – discovery to review challenges, integrations, reconfiguration – value add</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Toolkit and templates – proprietary?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• One on one outreach to leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tasks detail p8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Methodology provided p43 baselined on workday methodology and includes organizational change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>B. Analysis and Design</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strategic readiness sessions to estimate level of effort</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>C. Requirements Analysis</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Forms statement of work for reconfiguration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>D. Design</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Goal streamline and use governance structure for exceptions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>E. Configuration and Development</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Parallel approach due to complexity – staffing capacity?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>F. Integrations and Interfaces</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Use of consultants in accelerated cloud deployment center, does not appear to be offshore, but should verify policy compliance due to reference to nighttime support overseas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>G. Data and Analytics</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Report tracker methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Advanced report library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Approach for ongoing reporting demands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>H. Data Conversion</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Different from RACI, not clear how approach will work with State’s vendor; they recommend change. Check how cost forms handled. What do they do if keep vendor?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assess work to date p24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of builds decided after assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Proprietary tool – use for future tenant builds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>I. Testing</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 3 payroll parallel tests – align with operational need?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Built into lifecycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Types of tests and responsibilities articulated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Security testing of group access

J. Training
• Start with strategy
• Will evaluate preliminary conclusions
• May need to clarify who develops content

K. Organizational Change Management
• Prosci based, scale and customized approach, most leadership are certified
• Right size approach
• User experience Sessions may be included in test stage

L. Cutover and Final Acceptance
• In methodology, start planning during testing phase

M. Warranty and Post-Production Services
• 30 days for each deliverable

N. Requirements Matrix (Appendix G)
• Will review in initial assessment, some items marked TBD and needing clarification; 5 marked not available

O. Deliverables
• Use templates

P. Additional Licenses
• Limited license for labor costing
• Advanced compensation - typo needs clarification and explanation

Q. Assumptions
• Use Collaborative SFTP – review needed
• State coordinates third party

3. Implementation – Work Plan
• Includes 22 week assessment
• Policy and compliance
• Time for deliverable review built in
• Gantt has modules

4. Resources – Staffing Plan
• Multiple workday implementations
• Clarify proposed PM availability – fulltime or half time
• Portfolio director has done multiple deployments; PM has PeopleSoft implementation and is currently on an implementation
• Review appendix J experience

5. Proposed Governance Structure
• Alignment with State team?
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Demonstrations

- 1000+ workday clients, cross industry/government/education 100% success.  
- All onshore resources  
- ROI- want to get knowledge transfer to State  
  - Example – Caterpillar – number of employees, countries, branding, complexity. Brought in at end of architecture phase to assess and reposition, union considerations not met  
  - Example Florida Tech - rescued  
- CVS= continuous value services  
- Team intros – combine change and strategy directors, All government experience, PM 20 year government experience  
- Approach – presented by PM, approach provide everything to be successful, review artifacts  
- Sharepoint project site and Proprietary tools  
- Project Management focus on monitoring, test focus on payroll  
- Project structure and governance approach, pair State and Collaborative, address risk mitigation  
- Scheduling – beta with workday – implemented with customers and Kronos connection  
- Labor cost distribution – believe can be solved  
- Risks -example projects  
  - identify data loads are core competency  
- Testing – test readiness assessment, toolset – communication for bug tracking, testing framework and plan  
- Change management – focus groups, biggest resistors, weekly workday  
- Recognize assessment done, but need to take through their process, run in parallel with change management,  
- Warranty -90 days post go live, 12 weeks hypercare with same consultants  
- Postproduction – can build in various ways – lean on, services, staff augmentation, consulting hours, AMS (abbreviation not known)  
- Manage all interactions with workday, will manage Delivery Assurance if engaged,  
- Coordination with other parties-important with external project managers, want to understand Kainos approach for automated testing  
- Did not address data conversation vendor in answers.  
- Change management -identify pockets of energy  
- Comparable projects WA – number of emps, FL Sheriff - complexity  
- Governance -adjust based on level of engagement from workday  
- Took exception to 6 month warranty

Key Personnel Interviews
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- Hillsboro – full platform, approvals routing for time tracking – configuration, disparate old systems = communication and org change. Groups autonomous but built unified system.

- Change management – weave Prosci into synergy methodology. example – teams channel – self paced if champions worn out. Voting tools.

- Artifacts – IJA impactful – referred to non workday project, rebuilding. Want to look at RTM, integrations, reports to build momentum.

- Data conversion with Premier – to do what? State do transformations, then hand off to Collaborative to load. Provide workbooks for state to fill in. use Daytona to load. kickout go back to state to triage. Proprietary workbooks and validation State does extract and transform, Collaborative does Load.

- Dave Manke – integration architect – depends on customer resources – no specific process, use Collaborative for more complex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tim Blake PM – 19 years gov ERP, certified PM 2006, mostly state local town gov and ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing lead – Jeff Horinek – 3 years implementations, 12 total, 25 years test lead ISTTB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance lead – Jennifer Durrett - advise experienced finance resource, CPA gov and county 10 years, auditors, Coll 3 years, 90% of projects last 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Business Analyst – Paul Nicotera – Functional Analyst – 8 years Collaborative, workstreams under him to align functional streams, partner Tim for escalations. Nick Paulo additional oversight and experience, 10 year experience in eco system, Paul 8 years, + 2 peoplesoft, mostly government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead technical analyst – Dave Manke – align 3 technical groups, collaborate with business experts, 20 years sf, 10 in workday ecosystem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dedication – full time Tim – FT, Natalie –  
Architect vary, leads full time, plus additional  
Workstream leads full time eg HCM, recruiting, payroll plus time tracking  
Assumed security lead 30 hours week  
Change management and training 100% and lead, training come in later  
Testing – assumptions – need to understand Kainos, full time after customer confirmation  
Technical architect – Dave Manke – full time after assessment – Daniel full time, supplemented

| Delivery assurance- recommended by workday, find valuable for communication with workday. Provide own quality assurance. |
| IV&V – experience working with. Do quality assurance at checkpoints – no issue to involve IV&V. Workday provides with their services. Build into test plan |
| SKU – advance compensation – not separate , recommend deferring another workstream. Can develop roadmap |
| Other SKUs – PEX People experience, Core Financials, WD Scheduling and Labor Optimization |
| Beta – part of implementer team- certified, risk – not all functionality there – identify gaps, contingency planning |
| Planning -22 weeks. Confusion in proposal. |
| ACDC team - staffed on one project at a time, no offshore, consultant stays through lifecycle. |
| Training license – no additional – bringing tools, artifacts can be save after project. No tools remain onsite after |
| Custom solution for reporting – load reports into tenant |
| Releases – collaborative will support state, identify impacts from release. Methodology – plan for release and test |
| Parallel test – all pay groups tested in parallels |
| **Integrations** | - use all integrations for parallel – dress rehearsals. Impact tool for reconciliation - reports in excel. |
| **Test scenario templates** | - need state to look at test cases and add flair |
| **Training** | - provide facilitator guides, scenarios, answered by Steph for trainers, training strategy |
| **Prosci** | - woven in to methodology – provide tools and overview, share principles as needed, built into deliverables |
| **Kronos** | - leverage resources from parent company? – have not used resources on a project. No opportunity yet, talk a lot with them |
| **Vijay from parent org** |  |
**Part IV. Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience (File #2)**

1. **Overview of the Organization**
   - **P:** Depth in government implementations and Workday experience
   - **P:** Committing to deep dives on troubled areas of prior implementation at the onset of their engagement
   - **P:** 6 governments with 10,000+ employees LIVE (Denver, Dallas, Baltimore, Iowa, Suffolk, and NASA JPL) and 3 more underway (Los Angeles, LA-DWP, Maricopa)
   - **Q:** Need to better understand The Accenture Project Portal (TAPP), for testing and other activities, that was deployed for City of Baltimore
   - **I:** Common themes across the listed Government implementation experiences: Business Process Alignment (BPA), Change Management, Premier International for data conversion
   - **Q:** How many of the listed references completed a phased implementation? Iowa appears to have been big-bang, Baltimore phased, Denver phased as well…what about Dallas? Several cited as phased later on page 29
   - **I:** City of Dallas encountered challenges implementing Workday and similarly brought in Accenture
   - **I:** City & County of Denver was first to use BPA methodology
   - **Q:** Need to better understand Accenture perspective on challenges faced upon Baltimore’s go-live on Workday for payroll (potential Demo question)

2. **Implementation Experience**
   - **P:** Cited remote delivery experiences during Covid pandemic
   - **I:** Accenture has a Prism Analytics accelerator that was deployed at Denver and has won accolades
   - **P:** Several government clients cited with numerous MOUs, phased implementation examples. And examples of legacy systems retired
   - **P:** Transparency about role Accenture has played across all government Workday implementations (page 31)
   - **N:** Customer quote for “Change Management with Executive Engagement” is from a government that is not yet successfully live (Maricopa Co.)
   - **Q:** Need to better understand some of the client-partnership Software Development examples, such as FLSA with City of Vancouver (page 33)
   - **I:** Cite use of Kronos Telestaff for timekeeping at cities of Dallas, Baltimore
   - **N:** Regarding Labor Cost Distribution, recommend addressing through BPA process
   - **Q:** Need to better understand how Iowa’s LCD requirements were met. Accenture was sub there to Workday and not directly contracted

3. **Product Experience**
   - **P:** Experience with all Workday modules and with numerous integration types
4. Subcontractors

5. Organizational Chart
   - **P:** Proposed team lead was involved with Dallas implementation; breakdown of which other referenced clients each team member has worked with is helpful
   - **P:** 15+ names provided across 10+ roles

6. Litigation

7. Financial Viability

8. Licensure/Certification

9. Certificate of Insurance

Part IV. Section III. Proposed Services (File #3)

1. Services to be Provided
   - **P:** Accenture analysis of RTM splits each into 6 categories spanning 1900+ items; 20 items require a 3P software solution to meet the requirement. A process workflow for how Accenture will handle each is laid out (page 4)
   - **I:** 2 formal Decision Points (exec alignment), 1 after BPA and 1 after Architect phase; Est. timeline with go-live of April 2023 (14 months?) will be confirmed after BPA (X months?) (pg 5)
   - **I:** Will leverage Nashville, TN Workday technology center
   - **Q:** Need to better understand content in “Bytes of Knowledge” video learning library

2. A. Project Management and Administration Requirements
   - **Q:** While they mention the ability to export data from TAPP to SharePoint, need to understand the limitations that could arise.
   - **N:** Some SI proprietary PM tools have little capability for customization (in order to maintain the SI standard), which can make the tool not quite in line with how the State would want to see some project management information.
   - **P:** The Accenture Project Portal (TAPP) system will provide one central location for project management to track and manage all project communications, tasks, activities, workflows, issues, risks, and documentation
   - **Q:** Since TAPP is the system used for project management and decision documentation, will the state receive a file with this information at the end of the engagement? Is this system backed up regularly in case of system issue or interruption? The State must decide whether its own SharePoint site is preferred over TAPP. (page 8)
   - **P:** Accenture Resource Capacity Tool will allow SOM to anticipate potential internal staffing issues for every stage of the project
   - **N:** Challenges table (page 14) includes no mention of software issues or software inability to meet client needs
   - **P:** Decision Paper approach (and provided sample) appear thorough for analysis of ongoing project issues

B. Analysis and Design

C. Requirements Analysis
• P: Completed BPA (Business Process Analysis) for Workday for 30 public sector organizations since 2015.
• N: BPA will be composed of 5 phases; each is well described but lack of durations make it hard to assess how comprehensive this effort will be
• N: ACFR write-up is appropriate for a Financial not an HR/Payroll implementation proposal as Workday will not be Maine’s system of record for such reporting (page 21)

D. Design
• P: Speak to how they will work with Premier on data conversion (experience from Dallas, Baltimore and Iowa)

E. Configuration and Development
• Q: For config-based solutions, config done and confirmed during ARCHITECT stage, and additionally confirmed during C&P with expanded group prior to testing; for non-config solutions (last 3 Accenture categories of requirements), no explicit review of prototype/report/integration by team or expanded group prior to state creating test case and unit testing occurring
• Q: Need to understand timing of Customer Confirmation Sessions to an expanded State audience relative to State SME sign-off on configuration approach for their area
• P: Solution Customization Comments outline their approach to working with clients to minimize these.

F. Integrations and Interfaces
• P: Integrations to be a shared Accenture & State responsibility with bidder taking on the more complex items (page 28); this is observed on most similar engagements unless otherwise specified in the solicitation
• P: Accenture has experience with G/L integration to the State’s financial solution

G. Data and Analytics
• Q: Accenture process is focused on use of standard Workday reports and “the ability to develop specific reports according to need”; also mention Reporting Repository and Developer Toolbox; could the State better understand this by providing an exercise for the bidder to present details steps on during demos?
• N: All reporting writing responsibility ends up with the State per steps laid out on page 30

H. Data Conversion
• P: Experience working with Premier (Dallas, Iowa, and Baltimore)
• N: While they acknowledge the role of Premier in one place, they include boiler plate language in other places which is irrelevant and /or inconsistent with Premier responsibility for data conversion.
• I: They have Data conversion accelerator tools for data extraction and validation. Not sure if these matters given the use of Premier for Data Conversion.
• Q: Need to see demo of Data Conversion Accelerator Tool (DCAT) to better understand how it facilitates streamlining data loading from one tenant to the next

I. Testing
• N: Accenture has deviated from the RACI for testing, including suggesting that there should be shared ownership of unit testing. May be unrealistic at that first stage of testing.
• N: Test stage activities lists deliverable “Completed User Experience Testing (UAT Support). The description of that type of testing elsewhere makes it clear that User Experience Testing is something completely different from UAT.
• N: State will be the owner (rather than shared ownership/responsibility) for creating test cases; Accenture does not own either the Unit Test or System Test functions, which is generally
observed as vendor responsibility (less so for SaaS implementations) – it is proposed as shared with the State

- I: Kainos supports, but does not replace, the testing required by the State testing team; have experience leveraging it with Maricopa and Iowa
- Q: Need to see demo of Test Scenario Generator that creates State-specific test scenarios

J. Training

- P: Explicitly recognizes the importance of workplace training (10% formal, 20% informal, 70% workplace)
- Q: Training content development and pilot training takes place in C&P stage prior to Test. How will updates to training be made based on problems discovered and fixed during Test?
- P: Extensive experience delivering remote projects and remote training
- N: Accenture expects State to produce all training materials with some support (contrary to requested role of SI in RACI). While this has some advantages, the State may not have the number of resources with appropriate skills to produce training materials of sufficient quality
- Q: Need better understanding of Accenture training content templates (accelerators) as this will also be a joint responsibility
- P: Thorough and standard Training approach and methodology

K. Organizational Change Management

- I: Recommends that State increase planned OCM staffing from 2 to 6.
- P: Five Pillars of Change – Leadership Alignment, Stakeholder Engagement, Readiness, Communication and Training and Performance Support (page 46) is a thorough approach
- Q: Can Accenture share a sample of the SaaS change readiness survey (PACT) during demos?
- Q: What OCM strategies has Accenture brought to engagements encountering implementation fatigue?
- Q: How does Accenture propose to engage Change Ambassadors during each phase of the implementation?

L. Cutover and Final Acceptance

- N: Tentative go-live date of 4/23 seems challenging given that Workday semi-annual update typically comes in March
- N: No mention of State requirement of back-out and recovery details

M. Warranty and Post-Production Services

- N: No mention of warranty at all, including warranty length (contrary to State requirement of 6 months)
- P: Develops Sustainability Plan to ensure success post go-live.
- Q: If Accenture does agree to warranty, how would that work in the case of items that were developed/configured in a collaborative way?

N. Requirements Matrix (Appendix G)

- N: Some inconsistencies between summary of requirements analysis in proposal and the RTM. 6 status categories in proposal, with only 5 in RTM. Some names of categories are different.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serviced to be Provided section</th>
<th>Appendix G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Functionality provided out-of-the-box or with configuration (no custom development required)</td>
<td>1,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Additional information is needed by Accenture to fully understand the requirement</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Standard Workday or Met with configuration (no custom development)</td>
<td>1,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Requirement is Unclear - Need additional Information</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Requirement cannot currently be met as understood</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Custom report development is required:</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Out of the box tools to support integration and report development available</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Third-party software required to fully support requirement</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Custom Report Development Required</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Out of the box tools to support integration and report development</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Third-party Software Integration - Need additional Information</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

O. Deliverables
- N: There are redundancies between BPA and Plan phase – multiple kick-off and project plan deliverables seem unnecessary
- N: There is not acknowledgment of the business process work done by IJA that was included in the solicitation; instead, Accenture proposes to start this effort over
- N: Executive Engagement Program deliverables have redundancies with work previously done on prior Workday project as well as recent Gartner effort

P. Additional Licenses

Q. Assumptions

3. Implementation – Work Plan
- N: 4 of the 13-month implementation timeline being spent on BPA & Plan phases seems excessive; also would be good to find ways to start testing earlier than month 9

4. Resources – Staffing Plan
- P: Key resources are senior resources with many years of experience in various areas.
- N: They do not guarantee that these resources will be available for project.
- N: References for some key resources do not represent the same role that they will be playing on this project (e.g., Lead Technical Analyst has references for role as Integration Developer and IT Project Manager; Testing Lead has reference for role as SME HCM)
- N: Inherent in naming a BPA project manager is the implication that this role goes away after 3 months, which negatively impacts continuity of knowledge for the remaining 10-month deployment

5. Proposed Governance Structure
- Q: In one place they discuss “State Decision-making Model” which assumes that 80% of decisions being made at project level. However, discussion of decision papers seems to imply that every change in scope, resourcing or timeline goes to steering committee. Need clarification.

**Bidder’s Experience and Staff Qualifications**

- N: Highlighted experience of staff with Workday and with each other but didn't focus on experience in the roles they will take on this project.

**Bidder’s Implementation Approach**

- N: OCM discussion does not address how to address fatigue, communicating why this implementation will be successful when the others were not.
- Q: What are the key action steps SOM needs to take / implement to make OCM different this time around?

**Presentation on Key Issues and Risks Identified by the SI Bidder**

- I: Important to understand the current interpretation of labor agreements as represented in the current system, rather than the theoretical terms shown in labor agreement.

**Demonstration on Application Operational Considerations**

- **Presentation on Partnership During and After Implementation**
  - P: Premier is Accenture’s go to data conversion partner

**Question and Answer Session**

-
**Interview Questions**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><em>N</em>: May need to redo artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td><em>P</em>: All team members should have deep Workday knowledge to be able to help write / assist with report creation / review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td><em>P</em>: Brad seems very knowledgeable; may need clarification on availability (listed at 25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Part IV. Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience (File #2)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Overview of the Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• N: No references provided for confidentiality reasons, but also did not provide any detail on how they are qualified as a company to provide the requested services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• P: Certified Workday Partner, since 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Implementation Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• P: Have over 1330 Workday-certified consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• N: Instead of listing any public sector clients, point to their website, which requires releasing an email address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• N: In response to experience working with clients with CBAs, cited a larger client, a company that has grown through M&amp;A and acquired unionized employees; lack of specificity in example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• N: In response to Workday configuration experience, simply recite the various phases in Workday deployment methodology; nothing specific in response to SOM’s current situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• N: In response to experience implementing segments of HR over time, the bidder provides some pros and cons of phasing vs. big-bang, but not specific company experience pertinent to retiring SOM’s current legacy solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• N: Responses to SOM’s functional challenges bely a lack of understanding of these very public-sector-specific situations. For example, response on schedules is about simple scheduling processes, and response on LCD meanders into discussion of supporting SOM consume Workday’s bi-annual releases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Product Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• N: One-sentence responses to question do not instill confidence that vendor understands this domain and will be detail-oriented in their deliverable documentation to SOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• N: In response to data integration question, assign responsibility to client data stewards rather than explain what Alight will do, and later reference collection of data from various countries/regions, which is not applicable for a State government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Subcontractors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• P: No planned use of sub-contractors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Organizational Chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• P: Provided 9 names for requested roles but no other detail, e.g., no org chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• N: One of the roles is data/analyst, not the data &amp; analytics lead role SOM is seeking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Litigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• N: Very qualified and reworded response from what was asked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Financial Viability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Licensure/Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Workday certified, 1332 employees certified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Certificate of Insurance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part IV. Section III. Proposed Services (File #3)

1. Services to be Provided

2. 
   A. Project Management and Administration Requirements
   • 
   B. Analysis and Design
   • 
   C. Requirements Analysis
   • 
   D. Design
   • 
   E. Configuration and Development
   • 
   F. Integrations and Interfaces
   • 
   G. Data and Analytics
   • 
   H. Data Conversion
   • 
   I. Testing
   • 
   J. Training
   • 
   K. Organizational Change Management
   • 
   L. Cutover and Final Acceptance
   • 
   M. Warranty and Post-Production Services
   • 
   N. Requirements Matrix (Appendix G)
   • 
   O. Deliverables
   • 
   P. Additional Licenses
   • 
   Q. Assumptions
   • 

3. Implementation – Work Plan
   • 

4. Resources – Staffing Plan
   • 

5. Proposed Governance Structure
   •
### Part IV. Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience (File #2)

#### 1. Overview of the Organization
- **P**: Longest-tenured Workday services partner with 1000+ customers
- **N**: Most of government experience is with smaller entities, either cities or government agencies
- **I**: Collaborative is an indirect wholly owned subsidiary of Cognizant Tech. Solutions
- **N**: None of the 3 references provided are a Statewide government (Maryland Environmental Services, Washington University, Hillsborough County Sheriff)

#### 2. Implementation Experience
- **I**: 450 employees companywide; customers in over 100 countries, nearly all industries
- **Q**: “saving” clients from failed deployments is a unique qualification that they bring; need to understand better
- **I**: Practice began with Oracle PeopleSoft experience, so broader ERP knowledge
- **P**: No State-level experience but well-tailored chart (page 12) showing related implementation experiences and narrative addressing how they have handled complex projects
- **P**: Have data integration experience with several vendor technologies
- **I**: Proposing single-phase approach
- **I**: For complex scheduling solutions, they recommend leveraging an external scheduling solution

#### 3. Product Experience
- **P**: Collaborative experience organized by SOM purchase SKUs is significant and compelling
- **P**: Have a proprietary tool for Payroll comparison, Impact – need to understand better
- **Q**: Is IPaaS an additional fee (page 28)
- **Q**: Collaborative cloud ACDC solution (page 30)
- **Q**: pre-packaged Advanced Report Dashboards & Analytics

#### 4. Subcontractors
- None proposed

#### 5. Organizational Chart
- **N**: Provided position titles, roles but no names or org chart
- **I**: Delivery assurance will be a separate agreement to be contracted with Workday

#### 6. Litigation
- 

#### 7. Financial Viability
- 

#### 8. Licensure/Certification
- 

#### 9. Certificate of Insurance
- 

---
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Bidder’s Experience and Staff Qualifications
- N: Experiences mentioned are for commercial clients not government agencies
- 
- 
- 

Bidder’s Implementation Approach
- P: Listed 3rd party vendors as part of the project governance structure
- N: Recommended that State shouldn’t use Premier
- 
- 

Presentation on Key Issues and Risks Identified by the SI Bidder
- N: OCM approach does not address key OCM challenges at Maine with failed projects or how to address fatigue
- P: Good & detailed discussion of testing
- 
- 

Demonstration on Application Operational Considerations
- 
- 
- 

Presentation on Partnership During and After Implementation
- P: Every ticket surveyed. 98% satisfaction rating
- 
- 
- 

Question and Answer Session
- 
- 

Interview Questions

1.
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| 8. |
| 9. |
| 10 |
| 11 |
| 12 |
| 13 |
| 14 |
| 15 |
| 16 |
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Part IV. Section III. Proposed Services (File #3)
1. Services to be Provided

- I: Program Operations Dashboard (POD) provides an online collaboration tool between the
  State and Collaborative
- I: Their methodology is termed Cynergy
- I: Quality Assurance program enabled by the Testing Center of Excellence (TCoE)
  Governance Model
- N: Lengthy chart on Page 8 is only to “give an idea of the types of tasks” – unclear why so
  much detail was added here only for illustration

2.

A. Project Management and Administration Requirements

- I: Their internal PMO reviews all projects for best practice usage and adherence to Workday
  guidelines, resulting in 100% pass rate from Workday’s Delivery Assurance.
- Q: How many 1:1 focus sessions will be needed with Agency staff? What’s the cadence?

B. Analysis and Design

C. Requirements Analysis

D. Design

- Q: Assessment period on page 35 of proposal mentions both 22 weeks and 14 weeks. Need
  clarification.
- I: State responsible for design maintenance and changes to Design documents after the
  Design sign off

E. Configuration and Development

F. Integrations and Interfaces

- I: Asserts that their approach to integrations will result in 30% reduction in cost, delivery time
  and re-testing.
- Q: Their Accelerated Cloud Deployment Center has completed over 7,000 integrations to date.
  Can they provide a demo to SOM?

G. Data and Analytics

- I: Repository of 500 pre-built reports in the Advanced Reporting Dashboard (ARD) library.
- Q: Not clear if the State or Collaborative will be responsible for tracking new reporting
  functionality prior to go-live

H. Data Conversion

- N: Proposal doesn’t mention/recognize that Premier is leading Data Conversion.
- I: Proposal suggests changing RACI for Data Conversion process

I. Testing

- I: Suggests 3 parallel test cycles.
- N: State responsible for documenting test scenarios.
- N: Mention of how Collaborative will work with Kainos
- N: Inconsistency between what is stated in RACI attachment and what is stated in this section

J. Training

- P: Experience successfully holding virtual instructor led training sessions
- N: Training strategy development but no assistance with development of content

K. Organizational Change Management
N: Mentioned change agents in the project administration section but did not elaborate on how these will be formed or used as part of the Change Management process

L. Cutover and Final Acceptance

I: Helped build the Workday deployment methodology.

P: Conducts Sustainability Workshop to discuss how to provide ongoing training and support Workday enhancements and release updates.

P: Delivers Integrations Operations Guides

M. Warranty and Post-Production Services

N: Only 1 month warranty rather than the 6 months requested by State.

N: 10 weeks post-production support instead of 90 days

N. Requirements Matrix (Appendix G)

N: They have a Security category but don’t have a general statement to indicate whether these requirements are satisfied out of the box, with configuration etc. A few of the requirements have comments, but it’s unclear what’s the level of effort for the remaining security requirements (e.g., configuration, custom, etc.)

O. Deliverables

I: Utilizes ProSCI (widely respected OCM methodology) for many OCM templates.

Q: The Deliverable matrix includes System Test execution report, Integration execution report and Load / Stress results, which imply Collaborative owns responsibility for completion of these activities, as opposed to UAT and Parallel Test Support, which imply Collaborative supports State of Maine who own responsibility. This is inconsistent with the write-up in section (I) above.

P. Additional Licenses

Q: Will the state have access to Workday Finance after deployment?

Q: Need clarification on whether the state has access to the Advanced Compensation functionality in Workday

Q. Assumptions

3. Implementation – Work Plan

N: No mention of how Collaborative will support Workday system updates during the implementation period

P: Proposing 21-month timeline; Assess phase followed immediately by Architect (skip Plan); start Testing in month 13 and allot 27 weeks (~6 months)

P: Accepted the RACI responsibilities proposed by SOM with exceptions, taking on more responsibility for Data Conversion and for Parallel testing

4. Resources – Staffing Plan

N: They do not identify a separate Test Lead resource, instead indicating that the engagement manager will provide guidance in that area.

N: They do not indicate which of their roles map to Lead Technical Analyst, Lead Business Analyst.

N: They don’t explain clearly what some of their roles will do on this project (Strategy Architect, Portfolio Director)

5. Proposed Governance Structure

•
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I, Douglas E. Cotnoir, accept the offer to become a member of the Request for Proposals (RFP) Evaluation Team for the State of Maine Department of Administrative and Financial Services. I do hereby accept the terms set forth in this agreement AND hereby disclose any affiliation or relationship I may have in connection with a bidder who has submitted a proposal to this RFP.

Neither I nor any member of my immediate family have a personal or financial interest, direct or indirect, in the bidders whose proposals I will be reviewing. “Interest” may include, but is not limited to: current or former ownership in the bidder’s company; current or former Board membership; current or former employment with the bidder; current or former personal contractual relationship with the bidder (example: paid consultant); and/or current or former relationship to a bidder’s official which could reasonably be construed to constitute a conflict of interest (personal relationships may be perceived by the public as a potential conflict of interest).

I have not advised, consulted with or assisted any bidder in the preparation of any proposal submitted in response to this RFP nor have I submitted a letter of support or similar endorsement.

I understand and agree that the evaluation process is to be conducted in an impartial manner without bias or prejudice. In this regard, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, there are no circumstances that would reasonably support a good faith charge of bias. I further understand that in the event a good faith charge of bias is made, it will rest with me to decide whether I should be disqualified from participation in the evaluation process.

I agree to hold confidential all information related to the contents of Requests for Proposals presented during the review process until such time as the Department formally releases the award decision notices for public distribution.

Signature: Douglas E. Cotnoir
Date: 1/11/2022

Rev. 8/25/2021
STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL SERVICES

AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFP #: 202110165
RFP TITLE: Human Resources Management System (HRMS) Systems Integrator

I, ______________________________ accept the offer to become a member of the Request for Proposals (RFP) Evaluation Team for the State of Maine Department of Administrative and Financial Services. I do hereby accept the terms set forth in this agreement AND hereby disclose any affiliation or relationship I may have in connection with a bidder who has submitted a proposal to this RFP.

Neither I nor any member of my immediate family have a personal or financial interest, direct or indirect, in the bidders whose proposals I will be reviewing. “Interest” may include, but is not limited to: current or former ownership in the bidder’s company; current or former Board membership; current or former employment with the bidder; current or former personal contractual relationship with the bidder (example: paid consultant); and/or current or former relationship to a bidder’s official which could reasonably be construed to constitute a conflict of interest (personal relationships may be perceived by the public as a potential conflict of interest).

I have not advised, consulted with or assisted any bidder in the preparation of any proposal submitted in response to this RFP nor have I submitted a letter of support or similar endorsement.

I understand and agree that the evaluation process is to be conducted in an impartial manner without bias or prejudice. In this regard, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, there are no circumstances that would reasonably support a good faith charge of bias. I further understand that in the event a good faith charge of bias is made, it will rest with me to decide whether I should be disqualified from participation in the evaluation process.

I agree to hold confidential all information related to the contents of Requests for Proposals presented during the review process until such time as the Department formally releases the award decision notices for public distribution.

__________________________  1/11/2022
Signature                      Date

Rev. 8/25/2021
AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

RFP #: 202110165

RFP TITLE: Human Resources Management System (HRMS) Systems Integrator

I, ___________________ accept the offer to become a member of the Request for Proposals (RFP) Evaluation Team for the State of Maine Department of Administrative and Financial Services. I do hereby accept the terms set forth in this agreement AND hereby disclose any affiliation or relationship I may have in connection with a bidder who has submitted a proposal to this RFP.

Neither I nor any member of my immediate family have a personal or financial interest, direct or indirect, in the bidders whose proposals I will be reviewing. “Interest” may include, but is not limited to: current or former ownership in the bidder’s company; current or former Board membership; current or former employment with the bidder; current or former personal contractual relationship with the bidder (example: paid consultant); and/or current or former relationship to a bidder’s official which could reasonably be construed to constitute a conflict of interest (personal relationships may be perceived by the public as a potential conflict of interest).

I have not advised, consulted with or assisted any bidder in the preparation of any proposal submitted in response to this RFP nor have I submitted a letter of support or similar endorsement.

I understand and agree that the evaluation process is to be conducted in an impartial manner without bias or prejudice. In this regard, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, there are no circumstances that would reasonably support a good faith charge of bias. I further understand that in the event a good faith charge of bias is made, it will rest with me to decide whether I should be disqualified from participation in the evaluation process.

I agree to hold confidential all information related to the contents of Requests for Proposals presented during the review process until such time as the Department formally releases the award decision notices for public distribution.

_______________________________________
Signature

_______________________________________
Date

1/11/2022

Rev. 8/25/2021
STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL SERVICES

AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFP #: 202110165
RFP TITLE: Human Resources Management System (HRMS) Systems Integrator

I, ___________________________ accept the offer to become a member of the Request for Proposals (RFP) Evaluation Team for the State of Maine Department of Administrative and Financial Services. I do hereby accept the terms set forth in this agreement AND hereby disclose any affiliation or relationship I may have in connection with a bidder who has submitted a proposal to this RFP.

Neither I nor any member of my immediate family have a personal or financial interest, direct or indirect, in the bidders whose proposals I will be reviewing. “Interest” may include, but is not limited to: current or former ownership in the bidder’s company; current or former Board membership; current or former employment with the bidder; current or former personal contractual relationship with the bidder (example: paid consultant); and/or current or former relationship to a bidder’s official which could reasonably be construed to constitute a conflict of interest (personal relationships may be perceived by the public as a potential conflict of interest).

I have not advised, consulted with or assisted any bidder in the preparation of any proposal submitted in response to this RFP nor have I submitted a letter of support or similar endorsement.

I understand and agree that the evaluation process is to be conducted in an impartial manner without bias or prejudice. In this regard, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, there are no circumstances that would reasonably support a good faith charge of bias. I further understand that in the event a good faith charge of bias is made, it will rest with me to decide whether I should be disqualified from participation in the evaluation process.

I agree to hold confidential all information related to the contents of Requests for Proposals presented during the review process until such time as the Department formally releases the award decision notices for public distribution.

_______________________________________
Signature

_______________________________________
Date

Janet T. Mills
Governor

Kirsten Figueroa
Commissioner
The following Agreement and Disclosure Statements are from Subject Matter Experts (SMEs).
AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFP #: 202110165

RFP TITLE: Human Resources Management System (HRMS) Systems Integrator

I, __________________________ accept the offer to become a member of the Request for Proposals (RFP) Evaluation Team for the State of Maine Department of Administrative and Financial Services. I do hereby accept the terms set forth in this agreement AND hereby disclose any affiliation or relationship I may have in connection with a bidder who has submitted a proposal to this RFP.

Neither I nor any member of my immediate family have a personal or financial interest, direct or indirect, in the bidders whose proposals I will be reviewing. “Interest” may include, but is not limited to: current or former ownership in the bidder’s company; current or former Board membership; current or former employment with the bidder; current or former personal contractual relationship with the bidder (example: paid consultant); and/or current or former relationship to a bidder’s official which could reasonably be construed to constitute a conflict of interest (personal relationships may be perceived by the public as a potential conflict of interest).

I have not advised, consulted with or assisted any bidder in the preparation of any proposal submitted in response to this RFP nor have I submitted a letter of support or similar endorsement.

I understand and agree that the evaluation process is to be conducted in an impartial manner without bias or prejudice. In this regard, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, there are no circumstances that would reasonably support a good faith charge of bias. I further understand that in the event a good faith charge of bias is made, it will rest with me to decide whether I should be disqualified from participation in the evaluation process.

I agree to hold confidential all information related to the contents of Requests for Proposals presented during the review process until such time as the Department formally releases the award decision notices for public distribution.

_______________________________________
Signature

___________________________
Date

STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL SERVICES

Janet T. Mills
Governor

Kirsten Figueroa
Commissioner

1/11/2022

Hazel Stevenson

DocuSign Envelope ID: AF017B13-EF9B-4E48-9D68-5F9412A55F57
STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL SERVICES

AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFP #: 202110165
RFP TITLE: Human Resources Management System (HRMS) Systems Integrator

I, ___________________________ accept the offer to become a member of the Request for Proposals (RFP) Evaluation Team for the State of Maine Department of Administrative and Financial Services. I do hereby accept the terms set forth in this agreement AND hereby disclose any affiliation or relationship I may have in connection with a bidder who has submitted a proposal to this RFP.

Neither I nor any member of my immediate family have a personal or financial interest, direct or indirect, in the bidders whose proposals I will be reviewing. “Interest” may include, but is not limited to: current or former ownership in the bidder’s company; current or former Board membership; current or former employment with the bidder; current or former personal contractual relationship with the bidder (example: paid consultant); and/or current or former relationship to a bidder’s official which could reasonably be construed to constitute a conflict of interest (personal relationships may be perceived by the public as a potential conflict of interest).

I have not advised, consulted with or assisted any bidder in the preparation of any proposal submitted in response to this RFP nor have I submitted a letter of support or similar endorsement.

I understand and agree that the evaluation process is to be conducted in an impartial manner without bias or prejudice. In this regard, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, there are no circumstances that would reasonably support a good faith charge of bias. I further understand that in the event a good faith charge of bias is made, it will rest with me to decide whether I should be disqualified from participation in the evaluation process.

I agree to hold confidential all information related to the contents of Requests for Proposals presented during the review process until such time as the Department formally releases the award decision notices for public distribution.

__________________________________________
Signature

________________________
Date

Janet T. Mills
Governor

Kirsten Figueroa
Commissioner

Jackson Smith
1/11/2022
AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFP #: 202110165
RFP TITLE: Human Resources Management System (HRMS) Systems Integrator

I, Lisa McGrotty, accept the offer to become a member of the Request for Proposals (RFP) Evaluation Team for the State of Maine Department of Administrative and Financial Services. I do hereby accept the terms set forth in this agreement AND hereby disclose any affiliation or relationship I may have in connection with a bidder who has submitted a proposal to this RFP.

Neither I nor any member of my immediate family have a personal or financial interest, direct or indirect, in the bidders whose proposals I will be reviewing. “Interest” may include, but is not limited to: current or former ownership in the bidder’s company; current or former Board membership; current or former employment with the bidder; current or former personal contractual relationship with the bidder (example: paid consultant); and/or current or former relationship to a bidder’s official which could reasonably be construed to constitute a conflict of interest (personal relationships may be perceived by the public as a potential conflict of interest).

I have not advised, consulted with or assisted any bidder in the preparation of any proposal submitted in response to this RFP nor have I submitted a letter of support or similar endorsement.

I understand and agree that the evaluation process is to be conducted in an impartial manner without bias or prejudice. In this regard, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, there are no circumstances that would reasonably support a good faith charge of bias. I further understand that in the event a good faith charge of bias is made, it will rest with me to decide whether I should be disqualified from participation in the evaluation process.

I agree to hold confidential all information related to the contents of Requests for Proposals presented during the review process until such time as the Department formally releases the award decision notices for public distribution.

__________________________________________________________________________
Signature: Lisa McGrotty
Date: 1/11/2022
STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL SERVICES

AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFP #: 202110165

RFP TITLE: Human Resources Management System (HRMS) Systems Integrator

I, Maydad Cohen, accept the offer to become a member of the Request for Proposals (RFP) Evaluation Team for the State of Maine Department of Administrative and Financial Services. I do hereby accept the terms set forth in this agreement AND hereby disclose any affiliation or relationship I may have in connection with a bidder who has submitted a proposal to this RFP.

Neither I nor any member of my immediate family have a personal or financial interest, direct or indirect, in the bidders whose proposals I will be reviewing. “Interest” may include, but is not limited to: current or former ownership in the bidder’s company; current or former Board membership; current or former employment with the bidder; current or former personal contractual relationship with the bidder (example: paid consultant); and/or current or former relationship to a bidder’s official which could reasonably be construed to constitute a conflict of interest (personal relationships may be perceived by the public as a potential conflict of interest).

I have not advised, consulted with or assisted any bidder in the preparation of any proposal submitted in response to this RFP nor have I submitted a letter of support or similar endorsement.

I understand and agree that the evaluation process is to be conducted in an impartial manner without bias or prejudice. In this regard, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, there are no circumstances that would reasonably support a good faith charge of bias. I further understand that in the event a good faith charge of bias is made, it will rest with me to decide whether I should be disqualified from participation in the evaluation process.

I agree to hold confidential all information related to the contents of Requests for Proposals presented during the review process until such time as the Department formally releases the award decision notices for public distribution.

Signature: Maydad Cohen
Date: 1/11/2022

Janet T. Mills
Governor

Kirsten Figueroa
Commissioner

Rev. 8/25/2021
STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL SERVICES

AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFP #: 202110165

RFP TITLE: Human Resources Management System (HRMS) Systems Integrator

I, ___________________________ accept the offer to become a member of the Request for Proposals (RFP) Evaluation Team for the State of Maine Department of Administrative and Financial Services. I do hereby accept the terms set forth in this agreement AND hereby disclose any affiliation or relationship I may have in connection with a bidder who has submitted a proposal to this RFP.

Neither I nor any member of my immediate family have a personal or financial interest, direct or indirect, in the bidders whose proposals I will be reviewing. “Interest” may include, but is not limited to: current or former ownership in the bidder’s company; current or former Board membership; current or former employment with the bidder; current or former personal contractual relationship with the bidder (example: paid consultant); and/or current or former relationship to a bidder’s official which could reasonably be construed to constitute a conflict of interest (personal relationships may be perceived by the public as a potential conflict of interest).

I have not advised, consulted with or assisted any bidder in the preparation of any proposal submitted in response to this RFP nor have I submitted a letter of support or similar endorsement.

I understand and agree that the evaluation process is to be conducted in an impartial manner without bias or prejudice. In this regard, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, there are no circumstances that would reasonably support a good faith charge of bias. I further understand that in the event a good faith charge of bias is made, it will rest with me to decide whether I should be disqualified from participation in the evaluation process.

I agree to hold confidential all information related to the contents of Requests for Proposals presented during the review process until such time as the Department formally releases the award decision notices for public distribution.

____________________________
Signature

____________________________
Date

Rev. 8/25/2021
STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL SERVICES

AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFP #: 202110165

RFP TITLE: Human Resources Management System (HRMS) Systems Integrator

I, Joel Gruber, accept the offer to become a member of the Request for Proposals (RFP) Evaluation Team for the State of Maine Department of Administrative and Financial Services. I do hereby accept the terms set forth in this agreement AND hereby disclose any affiliation or relationship I may have in connection with a bidder who has submitted a proposal to this RFP.

Neither I nor any member of my immediate family have a personal or financial interest, direct or indirect, in the bidders whose proposals I will be reviewing. “Interest” may include, but is not limited to: current or former ownership in the bidder’s company; current or former Board membership; current or former employment with the bidder; current or former personal contractual relationship with the bidder (example: paid consultant); and/or current or former relationship to a bidder’s official which could reasonably be construed to constitute a conflict of interest (personal relationships may be perceived by the public as a potential conflict of interest).

I have not advised, consulted with or assisted any bidder in the preparation of any proposal submitted in response to this RFP nor have I submitted a letter of support or similar endorsement.

I understand and agree that the evaluation process is to be conducted in an impartial manner without bias or prejudice. In this regard, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, there are no circumstances that would reasonably support a good faith charge of bias. I further understand that in the event a good faith charge of bias is made, it will rest with me to decide whether I should be disqualified from participation in the evaluation process.

I agree to hold confidential all information related to the contents of Requests for Proposals presented during the review process until such time as the Department formally releases the award decision notices for public distribution.

_______________________________________  ____________________
Signature                                  Date

1/20/2022

Janet T. Mills
Governor

Kirsten Figueroa
Commissioner

Rev. 8/25/2021
AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFP #: 202110165
RFP TITLE: Human Resources Management System (HRMS) Systems Integrator

I, __________________________ accept the offer to become a member of the Request for Proposals (RFP) Evaluation Team for the State of Maine Department of Administrative and Financial Services. I do hereby accept the terms set forth in this agreement AND hereby disclose any affiliation or relationship I may have in connection with a bidder who has submitted a proposal to this RFP.

Neither I nor any member of my immediate family have a personal or financial interest, direct or indirect, in the bidders whose proposals I will be reviewing. “Interest” may include, but is not limited to: current or former ownership in the bidder’s company; current or former Board membership; current or former employment with the bidder; current or former personal contractual relationship with the bidder (example: paid consultant); and/or current or former relationship to a bidder’s official which could reasonably be construed to constitute a conflict of interest (personal relationships may be perceived by the public as a potential conflict of interest).

I have not advised, consulted with or assisted any bidder in the preparation of any proposal submitted in response to this RFP nor have I submitted a letter of support or similar endorsement.

I understand and agree that the evaluation process is to be conducted in an impartial manner without bias or prejudice. In this regard, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, there are no circumstances that would reasonably support a good faith charge of bias. I further understand that in the event a good faith charge of bias is made, it will rest with me to decide whether I should be disqualified from participation in the evaluation process.

I agree to hold confidential all information related to the contents of Requests for Proposals presented during the review process until such time as the Department formally releases the award decision notices for public distribution.

[Signature]
Mary Akinleye
Jan-13-2022

[Date]