

Shared Services Pre-Bid Conference  
Participant List  
June 27, 2006

Name	Firm	Contact Information
James Devey	AT Kearney	(703) 739-1630
Thomas Lesiewicz	Blackwell Consulting	(312) 873-5230
Nancy Draper	CGN	(217) 652-6200
Pat Hahn	CSG	<a href="mailto:phahn@csgdelivers.com">phahn@csgdelivers.com</a> (312) 423-2102
Sandra Baker	Certified Procurement Services	(630) 779-7576
Kevin Ohl	Crowe, Chizek and Company	<a href="mailto:kohl@crowechizek.com">kohl@crowechizek.com</a> (312) 899-5313
Bob Dobis	Crowe, Chizek and Company	(312) 899-5499
Clayton Frick	Deloitte	<a href="mailto:cfrick@deloitte.com">cfrick@deloitte.com</a> (630) 818-7336
Brent Christenson	Deloitte	(612) 397-4549
Chris O'Brien	DiamondCluster	(312) 255-5770
John Stevens	Freeborn & Peters	<a href="mailto:jstevens@freebornpeters.com">jstevens@freebornpeters.com</a> (217) 535-1060
Nick Palazzolo	IBM	<a href="mailto:npalazzo@us.ibm.com">npalazzo@us.ibm.com</a> (217) 793-5969
Mark Barry	IBM	<a href="mailto:mbarry@us.ibm.com">mbarry@us.ibm.com</a> (314) 239-8728
Ted Hamer	KPMG	(312) 665-2856
Nan Hendrickson	Kerber, Eck & Braeckel	<a href="mailto:nanh@kebcpa.com">nanh@kebcpa.com</a> (217) 789-0960

<u>Name</u>	<u>Firm</u>	<u>Contact Information</u>
Pat LePenske	LPR Services, Inc.	(847) 397-8744
Dan Turula	Navigant Consulting	(312) 583-5712
Daryl Higueros	Next Generation	(312) 226-5956
Valerie King-Bailey	OnShore Technology Group	(312) 321-6400
Deneen Omer	Rational Design	<a href="mailto:domer@rational-design.com">domer@rational-design.com</a> (217) 891-6629
Michael Cusick	SDI	(312) 259-7552
Mike Maher	Synch Solutions	<a href="mailto:mmaher@synch-solutions.com">mmaher@synch-solutions.com</a> (312) 252-3715

**Shared Services Pre-Bid Conference  
Questions and Answers  
June 27, 2006**

1. *Under Scope of Services A (Implementation of Public Safety and Administrative Shared Services Centers) and B, does the GOMB envision the need to integrate activities between the six anticipated service centers or are the services independent of each other? (Kevin Ohl, Crowe, Chizek and Company)*

The State of Illinois will approach the shared services centers related to Executive Order 06-06 (Public Safety and Administrative and Regulatory) collectively. The State of Illinois wishes to maximize standardization of business processes and minimize customization of IT systems. With regard to the formulation of detailed implementation plans for other shared services centers, the State has an interest in approaching these centers collectively, but individual needs should also be actively considered. For purposes of designing IT requirements, the centers are viewed collectively.

---

2. *Will Projects A-C run parallel to one another? (Valerie King-Bailey, OnShore Technology Group)*

Yes. Projects A and C will run in parallel, and Project B will begin after the inception of the other two projects but will proceed in parallel with them. Please refer to Attachment A of the RFP for further details on project timing.

---

3. *On page 3 of the RFP, information is provided regarding submission of a fax to confirm receipt of the entire RFP and intent to bid. Can you please clarify when this is needed? (Clayton Frick, Deloitte Consulting)*

A commitment to bid to the Governor's Office of Management and Budget is required to indicate your firm's interest in submitting a bid on the RFP. This process will facilitate GOMB's ability to ensure that all proposals will be successfully received at GOMB by the deadline.

---

4. *In the discussion of Project C in the RFP, a statement is included that supplemental information relating to the requirements of a statewide automated timekeeping system will be provided. Can you please indicate when this information will be made available? (Clayton Frick, Deloitte Consulting)*

This information is posted in Addendum B, attached hereto.

- 
5. *Will the winning vendor for Scope of Services B (Strategic and Implementation Services for Other Shared Services Centers) be prohibited from bidding on future implementation services within these Shared Services Centers? (Bob Dobis, Crowe, Chizek and Company)*

The winning vendor for Scope of Services B will not be precluded from bidding on future implementation services within these shared services centers, because the winning vendor will be entirely excluded from the RFP drafting and selection process for future implementation services. However, the winning vendor(s) for Scope of Services A and C will be precluded from bidding on future implementation services for IT design and implementation services contemplated in Scope of Services Project C, as this vendor (these vendors) will have involvement in the drafting of material (requirements and/or business processes) that will be used in subsequent RFPs.

- 
6. *Will a listing of the vendors of this pre-bid conference be available? (Sandra Baker, Certified Procurement Services)*

Yes. A list of participants is attached.

- 
7. *Is there a deadline for questions on this RFP? (Sandra Baker of Certified Procurement Services)*

Yes. All questions must be submitted no later than Wednesday, July 5, 2006 to Christopher Flynn of the Governor's Office of Management and Budget at [christopher.flynn@illinois.gov](mailto:christopher.flynn@illinois.gov).

- 
8. *Please describe the pricing format and speak to the cumulative and individual breakdowns. Related to pricing, is the State looking for the fee quote to be broken down in to the three areas for both the cumulative pricing sheet and each individual project pricing sheet? Thus, creating six pricing elements? (Ted Hamer, KPMG)*

*The pricing grid included in the recent Addendum includes a cumulative pricing grid. Is this grid to be completed once for all Scope of Services a vendor is proposing? If not, please elaborate on the permutations required. (Bob Dobis, Crowe, Chizek and Company)*

The alternative pricing formats described in Section IV.F of and Attachment C to the RFP (hourly rate per staff category, blended hourly rate, and by deliverable), present distinct *methods* of determining total bid price, rather

than separate *components* of total bid price. Bidders should submit pricing data in **each** alternative pricing format for each project bid upon.

The cumulative grid should be completed once for all services a vendor is proposing. The amount set forth therein should equal the sum of the fees requested for each project bid upon.

---

9. *Does the thirty-page limit on the response size include all three Scope of Services? If you do not respond to all three, is the response size still 30 pages?* (Bob Dobis, Crowe, Chizek and Company)

The response should be limited to thirty pages, with the exceptions expressly listed in the RFP. The space limit will remain thirty pages even if the bidder responds to fewer than all requested services.

---

10. *Does the GOMB require detailed staff resumes or is a brief overview with your requested information sufficient? If detailed resumes are required, do the resumes count toward the 30 page limit?* (Bob Dobis, Crowe, Chizek and Company)

Detailed staff resumes will count toward the thirty-page limit for the RFP response. However, detailed resumes are not required to be submitted in the RFP response and may be instead replaced with staff summaries or related material.

---

11. *Does performing audit work (through the Office of the Auditor General) for a State Agency participating in a Shared Services Center prevent a Firm from performing the services required in this RFP. Does this answer change if the audit work concludes with the fiscal year ending June 30, 2006?* (Bob Dobis, Crowe, Chizek and Company)

The Governor's Office of Management and Budget will not preclude any bidder on the basis of such bidder's current work for the State in an audit capacity. Each bidder performing work for Office of the Auditor General must also consult with the Office of the Auditor General to confirm that no conflict exists. Employees of the bidder currently performing audit work for such State Agency should not be expected to perform work on the project, and all efforts should be undertaken to segregate the two engagements from one another.

---

12. *For Scope of Services A, is the intent of GOMB to initially implement a Shared Services Model utilizing existing technology/systems?* (Pat Hahn,

CSG) *Is it correct to assume that all new technology/systems will be determined as a result of Scope of Services C (Statewide Information System Requirements, Vendor Selection and Quality Assurance) and will be implemented via RFPs created during this Scope of Service?* (Bob Dobis, Crowe, Chizek and Company)

The State will consider leveraging existing state systems in order to create an integrated fiscal and HR systems. This analysis is anticipated to be part of the requirements analysis produced as Project C to this RFP. However, in its strategic review of the opportunity, the State determined that existing systems appear unlikely to be economically customized to provide statewide service at the required efficiency level.

It is correct to assume that all new technology/systems related to Shared Services Centers (though not any State systems unrelated to these centers) will be determined as a result of Scope of Services C and that the State will implement such systems via RFP's created as a result of Scope of Service C.

- 
13. *How will the firms engaged in the project be contracted by the State - prime/sub relationship, or consortium of firms representing a team individually contracted by the State? Based on the above question, does the preclusion outlined in Scope Area C restrict firms that will be engaged in a team consortium but performing other Scope areas (A and B)?* (Clayton Frick, Deloitte Consulting)

The State retains the option to engage winning bidders in the project either in a primary contractor/sub-contractor relationship, through independent contracts, or as a consortium of firms representing a team individually contracted by the State. The preclusion from bidding on subsequent IT projects outlined in Question 5, above, will preclude any contractor engaged in Scope of Services A or C, but will not preclude a member of a consortium engaged in Scope of Services B from providing subsequent IT design and implementation services to the State.

## Shared Services Request for Proposals Automated Timekeeping

In addition to those requirements set forth in the original RFP, the State is requesting offers to provide a complete time management system for the State workforce of both professional and hourly employees. Time and attendance management for the current payroll system is a time consuming, costly and primarily manual effort. The State seeks an integrated time and attendance management solution that also addresses the many security issues inherent in the process.

The management system should integrate into the proposed State IT architecture to provide web-enabled access for managers and employees, and will additionally be integrated into the State payroll system, with the flexibility to be integrated into future systems. Employees with web access should be provided with self-service access to manage their time through the web while maintaining the security and privacy of all employee data.

The State is seeking proposals for a time management system to eliminate manual time-entry to its mainframe payroll system and to improve employee access and personal management of their time. Additionally, the system should improve the ability of managers, supervisors and timekeepers to manage employee's schedules, use of leave time, and compliance with State rules regarding the use and accrual of time. The system will incorporate electronic timeclocks, card readers, or biometric devices for employee check-in as well as the ability for entry of time via web-based forms. Improved employee access to time entry, scheduling, and leave information via the web will be provided through an accessible but secure interface. Managers and supervisors will be provided with active notifications and improved access to approve and manage employee schedules and time use. In depth reporting and audit trails will be provided for senior management and human resources professionals.

The primary objective of this project is to:

1. Phase-in a fully automated time and attendance system.
2. Utilize any existing identification methods.
3. Create a system that can be integrated into the State payroll system, with the flexibility to be integrated into future systems.
4. Provide integration to the web to allow maximized employee access to time information in an accessible manner.
5. Provide extensive, user-friendly reporting and management tools for supervisors and managers.