

State Bar of California
Enterprise Financial and Human Resource Project
Vendors Pre-proposal Conference Call Questions and Answers
October 7, 2002

Q1. Describe fund accounting for the organization.

Answer: *The State Bar of California is a public corporation with the judicial branch of California state government that uses "Funds" to account for separate activities. "Projects" are used to track programs within the funds.*

Q2. Does the State Bar of California use full encumbrance accounting or project accounting?

Answer. *Again, the State Bar should be treated as a government's enterprise fund, which could use modified (for budgetary and operational purposes) and full accrual accounting (for FASB and GASB reporting requirements). Internally, the State Bar tracks commitments throughout the fiscal year.*

Q3. Does the bar desire the ability to have project to date reporting?

Answer: *Yes*

Q4. Does the bar have a preference between an iSeries or NT solution?

Answer: *No preference.*

Q5. Has the bar previewed or seen any demos of systems?

Answer: *The State Bar has reviewed the latest version of its current financial software as well some software demonstrations of "best-of-breed" human resources products.*

Q6. Are there any interfaces outside of the new applications that are required?

Answer: *A table is included in the RFP, which shows systems that are currently being used by the State Bar. The State Bar only anticipates importing data from the membership system (KOALA) for reconciliation purposes. The State Bar will work with the implementer to design the import process.*

Q7. What and how much historical data is needed in the new system and is it part of the initial install?

Answer: *The State Bar anticipates loading beginning year balances and open accounts (e.g., payables and associated vendor records) prior to "Go-Live". The State Bar expects to convert most if not all data contained in the current Human Resources database.*

Q8. Are there any remote user locations where Web access would be beneficial?

Answer: *The State Bar does not intend to have any remote users outside of the network, however, it may be cost beneficial to have internal users access the software via a browser. This is in reference to employee self maintenance of HR records, or viewing departmental financial information.*

Q9. What is the network connectivity infrastructure?

Answer: *The San Francisco and Los Angeles offices are connected by a dedicated T1. Currently the State Bar has a T1 pipe out to the Internet with the Los Angeles office passing through the San Francisco office for access. Internet access is scheduled for an upgrade in the near future.*

Q10. Is there a database preference, experience with Informix?

Answer: *The State Bar supports DB2/400 and MS SQL Server and does not have any experience with Informix. The preference is to keep within our experience range.*

Q11. Can a vendor propose the minimum for hardware since it is assumed that the State Bar can get better pricing through the State?

Answer: *The RFP contains hardware pricing for three reasons. First, if your solution requires unique hardware (e.g., barcode reader) to meet the RFP requirements, the State Bar needs to know this up-front. Second, the State Bar wants vendors to propose adequate hardware to run the system efficiently so that the Bar has an accurate understanding of hardware needs. Third, hardware vendors may indeed offer better pricing for some hardware and the State Bar needs to explore this possibility. The required price submission schedule separates “hardware” prices from software and implementation costs. For this selection software price and implementation costs are more important from the standpoint of presenting a thorough cost proposal.*

Q12. What hardware does the Bar currently use?

Answer: *HP and Compaq*

Q13. On page 24 what does the 50% staffing mean?

Answer: *50% staffing means that there will be a 1:1 ratio between implementation consultant and State Bar employee participation (FTE) during implementation. For example, if your firm estimates a total of 10,000 hours to install the product—the State Bar is prepared to contribute up to 5,000 hours of this with the implementation firm staff working the other 5,000 hours. Vendors should assume this ratio when submitting costs.*

This does not mean that every activity in the implementation itself is split evenly—but that the overall work effort is split evenly. If a vendor proposes anything less or more, then it should be clearly stated in the cost schedules and the reasons should be outlined in the implementation methodology section.

Q14. Is the Bar interested in software that posts reports directly to the Web?

Answer: *Yes.*

Q15. Are the AS/400s leased or owned?

Answer: *Owned.*

Q16. What is the ERP implementation project budget?

Answer: The State Bar is committed to acquiring a system that meets its needs currently and into the future. It has received project cost estimates from GFOA for mid-market enterprise software and implementation services and is prepared to make an appropriate investment. GFOA and the State Bar concur that high-end ERP packages that are being used by large corporations and governments are likely to be outside the range of what the State Bar is prepared to spend primarily because of the high cost of implementation associated with ERP systems. However, many ERP firms are advertising “pre-configured” or “template” driven implementations that may be less costly than traditional ERP implementations that require a long configuration cycle. The Bar would certainly examine such proposals from ERP firms if they are presented thoroughly and in a cost effective manner.