

AGENDA ITEM 19

Consider awarding an HR/Payroll software implementation services contract to vendor meeting the County's selection criteria.

This item was tabled until next week.

< Attachment >

WILLIAMSON COUNTY
HR/PAYROLL IMPLEMENTATION SERVICES
VENDOR RFP REVIEW

29 APRIL, 2003

Williamson County issued a Request for Proposal (RFP) to solicit responses from qualified vendors to assist the County in its implementation of the Oracle HR/Payroll software. Since its issuance, the County has received several RFP's and initiated a formal review process to identify the best offers. This brief is an effort to inform the Court of the progress to date and lay out the next step.

The County has assembled a team from the County Auditor, Human Resources, and Information Technology Services departments to lead the review process. The team consists of the following members:

Jay Schade – ITS
Lisa Zirkle – HR
Michelle Bowdy – HR
Julie Kiley – County Auditor

Other staff members have assisted during the process on an as-needed basis. An outside consultant, Gus Gómez, has also assisted the County in this effort by coordinating and directing the overall review process.

Review Process

The County received a total of six RFP's from interested vendors. Of the six, the County elected to concentrate the review effort on only four of those– see Attachment A for a listing. That review effort included assessing the strengths and weaknesses of each individual proposal, exclusive of proffered pricing. The specific characteristics the team looked for was the length and timing of the actual implementation in association with the expected resource needs, as well as the past experience of the consulting firm.

The team looked closely at each vendor's implementation and staffing plan to ensure that adequate resources would be available throughout the life of the implementation, both on the part of the County and the outside firm. The County anticipates going "live" with the new system effective 1 January, 2004 and resource issues will be critical to a successful implementation. To assist each vendor in assessing those requirements, several vendors came on-site to meet County personnel and discuss the County's requirements. Other vendors conducted those interviews over the phone. The result of those discussions gave each vendor added insight into the specific needs of the County and resulted in proposals that more closely met the needs of the County.

Another important consideration to the County was the past experience of the proposing firms. Each vendor was required to submit several references to substantiate their experience in performing implementations of scope and size similar to that of the County. The Team assigned that responsibility to Michelle Bowdy and Julie Kiley, with Gus Gómez assisting. Telephone interviews were conducted with eight references over a three week period. Those references were instrumental not only in validating the vendors' credentials, but also allowing the Team to assess the efficacy of each vendor's overall proposal. That helped to lay the ground-work for the formal on-site interviews with each vendor.

Each of the four vendors was requested to come on-site to meet with the entire Project Team to discuss and defend their proposals. Those meetings were held over the course of the last two weeks. In each meeting, the Project Team reviewed the outline of their proposals to ensure the requirements of the County were being met. At the same time, each vendor was afforded the opportunity to analyze more closely those requirements vis-à-vis their original proposal. One of the outcomes of the meetings is that every one of the vendors has made changes to the original proposal. From the County's perspective, those meetings proved valuable in the Project Team's selection process.

Vendor Selection

Immediately following the end of the on-site interviews, the Project Team met to evaluate and discuss each vendor and their implementation proposals. In general, the Project Team felt all four had very strong qualities in terms of experience and expertise. Nonetheless, two vendors, AST and Xcelicor stood out from the rest.

With the narrowing of the field, Bob Space – Purchasing Director, is taking responsibility for negotiating pricing with the vendors. That process will result in delivery of a Best and Final Offer from those vendors.

Once the negotiations are completed, the Project Team will select a Finalist and present that to the Court for its consideration.

Attachment A

<u>Vendor</u>	<u>Description</u>
AST Corp.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Based in Naperville, Il.- Full-service Oracle Applications consulting firm.- Extensive experience in the public sector area; e.g. Marion County, Oklahoma County, King County.- One of four bidders on the County's 11i software upgrade in 2002.
BOSS Corp.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Based in Diluth, Ga.- Company has a focus on Oracle HR software implementations.- One of four bidders on the County's 11i software upgrade in 2002.
Ciber, Inc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Based in Greenwood Village, Co.- A company with multiple divisions concentrating in various market segments. It has a division that concentrates specifically on the Oracle practice.- Won the bid to perform the 11i upgrade for Williamson County in 2002.
Xcelicor, Inc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Based in Tamp, Fl.- Company specializes in HR software implementations.- Has completed over 60 implementations nation-wide; e.g. Dartmouth College, West Virginia University.

AGENDA ITEM 20

Consider approving Tax Collection Agreement between Williamson County and Williamson County ESD #6.

Moved: **Commissioner Heiligenstein**

Seconded: **Judge Doerfler**

Motion: To approve a Tax Collection Agreement between Williamson County and Williamson County ESD #6.

Vote: **5 - 0**

<Attachment>