THE TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY SYSTEM
Office of HUB & Procurement Programs

ADDENDUM NO. 1

Date: March 25, 2021

RE: RFQ01 CIO-21-103
        RFP Due Date: April 6, 2021
        New RFP Due Date: April 13, 2021

Respondents shall acknowledge receipt of addendum(s) on the Execution of Offer (Exhibit A).

RFP Extension:

The due date of the RFP has been extended to April 13, 2021. The first sentence of Section 2.3 shall now read as follows, "All proposals must be received by the A&M System no later than **2:00:00 p.m. CDT, April 13, 2021** electronically via email to soprocurement@tamus.edu with the subject line of "**RFP01 CIO-21-103 – AFR**."

As such, the dates within Section 1.5 - Calendar of Events have been revised as below:

Deadline to submit questions	March 29, 2021 by 2:00 p.m.
Release of Addendum (if applicable)	April 2, 2021
Responses Due	**April 13, 2021 by 2:00 p.m. CDT**
Presentation/Demonstrations (at A&M System's option)	week of May 3 and/or May 10, 2021
Selection of Respondent	anticipated by June 11, 2021

Questions:

The deadline to submit questions has been extended to March 29, 2021. Note that questions must be submitted by 2:00 p.m. that day and each vendor is limited to **no more than** two (2) questions.

Pre-proposal Conference:

The pre-proposal conference held on March 12, 2021 was recorded and the audio file can be accessed at the following link; https://www.tamus.edu/business/hub-procurement/rfps/

General Statement

The Texas A&M University System (the A&M System) first and foremost needs to acquire a software tool and platform that has the capabilities described to enable better financial and statutory reporting, and also to enable financial forecasting. These requirements are described in the RFP.

As described in the RFP the A&M System understands it will need professional services to implement the software, and we have also requested a proposal for those services. The nature of that implementation

project highly depends on the capability of the software. Many of the questions received by the A&M System can best be answered during an implementation. Hence, many of the answers provided by the A&M System are "to be determined."

The A&M Systems expects to proceed with implementation in an iterative manner. We are not expecting respondents to provide a day by day, task by task, comprehensive implementation project plan. There is an understanding that scope and discovery will be required.

Respondents may wish to propose a discovery and scoping phase for implementation services and provide broad estimated ranges for future phases.

Report Inventory

The following reports are the reports currently produced by the A&M System current reporting software. Some of these reports are for internal use, some are published external.

Many of these reports are viewable at: https://www.tamus.edu/business/budgets-and-accounting/reports/statutory-reports/annual-financial-reports/fy-2020/

Report ID	Report Description
FOUR-1	SCHEDULE OF HIGHER EDUCATION FUNDS
III	STATEMENT OF NET POSITION
III-FUND	STATEMENT OF NET POSITION BY FUND GROUP
III-1	UNRESTRICTED NET POSITION DETAIL
IV	STATEMENT OF REVENUES, EXPENSES, AND CHANGES IN NET POSITION
IV-FUND	STATEMENT OF REVENUES, EXPENSES, AND CHANGES IN NET POSITION BY FUND GROUP
IV-1	NACUBO FUNCTION TO NATURAL CLASSIFICATION MATRIX
IV-2	NATURAL CLASSIFICATION TO NACUBO FUNCTION MATRIX
IV-3	SCHEDULE OF EXPENSES - BY NACUBO FUNCTION
IV-3-A	SCHEDULE OF EXPENSES -(CONT'D)
IV-4	SERVICE DEPARTMENT SCHEDULE – CHANGES IN NET POSITION
IV-5-A	SCHEDULE OF PROPRIETARY TRANSFERS, BEGINNING BALANCE, AND RESTATEMENT
N-2	NOTE 2 - CAPITAL ASSETS
N-2-FN	NOTE 2 - FOOTNOTE FOR VERIFICATION TO IV-FUND
N-6	NOTE 6 - PLEDGED/NON-PLEDGED REVENUES AND DISCOUNTS AND ALLOWANCES
TANDF-TD	SCHEDULE OF TUITION, FEES, EXEMPTIONS AND DISCOUNTS
THREE	SCHEDULE OF PROPRIETARY CASH & CASH EQUIVALENTS
THREE-A	SCHEDULE OF PROPRIETARY CASH & CASH EQUIVALENTS
THREE-C	COMBINED CASH & CASH EQUIVALENTS
THREE-F	SCHEDULE OF FIDUCIARY CASH & CASH EQUIVALENTS-CUSTODIAL FUNDS
THREE-F2	SCHEDULE OF FIDUCIARY CASH & CASH EQUIVALENTS-CUSTODIAL FUNDS
V	STATEMENT OF CASH FLOWS
VI	STATEMENT OF FIDUCIARY NET POSITION-CUSTODIAL FUNDS
VI-FUND	STATEMENT OF FIDUCIARY NET POSITION-CUSTODIAL FUNDS BY FUND GROUP
VII	STATEMENT OF CHANGES IN FIDUCIARY NET POSITION
VII-FUND	STATEMENT OF CHANGES IN FIDUCIARY NET POSITION BY FUND GROUP
VII-5-A	SCHEDULE OF FIDUCIARY TRANSFERS AND BEGINNING BALANCE AND RESTATEMENT

A&M System Financial Data Environment

Several questions received were about counts and data to be used in the implementation of this software. The following explanation should answer many of these questions.

The following data areas and dimensions are expected to provide the necessary data to produce the financial reports.

1. The A&M System uses common subcodes. These are revenue codes, expense codes, transfer codes, and balance sheet accounts. They are available publicly and can be found at: https://apps1.system.tamus.edu/objcodes/
   a. These subcodes have many of the required attributes that are used in the financial reporting process (e.g. operating, non-operating)
2. The A&M System uses the term "GL account" to refer to an individual fund. The A&M System has as approximately 21,000 GL accounts.
3. The A&M System uses the term "SL account" to refer to a cost center. These costs centers track revenues, expenses, and budgets. The A&M System has approximately 71,000 SL accounts. These SL accounts are linked to GL accounts. The operating statement is derived from the SL accounts and the balance sheet is derived from GL accounts.
4. SL and GL accounts contain attributes such as NACUBO function and AFR fund group that are used for financial reporting.
5. Bank Account / Appropriations. The A&M System uses a concept of a bank/appropriation that is coded on every transaction in the financial journal. These bank/appropriation accounts contain several attributes that are used for financial reporting. We must report remaining cash balances by bank to the State of Texas.
6. The A&M System has approximately 3000 organization codes that map SL accounts and GL accounts to organization units. Organization codes are generally not used for statutory financial reports, but organization codes also help with routing of documents.

Questions/Answers:

1. The virtual pre-proposal conference held on March 12, 2021 was recorded and the audio file can be accessed at the following link: https://www.tamus.edu/business/hub-procurement/rfps/

2. Do you want a full costing and implementation plan for Phase II – Institutional Financial Forecasting Module (IFFM) re-implementation listed in the RFP?

   Per the RFP

   Phase 2 will consist of a reimplementation of the current IFFM on the new platform. Data will be obtained from the newly implemented AFR module; student enrollment and tuition forecasting must be redesigned. Other features of the original IFFM may be enhanced and upgraded as required.

   A – Phase II of this project will be re-implementing and enhancing our current IFFM processes. While we don't currently have a detailed plan for this phase of the project we do not intend to begin this portion until after Phase I is complete.

   We would like to see included in the response:

   - Description of how the proposed software can generally meet the needs of Phase II
   - Any additional cost of software (such as a different module to the solution proposed for Phase I) required to implement Phase II

- A high level plan with rough estimates of time and costs to implement Phase II

3. Are travel rates needed for on-site services?

A – While we may ultimately determine that a virtual implementation is preferred; please provide a travel budget in the event during negotiation we determine an on-site implementation is required. A hybrid model proposal is also acceptable.

4. 1.1 - Regarding expectations for a "common platform" - Are you looking for the same platform (single UI with single sign on) to ideally handle both your Phase 1 requirements and your Phase 2 requirements? Would the following alternative be acceptable - multiple products and/or applications/cubes that would need to be integrated and maintained separately?

A – Ideally yes, a single application platform with a single UI with single sign on is certainly the A&M System preference. An alternate solution proposal could be evaluated and considered.

5. 1.1 - Is the implementation of the Institutional Financial Forecasting Module (Phase 2) to be included in the scope and pricing of this response?

A – Yes, but it should be at a high level – and should be broken out and separated from Phase I. See answer to Question #2.

6. Given the following reference found in 3.7.1 Current IFFM Will Serve as Requirements Base, should one assume the need for an integrated, extensible master data solution to enable the following example – "Ability to have revenue and expense modeling vary by A&M System member, account or other dimension. Alternatively, would TAMUS accept different, integrated cubes for each member of the System?

A – The A&M System has made no assumptions about cubes and the technical implementation. We do not necessarily see a "master data solution" as the answer.   Revenue sources vary widely across A&M System members – certainly between the academic and non-academic members. Common and shared data sources are likely preferable, with each member using the appropriate categories that make sense for them.   However, given the complexity of the A&M System, individual or a set of three or four template data models may be the appropriate solution.

7. Is Respondent expected to extract requirements from sections 3.1 to 3.5 of the RFP? Or should sections 3.1 to 3.5 only be considered as supporting information to inform requirements formally listed in sections 3.6 to 3.8 of the RFP?

A – Sections 3.1 to 3.5 are supporting information to the requirements in 3.6 to 3.8.

8. 3.8.4 - Does TAMUS have a preference between On-premise, Hosted, or SaaS?

A –The A&M System order of preference is 1) Saas, 2) On-premise, and 3) Hosted. Costs, ease of access, features and function, and other requirements will drive the decision.

9. 3.6.1 - Use of Journal/Transaction Detail - Are there any reporting requirements around subledger detail? Traditionally we bring in a trial balance and then drill back to the subledger to get the transaction level detail.

A – As mentioned in that section, the trial balance and subsidiary summary ledgers do not have the necessary dimensions to create all the reports. Also, the FAMIS system does not produce a trial balance in a manner that is easy to export. **The A&M System strongly believes that the best approach is to pass journal level detail to the AFR reporting system. Perhaps an intermediate aggregation can be built as part of the integration.**

10. 3.6.1 - Use of Journal/Transaction Detail - Does FAMIS allow us (via an API) to have us access transaction level detail when drilling back?

A – Currently an API does not exist.   That said, the A&M System could consider building an API to expose detail if that was determined to be the best approach.

11. 3.4 - Recent Reporting Assessment and Recommendations - How many users are interfacing with the system – members?

A – Each A&M System member is expected to interface with the new system; there will be two or three employees at each member who will work with the software for AFR reporting, approximately 72 employees.   Texas A&M University in College Station will likely have two or three times as many.   Phase II-forecasting will likely add another two or three users from each system member.

12. 3.4 - Can you walk us through this coordination process?

A – A full walk through is beyond the scope of what can be answered at this time. Analysis during the implementation will be needed to fully answer this question. Generally, each system member must balance and complete their own set of reports, coordinate inter-member due to/due from (and other inter-member activity), and work with the System Offices to complete a final review. During the AFR desk review at the System Office, corrections will be needed at the member level. The member is opened back up for the member to post the corrections. The System Office tries to only post elimination entries at the consolidated member level, vs. correcting the member's AFR.

13. 3.4 - Outside of FAMIS and the 2 other systems how many integrations need to be considered?

A – Nothing outside of those two integrations are anticipated for phase 1. Primarily journal detail and supporting dimensional attributes.

14. 3.6.4 - What is the format for file that needs to be exported back to the financial systems?

A – To be defined. But a straightforward file of Journal debits and credits in CSV format is what is anticipated. At most 20 columns in the data file. The A&M System members post year end entries, they currently post these directly into the accounting system; we believe this is the path we will move forward with for the future. The consolidation entries are posted at the System Office level and we believe these will be posted in the new software then fed back into the accounting system.

15. 3.6.5 - How is it determined what is being eliminated?

A - Elimination entries are determined by analyzing intra-member excel files, we verify the pass-throughs, transfers and Due to/from (receivables/payables) match in the spreadsheet and match to the balances reported on the AFR, and then elimination entries are posted. These entries can be posted at the NACUBO column level or at the single column level. There are reclassification entries which eliminated Assets Held by System off of the member's AFR and record true Investment balances on the balances for the consolidated AFR entity.

16. 3.6.5 - How is it being capturing today?

A – Elimination analysis is primarily done manually by spreadsheet. Current report definitions in the current reporting tool may do some elimination. The elimination entries are captured in excel and are gathered for all members or gathered from other sources (i.e. investment manager reports, actuary reports for OPEB, Teacher's Retirement reports for the pension calculation, etc.)

17. 3.6.5 - Is the information being tagged with the offset so we know what needs to be eliminated when reporting externally?

A - Some information is 'tagged' in our accounting system, where automated entries could be created. For instance, we have unique account controls for Due to/from and Transfers which define the opposing entity's balance or activity. Due To TAMU for $20k is posted on HSC's AFR and TAMU as an account control with Due from HSC for $20k. For the reclassification entries, we would have an account control for Assets Held by System current and non-current and this would match the total pooled balances and then we would convert to various lines item (i.e. Cash Equivalents, Derivatives, Current Investments and Non-Current Investments.

18. 3.6.5 - Post year end entries - do you have a separate time period that is capturing the year end entries i.e. a 13th period?

A – Yes there is a 13th period that is used to capture year end entries.

19. 3.6.1 - What attributes that are being used today will have to be leveraged by the new solution?

A - This list may not be complete – and some may need to be determined. The current process today heavily depends on account and subcode ranges. The A&M System desires the process to move to an attribute driven process.

- Fund Group (defined by NACUBO, 11 separate columns for Current Funds and Plant funds.
- NACUBO Function (groups SL account date by 10 NACUBO function i.e. instruction, research, etc. this function is established when the SL is setup)
- Operating/Non-Operating-we roll our object codes into operating and nonoperating for reporting on the operating statement
- Bank / Appropriation-we use bank for cash reporting and cash revenue/expense reporting
- Department code-defines routing
- Balance Sheet type-we report on proprietary and fiduciary
- Natural classification-we roll our object codes into the natural expense class (salaries, benefits, professional fees, etc.
- CFDA Number is used to pull in data for the Federal Schedule

20. 3.6.1 - What does the report breakdown look like - i.e. do you look at reports by dept.? What level of detail?

   A – There are several variations of report breakdowns, by A&M System Member and rolled up to System wide. The members are using Business Objects to drill down into the AFR line items to explain fluctuations. It would be good to have the drill down capability in the new software. Statutory reports are not issued at the department or college level.
   However, there are also varied uses by College or Department within a System Member. We envision the tool being able to report at many different levels.

21. Internal and external reporting - are the hierarchies currently different for both types of reports?

   A – Yes, but the attributes generally connect to common dimensions.   As mentioned in #19, College, Division and department are used more for internal reports.

22. Are you required to produce a report in the AFR process that shows personnel information in terms of salary expenses and what funds those expenses are being paid out of?

   A – Yes, but not at an individual person basis.   We do need to tie the salary data from the Workday HCM product to the FAMIS accounting data for expenses and payables.

23. Do we also have to facilitate fund transfers within the solution?

   A - Yes, we do have intra-system fund transfers, not sure the reason for this question. We report transfers as mandatory and non-mandatory. We would post these in our accounting system and we would need help eliminating these transfers in the software.

24. Pre-Proposal Conference – Can the A&M System provide clarification regarding the evaluation of a solution that can best address the needs of both AFR and IFFM processes but is only requiring cost proposals for the AFR process?

   A – See question 2 related to cost proposal for this response.

25. 1.1 – Can the A&M System detail how a common platform that can be used for both phases of the project will be chosen if costs and overviews of both phases are not presented?

   A – See question 2 for this response. The respondent is expected to disclose if different or additional software is required for phase 2.

26. 1.1 – Is the A&M System open to a proposal that offer's best of breed functionality for each use case (Multiple Software Vendors, Single Consultancy) if it is advantageous to the A&M System? If open to this type of proposal, what would be the key questions the A&M System would like to have answered?

   A – See answer to questions 2 and 4.

27. 1.1 – Are there any other processes that may not be detailed in the RFP beyond the AFR and IFFM processes the A&M System would like to consider in the evaluation?

A – Additional features and capabilities are welcome in the response.   These will be considered, provided the necessary requirements are present and the focus of the proposal.

28. 1.1 – Is the A&M system willing to contract separately for the resulting software agreement and professional services related to the implementation?

    A – This would not be optimal but could be considered.

29. 2.6 – Can the A&M System provide the names, titles, roles, and organizations (or just titles, roles, and organizations) that are part of the evaluation committee?

    A - The titles and roles of the evaluation committee include representatives from several members who work in the fiscal offices. Their titles vary, (i.e. assistant controller, directors and financial analysts plus budgeting directors and financial analysts for the forecasting model). Names of individuals will not be provided.

30. 2.6 – How many members of the evaluation committee are from member institutions and from the A&M System office itself?

    A – The specific breakdown has not been determined at this time, but member institutions will be represented on the evaluation committee.

31. 2.6 – Can the A&M System provide the evaluation criteria, major buckets, and weightings for evaluation of proposals including a breakout of AFR and IFFM functionality?

    A – Not at this time.

32. 3.2 – Which member of the A&M system currently uses Masterpiece FMS?

    A – Texas Engineering Extension Service (TEEX) uses Masterpiece for their project and AFR reporting.

33. 3.4 – How many different systems and integrations does the A&M System currently have with each of the member Institutions?

    A – Currently the A&M System uses the same integration for TEEX (Masterpiece) and for WTAMU (Colleague). The integration supports new sub-ledger accounts and actuals.   It is expected that these integrations will be replaced by new integrations.

34. 3.5 – Can the A&M System detail the intended objectives that were not met by IFFM or confirm that IFFM met the objectives for the A&M System but did not allow for the appropriate level of detail and accommodate modeling differences within each of the A&M System Members and their profile as a University?

    A -We believe this was sufficiently disclosed in section 3.5. Since member needs were not fully met, it was difficult to achieve all A&M System objectives as well.

35. 3.6 – Can the A&M System provide a process flow diagram or describe in detail the hand-offs between the A&M System and the Member Institutions and the various systems necessary to complete the AFR submission?

A – A process flow diagram is not available. The process is heavily dependent on email, spreadsheets, and verbal communication. To submit their AFR package, the member institutions send an email notifying the A&M System their reports are ready to review, attached to the email are supporting workpapers/schedules (most are in Excel). The A&M System then locks the member's reports in FAMIS to prevent additional journal entries and generates a set of AFR reports to begin the review process. The A&M System coordinates with the members to resolve errors, which may include unlocking the FAMIS reports to allow additional entries.

36. 3.6.1 – Can the A&M System detail which key dimension is lacking in the summary ledgers and what sections are impacted in the AFR?

    A – The dimension is known as the "bank" dimension in FAMIS. It contains information on local/state funds, federal appropriations, and federal appropriations. The bank dimension is used to build the schedule of cash & cash equivalents which is used to report the cash in bank according to where the funds are held – local bank or cash in state treasury.

37. 3.6.1 – When will a sample spreadsheet mentioned be provided with prototype data that can be reviewed and can it be provided before the end of April?

    A – Sample data will be provided when demonstrations are scheduled. The options for banking entries are still being reviewed, this is one option being considered.

38. 3.6.1 – Can the System provide information stating whether cash vs. accruals data is currently leveraged and if cash data is used is there mapping and known logic to map and translate this to a cash flow statement?

    A - For the cash flow statement, we have built a template to assist in correlating the accruals to the appropriate revenue and expense streams. The subcodes currently used for accruals are not specific enough to identify to the cash flow line items, there are manual steps involved.

39. 3.6.1 – Can the A&M System confirm that all journal entries are booked in a manner that provides cash and non-cash line items in a way that creates a formulaic derivation of the cash flow form the balance sheet and operating statement?

    A - No, journal entries are recorded to accrue receivables and payables, the subcodes used for these accruals may correlate to multiple operating statement line items.

40. 3.7.1 – Can the A&M System further elaborate what it means by derive a budgeted and forecasted cash flow statement from planned revenue and expense drivers without reliance on the financial model logic of cash flow?

    A – In the existing forecasting model, the consultants built the cash flow forecasting by using the planned revenue/expense data. The revenue/expense data used by the budgeting team varies from the AFR, for instance the budgeting team will have all inflows and outflows listed vs. breaking by operating and non-operating which is required by GAAP.

41. 3.7.1 – Can each of the A&M System members describe their detailed enrollment, tuition, and expense forecasting they would like to model at? For example, cohort modeling based on student classifications and tuition types?

A – Each member of the A&M System has their own methodology for revenue and expense forecasting. These will need to be fully discovered during implementation. However, all of the academic models are heavily dependent on State of Texas formula funding rules.

42. 3.7.1 – How many differences need to be incorporated and do the various member institutions plan revenue and expenses significantly different (Retention vs. Persistence) for each of the member schools and how does the System expect to approach this?

    A – This will require more work with A&M System member institutions. A common approach will be preferred whenever practical.

43. Will journal entries produced in consolidation require being loaded back to source ERP?

    A – Yes – that is the plan. A&M System IT expects to do most of the work for this integration – as long as the data can be made available in a common format. Consolidation entries recorded on the master campus (not for a specific member) and they will be loaded to the ERP (accounting) system.

44. Will these be general journal entries or will there be entries impacting supplemental journals?

    A – To be determined, but at this time, the thought is to post them back to the general journal.

45. Will consolidation only be a top level in FAMIS, or will subsidiary consolidations (by university) be required as well?

    A – Consolidation is at the top level in the new software and in FAMIS. Eliminations at the member level occur in FAMIS today.

46. Will the source ERP be FAMIS or will data need to be moved from/to Ellucian and Masterpiece?

    A – To be determined. Today it flows through FAMIS, but in the future is could integrate directly with the new solution.

47. Will Anaplan be source of record for consolidations? If so, what are your platform governance requirements?

    A – Anaplan is not a tool currently used System wide or in the System offices. Respondents may propose it as a solution.

48. What will the approval process for Reclasses, Eliminations and Adjustments be?

    A – This will depend on the features of the product/solution.

49. Can you provide a workflow process diagram to denote your current close process?

    A – That is not available and out of scope at this point in the process.

50. What is the preferred format of notifications?

    A – To be determined, and will depend on the features of the product/solution.

51.   Is there a need for access on multiple devices including mobile?

        A – This is not required at this time.

52.   Section 4.6 states that the exact number of users has yet to be determined. Is there an estimated number of users for Phase 1 as well as an estimated number of users for Phase 2?

        A – See the answer to question 10

53.   Will the Texas A&M System expect to invoice both the services and the software to a single vendor or will multiple vendors be allowed to be invoiced?

        A – Either way could possibly work.

54.   Considering the requirement under Section 4 – Proposal Response, paragraph 4.2. Technical Proposal, namely *Must provide narrative in response to the requirements described in each sub-section of Section 3 addressing all requirement*s. Can you please confirm the subsections #3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 are for reference/informational purpose only and the Respondent must not provide narrative responses to them.

        A – Yes those sections are for reference and background only.

55.   A data set is referenced in section 3.6, when will the data be provided?

        A – See question 36.

56.   In section 4.3 regarding the demonstration plan, could you please provide additional details as to what is expected, a checklist or Day in the Life, etc.? How are you evaluating success of this section?

        A - Vendors selected for demonstration will be provided additional details on what is expected; typically we provide a script and request certain specific items be demonstrated. In responding to that section, please propose what you think will work best and how much time will be required.

57.   In section 4.4 regarding the proof of concept, could you please provide additional details as to the desired requirements of the proof of concept and the timing of when a proof of concept would occur?

        A – Those details are to be determined.   The A&M System is primarily interested if a proof of concept would be possible.   The A&M System would only expect to engage in a proof of concept with the finalist.

58.   1.1 - Is there a preferred method of data integration, i.e. a specific ETL tool like Informatica or perhaps REST APIs?

        A – The A&M System can support multiple options and has no specific requirement. We are a Dell Boomi customer, but would also be willing work with simple CSV files.

59. 1.1 - Will there be a need to pull from other source systems (other than A&M System and Workday)?

A – Data from Workday is not in scope at this time. The data source is expected to be FAMIS, Colleague from WTAMU, and Masterpiece FMS from TEEX.

60. 3.5 - Please provide a high-level process flow or examples of some of the logic.

A – Not at this time. These will be implementation activities.

61. 3.7.1 - Please elaborate further and explain what 'each member of the A&M System' means.

   a. Will every user work on their own set of data?

A – Yes, the A&M System is comprised of 12 universities, 1 health science center and 8 State Agencies as well as the System Office, a shared services center and a blended component unit. With few exceptions, each member works on their own AFR data and submits to the System Office for consolidation. There is typically more than one individual at each System Member who works on AFR data.

62. 3.7.1 - Is the goal/process to have a separate model (with varying data) by each of the system administrator?

A – Not necessarily separate, but more flexibility than is in place today.

63. 3.7.1 - Please explain ' without reliance…'

A – Not sure what this is referring to, N/A

64. 3.7.1 - Is the level of detail by year, quarter, or month? As an example if the year 2025 is being planned is it being planned on a yearly basis or at a more detailed level like months or quarters within?

A – Generally by year, but revenue forecasting for academic institutions may involve semesters.

65. 3.7.3 - Please provide some logic details. How many cohorts are planned?

A – Each university within the A&M System calculates their tuition differently, some have many cohorts and some just a few.

66. What is the expected number of system administrators/model builders as well as end users?

A – To be determined. These decisions will be made in implementation.

67. For the anticipated end users is there a functional split? As an example are there some users that will plan tuition and a different set of users that will plan expenses or capital purchases?

A – Yes it varies greatly by System Member. Some members have a budget office of one person and others may have 10 – 15 individuals working on various portions of budgeting.

68. How long is the planning cycle for annual budget, forecast, etc.? When do the cycles start and when do they end? How many iterations are there?

A – The forecasting cycle would use the most recent final annual financial numbers that are completed usually in late November. That data would then be used to load into the forecasting module to run base cases starting in December and run through January to provide updated forecasting numbers to the Board of Regents at the February meeting where we give the financial update.

69. Do outputs from the planning system need to feed any other systems?

A – Not at this time.

70. What kind of forecast methods do you incorporate (top-down, bottoms-up, driver-based, historical-based, etc.) or want to use?

A – We are flexible on the methods, however we expect the annual financial results to be the foundation from which the forecast is built either from driver data or other methods. Tuition and Fee forecasting is the most challenging of the items to forecast based on the multiple tuition rates and the level of detail that gives the members a good tool vs making it too complicated and cumbersome for the members to use.

71. Are approvals or workflow part of the requirements?

A - Yes

72. Which BlackLine Products are included in this proposal?

A – The A&M System does not have any pre-conceived ideas on what products can be proposed.

73. What is the basis for your fiscal accounting calendar (Calendar year,4/4/5 etc.)?

A - September through August. Fall Semester, Spring Semester, and summer for academic institutions.

74. We assume the current ERP system (FAMIS) will continue as is with no replacement. Please confirm.

A - Yes

75. Is there any other ERP system used (other than FAMIS)?

A – As mentioned in the RFP two members use other software, Colleague and Masterpiece

76. How many FAMIS ERP(s) instances are implemented which will be required to be connected to BlackLine?

A - There are no assumptions on the use of Blackline or any other product.

77. How many Company Codes (legal entities) will be included?

A - 22. See section 1.2 of the RFP

78. How many different Charts of Accounts are involved?

A – Each member of the A&M system has their own fund and cost centers, but all share a common subcode/account and attribute structure.

79. How many Ledger Types to be included? Ex: Leading Ledger : IFRS GAAP Non Leading Ledger: Local GAAP

A - We are not sure how ledger types are used in this question. The A&M System members follow GASB standards, we do not operate under IFRS, and we are considered a state agency reporting as a proprietary entity in the consolidated State of Texas CAFR.

80. Are the posting periods the same across all ledgers?

A - Yes

81. What is the Total Number G.L. Accounts for all COAs?

A - Each A&M System member established their own GL accounts. The System Office maintains a master list of subcodes to record revenues and expenses – 763 expense codes, 513 revenue subcodes, plus 350 account controls for balance sheet reporting.

82. How many accounts are Balance Sheet Accounts?

A - We currently have 368 different account controls (subcodes) which represent balance sheet items – Receivable, Payables, etc. Some of these account controls are grouped on the same row on our Statement of Net Position.

83. Are you currently using any other Reconciliation Tools?

A – Many members of the A&M system use T-Recs. Replacement of that tool is not in scope.

84. Will any Legacy data to be migrated into the Blackline Instance? If so:

   a. How many years

   b. Just Balances?

   c. Balances & Items?

   d. Balances, Items & Attachments?

A - No assumptions have been made about Blackline

85. How many and from which ERPs will Legacy Data migrate from?

A – Answered previously.

86. Have you seen any Demo of BlackLine?

    a.   Please share the Use Cases for Blackline Implementation, if any"

A - No assumptions have been made about Blackline products. The A&M System is aware of the product, but has not seen a demonstration.

87. Approximately how many Journal Entries are posted in a month?

A – Answered in section 3.6.1 of the RFP.

88. For Data Transport & IT requirement, which of the following teams will we coordinate with?

    a.   For the SSO Setup

    b.   For the API Setup

    c.   For the SFTP Setup

(One user License will be consumed for the API Connector)

89. How many users would do the Financial Close Process? We assume 22. Request confirmation.

A – No Usually one or two per system member, 48.

90. Which Time Zones are Applicable? (We need this to estimate effort for User Training and User Acceptance Testing). Request confirmation

A – All in Central time zone

91. TCS will manage the project end to end for implementation. Resources will be onboarded and offboarded as per their requirement during the implementation. However, 5 BlackLine User licenses will be needed for the implementation team. Request confirmation if this is okay.

A – Respondent may propose a plan of this nature.

92. What is your expected time horizon for completion of the project (Weeks)

A – To be determined. Once the project ramps up and begins, Phase I may take 4 to 6 months.

93. Will the vendor of choice have an opportunity to interview the end users to develop the best processes and practices that we want to implement at the organization?

A – Yes, that is expected to be part of the implementation process.

94. What roles and approximately how much time do you expect being contributed from internal project team members?

A – To be determined as implementation time, but the A&M System expects to partner and contribute to the creation of the solution, and own the solution going forward.

95. What are some outstanding business decisions and their timeline that may impact the application?

A – Projects of this nature always face the triple constraint of time, costs, and scope. The A&M System will negotiate through these with the selected solution and partner.

96. Are there any major business events and/or projects that may impact the timeline, scope, and business availability? (Aside from monthly and quarterly business schedules)

A – The A&M System will not contribute full resources until the FY 2021 close process is complete.

97. How many weeks of post go-live support are you expecting from the implementation partner?

A – To be determined.

98. Does the system have a preference for a SaaS, hosted, or on-premise solution?

A – See question #8.

99. What degree of chart of accounts mappings will be necessary (low, moderate, extensive) and how much work has already been done on this effort?

A –Low to moderate. Significant work has been done in the enterprise data warehouse.

100. Is there a Chart of Accounts or Entity structure redesign that is required before the start of the implementation or during the course of the project?

A – Not that we are aware of at this time. We have 4 values for our subcodes, we would like to increase this by at least 2 digits to have room for new accounting events in the future.

101. Are there any data cleansing efforts that are required before the start of the implementation, or during the course of the project that are relevant? (e.g. Chart of Accounts cleanup)

A – Not that we are aware of at this time.

102. What is the current process used to manage metadata (e.g. Accounts, Departments, etc.) in the General Ledger source systems and other applications? What is the frequency of metadata changes today?

A – Meta data values are changed regularly. Structures are fairly static. New values and changes would be expected to be part of an ongoing integration – if needed.

103. Does the University have a governance and change control process today to ensure that metadata updates are managed and communicated throughout systems proactively?

A –The A&M System is a University system. No formal, governed process at this time.

104. What kind of data load frequency and automation is expected as part of the process for consolidations, reporting, and forecasting respectively?

A - During end of year close periods – near real time frequency is desired. Perhaps every 30-60 minutes.

105. Will there be a requirement for data conversion for prior year data? If so, how many prior years will be required for consolidation, forecasting, and reporting respectively?

    A – Not at this time. The A&M System will focus on go-forward reporting.

106. Does this RFP include an application to manage all hierarchies and metadata upstream and downstream for business processes in scope? (i.e. a single application to add an Account that pushes to the AFR and IFFM applications)

    A – Required metadata is expected to come from the integrations to the ERP system.

107. Please describe the Financial Close & Consolidation process in your own words.

    A – Each A&M System member records their own accrual entries, the AFR reports are all generated from FAMIS AFR module. After all reports are reviewed, the consolidated reports are generated from AFR module and consolidated entries are posted by System Office to eliminate internal activities.

108. How much time is currently being spent on the existing Close & Consolidation processes?

    A – Each A&M System member spends significant time preparing their financial statements, from August 31 to October 30, the System Office spends one-two weeks on the consolidation process and publication from November 1st to November 20th.

109. How many people are currently involved in the current Close & Consolidation process?

    A – Answered Previously

110. Can you provide the consolidation workbook with calculations for us to understand the process and complexity?

    A – Not at this time.   Will be determine in implementation.

111. On a scale of 1-5, how defined are the current Close & Consolidation processes and procedures (with a score of 5 being "very defined")?

    A – The process and procedures are fairly defined, maybe a 3, the System members have different items in their close process, they each have their own processes.

112. What is the most time consuming and complex area of the consolidation calculation process and why? (e.g. Net Income Roll to Balance Sheet, Historical Overrides, Currency Translation, Allocations, etc.)

    A – Desk review of all the members' AFRs takes considerable time, 12 page check list to ensure the reporting is accurate. Also, allocations, balancing and eliminating internal activities, and

preparing the Management Discussion and Analysis and the note disclosures. We do not have currency translation. The net income rolls to the balance sheet automatically.

113. How many different source systems are part of the Close & Consolidation process, aside from FAMIS, Ellucian Colleague, and Infor Masterpiece FMS?

    A – Answered previously.

114. What is the estimated number of accounts in the 3 charts of accounts, consolidation hierarchy, and other required AFR reporting hierarchies?

    A – Answered previously

115. Please describe the dimensions by which you consolidate and report. (e.g. Account, Department, NACUBO Function, Fund, etc.)

    A – See question 18

116. Can you please describe the inter-system member elimination process?

    A – See question 14

117. Please describe or provide a model for your cash flow reporting.

    A – To be determined in implementation

118. Is the Cash Flow statement based on the direct or indirect method?

    A - Direct method

119. Are the different Cash Flow statement components identifiable by Account or other dimensionality within the source data?

    A - No, see questions 37, 38

120. In reference to section 3.6.1, what dimensionality is missing from the ledgers that would be required for the reporting process? How is this information being identified today?

    A – See question 35, the bank dimension is missing, the information is currently identified based on specific attributes assigned to each bank.

121. In reference to section 3.6.2, what types of information things change year over year for the reporting process? (e.g. Account or Entity structure versus presentation)

    A – Generally attributes that change over the course of the year are replaced. Attributes are tied to a fiscal year.

122. In reference to section 3.6.2, what is an example of outside data for additional analysis and reporting?

A – The A&M System had no specific use case in mind for this requirement. It is just a desired feature.

123. In reference to 3.6.4, what are examples of supplemental journals and adjustments? Secondly, would these journals be exported back to the legacy system due to timing issues, or another requirement? Thirdly, would this information be journal line detail, or the result of those adjustments?

    A – These would be the adjustments, reclassifications, and consolidations. Yes, we are envisioning these entries being exported back to the legacy system. This information would be journal line detail but could be the result of automated processes in the new software.

124. In reference to section 3.6.4, what are examples of supplemental structured data?

    A – These are the manual entries that occur today, examples include entries to eliminate intra-system activity and reclassify investments for financial statement presentation.

125. In reference to section 3.6.5, what is the estimated volume of reclassification and allocation journal entries?

    A – The volume varies depending on each A&M System member's specific activities.

126. In reference to section 3.6.5, what are examples of allocations for these adjustments and are the allocation drivers in 1 legacy or a combination of the 3 legacy systems? (e.g. total overhead cost needs to be allocated across entities that are on different legacy systems)

    A - Allocations are recorded for pension and OPEB expenses across NACUBO functions, this could occur at the member level or system level. The drivers would be based upon the underlying data from the legacy systems. No total overhead costs does not need to be allocated across entities.

127. In reference to section 3.6.5, what is the estimated volume of elimination entries, and are elimination partners identified from the source systems?

    A – Approximately 150 entries, if elimination partners are the offsetting entity, then yes, this is the case for Due to/from (receivables/payables) and transfers.

128. In reference to section 3.6.6, is the reconciliation requirement for inter-system member transaction detail or balances?

    A - Balances

129. In reference to section 3.6.7, are the three charts of accounts (FAMIS, Ellucian Colleague, Infor Masterpiece FMS) mapped to a single reporting chart of accounts, or do the legacy charts need to be retained in the reporting application?

    A – Masterpiece and Colleague already map to the FAMIS chart of accounts

130. How many different reporting hierarchies are required for the AFR reporting application?

A – See question 18

131. Is there a current financial close calendar that exists in a system or offline application (e.g. Excel) today, with tasks, owners, and dependencies?

    A – Not centrally, each A&M System member maintains their own calendar of events for year-end close.

132. Is there an expectation to set up multiple Close calendars within the system? (e.g. Monthly, Quarterly, Annual)

    A – The primary need is for annual reporting. There are discussions about quarterly financial statements as well.

133. Have owners, predecessors, risk ratings, durations, etc. and other Close task attributes been defined already?

    A – To be determined.

134. Is there a complete list of rules required today for the consolidation process that you can please share? (e.g. tables/charts, diagrams)

    A – To be determined during implementation

135. In reference to section 3.6.6, is a reconciliation module for all Balance Sheet reconciliations (e.g. GL, AR, AP, Fixed Assets, etc.) in scope for this RFP? If so, please address Reconciliation Compliance questions below.

    A – Full reconciliation is not in scope. The A&M System is interested in understanding the features available in the product/solution, but reconciliation will generally be limited to validation of the statutory reports.

136. How many reconciliations are in scope, and at what level of detail (e.g. Account, Department, Fund, Student)?

    A – N/A – Not in Scope

137. Across how many different ledgers do you perform reconciliations?

    A – N/A – Not in Scope

138. What is the estimated volume of accounts and reconciliations on a monthly, quarterly, and annual basis?

    A – N/A – Not in Scope

139. What is the current high-level reconciliation timeline?

    A – N/A – Not in Scope

140. What source systems are part of the reconciliation scope?

    A – N/A – Not in Scope

141. What subledger reconciliations are in scope?

    A – N/A – Not in Scope

142. How do you define "complex" reconciliations and what are some examples?

    A – N/A – Not in Scope

143. What is the approximate percentage of High, Medium, or Low complexity of reconciliations?

    A – N/A – Not in Scope

144. Is there a requirement to group account balances (e.g. by Department, Fund, Account, etc.) for a single reconciliation? If so, what is the rough percentage of these groupings?

    A – N/A – Not in Scope

145. How defined are the reconciliation policy standards (scale of 1-5) and would there be any global reconciliation policy changes prior to this project, or as part of it?

    A – N/A – Not in Scope

146. Are standard reconciliation characteristics currently defined in the policies and procedures? (e.g. preparer/reviewer, frequency, duration, risk rating, aging thresholds, auto-recon method, auto-reconciliation thresholds, etc.)?

    A – N/A – Not in Scope

147. What is the process to post adjusting entries to the source system for reconciliations completed during and outside of month-end close?

    A – N/A – Not in Scope

148. What are some challenges of the existing reconciliation process?

    A – N/A – Not in Scope

149. How are the reconciliation roles & responsibilities defined? What is the estimated number of preparers and reviewers across the system?

    A – N/A – Not in Scope

150. Has there been an analysis on the centralization and standardization of like reconciliations across departments, or would this be part of the implementation?

    A – N/A – Not in Scope

151. How are amortization schedules tracked and maintained to support reconciliations?

A – N/A – Not in Scope

152. Is the development of the annual budget in scope for this RFP? If so, please address Planning & Budgeting questions included below.

A – The annual budget process is **not in scope** for this RFP.

153. What is your planning and budgeting methodology?

A – N/A – not in scope

154. What planning and budgeting deliverables is the University responsible for?

A – N/A – Not in Scope

155. Please describe any "pain points" or limitations you encounter with your current approach.

A – N/A – Not in Scope

156. Approximately, how many dimensions are in the current budget model and what would be their approximate size? (e.g. Accounts, Departments, etc.)

A – N/A – Not in Scope

157. Do the dimensions needed differ based on functional area planned? (e.g. revenue model vs. expenses, position planning, capital planning)

A – N/A – Not in Scope

158. How many drivers, forecast scenarios, and financial modeling situations are you hoping to deploy? (e.g. current year budget, 5 year forecast, etc.)

A – N/A – Not in Scope

159. For Workforce or Employee related expenses, is there a requirement to see the budget impact based on salaries, benefits, payroll taxes, merit %, etc.?

A – N/A – Not in Scope

160. For Workforce or Employee related expenses, is there a requirement to capture information at the employee level of detail, the position/job level of detail, or both employee and job level of detail concurrently?

A – N/A – Not in Scope

161. For Workforce or Employee related expenses, is there a requirement to capture and plan for the split funding of a position across multiple cost centers, departments, or other categories? (e.g. position is 50% funded from department A and 25% funded from department B, etc.)

A – N/A – Not in Scope

162. Is there a complete list of tasks associated with the processes described for existing systems, including budgeting, forecasting, and reporting that you can please share? (e.g. Operating Budgets - Non Salaries, Operating Budgets - Salaries, etc.)

    A – N/A – Not in Scope

163. Is there a complete list of rules required today for the budgeting, forecasting, and reporting processes that you can please share? (e.g. tables/charts, diagrams)

    A – N/A – Not in Scope

164. For general budgeting, is there a requirement to separately track departmental input and various levels of adjustments performed by the budget office or other entities? (This is in addition to an ability to store different versions of a budget.)

    A – N/A – Not in Scope

165. For budgeting, does TAMU have or foresee a need to have a method to track interdepartmental funding transfers within the budgeting tool?

    A – N/A – Not in Scope

166. What are examples of different forecasting models that you can describe or please share? If models are different based on functional area please provide examples of those differences.

    A – We have been using the Oracle Hyperion Financial forecasting client module. We had all members data loaded with the models rolling up into Academic and Agency summary data as well as rolling up to an A&M System total. Members could go in and change their base cases and run individual scenarios. The model was based on prior year annual financial data and the model produced a balance sheet, profit and loss statement, cash flow statement, and CFI ratios forecasted out for over 10+ years

167. In reference to section 3.7.3, how many student cohorts need to be tracked within the system at once? Within each cohort, is a breakdown needed to split groups of students by major?

    A – Analysis has not been completed, but generally cohorts would be by academic year and could be break down by Major and College.

168. Is an integration with the student information system planned for this implementation? If so, what is that system today?

    A – To be determined. Each university within the A&M System has its own Banner implementation.

169. What are the current anticipated source systems for the IFFM application? (e.g. Workday HCM, Data Warehouse, etc.)

    A – To be determined.

170. Please describe the IFFM business process in your own words.

A –This forecasting module used the Oracle Hyperion Financial forecasting module. This was the client version not the cloud version. We loaded each members' annual financial data into the module and other academic and research data such as enrollment by classification, total salaries by faculty level, research award and proposal data etc. A&M System members could then adjust growth rates and other methods to forecast their data. The individual member data was then rolled up to fall under either an Academic or Agency summary as well as an elimination entry bucket for the A&M System rollup. The model produced a balance sheet, profit and loss statement, cash flow and CFI calculation reflecting 10+ years of forecasting results.

171. How much time is currently being spent on the existing IFFM processes?

A – Currently the model is not utilized as much as we had hoped. The academic members reverted back to using their internal spreadsheets to forecast tuition and fees due to the complexity of the rate structure and the current system didn't have the level of detail that helped them answer the questions they needed, but at the same time they found the current system too complicated and cumbersome as well. The A&M System Office used it last year to help project the CFI score and present to the Board of Regents. If we find a useful solution, we hope that members would utilize the project much more.

172. How many people are currently involved in the IFFM process?

A – We have around 15-20 licenses. As not all members utilized the model. If all members used the product, we could have as many as 2 per member or around 46.

173. Can you provide supporting documents for the IFFM process for us to understand the complexity?

A – We could provide the Oracle Hyperion Strategic Finance Users guide in pdf. Or it is likely online. It would be the client based system and not the newer cloud based system.

174. On a scale of 1-5, how defined are the current IFFM processes and procedures (with a score of 5 being "very defined")?

A – Also depends on which processes.

175. What is the most time consuming and complex areas of the IFFM process and why? (e.g. scenario planning based on enrollment, tuition, debt and debt requirements, etc.)

A – Loading data into the model. Making sure it ties back to our Annual Financial Reports and other academic data.

176. How many different hierarchies are required for the IFFM application?

A – Each member (24) would roll under either academic or agency or System offices. But Texas A&M main campus would also have 2 members roll into the TAMU total. (TAMU; TAMU-Galveston, TAM Health Science Center). We also had to have a bucket for Campus 00, which

included the elimination entries so that the totals roll to the A&M System total would include the elimination entries to eliminate double counting of revenue and expenses.

177. Can you provide a sample of the existing tuition revenue forecasting model?

A – Each A&M System member has their own tuition and fee forecasting in Excel. The model we used for the IFFM was to load the annual financial data which included the actual tuition and fees reported and then solve based on enrollment data and other percentage splits loaded to IFM to get a back blended rate for each classification. This is one of the reasons the model was not used by members as the back blended rate was so high level and they had a hard time following the data and logic that they didn't feel comfortable using that rate to flex for analysis.

178. Please list and describe the reporting packages you aim to create, their respective audience, and frequency

A – The focus will be the statutory reports. See the link in section 3.6.9

179. How many people are involved in the current reporting processes and how long does it take?

A – Answered previously

180. What kind of manual changes are required for the reporting packages to achieve a final output?

A – This question is unclear and will depend on the product and the implementation

181. What are the most time consuming aspects of the reporting processes and why?

A – Changes to report definitions are difficult. It's a very manual process to maintain the reports, new subcodes must be manually added to each report and reference numbers are manually assigned to pull data from one report to another. There are also limitations on how the reports may be structured

182. Does the RFP include contracting for both Phase 1 and Phase 2 or is this to price and implement only Phase 1 while indicating that the solution presented can support phase 2?

A – See questions 3 & 5.

183. How long after the completion of Phase 1 would you expect to begin phase 2?

A – To be determined. It will depend on the success and stability of phase 1, and the confidence that at that time that the platform selected can support phase 2.

184. Is this project to cover AFR reporting only or is there consideration for monthly and standalone reports for locations?

A – The primary focus is on the AFR which includes stand-alone reports by member. If successful and easy to use, reporting could be extended into other areas.

185. If the HUB is the Prime on the response, does a HUB subcontracting Plan need to be completed?

A – This was covered in the Pre-Proposal meeting.

186. How many accounts in total and does a common chart of accounts exist?

A – see question 77, each A&M System Member sets up their own accounts, a common set of subcodes are used to build the financial statements – balance sheet, revenues, expenses, etc.

187. Is Cashflow reporting in scope?

A – Yes, cash flow reporting is in scope. We would like the new software to generate a cash flow statement based upon the balance sheet and operating statement.

188. Approximately how many base entities are expected?

A – The A&M System is unfamiliar with the term base entities. See the introductory section.

189. Is all reporting in USD?

A - Yes

190. Is there interfund and/or intersystem activity to be eliminated?

A - Yes

191. How many additional dimensions will be needed, such as Fund, Department, etc?

A – See question 18

192. Calculation of NI to Equity, roll forward accounts, and validation rules to be included?

A – To be determined.

193. How many allocations would be needed and can you explain the complexity for those allocations?

A – To be determined in implementation

194. Will there be any KPI's requested ?

A – For the IFFM some KPIs will be expected. To be determined in implementation. It would be interesting to see what the tools can provide related to KPIs

195. Any other complex calculations to be included?

A – The A&M System performs a cash allocation today – which is mostly manual, but it is hoped that incorporation of the "bank/appropriation" dimension will simplify that process. See question 35. The bank allocations are performed once a year to allocate the cash reported on the schedule of cash & cash equivalents, still reviewing options on how this will work with a new system.

196. In section 3.2 it mentions that FAMIS is moving to new relational database - In phase 1 will we be connecting to the "older version" of FAMIS therefore needing a move to the new connection?

A – Timing is to be determined. There is no expectation of a "connection" to the mainframe version of FAMIS.   With these changes in flight, the A&M System will likely lean towards CSV integrations, or integrations from the A&M System data warehouse – which is MS SQL server.

197. How many data sources are in scope? Are they direct connect? Or flat file uploads?

A - See the A&M System introductory comments

198. Are the data mappings complex or merely one to one mapping?

A – Data mapping to dimensions should be simple/standard to a single row.

199. Will data out of OneStream need to be fed to other systems?

A – The A&M System has made no assumptions on a particular platform. As described earlier, supplemental journal data may be fed back to the source ERP system, and data from the AFR will eventually flow into the IFFM module.

200. Will data be loaded from a subsystem or subledger for monthly activity?

A - See section 3.6.1 and answers to question 8.

201. How will roll forward data be loaded? Will that need to be input or through rules or from a subsystem?

A – Year end roll forward data should be present in the standard journal transactions. Or a separate integration may be developed.

202. How many years of historical data are needed and are they from disparate systems?

A – At this time, no historical data is in scope.

203. How many internal resources are available to validate the data?

A – The A&M System will assign technical and functional staff to this project. See earlier answers.

204. How many reports /reporting packages in total?

A – The current AFR reporting tool produces 26 reports.

205. Would that include Income Statement, Balance Sheet, and Cash Flow? Any other reports? How many of each?

A – See the A&M System introductory statement

206. Are any Dashboards required?

A – To be determined

207. Does TAMUS prepare interim financial statements at any quarter end where they accrue and consolidate entries? Can you provide a typical year-end close calendar and deadlines?

A – At this time, no. All A&M System Members close August the 1st week of September, then they make accruals/adjustment in Month 13. The final close of Month 13 occurs for each System Member after the A&M System completes the review of their financial statements. All A&M System Members have closed Month 13 by the end of October/early November, then System Office works to complete the consolidated financial statements by the State of Texas deadline, November 20th. It has been discussed issuing quarterly financial statements when we move to the new software.

208. There are three financial systems. FAMIS is currently used by 20 of the 22 members, with two members using Colleague and Masterpiece. During the pre-proposal conference held on Friday, March 12, TAMUS mentioned that are 3 charts of accounts. Can you confirm that all members using FAMIS are using the same chart of accounts?

A - Colleague and Masterpiece already map their system to the FAMIS chart of accounts.   All members of the A&M System use the same chart of accounts – but have their own cost center and detailed fund list.

209. Are there any blackout periods where Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) will not be available for workshops and meetings (for example, during year-end close)?

A – Generally September through mid-November are consumed with end of year closing and reporting.

210. Do each of the 20 TAMUS members who receive funding from the State of Texas submit their own budget request, or is a consolidated budget request submitted for the TAMUS system?

A – Yes, Each A&M System Member submits its own annual budget request

211. Has TAMUS viewed demonstrations of products or evaluated any products leading up to this procurement?

A – The A&M System has been surveying the market place and has had discussions with many potential respondents.

212. How many personnel does TAMUS plan to assign to the project?

A – To be determined, but the A&M System expects to assign a project manager and a couple technical resources.   Three or more functional resources will likely be assigned.   Assignments may be shared with other duties.

213. Assuming a 1-4 hour upgrade effort, is the Texas A&M System open to the AFR solution being deploying in their own hosting environment (A&M Data Center or A&M System Cloud preference of AWS/Google/Azure) as well as the stated SaaS hosting environment?

    A – Depending on the options offered by the selected respondent, the A&M System expects to make decisions based on the factors such as cost, security, recovery options, etc.

214. In a vendor hosted SaaS offering, do you prefer to upgrade at your preference or be forced in a certain window every single month?

    A – In the SasS model, the A&M System would expect the vendor to lead with a standard approach, or provide a recommendation.

215. In a vendor hosted SaaS offering, would you prefer a multi-tenant environment (defined as multiple customers sharing server resources) or a single tenant environment (defined as a single customer having its own server resources at its disposal)?

    A – Most likely single tenant. To be determined based on cost, performance, etc.

216. Do you have a guaranteed uptime expectation for Cloud?

    A – Undefined – but will need to be understood if a SaaS model is chosen.

217. Do you have Disaster recover requirements for RTO (Recovery Time Objective) and RPO (Recovery Point Objective)?

    A – Undefined for this project at this time. Propose what you recommend.

218. In a Disaster scenario, would the Texas A&M System prefer "best efforts" to recover the data or specific stated objectives to a 10 minute window to ensure rapid and a stable operation?

    A – If the proposed software is Saas, the A&M System will need to understand RTO and RPO provided by the SasS solution.

219. Will TAMUS potentially issue a second RFP for its Phase 2 initiative (IFFM) after Phase 1 is completed?

    A – This could be a possibility if it became clear during the RFP process or during phase I implementation that the selected software for Phase 1 could not meet the needs of phase 2.

220. As discussed during the pre-proposal conference, does TAMUS want RFP responses to primarily focus on Phase 1 only, given that Phase 1 is TAMUS's key focus?

    A – See response to question 2

221. What are TAMUS's desired dates for kick-off and go-live for both Phase 1 and Phase 2?

    A – Phase 1 – preliminary work through November 2021. The project will begin in earnest after the close of the FY 2021 period on the current system. The new solution should be in place for the close of the FY 2022 period. Phase 2 – To be determined.

222. While many software platforms in the market can fulfill the span of TAMUS's requirements for both Phase 1 and Phase 2, one single software platform is not the best at all of TAMUS's use cases across financial close and consolidation, statutory reporting, and financial forecasting (as clearly supported by Gartner's Magic Quadrants). Given this, is TAMUS open to vendors proposing more than one software platform (that are then integrated) across Phase 1 and Phase 2, or is TAMUS keen on implementing a single software platform across Phase 1 and Phase 2?

A – The A&M System does not necessarily accept the statement in this question as fact. The respondent should make the case for their proposal. As mentioned in the RFP, the current IFFM module is severely hampered by the challenge of getting reliable and accurate financial data that balances to statutory reports (i.e. AFR reports). As stated previously, the preference is for a single platform, but the A&M System will consider all proposals.

223. Does A&M have a preference on the project development location and approach? In other words, does A&M strongly believe offshore resources should be utilized? The project be completed on-site in College Station, remotely considering the pandemic,etc.

A – If possible, some of the project should be completed on-site. However, remote resources and expertise is likely to be part of the project. To be determined and both are acceptable.

224. A&M System Annual report in section 3.6.9 references foreign currency. Will assumption be that foreign currency and international obligations be handled in the application? Or will the approach be that local systems will handle foreign currency and translations with data for each entity loaded in USD?

A – Currently there are no foreign currency requirements for the new software.

225. 3.2 - The financial system is integrated with a data warehouse with SQL and BO. Should we plan to provide "Direct Connects" to the data warehouse allowing the data to be accessible in OneStream or look at direct connect to ERP by A&M System?

A - Since the A&M System ERP is moving to a new technology, the answer to this is unclear. To be determined

   a. Integrations - Ability to automate completion of tasks when completed within the application, such as loading of ledger data. What would be some tasks that would need to be automated after ledger data loads for example?

A – To be determined. Perhaps regeneration of reports, notification of review, etc.

226. 3.6.7 - Does this mean that footnote or any comments need to be visualized in a consolidated manner (e.g. see all comments by account for all system members at an aggregated level)?

A – This was not envisioned as a requirement. The A&M System is interested in understanding the features of the software.

227. 3.6.9 - Is the assumption that each member system will have their own metadata and they will maintain that? Is there any metadata that is utilized similarly across all systems? What unique attributes would differ between other system members (e.g. departments/department codes)?

A – Generally no. Meta data will follow the same patterns across the A&M System.

228. Security requirement question: Will each system member only see their data and no view of other system data or at a consolidated level?

    A – Yes –The A&M System would like to see security and access handled in that manner.

229. 3.7.4 - Will each system member have their own ability to do what-if analysis or will this scenario modeling be done at a consolidated level?

    A - To be determined.

230. Because OneStream is a platform that can manage Phase 1 and Phase 2 requirements, we can begin or stagger both phases as needed. As part of this RFP response, should we include our approach, recommendation, and costs for accomplishing both phases?

    A – The A&M System understands that full details on implementation will need discussion and negotiation, but we would like to know what a respondent thinks is the right approach for implementation, along with estimated costs.

231. Will A&M provide an internal PM to compliment the selected implementation partner's Project Manager?

    A – Yes, it is anticipated that the A&M System will have an internal PM.

232. Organizational Change Management – Please describe A&M's strategy or involvement for OCM? Should we provide the recommended strategy, approach and costs associated?

    A - Yes, please provide a recommended strategy, approach and associated costs for OCM.

233. Please describe the level of expected involvement of A&M's IT resources with respect to ownership of and execution of conversions and development of integrations? Of the technical areas of responsibility are there any that should be carved out as owned and executed by A&M IT?

    A – A&M System IT expects to contribute significantly to the project – as we do today in supporting the current reporting system.

234. Besides the necessary resources need for tasks related to integrations, is the expectation that A&M will have resources available for data validation and possible development work where it seems fit?

    A – Yes.

END OF ADDENDUM NO. 1