



DIVISION OF FINANCE – PURCHASING DEPARTMENT

100 N. Broadway St, Suite 610 Wichita, KS 67202 • Phone (316) 660-7255 • Fax (316) 660-1839
PURCHASING@SEDGWICK.GOV • SEDGWICKCOUNTY.ORG

ADDENDUM #3 RFP #24-0037 RISE WITH SAP S/4 HANA CLOUD PRIVATE EDITION PREMIUM AND SAP ARIBA SNAP BUYING IMPLEMENTATION

August 20, 2024

The following is to ensure that vendors have complete information prior to submitting a proposal. Here are some clarifications regarding the proposal for Rise with SAP S/4Hana Cloud Private Edition Premium and SAP Snap Buying Implementation.

Questions and/or statements of clarification are in **bold** font, and answers to specific questions are *italicized*.

1. **As a requirement, you have stated: “Implement Rise with SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition, Premium (S/4HANA) using a Brownfield approach.”** The driver for this question is understanding your vision of System Conversion (Brownfield approach), which comes in two distinct types:

Type A: The Full System Conversion will be accomplished using the SAP Software Update Manager (SUM) in a one-step procedure with a single downtime. This approach also includes migrating your SAP system from your own data center to either a data center of SAP or a data center of an infrastructure-as-a-service (IaaS) provider.

Type B: Selective Data Transition migrates and transforms configuration, master, and transactional data to meet your specific requirements. This type also includes migrating your SAP system from your own data center to either a data center of SAP or a data center of an infrastructure-as-a-service (IaaS) provider.

- a. **Based on your requirement to maintain the classic ledger intact in your ECC6 environment, which is a correct approach, we believe that a Brown-Filled (Type B) approach would be the correct one as it would help preserve your current numbering ranges and transform secondary cost elements form classic ledger to Universal Ledger accounts thus preserving your costing structures and facilitating reporting conversion. This approach would also allow implementation to "retain Sedgwick County employees as vendors with their current employee vendor number" as we would use a specific Business Partner separate account groups for employees, one-time vendors, and standard vendors. Please confirm our understanding and provide additional insights.**

Your understanding is correct. The IaaS provider will be Microsoft Azure. The county is using Classic Ledger with Special Purpose Ledger for Document Splitting. Former Budgeting is used for Public Sector Funds Management. Standard and custom workflows are used for approvals. Numerous departments rely heavily on FMEQ and Document Splitting reporting.

2. Could you please clarify your vision of "a Brownfield approach"?

The specifics of the county's Brownfield Approach can be found in the project requirements section of the RFP.

3. Where will the new SAP S/4 HANA RISE Private edition be hosted?

Microsoft Azure Data Center.

4. Which release of SAP MDM do you have today?

The county has MDM Data Manager version 7.1.17.116 and MDM Import Manager version 7.1.17.124. The county does not use a pure SAP MDM and instead uses SAP SRM-MDM.

5. Does it live in a separate landscape?

Yes: development, quality assurance, and production.

6. Please confirm our understanding from RFP that the integration with current SRM/PPS utilizes only SAP PI?

The SRM system uses PI as well as RFC connections to the ECC server.

7. Please confirm our understanding from RFP that the integration with current SRM/PPS utilizes only SAP PI?

See answer above.

8. Do you envision maintaining the "SAP-Only" approval workflows similar to SRM/PPS today or would you prefer using the native Ariba SNAP workflow process?

No preference.

9. Can you please elaborate on which master data you have or plan to use S/4 a Funds Management Government settings in BCS functionality?

The RFP Budget Overview attachment provides details on the information included in the master data.

10. Do you have a point of view on derivation rules and do you plan to derive them automatically in purchasing documents?

We do use derivation rules to verify budget availability for purchasing documents. The information can be found in the RFP Budget Overview attachment.

11. Do you currently use RF technology to receive inventory in warehouses or for goods issued to the business? Do you use IM or SAP WM functionalities? How do you presently relieve inventory from warehouses?

The county does not use RF technology. We use MRP functionality for two warehouses. Inventory is relieved from the system by users manually executing system t-codes which update the material counts to accurately reflect when materials have been physically issued.

12. Do you plan to acquire SAP BTP with its Cloud Process Integration (CPI) capabilities?

We will use BTP and do not plan to use CPI capabilities.

13. Do you use electronic banking statement (EBS) functionality with your bank in addition to Positive Pay and ACH bank files?

The county does not currently do EBS. We do produce Positive Pay and ACH bank files.

14. If SAP BW 7.5 on HANA will remain in operation, the ECC and SRM data sources must be addressed. Do you have current documentation on custom and standard data sources from ECC and SRM that we can use to redefine resources from S/4 and Ariba SNAP?

Yes, see attached for documentation. This list was last updated July 2023. Any new items since July 2023 would not make a notable difference and an updated list would be provided during the project. The list is for both ECC and SRM. BW installation is not on HANA. The BW version is 7.5.

15. How many forms do you currently use in ECC and SRM?

Less than 10.

16. Is Sedgwick County open to a Global Deployment Model for the Implementation Team?

The implementation partner must deploy the SAP systems using our selected Microsoft Azure cloud service provider.

17. Can we get a two (2) week extension to optimize our Response, as it will take time to review your Sandbox and conduct an Assessment. Are we allowed to install our Proprietary Assessment Tools on it?

No. We cannot allow for an extension.

18. We understand Sedgwick County conducted some Analysis/Assessments last year using SAP Tools (BSR etc.). Can these findings be shared?

We do not have any results for an analysis from a BSR (assuming this stands for SAP Business Scenario Recommendation report) stored to share.

19. What is the use case or not using Fiori?

See page five (5) of the RFP. Project requirement is to implement using the SAP GUI. We would only implement Fiori for a specific transaction code or codes provided we find out we are utilizing a transaction code or codes that require the Fiori interface. In that case, we would only implement Fiori for the transaction(s) that require Fiori and implement GUI for everything else.

20. Can you provide specifics on data migration requirements?

Selective Data Transition.

21. What is the county's initial assessment of objects from a complexity point?

The RFP's Scope provides a thorough description of the objects, programs, and information in our system and the attachments provide additional description to duplicate those.

22. Does the county anticipate any specific customizations or unique workflows within SAP S/4HANA or SAP Ariba that must be addressed in the proposal?

Yes. This information is in the scope there are attachments that provide more information and describes them in more detail.

23. Could you clarify any specific deadlines or milestones the county expects to achieve during the implementation process?

The expectation is to identify specific deadlines and milestones based on the scope. An example of a milestone might be that the implementation partner would complete migration of ECC data to S/4 development tenant. Project timelines/milestones will be established at the start of the project and then once those milestones are completed successfully, Sedgwick County would be invoiced.

24. We see that Sedgwick County will accept electronic or physical copies of the proposals. Does Sedgwick County have a preference?

Vendors should provide one (1) physical copy AND an electronic copy. See Section IV Submittals.

25. The RFP indicates an October 2024 start, with a go live goal of October 2025. Does the county have fixed specific dates in mind, or are these general timeframes? Can the county arrange additional downtime in October, if necessary?

These are general timeframes. Additional downtime in October can be arranged if necessary.

26. In Addendum #1, it is stated that "Every day the people owing Delinquent Taxes are extracted from GRM/Aumentum, an external system, and loaded into an SAP ECC custom Delinquent Tax table ZFI_DELINQ_VEND." Can Sedgwick confirm how the extraction from GRM is performed? Is this automatic via integration, or a manual activity (like download/upload) that is then loaded into the SAP tables by Sedgwick personnel?

The process is automated from GRM and an ABAP program picks it up using a flat file interface. The background job is what runs the ABAP program.

27. Can you confirm who/which entity handles the ECC HR mini master? (Sedgwick or the SuccessFactors partner)

All HR data is stored in SuccessFactors.

28. Concerning data migration, the RFP states that the Implementation Partner will aid with data clean-up. Can Sedgwick clarify what specific activities are expected from the implementation partner?

Recommendations and implementation of recommendations.

29. Which system is the master system for vendors (SRM or ECC or MDM)?

ECC

30. Regarding approval workflow, do the approving users receive the approval request using SBWP (in SAPGui), or via external systems such as Email/Outlook?

They get workflows in SBWP and also get notified via email when new items arrive.

31. Concerning MDM, in the RFP it is stated "... an internal catalog supported by SAP MDM". Does the county intend to continue using MDM for internal catalog maintenance?

No.

32. Would you please confirm how many Contracts are currently maintained within the SRM system?

There are about 150 open contracts.

33. Is Sedgwick using SAP WM warehousing or just storage locations to manage stock?

We don't have SAP WM and we are not using storage locations to manage stock. We run MRP nightly to manage inventory.

34. In the Required Response Content list, number 8 states "Sample of Agreement". Can Sedgwick County please clarify what that refers to? Acknowledgement of Sedgwick County sample agreement? Provide the partners sample agreement? Other?

Sedgwick County is requesting a sample agreement/contract that shows terms and conditions. It can also include the appropriate scope statements.

35. In the Required Response Content list, number 11 states "Acknowledge receipt of Business Associate Addendum". Can Sedgwick County please clarify what that refers to?

This requirement can be disregarded.

36. Regarding Section F of the RFP (Acceptance Testing).

Typical testing strategies include:

- 1. Unit Testing: Conducted by SI to verify individual components.**
- 2. Integration Testing: Involves key client users to ensure components work together as expected.**
- 3. User Acceptance Testing (UAT): Engages a broader client audience to validate the end-to-end system against business requirements.**

When you mention SI performing the preliminary user acceptance test, could you please specify:

- Are you referring to SI's role in Unit Testing, Integration Testing, or an initial phase of the User Acceptance Testing?**
- Do you envision a preliminary UAT involving a smaller subset of users before the full UAT with a wider audience?**

Your clarification will help us align our efforts with your expectations and ensure a smooth testing process.

This question does not align with the RFP's section F.

37. Concerning the SAP BW extractors on SRM, what data elements are you extracting and sending from SRM to BW?

Please see BW Data Sources spreadsheet.

38. Can Sedgwick County share the name of the budgeting program that is used for budget creation? (The source of the downloaded budget data that is then subsequently uploaded into SAP)

BPC - Budget Planning and Consolidation

39. Has Sedgwick enhanced any of the standard funds management programs? (ABAP, Add-On, Other)

The SAP object we have modified is the function module FM_GET_EXTRA_PERIOD.

40. Will the county accept the use of offshore resources?

Yes.

41. Can the county share the budget allotted for the project?

Please provide your best offer.

42. Does the county have any size limitations on email for submittals?

35 MB

43. Does the county prefer a fixed-price deliverables with phases/milestones contract or does the county prefer a contract based on time and materials (T&M)?

Fixed price deliverables with phases/milestones contract.

44. Does the county require 100% onsite resources or will it accept a remote model or a combination?

The county will accept a remote model and/or combination.

45. The RFP states that there will be a 12-month contractual term plus extensions beyond that. Does this mean the county requires a completed 12-month implementation or could it differ from that?

It could differ.

46. Are there any ongoing or upcoming initiatives impacting end users' capacity to adopt the ERP/EPM implementation changes? If so, please describe.

Sedgwick County does not want to go live during year end activities and we will have limited staff available for testing resources during our budget planning activities which run from around February through May.

47. Does the county anticipate acquiring and using SAP Enable Now to develop and deliver end-user training materials, scenario-based learning artifacts, etc.?

No.

48. Would the county be able to provide a SAP Readiness Findings Summary Report?

No.

49. The paragraphs after Section F on page 16 refer to having "...three (3) full-time ERP staff members at 75%". Are these resources from the technical staff, or will these three staff members represent the functional business/process areas?

The three (3) staff members have both technical and functional business/process skills.

50. How many staff members does the county anticipate providing for the delivery of the train-the-trainer model with end-user training? Will this be the same three resources already assigned to the project?

This number is to be determined.

51. How many shifts are there outside of "normal training hours"? Are these staff grouped within certain operational areas? How geographically dispersed are these shift workers?

We may have to provide some training outside of work hours but it will be limited. We would try to use a centralized location or virtual means for training when possible.

52. What facilities, equipment, and presentational resources does the county have to deliver in-person end-user training?

We have facilities, video and audio aids, and we have a centrally located training room, computers, etc.

53. Is data transformation required for SAP master data, such as the Chart of Accounts, Cost Centers, etc.?

We are not planning to transform any data.

54. The county will provide three (3) full-time ERP staff members at 75% to assist with the project. Can you please provide the SME functional areas that will be assigned to the project?

Finance, Purchasing, Budget, Accounting, Inventory, and Grants.

55. Aside from the SMEs, is there a plan to ask the business to participate in the testing cycles?

Yes.

56. The RFP asks for a RISE Brownfield implementation which presumes that your data will remain with the system. However, is Sedgwick looking to pick and choose which data is brought into the system?

We are doing selective data transitioning.

57. What are the estimated transactional data volumes for historical data migration?

Our production database size is about 341 GB (compressed) and grows about 1 GB per month. The current compression space savings is estimated to be about 200GB. We do not know the data size we are selecting to transition.

58. The county Business Users must conduct the regression test. Are the test scripts available for all the scenarios across the process areas? Are the scripts automated, and do you have a test automation tool? If yes, which tool is being used?

No. We do not have test scripts. They are not automated and we do not have a tool to use.

59. Is there flexibility for a change in the go-live date? Can we propose a timeline considering - a) brownfield vs. bluefield approach after getting confirmation on the selective data migration, b) pre-requisites for the migration, c) scope, and lastly, d) our practical experience in such migration projects.

No.

60. What are the timelines for requesting sandbox system access and running the analysis tools of the current ERP system?

Access to the sandbox system was available between July 10 and August 12. Per the RFP, questions pertaining to the analysis should have been submitted during that time frame and an analysis provided by Sedgwick County would have been provided at that time. No access will be granted after this addendum has been issued.

61. With regard to retaining as much historical data as possible. (Implementation Partner will aid with data clean-up.) – Where would the county like the historical data to reside (BW or migrated to S/4HANA)? How many years of detailed data does the county need to keep for reporting compliance?

Looking for recommendations from Implementation Partner.

62. Please provide an overview diagram of the current system landscape, including third party applications, reporting solutions, and the desired future state system landscape.

Please see Sedgwick ECC Layout, ECC Interfaces Overview, and ECC SRM PPS Interfaces attachments. The desired future state system landscape is not included and we are open to guidance.

63. Which hyper scalers being used in the target landscape (AWS,Google cloud,Azure or any)?

Azure.

64. Number of business process currently being handled per module wise.

We do not have this information.

65. List of RICEFW per module wise.

Time does not allow for this list to be produced.

66. Is the contract management is also part of scope along with Ariba Snap Buying.

It is our expectation that contracts will be managed in Ariba SNAP Buying.

67. We would like to know the clarification for the following questions:

Number of Cost Centers?

Number of Separate Legal Entities are tracked?

Number of G/L accounts in current system?

HR Data - Number of Payroll Employees?

Payroll Periods per Year?

Number of Cost Centers? 1,021

Number of Separate Legal Entities are tracked? 1 Company code

Number of G/L accounts in current system? 1,386

HR Data - Number of Payroll Employees? Estimated 3,500

Payroll Periods per Year? 26

68. How do you handle inter-departmental workflows and approvals within your current ERP system?

Refer to Workflow Overview attachment issued as part of addendum 1.

69. What are the specific reporting roles currently set up (e.g., super user, user, etc.)?

Primarily employees and supervisors are users but supervisors have more access than employees. There are also super users who are the technical staff.

70. How do Power users and Self Service/Casual users, including non-employee/external users, access ERP applications currently?

They primarily use the SAPGui or the portal and we have SSO.

71. What specific types of permissions and roles are anticipated for county administrative users in the new system?

We will be using group authorization groups. We would anticipate that our users would have the same type of permissions that they have now.

72. What are the detailed security policies and requirements, particularly regarding data access and protection?

We use best practices for security and follow segregation of duty practices.

73. What are the specific expectations for disaster recovery and business continuity from the new systems?

This does not pertain to this RFP. The county has a designated COOP.

74. What is the county commitment on resources to the project for the following activities: Explore – workshops, process design; Functional specifications; Security requirements; Reporting requirements; Validation and testing in all areas; Data conversion; UAT and Ongoing system support post go-live.

Full commitment from our resources.

75. Is there a preferred Organizational Change Management methodology that is used by county?

No.

76. Any Project Management Tools used currently?

Sedgwick County does not currently use a Project Management Tool.

77. How many active reports currently exist? From a legal/ compliance perspective, how much history is required for reporting purposes? How much history is used in typical reporting?

The number of active reports is not available at this time. We have historical data back to 2002 that would be required for reporting.

78. Are there any specialized, standalone databases that will be replaced by the new functional and reporting solutions? Please provide details.

There are no standalone databases.

79. How many reporting users exist in the main ERP solution?

About 431.

80. How many custom reports do you currently have deployed per module wise system?

We are unsure of an exact number.

81. Do you have any preferences for the format in which reports should be generated and shared?

Typically reports are shared in multiple formats. Reports at the very least should be able to shared and generated in Excel, Word, Text, CSV, and PDF.

82. Can you please provide List of interfaces with S/4HANA with associated integration Methods?

This will occur with the advice of our Implementation Partner.

83. Are there any changes to 3rd party integrations planned during the county ERP project? If yes, please explain.

No.

84. What are your requirements for real-time data integration and synchronization?

We will be looking for the advice of our Implementation Partner.

85. Can you brief about the line specified in the RFP "ArchiveLink integration with OnBase for financial document storage"?

ArchiveLink is a service integrated in the SAP Web Application Server for linking archived documents and the application documents entered in the SAP system.

86. Can you brief about the line specified in the RFP "ECC interfaces with GRM via Web Service Call to create A/R Payment documents"?

GRM (Government Revenue Management) is the system used by the Treasurer to receipt payments for property taxes and payments to Sedgwick County that were billed using the SAP Accounts Receivable system. GRM connects to ECC via RFC to query accounts receivable invoice information and then post AR payment document.

87. In the RFP it has been specified as "The county will be implementing Ariba SNAP Buying as part of the S/4HANA implementation to replace the SRM/PPS procurement functionality". But in the interfaces section it has been specified as "Standard and custom integrations between ECC and SRM (PI) as well as between SRM and Punch- Out/MDM Catalogs (S25RM Contracts) must be replicated to/from Ariba SNAP Buying". Can you please clarify?

Please see RFP scope.

88. What is the expected timeline for the implementation of the Rise with SAP S/4HANA Private cloud with Ariba SNAP buying?

October 2025.

89. What kind of training and support is expected for the new system?

Please see section V. F. regarding acceptance testing.

90. What are your expectations for ongoing support and maintenance post-implementation?

We don't anticipate that as part of this RFP.

91. How do you plan to handle system updates, upgrades, and new feature implementations in the future?

We don't anticipate that as part of this RFP.

92. What is the volume of data to be migrated from the existing systems to the new systems?

Our database is about 341 GB compressed. Current compression space savings is estimated to be about 200 GB.

93. Are there any specific data formats or structures that we need to be aware of for the migration process?

We are not aware of anything we need to point out specifically.

94. How do you plan to handle data validation and cleansing during the migration?

We are looking for the Implementation Partner's advice.

95. Please indicate if there will be any on-going or future/planned projects that would impact the county ERP project. If so, please describe and provide the planned go-live date for each project.

Sedgwick County does not want to go live during year end activities, and we will have limited staff available for testing resources during our budget planning activities which run from around February through May.

96. Current Ticketing Tool used?

Heat Service and Support by Ivanti.

97. Is your current SRM system implemented in ECC or is it stand alone?

Stand alone.

98. What are the different modules you have implemented in ECC?

See Ecc Modules attachment.

99. What are your current ECC landscapes? Sandbox, Development, Quality, Production?

Sandbox, Development, Quality, Production.

100. If the county has run a SAP Readiness report, can you share the SAP Readiness Check Report?

No.

101. Scope includes "end user training plan including documentation", with a Brownfield migration and continuing to use GUI. What is the expectation for updating Training documentation?

Our expectation is that the implementation partner will be responsible for documentation. This may include updating what we currently have or creating new documentation.

102. Can you confirm that the county has not migrated to CVI ahead of the project start and implementation partner is responsible for performing this as part of the project? Is Sedgwick County prepared to manage CVI change prior to any system migrations?

Yes, we can confirm that we have not started switching our vendors over. Sedgwick County has the expectation that the implementation partner will work with us to perform the CVI migration.

103. Other than Ariba, SuccessFactors, and BW 7.5, what are the other systems connected to ECC today? Can Sedgwick County share the Architecture diagram of ECC landscape with all connected systems along with middleware tool for each?

See attached Sedgwick ECC Layout.

104. Is Sedgwick County conducting any data clean up activity before migration start? (i.e. loading data into Ariba)

No. Sedgwick County will work with the implementation partner to do data cleanup with their advice.

105. Is Sedgwick County requesting a Time and Material and/or Fixed Price response? If Fixed Price, what commitment for delivery responsibility is there for the Sedgwick County partial resources assigned to the project? How should the requested "bucket of hours for support when needed" be handled?

Fixed price deliverables with phases/milestones contract.

106. The RFP does not specify what electronic format is acceptable. Is it acceptable to submit the response in PowerPoint / Word / PDF?

See section IV. Submittals; PDF/Word.

107. Sample of agreement. Please confirm if Sedgwick County is requesting a sample Statement of Work or what agreement? Should the agreement be a proposed document or a sample showing terms and conditions or including appropriate scope statements?

Sedgwick County is requesting a sample agreement/contract that shows terms and conditions. It can also include the appropriate scope statements.

108. Non-Employee User Agreement. Please confirm that no Non-Employee User Agreement is required at this time. If it is to be submitted, who should be on the form?

The agreement is not required with the submittal of the RFP.

109. Section V.D. - Cost of Work - outlines the expectation for providing a cost; however, the Required Response Content does not provide a section for cost. Please provide guidance on how costs should be submitted either in the response, separate response, separate sealed response, etc.

The cost of work can be included as part of the proposal response.

110. Please provide additional detail on the custom data sources for SRM that are used to supply data to BW. Which objects are included in these data sources?

See attachment BW data sources.

111. Please provide additional detail on the external website where contracts are published. How does that interface work today? What level of detail needs to be published to the external website?

If a flag on the contract is set, an XML version of the contract is written to a file share. A non-SAP application is executed periodically which processes the XML file and posts the data to the web site. Only high-level values like Contract Number, Total Value, Start/End Dates, etc. are posted to the web site.

112. In the new landscape, will suppliers be expected to submit their invoices through the SAP Business Network?

Yes, but we will also expect there to be exceptions such as manual entry.

113. Please confirm that all resulting contracts in SRM reside in ECC.

No.

114. Funds Management with Special Purpose Ledgers is implemented and there are two target methods - implement with SPL or move this to Universal Journal, any specific approach is finalized?

Please review RFP project requirements and the bullet point related to upgrade from Classic Ledger to Universal Journal.

115. Former BCS to Budgetary Control (S/4 compatible) - were any assessments performed for the overall impact of technical changes?

No.

116. Do you currently use Multi-level Budget Structure (MBS) in the Budget Control System? (This allows a customer to perform hierarchical budget processes - top down distribution & bottom up - roll up (MBS business functions PSM_FM_BCS_MBS and PSM_FM_BCS_MBS_2 are turned ON or not.))

*We are unfamiliar with the functions provided. Here are the functions Sedgwick County is using: FM_SETS_FICTR2
FM_SETS_FICTR3
FM_SETS_FUND1
FM_SETS_FUND2
FM_SETS_FUND3*

117. Are you currently using ADB (Average Daily Balance) in ECC? Please describe the functionality to map to S/4 features

No.

118. Are there any specific authorization checks or segregation of duties that need to be incorporated into the 2-level workflow approval?

Please review the workflow overview attachment issued as part of Addendum 1.

119. Are you using - Authorization Groups or old authorization concept - based on respective master data object prior to 4.6c version? (in S/4HANA only Groups are allowed)

We are primarily using old authorization concepts. We do have some new authorizations groups that are used as well.

120. For integration of ArchiveLink with OnBase for financial document storage? Are up using Connector compatible for latest versions? What objects are currently archived and have links?

We have an archive link connecting to OnBase to store FIDCC2 documents, which are invoices.

121. Has any assessment of custom programs been done (100 mentioned)?

No.

122. A lot of new functionalities around Funds Management and Budgets are available through Fiori only, can we presume - Fiori license is available to enable some of the mandatory functionality?

Fiori is a requirement and Sedgwick would prepare what is needed to acquire licenses.

123. Some specific Data migration related information was called out; since it is Brownfield migration, all the data which is available would be migrated - are there any specific areas that need to be considered not migration?

No.

124. Have had any business discussions around New Asset Accounting? (The functionality has been available for a couple of years.)

Reference RFP Project Scope bullet point new asset accounting configuration.

125. Do you use Standard Costing system for Materials / Products bought? If yes, to consider for actual costing needs, are there many variances?

Reference RFP Project Scope bullet point new asset accounting configuration.

126. Please provide details of SAP ECC EhP8 Service Pack level & inventory of add-on's being implemented.

We are on Enhancement Pack 6.

127. Provide details of OS & DB versions for SAP ECC.

Windows 2019, DB2 11.5

128. Has Sedgwick Basis team ran S/4HANA readiness check report? If Yes, can the report be shared?

No. A readiness check report has not been run.

129. Please confirm whether you have SAP Business Objects Data Services (BODS) in the landscape to perform data transformation/migration into Ariba?

No. We have Business Objects Intelligence Platform.

130. Implementation Partner will aid with data clean-up.

We assume that actual cleansing will be performed by Sedgwick County data team, with the help/aid by the implementation partner. Please confirm?

What is the envisioned scope of data cleansing? Does Sedgwick County have any third party tool available for data cleansing?

Sedgwick County does expect help from the Implementation Partner. We do not have a third party tool for data cleansing.

131. Are you getting data from Non-SAP systems, other than SAP ECC & SRM into SAP BW?

Yes.

132. Has Sedgwick County Basis team ran S/4HANA readiness check report on BW? If Yes, can the report be shared for impact assessment?

No. A readiness check report has not been run.

133. What middleware is currently being used, and how many inbound/outbound interfaces are there in SAP ECC?

PI is in use for some purchasing scenarios between SRM and ECC. Everything else is flat files. There is also some custom programming that uses RFC via .NET connector. There are approximately 50 interfaces.

134. Is Sedgwick County open to modernize the current interfaces with S/4HANA APIs?

Yes.

135. What middleware is being used between ECC and the SuccessFactors integration?

RFC connections.

136. Which middleware tool will be utilized between SAP S/4HANA and ARIBA SNAP Buying?

This is open to advice of the Implementation Partner. We will have BTP if that is an option.

137. How many interfaces are there between ECC and SRM?

ECC and SRM interface using RFC calls.

138. What is the extent of migrating the current middleware to SAP Cloud Integration Suite (CPI)?

We don't think CPI will be needed.

139. Are you planning to post payroll from SuccessFactors-Employee Central Payroll (SF-ECP) to S/4HANA? By enabling ECP and S/4 Integration we can post payroll posting to S/4 HANA. Is CPI needed as a middleware?

Yes. We will need to post payroll. We do not know what middleware will be needed.

140. We don't have proprietary tools for system assessment. However, can you provision sandbox access (read-only) for our preliminary analysis of current system sizing and setup?

No.

141. Can you provide Sedgwick Systems & Integration Landscape architecture, to understand the systems integration complexity?

See attached Sedgwick ECC Layout.

142. Can you provide list of Custom RICEFW objects to understand the scope considerations for our effort/resource estimation?

Time does not allow for this list to be produced.

143. Is sourcing/Tender involved?

The question is not clear and we would need clarification.

144. What are the custom processes in SRM?

Sedgwick County has multiple custom processes within SRM. Some of these include the Tax Certificate functionality and subsequent workflow, which identifies the need for a tax certificate and initiates a workflow. UNSPSC to NIGP conversion, which converts Product Categories of the UNSPSC standard to the NIGP standard on shopping carts. Our list also includes an NDC mapping process, which maps a warehouse material number to its NDC (National Drug Code) number to populate the NDC field on a shopping cart. While there are additional custom processes these are representative of the types of processes found in SRM at this time.

145. Is Supplier Enablement needed in Ariba?

We will need advice from the Implementation Partner.

146. Is Ariba Network needed in upgraded environment?

The question is not clear and we would need clarification.

147. What is the scope of data migration from SRM to Ariba? Internal Catalogs/Contract Documents. Are there any transactional documents needed - open/closed?

Internal catalogs, contract documents, open POs, punch out catalogs. Relying on Implementation Partner to help us make decisions about these items.

Firms interested in submitting a **proposal** must respond with complete information and **deliver on or before 1:45 pm CDT, September 3, 2024**. Late **proposals** will not be accepted and will not receive consideration for final award.

“PLEASE ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF THIS ADDENDUM ON THE PROPOSAL/BID RESPONSE PAGE.”



Lee Barrier
Purchasing Agent

LB /ch