



miamidade.gov

INTERNAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT  
PROCUREMENT MANAGEMENT SERVICES  
111 NW 1<sup>ST</sup> Street • Suite 1300  
Miami, Florida 33128 - 1974  
Telephone: 305-375-5289  
Fax: (305) 375-4407 or (305) 372-6128

**RFP NO. 819  
ADDENDUM NO. 1**

Date: June 14, 2012

To: ALL PROSPECTIVE PROPOSERS

Subject: RFP No. 819: Automated Biometric Time and Data Capture Solution

---

This Addendum No. 1 becomes a part of Request For Proposals (RFP) No. 819 entitled: Automated Biometric Time and Data Capture Solution

1. Attached to this Addendum No.1 are the questions received in response to the solicitation during the pre-proposal question period and the associated County responses.
2. A Pre-Proposal Conference was held on June 4, 2012. Attached is the sign-in sheet for all attendees.
3. The Proposal close date has been extended through July 9, 2012. Proposals are due to the Clerk of the Board by 2:00 PM.
4. The Proposal Submission package has been posted as a Microsoft Word document with this addendum.

All other portions of RFP No. 819 remain the same as written.

Miami-Dade County

Melissa Adames  
Procurement Contracting Manager  
Procurement Management Services  
Internal Services Department

*Delivering Excellence Every Day*



**Please find below all pre-proposal questions submitted in response to Request for Proposals No. 819 and the associated County responses.**

1. Is the system desired to be installed on your servers only? Will Vendor Hosted solutions be considered?

**A:** *Installation on county servers is required as per the specifications outlined with the Request for Proposal. Proposers who wish to provide an alternate proposal must submit a proposal that meets the requirements as outlined with the RFP. An alternate proposal may be submitted by a firm however as stated before we are open to other options that may be presented for evaluation as they may provide a better solution for the county that may have not been previously considered.*

2. How many employees need access to PC Entry?

**A:** *None, employees will not require access to PC Entry for time recording/reporting. Only administrators will require PC Entry which is estimated to be up to 10% of total employee count.*

3. How many employees need access to Phone Entry?

**A:** *None. This is not a current requirement of the Solution, however if a Proposer has the capability of offering this feature information should be provided within the proposal submission and priced as an option.*

4. Do the time clocks need to be able to handle Job costing? (Employees punching in/out of different locations/jobs/departments)

**A:** *No, time clocks do not need to handle job costing. This functionality needs to be in conjunction with the PeopleSoft time and labor software. Yes to the capability of punching in and out of other locations and by tasks.*

5. Do all employees need to be able to punch at all clocks?

**A:** *Yes, all employees need to be able to punch at all clocks. The County desires the capability to program the clocks to be configured by department to have the ability to assign staff to certain clocks if required. Proposers should include their response if this capability and configuration is available and if limitations exist.*

6. Do the Time clocks need to be Power Over Ethernet?

**A:** *No, they do not have to be Power Over Ethernet but certainly a consideration if the capability is available and may reduce the cabling/power requirements.*

7. Do the clocks need to have Lock Out capabilities? (employees cannot punch in before a certain time in the morning, or after a certain time in the afternoon)

**A:** *The County desires the capability to program the clocks to be configured by department to have the ability to assign certain business rules for lock out. Proposers should include their response if this capability and configuration is available and if limitations exist.*

8. Should the Time Clocks be installed by the Vendor or by the staff of Miami Dade County?

**A:** *Time clocks must be installed and tested by the vendor. The County will provide the required cabling and power as required.*

9. Is Oracle the only system that the new time and attendance system need to interface with?

**A:** *Yes, it is the only one as detailed within the solicitation document.*

10. It was noted that the Transit department utilizes "DESfire EV1 contactless smart cards and readers" – will the County be looking to maintain these same cards for TCD's going forward for this department? If proximity card technology will not be used, will biometric replace all validation options, including that of Seaport?

**A:** *All County departments will be utilizing the new automated biometric time and data capture solution. The Seaport will require the continued use of the current proximity cards along with the new automated biometric solution.*

11. What is the selected validation TCD option for Seaport, noted as "Alternative"? What type of Alternative device is being requested? (TCD – proximity, magstripe, barcode, mobile platform, etc)

**A:** *The selected validation TCD option for Seaport is the continued use of the current proximity cards system in conjunction with the new automated biometric solution. The alternative device is proximity.*

12. In section 2.1, a requirement is to be a web-based solution. Will the County require a selection of employees to use a vendor supplied web-based punch option, to interface with PeopleSoft, or will employees utilize PeopleSoft ESS directly? If vendor supplied web interface, how many employees will utilize the web based option?

**A:** *Yes, for administration of the Solution the County requires a web based system. The County will be utilizing PeopleSoft for all other time collection for those who do not use time clocks.*

13. The County has requested pricing for software and hardware maintenance for years 2-5, however year one is not included, as noted in section 2.4 and indicated on Form B-1. Will the County pursue the option for both types of maintenance for year one? If yes, where shall this pricing be noted? (For clarification, the Warranty as noted is for manufacturer defect of hardware, but will not include items such as the maintenance agreement, including configuration, connectivity, and device management.)

**A:** *The County requires a one year warranty for the Solution from final system acceptance as noted within the draft form of agreement. Proposers are to provide pricing for years 2-5 for ongoing hardware and software maintenance support services.*

14. Under Section 2.8 for Escrow Service, it is understood that the selected vendor will provide source code for implementation to a third party escrow. Does this infer that the software itself will be held in preparation for implementation, or that the vendor will relinquish control of actual source code associated with solution?

**A:** *The County requires the source code to be deposited to the third party escrow agent at the time the Solution is accepted by the County (Final System Acceptance) and placed into production not at the time of implementation.*

15. Will the County like to allow the TCD users to review schedules, manage PTO balance and time off requests at the TCD level, and provide an interface to PeopleSoft Absence Management?

**A:** *At this time, the only interface required is within the PeopleSoft time and leave module. Any interfacing to absence management is a future consideration.*

16. Does the County have the ability to support PoE (Power over Ethernet) for TCD's?

**A:** *Please refer to the response provided in Question 6.*

17. As noted on Form A-4, a local business is established for either Miami Dade County, or Broward County, however it is also noticed that the agreement for interlocal counties has expired as of September 30, 2011. Should a vendor maintain presence in Broward County and not Miami Dade County, will said vendor still be considered a local business.

**A:** *The interlocal agreement between Miami-Dade County and Broward County is in place through September 30, 2012. An updated A-4 form will be released with Addendum No. 1. To be eligible for local preference, the firm should be able to meet the requirements as outlined and provide the required documentation to be afforded local preference.*

18. The RFP describes badges that are needed for MDT (ref 2.2.2) and the Seaport (ref 2.2.4). The Device recap in 2.3 states that Biometric TCDs are needed at MDT while the Seaport will use badges. Should Proposer quote badges for MDT based on stated format or Biometric? Please clarify.

**A:** *Proposers are encouraged to propose and price the required format based on the Solutions functionality. Proposers should describe within their proposal response how the County requirements are met and what method is used.*

19. Page 68, question 33 requests Proposer to detail functionality for Mobile, Phone and PC data collection. Does the County want the Proposer to quote these options? If yes, where should these options be quoted? More information is needed especially regarding the requirements for Phone (IVR) data collection. There is currently not enough information to accurately quote IVR.

**A:** *Proposers may provide information and pricing for optional features and equipment. This information should be listed as optional and not included in the price proposed to the County. The pricing information should be included on Form B-1 under "C – Optional Products/Services".*

20. Regarding the Draft Agreement, is it required that Proposer sign the Agreement?

**A:** *No, this is the draft form of agreement that will be negotiated with the recommended vendor based on the Solution proposed. It is provided in advance for review and comment. All exceptions to the County terms and conditions should be noted within the Proposal Submission Package.*

21. Does the County wish to have the Time Clock Devices powered by 100v, Power over Ethernet (PoE) or quote both?

**A:** *No the County does not wish to have the time clock devices POE. Please quote based on the Solutions standard power/electrical components.*

22. In section 2.7, it states that the selected vendor is responsible for "...cleaning, converting, and importing existing employee data and other related support data.). More specificity is necessary. What is the existing data? What are the formats? Define cleaning? What is other related data? There may be no "standard" way to clean, convert and import existing data between 2 disparate systems. This effort, if necessary, would most likely require creation of custom integration points and/or manual efforts by both County and Proposer. This requirement would not be possible to estimate without more information. It is standard practice for customers to backup/archive legacy time related data and start fresh with the new solution. Please clarify.

*A: Proposers should define what the standard backup and archive processes are for the Solution proposed. Proposers should detail within their proposal submission their standard approach and methodology for the Solution inclusive of all components.*

23. Is there a requirement that the proposed solution must support Websphere? Is Weblogic or JBOSS acceptable?

*A: The County only accepts WEBLOGIC v10. No Webshpere OR JBOSS.*

24. Page 17, Section 6.0 Attachments – Attachment 3 is not included. Can you please provide this attachment?

*A: There is no Attachment 3 noted.*

25. Page 58 – Item 2 – Can we please get a copy of the Proposal Submission packet in Word format?

*A: Yes, the Proposal Submission Package will be released in word format with Addendum No. 1*

26. If the answers to these questions are not posted by Wednesday June 13<sup>th</sup>, can we respectfully request a one week extension of the due date?

*A: Please refer to Addendum No. 1.*

27. Is it feasible for Miami-Dade County to procure off of an alternative contract vehicle such as the GSA Schedule 70 or another County's contract resulting from a competitive bid?

*A: No. The County is issuing this RFP to establish a new agreement for an enterprise solution.*

28. When will the RFP's target group of employees be live on PeopleSoft 9.1?

*A: Currently on v8.9 and will most likely start on v8.9. v9.1 upgrade is a work in progress targeted for a Q3/2013 time frame.*

29. When will the RFP's target group of employees be live on PeopleSoft Absence Management?

*A: It is anticipated that this feature will not be available until 6 – 18 months from now.*

30. Is it the intent of the County to have the PeopleSoft upgrade completed for all target groups prior to implementation of Time and Attendance system?

*A: No. The County is only looking for a time and collection solution, not a time and attendance System.*

31. Have you hired a system integrator to perform the upgrade to PeopleSoft 9.1 and if so, can you tell us who is performing this work for you?

*A: For the purpose of this solicitation this question is not applicable.*

32. Your RFP would suggest a need for staff augmentation in the areas of data cleansing and testing of the solution. Is this your intent or do you have project team members that can perform these tasks under the direction of our project team?

*A: Yes, it is the County's intent to perform the cleansing and testing of data, with some consultation with the selected vendor.*

33. Page 10, Section 2.4- point of clarification- are you asking that the vendor to cover costs associated with changes to your internally hosted infrastructure if software upgrades require these changes?

*A: The Proposer is solely responsible for the Solution and providing the maintenance and support to the hardware (time collection devices) and software used to operate it.*

34. You support both SQL and Oracle. For the Time and Attendance application do you have a preference for one or the other?

*A: The County preference is SQL Server. Please refer to Attachment 2 – Miami-Dade Technology Model for more detail.*

35. Can you tell us who comprises the selection committee for this project? If you cannot give us names can you tell us the mix of committee members- number of members from IT, Target Departments, Payroll/ HR, etc.

*A: Proposals will be evaluated by an Evaluation/Selection Committee which will evaluate and rank proposals on the criteria listed within RFP819. The Evaluation/Selection Committee will be comprised of appropriate County personnel and members of the community, as deemed necessary, with the appropriate experience and/or knowledge, striving to ensure that the Evaluation/Selection Committee is balanced with regard to both ethnicity and gender.*

36. On page 9 you indicate a need for "alternative time clock devices" at the Seaport. Will you please clarify your meaning here in as much detail as possible? Are you hoping to use those devices with the system?

*A: Please refer to the response provided for Question 10.*

37. Is it MDT's desire to utilize external DESfire card readers as a front end to the 50 requested time clock devices? If so, will you be providing these devices?

*A: Please refer to the response provide for Question 10.*

38. On pages 9-10 you describe the number of software users for each department. Can you also provide the number of managers/ timekeepers for each of those departments (named users, not concurrent)? Anyone that is responsible to sign off, edit a timesheet, or access the system for reporting would be included in this manager/ timekeeper number.

*A: The County estimates the following:*

- *Parks = 15 Managers / Timekeepers.*
- *Public Works and Waste Management = 31 Managers/Timekeepers*
- *Seaport = 20 Managers / Timekeepers.*

*Please note that all approvals will be done within the PeopleSoft system and not the proposed Solution. The estimates provided may change dependant on the Solution requirements.*

39. How many payroll (centralized payroll) staff will need access to the system for the purposes of final edits, sign-offs, running interfaces.

*A: The County estimates six at this time depending on how the interfaces are communicated between the Solution and PeopleSoft. This number may change based on the Solution functionality and features.*

40. How many IT staff will need access to maintain the system?

*A: The County estimates six at this time. This number may change based on the Solution functionality and features.*

41. You mention an interest in mobile data collection. Can you provide a use case and indicate the number of employees that would benefit from a mobile solution? Do these employees utilize iPhones, iPads, Droid, Blackberries or a mix of devices?

*A: This is not a requirement of the solicitation. Proposers may provide information and pricing for optional features and equipment. This information should be listed as optional and not included in the price proposed to the County. The pricing information should be included on Form B-1 under "C – Optional Products/Services".*

42. On pages 6-9 you outline your current processes. Currently there are staff members that do not interact with time clocks but utilize timesheets. Is it your intent that all of these employees should access the time clocks or would you want to provide them with an electronic timesheet accessible from their workstation? If so, how many total employees would need access to the electronic timesheet?

*A: No.*

43. Expanding on the question above, is it the County's desire to eliminate all manual processes/ paper timesheets associated with the time collection effort? If so, would this extend to giving the end user employees access to the system for the input of exception based time such as special assignment time, time spent on activities, training time, etc.? Anything an employee submits to a timekeeper/ manager today on paper can be automated at the clock or at a workstation.

*A: All of the items listed are consideration for future deployment of the Solution.*

44. Would you like for the end user employees to be able to enter, at a clock or through a workstation, a department transfer (as opposed to reporting this transaction on paper to a timekeeper)? i.e.- the employee clocks out of one location/department/ cost center / job and clocks into a different location/department/ cost center / job upon arrival or initiation of work). Such transfers would result in time being aggregated under the different location/ departments/ cost centers/ jobs.

*A: Please refer to requirements outlined within the Solicitation and propose accordingly.*

45. On page 11 the County expresses a desire to have this system in place as soon as possible. Is there a timeline/ deadline you are trying to meet and if so, what is it?

*A: The County will evaluate the Proposer's approach and methodology inclusive of the project plan and implementation schedule as outlined within the Evaluation Criteria Section 4.2*

46. Reference Page 12, Section 2.9 Interfaces To Be Provided – Time Collection Interfaces. In this section you state, "The County currently has more than 175 TRCs utilized for time tracking, however, only certain codes may be used by employees based on Union Agreements and Job Status categories. The Proposed Solution will need to determine which codes an employee may use when time is captured".

- a. Is Miami-Dade County expecting that the proposed solution capture individual employee punch transactions (In and Out) and provide real-time calculation and application of business rules (Shift Premium, Holiday, Birthday OT, Overtime, Meals, Straight Overtime, etc) to these transactions, including Union and Department specific calculations? The result being a daily breakdown of time worked assigned to a Time Reporting Code (TRC) and possibly Task Reporting Codes for integration with PeopleSoft Time and Labor. **If the answer to this question is yes, then skip to item e. below.**

*A: The County needs to be able to track employee time (time in/out, location, etc.) through the proposed Solution. Please refer to the requirements outlined within the solicitation.*

- b. If the answer to the question above is no, is it the County's intent that PeopleSoft , as the system of record, will provide the rules engine necessary to apply all business logic (OT rules, holiday rules, premium pay rules, call back rules, etc) to time data? Have all of the necessary rules been successfully configured in PeopleSoft 9.1 to handle the target departments? Has customization of the application been necessary to do so?

*A: Please refer to the requirements outlined within the solicitation.*

- c. Your current process indicates that the department timekeepers play a role in allocating time to the proper TRCs, prior to entering this data into ePar. Is that accurate? If PeopleSoft is the rules engine, how will the determination of the proper TRC be made at the departmental level prior to passing time data to PeopleSoft? We can hold as many codes as are necessary and can also control who is allowed access to specific codes, however if assignment of time to a code requires some business logic or application of a rule, then this would have to be automated in our system (which takes us back to item a. above) or will still be left to a timekeeper, supervisor, or employee to interpret. Please help clarify this for us.

*A: Please refer to the requirements outlined within the solicitation.*

- d. How often will the application of the pay rules occur and will the resulting data be available in real time? Do all front line directors/ managers/supervisors have real time access to this data in order to make labor decisions (i.e.- not allow an employee with 38.5 hours to take on another shift that results in OT for this pay period)?

*A: Please refer to the requirements outlined within the solicitation.*

- e. Please provide a list of the 175 Time Reporting Codes (TRC).

*A: This was provided solely for information. The list of TRC codes is not applicable to the Solution at this time. The County is expecting that only hours worked will be collected.*

- f. Please provide examples of the possible Task Reporting Codes.?

*A: Currently, the County does not have Task Reporting Codes. This may be a future consideration.*

47. As outlined in your process descriptions (RFP pages 6-9), manual timesheets or punch cards are being gathered at each location and totaled for input into ePar. Leave time is being provided to the timekeepers for inclusion on the timesheet and for input into ePar: Is it the County's desire to eliminate this manual process and allow for the leave time (sick, vacation, holiday) to be captured within the automated Time and Attendance system and passed back to PeopleSoft through integration? Leave and sick time effects the calculation of OT so should be in the same system with all other worked time.

*A: Please refer to the requirements outlined within the Solicitation for the automated biometric time and data capture solution.*

48. You mention a time tracker spreadsheet that exists in PWWM today. Would it be desirable to have the rosters/schedules in the Time and Attendance solution as opposed to an external spreadsheet?

*A: Please refer to the requirements outlined within the Solicitation for the automated biometric time and data capture solution.*

49. Is it the County's desire that schedules/ rosters be maintained in the Time and Attendance system for the purposes of identifying, controlling, and reporting on things such as – early in, late in, early out, late out; rounding up or back to scheduled start/ stop time?

*A: Please refer to the requirements outlined within the Solicitation for the automated biometric time and data capture solution.*

50. Is there a desire for department managers to be able to view, within the schedule, such things as scheduled sick, vacation, or leave time for the purposes of determining proper coverage for the department?

*A: Please refer to the requirements outlined within the Solicitation for the automated biometric time and data capture solution.*

51. On page 14 under Technical Criteria you list items A-D. For each item A-C you have provided a specific and detailed requirements section. You do not provide specific and detailed requirements for item D, Interface Requirements. Is the summary data on page 12 the extent of the information available?

**A:** *The evaluation criteria for item D pertains to interfaces which are defined within Section 2.9 of the solicitation document. The interface must include employee, day, time worked (punched in/out) and location.*

52. In your RFP, you list 10-15 End Users in a Train-the-trainer environment. Can you please define the role of the 'End Users'? Are they trainers who will be rolling out and delivering training to those not listed in the RFP Section 2.5 page 10?

**A:** *Yes, the end users listed under Section 2.5 will be the users who will then conduct training for all other end users not listed in the RFP.*

53. Are you amenable to Virtual Training with a live instructor and hands-on labs?

**A:** *The County requires onsite training as listed within the solicitation document under Section 2.5 for the initial rollout of the Solution. Proposers are to provide within their proposal submission information on how they will meet the requirements listed for additional training as outlined on Page 10 Section 2.5.*

54. Do you have a Learning Management Solution (LMS) that is Sharable Content Object Reference Model (SCORM) compliant?

**A:** *No.*

55. Do you have a formal training department that will be part of the training delivery effort? If so, how many trainers will be taking part in this project?

**A:** *No, the County does not have a formal training department that will be a part of this project. The training should be provided as outlined within Section 2.5 of the solicitation.*

56. Do you plan to train Payroll Administrators/Staff on the selected vendor product? If so, how many

*Yes, the County does plan to train the payroll administrator /staff. Please refer to Section 2.5, page 10.*

57. Is Miami-Dade providing a LAN network point at each one of the 99 locations?

**A:** *Yes.*

58. For the Interface, will Miami-Dade provide the interface program coordination for the existing system while we provide the API for the integration?

**A:** *The Proposer should be providing the interface please refer to the solicitation requirements. The County will assist with the coordination.*

59. The Maintenance is preventive maintenance for 5 years or full maintenance?

**A:** *Please refer to page 10, Section 2.4 "Maintenance Services to be Provided" and page 11 Section 2.6 "Technical Support Services to be Provided".*

# ATTENDANCE SHEET



RFP/RFQ NUMBER: RFP819 - Automated Biometric Time and Data Capture Solution

LOCATION: Procurement Management - Conference Room A, 111 NW 1st Street, Suite 1300

PURPOSE: Pre-Proposal Conference

DATE: June 4, 2012 @ 11:00 AM

Completing this attendance sheet is optional.

NAME	COMPANY	ADDRESS	PHONE	E-MAIL
Melissa Adames	Miami-Dade County - PMS	111 NW 1st Street, Suite 1300, Miami, FL	(305) 375-4029	madames@miamidade.gov
Carlos A. Gonzalez	Advanced Technical Group	14046 NW 82 Ave Miami, FL	786 269 3636	carlos.gonzalez@a-tg.com
Jorge Rivero	Advanced Technical Group	14046 NW 82 Ave M. Lakes	(305) 502-4723	Jorge.rivero@a-tg.com
Danie Blundell	Andrews Technology	110 Butterwood Lane, Fort Lauderdale, FL	(954) 592-0889	Danie@andrewstech.com
Chris Rose	Public Works - W&A	2525 NW 62 Street	(305) 514-608	crrose@miamidade.gov
Bob Peña	TIME MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS	213 E SPHERD ST	(305) 271-7124	SOSET@THSTIME.COM
EDUARDO BELTRAN	MDC - IFT	5680 SW 87 AVE, 33173	(305) 275-7883	EDB@MDC-IFT.COM
Joe Conway	MDC - IFT	/ /	(305) 596-8453	Jconway@miamidade.gov
MICHAEL TOMASSO	MDC - PAMS	275 NW 2nd St 3308	(305) 755-7967	DMDD@MIAMIDADE.GOV
Tim Gomez	Floridian Partners	235 Catalonia Ave Coral Gables	(305) 461-4266	timgomez@gmail.com
ROSS CONWAY	TIMELINK INTL.	2915 Westchester Ave	(305) 244-5591	ross.conway@time-link.com
Tammy Parker	KRONOS Incorporated	1910 SW 6 Pl Boca Raton	(561) 870-4292	tammy.parker@kronos.com
Scott Massey	Kaba	3915 N. Commerce Pkwy	(954) 416-1720	scott.massey@kaba.com
Erick Martinez	Inferral Services - PMS	11 NW 14 st. Miami	(305) 375-1015	erickm@inferral.com
LUIS PINOS	DL Controls, INC	9805 NW 5251 #402 DONALD FC	(786) 351-5779	lepinos@comcast.net
SERGIO SANCHEZ	DL CONTROLS, I-K	9805 NW 5251 #402	(305) 989-4850	SERGIO@DLCONTROLS.COM