

**SUBMITTAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA**



969

**FROM:** OASIS/Executive Office

**SUBMITTAL DATE:**  
June 28, 2005

**SUBJECT:** Approve the Agreement with CherryRoad Technologies Inc. for Upgrade Services of the OASIS PeopleSoft Financials System

**RECOMMENDED MOTION:** Move that the Board of Supervisors;

- 1) Approve and execute the professional service agreement with CherryRoad Technologies Inc., in the aggregate amount of \$2,874,800
- 2) Authorize the Purchasing Agent to sign amendments for an amount not to exceed ten percent of the contract maximum

**BACKGROUND:** OASIS requires the services of a PeopleSoft upgrade consulting firm to assist the county in upgrading PeopleSoft Financials version 7.5 to PeopleSoft Financials version 8.8. This document is to request Board approval to engage the services of CherryRoad Technologies Inc., a PeopleSoft upgrade consulting firm, to provide these services.

The OASIS Project Team was established in 2000 to implement, operate and support the county's PeopleSoft Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system which is the primary system

MICHAEL DEARMAN, Director  
OASIS

<b>FINANCIAL DATA</b>	Current F.Y. Total Cost:	\$ 2,874,800	In Current Year Budget:	Yes
	Current F.Y. Net County Cost:	\$ 0	Budget Adjustment:	No
	Annual Net County Cost:	\$ 0	For Fiscal Year:	FY 05/06

<b>SOURCE OF FUNDS:</b> OASIS Financial Chargeback Rate 45420-1109200000	Positions To Be Deleted Per A-30	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Requires 4/5 Vote	<input type="checkbox"/>

**C.E.O. RECOMMENDATION:**

**APPROVE.**

County Executive Office Signature

Prev. Agn. Ref.: \_\_\_\_\_ District: \_\_\_\_\_ Agenda Number: \_\_\_\_\_

**ATTACHMENTS FILED  
WITH THE CLERK OF THE BOARD**

3.44

FORM APPROVED  
COUNTY COUNSEL

JUN 20 2005

Purchasing:   
IT DEPT  
Departmental Concurrence  
Director

Dep't Recomm.:  Consent  Policy   
Per Exec. Ofc.:  Consent  Policy

used by all departments and agencies for county business. The OASIS system consists of two major system components: PeopleSoft HRMS for human resources and payroll functions and PeopleSoft Financials for business financial planning, operations and reporting. Each system has several integrated modules. The PeopleSoft HRMS system version 7.5 "went live" in July 2001 and PeopleSoft Financials system version 7.5 went live in July of 2002. Consequently, PeopleSoft HRMS was upgraded to version 8.3 in August 2003 with assistance from a PeopleSoft upgrade consulting firm.

The planned go-live date for the Financials 8.8 system upgrade is February 15, 2007. The project schedule includes a minimum of six months of department end-user training on the stable, upgraded system before go-live. This will permit users to fully learn, understand and plan for the upgrade before it moves to a production status. The extended training schedule is a valuable "lesson learned" from the original implementation projects in 2001 and 2002 that OASIS has incorporated into its upgrade planning. In addition, the extended project schedule permits all county 2005/2006 year-end close processing and reporting to be completed in the current financial system, thus minimizing disruption of these essential activities.

In addition to the upgrade of the existing PeopleSoft Financials 7.5 modules, new modules for contracts management and budget planning functions will be added. PeopleSoft Contracts is a new module necessitated by the business requirements of Transportation Land Management Agency, Flood Control and Water Conservation District and Office on Aging, as well as future project costing system users. The PeopleSoft Budgets module will replace the county's current budget management program which is being phased out. The PeopleSoft Budgets module was purchased by OASIS in 2000 but it was never implemented.

Once completed, the upgrade of PeopleSoft Financials positions OASIS to adopt improved web-based collaborative applications such as: procurement, cash management, order/cost management, expense management, business planning and others. This advances the county business processes, workflow, analysis and reporting and further improves the return on investment the county has made in OASIS.

**REVIEW/APPROVAL:** A request for proposal (RFP) document was developed by the Purchasing Department and OASIS and issued by Purchasing for vendor responses. Concurrently, an evaluation committee was established by OASIS to select the most qualified vendor. The evaluation committee members were selected from a cross-section of the County's OASIS PeopleSoft Financials department users. Representatives were selected from the Auditor Controller's Office, Department of Public Social Services, Community Health Agency, Purchasing, and OASIS. The evaluation committee reviewed all qualified vendor proposals and selected the "top three" vendors for a subsequent on-site presentation. A rating system was used with scoring factors for cost, technical abilities, project methodology, project experience, financial background, and reference criteria. All evaluation committee members' scores were aggregated. Representatives from Purchasing and County Counsel assisted in the development of the RFP documentation and evaluation criteria and monitored the committee's vendor evaluation and selection process.

The evaluation committee selected CherryRoad Technologies Inc. as the most responsive vendor based on the evaluation criteria.

A detailed Statement of Work (SOW) and Contract Agreement were subsequently negotiated with CherryRoad Technologies Inc. These documents have been reviewed by Purchasing, County Counsel and Information Technology. The Contract Agreement which includes the RFP, vendor response and SOW are attached to this Form 11.

**PRICE REASONABLENESS:** The Purchasing Department mailed the RFP to 59 vendors and advertised the RFP on the County's internet website. The County received 10 responses with the qualified bids ranging from \$2,243,286 to \$6,711,248. The evaluation committee requested a "best and final" price from the top three vendors and CherryRoad Technologies lowered their proposed fee by \$165,000 without compromising service.