PORT OF OAKLAND

Purchasing Department
530 Water Street
Oakland, CA 94607

Date: **May 12, 2017**

ADDENDUM No. 1

RFP No. 16-17/17 – Oracle E-Business Suite Upgrade to R12.2.x

This Addendum modifies the original RFP Documents for the above mentioned RFP. **Acknowledge receipt of this addendum in the space provided on the RFP Acknowledgement and Signature Form (Attachment 3). Failure to do so may disqualify your proposal.**

The following corrections have been made to the above referenced RFP:

1. The following paragraph in the RFP, Section II. table on page 5 of 16, is appended as follows:

    The Port has the following customizations:

Concurrent Programs (includes interfaces listed above)	360
Forms (including Maritime Tenant Revenue)	8
BI Publisher templates	251
Alerts	25
Discoverer Business Areas	19
Discoverer Folders	367
Discoverer Workbooks	207
Workflow Customizations	11
Screens created/modified via Oracle Applications Framework	6

2. The Port is releasing the prior assessment done for the Oracle E-Business Suite Upgrade and has included it as "Attachment A" to this Addendum 1. To download this attachment, visit the Port's website at: http://www.portofoakland.com/business/bids-rfps/ locate RFP 16-17/17 and click on "Attachment A – OAK Assessment" or navigate to the Port of Oakland's main website at: http://www.portofoakland.com/, then click on "Bids/RFPs" from the banner on the top of the page, and then scroll down to download the Attachment A for RFP 16-17/17.

There are no other changes to RFP No. 16-17/17.

The following questions were submitted by the deadline and are answered in this addendum:

1. **Supplier Question**: What is the budget for the upgrade project?

   Port Response: We cannot disclose the budget. All firms proposing on this project are to develop their proposals and include realistic cost estimates for their firm to complete the project.

2. **Supplier Question**: The Port has indicated that proposal's should be able to support future projects, what does that mean? Is there any detailed information in regards to items that are up for consideration in the future to allow for proper solution of scope covered in this RFP?

   Port Response: The section on "future projects" on page 7 of 16 was included in the RFP for informational purposes only on our future roadmap. No other information is available at this time.

3. **Supplier Question:** Has the Port budgeted and allocated funds for the future projects listed in the RFP?

   Port Response: Since these are future projects, funds will be budgeted and allocated in the future as we begin to work on those projects.

4. **Supplier Question:** Does the Proposal response restriction of 40 pages include the various insurance, business and other legal collateral/affidavits/forms? Can proposal responses be delivered by email or are hard copies required to be delivered to Port office?

   Port Response: Section V., Item 8, page 12 of 16 Respondents must fill out all of the forms included in the RFP (listed under "Attachments" section and marked with a "Yes". These required forms will not count against the maximum page count for your response. Attachments to the RFP are acceptable to provide additional examples or detail to respondents proposals but will not replace any of the submission requirements, evaluators may not review noted attachments during the written evaluation.

5. **Supplier Question**: Who is the Port of Oakland's hosting provider? Which firm is providing hosting services in Southern California? Do you have high availability systems?

   Port Response: Mercury Technology Group (MTG) provides hosting services for all of our environments. Our Production instance is housed in a data center in Irvine, CA. Our five non-production instances and the Disaster Recovery instance are all housed in a data center in Virginia. Yes, these are high availability systems.

6. **Supplier Question**: Who will be responsible for the database and APPS DBA functions during the upgrade? Is the current DBA responsible for upgrading the database from DB11g to DB12c version and its prerequisites (like Linux patches), if required? Are there any specific days/times when the DBAs will not be available to support this project?

   Port Response: The Port of Oakland's hosting provider, MTG, will be responsible for the DBA and APPS DBA functions during the upgrade. We plan to upgrade the database to 12c as part of the R12.2.x upgrade project. MTG provides support 24x7. If the requested tasks are not urgent, they may be completed during overnight hours.

7. **Supplier Question:** Have the DBAs run upgrade impact patch script on your current environment? Oracle Support Note: 1531121.1. If already run, can the Port share the results?

    Port Response: Yes, the scripts in "Using the Online Patching Readiness Report in Oracle E-Business Suite Release 12.2 (Doc ID 1531121.1)" have been run and the results reviewed by the DBA. There are no show-stoppers.

8. **Supplier Question**: What is the SLA or turn-around time for cloning and application of patches with MTG?

    Port Response: MTG has been very responsive to the Ports requests for cloning and application of patches. Currently, MTG is able to clone an instance overnight. Depending on the priority, we can file urgent or regular request tickets. Per the SLA, Urgent tickets are addressed immediately. Regular tickets are addressed within 24 hours (although our experience has been that MTG responds within 1 to 2 hours).

9. **Supplier Question**: Would the Port need additional infrastructure and/or DBA/APPS DBA support for the Release 12.2 upgrade?

    Port Response: No. MTG will provide the additional infrastructure (if needed) and DBA/APPS DBA support for the Release 12.2 upgrade. MTG needs three weeks lead time to procure additional infrastructure, if needed.

10. **Supplier Question**: Who did the original "Oracle ERP" implementation in 2010? Does the Port still have technical consultants from this systems integrator?

    Port Response: The Port originally contracted with Sierra Atlantic and Yield Technologies (provided project management services). During the course of the implementation, Hitachi bought out Sierra Atlantic. We no longer have technical consultants from this systems integrator.

11. **Supplier Question**: In terms of logistics, will there be enough workspaces on the Port of Oakland premises for on-site resources?

    Port Response: Yes, there will be enough workspaces available for on-site resources. Each firm is to outline their team members, and state whether they will be onsite, or offsite, or a combination of both. The workspaces for on-site resources will be addressed during the start of the project.

12. **Supplier Question**: Will the Port of Oakland allow offsite and/or offshore resources for this project?

    Port Response: The Port of Oakland allows resources to be off-site to minimize the cost of the project. Resources can come onsite during critical points of the project. However, for this project the Port will not allow resources to be off-shore.

13. **Supplier Question**: Do the resources for the project team proposers engage with need to be US Citizens or can the project team members have H1B visa or Green-card status?

    Port Response: All members of the consulting project team must be able to work legally in the United States. The consulting firm is responsible for compliance.

14. **Supplier Question:** What is the timeline for completing this project and are there any blackout date or other competing projects that might affect this project timelines? Does the Port have an internal or external constraint on the timeline of the upgrade project? What is the availability/restriction of the users/super-users for this upgrade initiative? Are there competing initiatives that may impact the upgrade schedule?

    Port Response: The Port's Fiscal Year-ends June 30th, and key accounting staff will be working with auditors on the year-end audits and financial reports for most of August and September. We have worked with our external auditors to develop a tight and condensed timeline with the goal of completing the majority of work by mid to late September so that key staff can be fully available for this project. This should not be taken as a complete block out of time but consideration should be made, as minimal time from this staff will be available. Payroll processing follows the calendar year and is a bi-weekly process, with certain HR and Payroll staff fully occupied for approximately two full days every other week.   The annual close and reporting process for payroll is from December through January when payroll staff will be less available. We also do HR/Payroll RUP, quarterly, and year-end patching. The Port's budget process is from March through May. Staff involved in grants, projects and funding will have limited availability in this time, with April and May having the most significant time constraints.

15. **Supplier Question**: The current IT/Oracle support and development team is mentioned. In order to "collaborate" as requested, should these individuals be considered full-time resources for the upgrade project? Or, for example, does the Port want proposers to be responsible for all technical objects (RICE/CEMLI items)? Will the Ports current IT support team also be contributing towards the Upgrade project tasks, if not, what is the count and composition of the internal PORT team that the PORT can dedicate for the upgrade effort. (e.g. Functional Analysts/users, CEMLI experts – who can clarify questions on the functional and technical changes done to the EBS so far.)?

    Port Response: Page 2 of the RFP lists the business areas and modules. Each business area is supported by an IT/Oracle support team member. They will be working on the upgrade project the majority of their time. Team members will also be handling production troubleshooting and patching as needed. The current IT Oracle support team (combination of employees and consultants) will be responsible for RICE/CEMLI items, including remediation work if needed. The proposer should provide a technical resource for the Port to ask questions or to elevate issues as needed (i.e. tier 3 support).

16. **Supplier Question**: What areas of improvements does the Port of Oakland need during this upgrade project?

    Port Response: The Port of Oakland is looking for process improvements as outlined in in the RFP: Projects & Grants, Property Manager, and Accounting. These modules will need more in-depth business user training.

17. **Supplier Question**: In Section II, the table on page 2 of 16, under Modules "Project Costing" is it used separate from Grants? If so, how is it used, for example what Project Types?

    Port Response: The Port uses Oracle's project costing functionality to apply fringe and indirect cost rates to direct project costs for the purpose of accumulating costs in order to capitalize those costs as an asset in our fixed asset system and/or for external billing and cost recovery. The external billing may be to a third party for which work is being performed (a tenant) or a party from which the cost may be otherwise recovered (insurance company) or a granting agency (Federal, State, or local). The Port uses project cost reports generated by Oracle to report on transactions at full cost and manually selects eligible transactions for billing third parties. Some third party invoices are prepared outside of Oracle and entered as a separate transactions some are billed through the Awards module. Third party billing may be done for Capital, Bill-To-Others or expense projects.

18. **Supplier Question:** Does the Port currently integrate labor costs from HR to Financials, especially into project costing?

    Port Response: Yes.

19. **Supplier Question**: Do you have a documented list of gaps identified for Projects and Awards (Grants) and Property Manager Module, through previously conducted gap analysis/assessment?

    Port Response: Assessment document has been added as Attachment A to this Addendum 1. Due to the size of the document the Assessment is available as a separate pdf document on Port's website to download a copy visit the Port of Oakland's main website at http://www.portofoakland.com/business/bids-rfps/ or navigate to the Port of Oakland's main website at: http://www.portofoakland.com/, then click on "Bids/RFPs" from the banner on the top of the page, and then scroll down to download "Attachment A – OAK Assessment".

20. **Supplier Question**: Is the Project & Awards (Grants) budgeting integrated or non-integrated budget, which are funded by Grans/Awards? If not would this be desired?

    Port Response: Grants does not support integration with Financial Plans or integration with Project Management Workplans. As a result, the Operational Planning done by Project Management is not integrated with the Financial management (i.e. Award Funding and Award Budgets for the Projects). The Port of Oakland would like to have ability to plan, monitor and forecast for an entire Project leveraging their existing Investments in products such as Oracle Project Management (PJT). This will also enable reporting of Metrics across the Project which is not possible in the current System.

21. **Supplier Question**: Does the Port generate invoices from the project costing -> billing against the grants? Please provide a description.

    Port Response: The Port does not generate invoices directly through project costing for grant reimbursements. All grant reimbursement invoices are prepared outside of Oracle and invoice amounts are entered into the GL manually. The Port used to process billing of grants through the awards module, however, the entries produced by Oracle would create problems with our AR sub ledger and complicate reporting and tracking of our trade AR. To prevent this we would reverse the entries generate by the awards module. Eventually we decided to stop billing through

the awards module. Insurance recoveries are also prepared outside of the system and entered into the GL manually or by a manual invoice.

22. **Supplier Question**: Can the Port explain how your funds distribution (80/20) and how it currently relates to challenges?

    Port Response: The Port does not use funds distribution functionality in Oracle.

23. **Supplier Question**: Do you currently generate CAFR reports from Financials? If not why, what are the challenges?

    Port Response: We use FSG for some monthly reports and produce monthly and year-end financial statements from FSG, but transfer the reports to Excel where we have flexible formatting.

24. **Supplier Question**: What is the current financial closing process and what improvements and/or challenges would the Port like to see change?

    Port Response: The financial close process is approximately 4 – 5 weeks in length and generally speaking starts with a review of revenue booked and an evaluation of needed revenue accruals. At the same time accounts payable evaluates invoices received and tracks invoices that should be accrued in the prior period. The procurement and accounts payables modules are left open for a few weeks to allow for posting of invoices directly into the prior period to avoid a manual accrual. Each module is systematically closed and a variance analysis is prepared. Final entries are booked through GL and financial statements are prepared, reviewed and published. Departmental expense and revenue reports are distributed to the various departments. We would like to shorten the cycle, but recognize that most of the excess time is the result of our business process and not with system limitations.

25. **Supplier Question**: Being a public sector could the Port explain your budget check, encumbrance or pre-encumbrance being utilized and any challenges?

    Port Response: The Port's annual budget process establishes an approved capital and operating budget that is available for that year only and is reset with each annual budget cycle for the next year. Each project in Oracle has to be funded, i.e. have an annual award set up by Finance (which equals the annual approved budget expenditure) before there can be any expenditures incurred. Monthly budget to actual reporting, project status reports, and quarterly capital budget reports monitor the Port's spending. All individuals at the Port are held accountable for keeping within their approved budget. The Port's procurement rules are strict and PO's for significant costs are not approved without verifying available budget. Spend of certain types and over certain dollar threshold require board approval regardless if the budget is already available. Systematically, the Port has encumbrances turned on at an advisory level, however the Port does not use encumbrances as a control to prevent an expenditure nor do we report encumbered balances. Due to the frequent reporting and strict procurement rules, the Port does not see the need to use encumbrances at this time.

26. **Supplier Question**: What areas does the Port think they need process improvement the most in Accounting? Please elaborate if possible?

    Port Response: The Port is open to reviewing any increased functionality in Oracle that could facilitate a faster month end close process. Our primary focus for process improvement in Accounting as it relates to this project will be the period end accrual process and gaining an understanding of the best way to set up Customer Accounts so that our collections procedures run smoothly. The Port recognizes that Oracle potentially has other functionality that we are not utilizing and are therefore not as efficient as we could be.

27. **Supplier Question**: What does the Port of Oakland need in terms of training for the Release 12.2 upgrade?

    Port Response: The Port of Oakland will need training on new functionalities available in Release 12.2.x. Our IT staff and Superusers will need training. Additionally, end-users of the three areas of process improvements will need training.

28. **Supplier Question**: How many customizations does the Port of Oakland have in the current Production environment?

    Port Response: The Port of Oakland's customization are described on pages 4 to 5 of the RFP and page 1 of this Addendum. It describes the Port's custom interfaces, custom concurrent programs, and custom objects.

29. **Supplier Question**: Can the Port please elaborate features/functionality of the Custom-built module i.e Maritime Tenant Revenue and are there any integrations with EBS / 3rd party applications? Does the "Maritime Tenant Revenue" use custom top? Are there documents related to the customization that the Port can share?

    Port Response: Maritime Tenant Revenue is a custom bolt-on to Oracle ERP that was developed internally. This bolt-on was developed using Oracle tools and adheres to Oracle's customization standards. Maritime Tenant Revenue was developed for our Maritime line of business. It tracks metrics such as ships' visits, how many containers loaded and unloaded per visit, etc. Maritime Tenant Revenue integrates with Oracle AR; a stored procedure calculates amounts to be billed and feeds to the AR interface tables. AutoInvoice is run to generate the invoices. This is a monthly process. All our custom code resides in a custom top ($XXPOO_TOP).

30. **Supplier Question**: In the RFP states that an assessment was conducted. Who did the assessment? Are they a third party? Is the firm excluded from bidding on this RFP for ensuring independence and fair evaluations?

    Port Response: The initial assessment was done last year April-May 2016 as the Port of Oakland was preparing for the Release 12.2 upgrade. The assessment was done by the consulting firm SmartDog Services. They are not excluded from responding to the RFP. A copy of their assessment is being released with this addendum. See question 19 and 31 on how to down load the Attachment A document.

31. **Supplier Question**: What environment was the assessment conducted on? Will the assessment results and recommendations be available for review as part of this RFP?

    Port Response: The assessment was conducted in April – May 2016. Our current R12.1.1 environment was examined and compared against the functionalities of R12.2.5 which was the latest release during the April – May 2016 timeframe. Assessment is available as a separate attachment to this Addendum 1 by visiting the Port of Oakland's main website at http://www.portofoakland.com/business/bids-rfps/ or navigate to the Port of Oakland's main website at: http://www.portofoakland.com/, then click on "Bids/RFPs" from the banner on the top of the page, and then scroll down to download "Attachment A – OAK Assessment".

32. **Supplier Question**: Does the Port need additional assessment during the upgrade project?

    Port Response: Yes, for the three areas needing process improvements.

33. **Supplier Question**: In the standard professional services agreement (attachment 10) -- Section 5.1 has defined Unlimited Liability. We will request a limited liability redline. Is this acceptable to the Port? Section 12 has a requirement to audit payroll records. This are private to the individual and not subject to external audit. Can this be removed from the PSA? Section 28 defines the Industrial Relations Requirements – does this project fall under the Public Works or Maintenance project and subject to the Union oversight?

    Port Response: Please see Section IV - Port Policy and Other Requirements - #4 (Port's Standard Professional Services Agreement). "Any objections to any provisions in the Port's Standard Professional Services Agreement and/or this RFP must clearly be identified in your proposal by section number and with proposed alternative language." All objections including any insurance requirement must be listed in your response and must be submitted as part of "Section V. Submission Requirements, Item 1 "Company Information".

34. **Supplier Question**: Post go-live support is requested to be three (3) months. Should proposers include their entire team as part of the support plan or provide our recommended approach over the three (3) months?

    Port Response: Please provide your recommended approach for the 3 months.

35. **Supplier Question**: Does the Port have a full set of test cases that are used for release management that can be used as a starting point for R12.2.x test cases?

    Port Response: The Port has test scripts for the HR, Payroll, and OTL areas. Test scripts are not available for other areas.

36. **Supplier Question**: In Section III, Item 1.f first bullet point; can the Port comment on the source of the "large and inaccurate accounting accruals" that are being system generated?

    Port Response: During our monthly close of the procurement and accounts payable modules a significantly large accounts payable accrual is generated by the system. The system-generated accrual is not accurate; therefore, we reverse the entry and book a manually calculated accrual. We suspect the majority of the accrual is coming from old purchase orders that were entered into the system during implementation but have never been cleaned up. The old purchase orders do

not account for all of the accrual so there may be something else within the configuration causing the incorrect calculation.

37. **Supplier Question**: Can the Port provide a count of master data items? i.e., customer, suppliers, projects, leases, etc…

    Port Response: Page 3 of the RFP provides transactional statistics including count of projects and leases. Additionally, we have 1,707 customers and 5,904 suppliers.

38. **Supplier Question:** Does the Port currently interface EAM costs to Oracle Projects?

    Port Response: Yes.

39. **Supplier Question**: Is Project Budgeting functionality used?

    Port Response: Grants does not support integration with Financial Plans or integration with Project Management Workplans. As a result, the Operational Planning done by Project Management is not integrated with the Financial management (i.e. Award Funding and Award Budgets for the Projects). The Port of Oakland would like to have ability to plan, monitor and forecast for an entire Project leveraging their existing Investments in products such as Oracle Project Management (PJT). This will also enable reporting of Metrics across the Project which is not possible in the current System.

40. **Supplier Question**: What percentage of projects with "funding" are considered capital projects?

    Port Response: The vast majority of projects created in Oracle are capital projects. The Port occasionally creates Bill-To-Other and expense projects but this is a very small percentage of our projects. All capital projects have to be funded with some type of funding source or combination of funding source assigned to them, determined during the annual budget process. The funding information is entered into Oracle as an annual award, based on budget and not updated for actuals. The Port does not have an efficient way in Oracle of tracking the final funding source of a capital project or the assets that result from the project, but we would like to establish a system.

41. **Supplier Question**: How extensive is current system documentation? Are all SDLC documents available from initial implementation and subsequent customization? What form is existing documentation available in scripts, design documents for code etc..?

    Port Response: We have documentation for some customizations, but not for all. Some SDLC documents are available from initial implementation; however, they are out of date or incomplete.

42. **Supplier Question**: Which SDLC Methodology is in use in the Port?

    Port Response: We use "SDLC-lite". In our development work, we use the basic steps of requirements gathering, build prototype, test, remediation, user acceptance, and move to production.

43. **Supplier Question**: Does the Port have well established Project Management Office (PMO)?

    Port Response: The Port has a small PMO that will help guide the project. It is expected that both the Port and the chosen supplier will provide project managers who will work together to ensure project success.

44. **Supplier Question**: If proposers are not a Small Business Firm themselves but partner with a small business firm, will the prime proposer get the 15% credit in the evaluation criteria? Are there any specific criteria proposers have to meet?

    Port Response: Attachments 5, 5A & 5B, The Port allots preference points for the percentage of work performed by consultants/sub-consultants located in either the LBA or the LIA. Please refer to Attachment 5, 5A, & 5B for additional explanation on how points are proportionately awarded.

45. **Supplier Question**: Section III, Item 1.e, page 7 of 16; does the Port expect that the systems should calculate Late Charges automatically on the basis of predefined formulas in Property Management Module or is the Port expecting this functionality in Oracle Receivable to charge Late Fee against customer on their delinquent invoices?

    Port Response: Late Fee Charge is a function of Oracle Accounts Receivable. The Port of Oakland is expecting the functionality to charge Late Fees against customers on their delinquent invoices to remain in the Oracle Accounts Receivable module.

46. **Supplier Question**: Section III, Item 1.e (page 7 of 16); does the Port expect that users should be able to delete billing items which are in approved status or Draft Status?

    Port Response: Currently, Property Manager users can delete billing items if the Approval Status of the lease is in Draft status. Once the approval status is Final, users cannot delete erroneous billing items. Property Manager users are requesting for a functionality (seeded or custom) that would allow them to delete erroneous billing items and corresponding payment schedules even if the lease approval status is set to Final.

47. **Supplier Question**: Section III, Item f (page 7 of 16); Does the Port expect the system to generate Customer EDI invoices and send it to customers or emailing of invoices in PDF Format?

    Port Response: The Port wants the ability to email out invoices from Oracle to customers in PDF format.

48. **Supplier Question**: What accounting standard is used (IFRS or US GAAP)?

    Port Response: US GAAP

49. **Supplier Question**: In the next phase, the Port has already decided upon an OBIEE/OBIA based solution as a reporting solution replacing Discoverer. Is the Port open to other viable alternative that help reduce the migration cost of discoverer assists requiring a new/large implementation?

    Port Response: At this point in time, the Port is considering implementing BICS (Business Intelligence Cloud Services) as a replacement for Oracle Discoverer as a future project.

50. **Supplier Question**: Does the Port have a short-term bridge plan for maintenance and testing of discoverer reports coinciding with the R12 upgrade (e.g. will the Port hold new report creation during this intervening timeframe)?

    Port Response: We do not plan on doing new Discoverer development work or enhancements, including new report creation, during the upgrade project. The Discoverer reports will be tested as part of the upgrade project.

51. **Supplier Question**: Does the Port have any specific restrictions on the number of hosted instances that can be deployed for the purpose of the upgrade project?
    Can proposers assume that they will have access to the required number of instances based on the timelines given in the proposed solution?
    Will the Port be able to provide these four upgrade environments?
    - Database
    - Application
        - Upgrade Dev
        - Upgrade QA
        - Upgrade Stage
        - Upgrade Production

    Port Response: The Port currently has five non-production instances. The plan is to keep two on the current R12.1.1 in order to support production troubleshooting and patching, and devote three instances to the upgrade project. If needed, we can provision a fourth instance for the upgrade project and decommission it upon completion of the project.

52. **Supplier Question**: Are there any further changes/upgrades being planned for the database, OS levels coinciding with the upgrade initiative?

    Port Response: The Port plans to upgrade the database to 12c as part of the R12.2.x upgrade project.

53. **Supplier Question**: Will there be a change in infrastructure servers as part of this upgrade?

    Port Response: It is anticipated that storage on the Applications Tier will need to be doubled based on our current usage. MTG needs three weeks lead time for hardware/storage procurement, so this needs to be factored into the project plan.

54. **Supplier Question**: Is the Port planning to deploy Edition Based Redefinition to manage code changes right after upgrade? Or delay that to a later stage. (this has an effect based on the code standards to be implemented for custom code)?

    Port Response: Yes, the Port plans to deploy Edition Based Redefinition as part of the upgrade without delay.

55. **Supplier Question**: What is the current average for period close activities for the major processes? Are there any long running processes, and how long do they run?

    Port Response: The average period closing time for the major processes is 15 minutes. Some modules have more processes and take the longest time. Most processes run within a minute.

56. **Supplier Question**: Clarify the statement "The Subject Matter Experts from the Business Areas will perform testing". Does this mean Port staff will perform the testing?

    Port Response: Yes, Port staff will perform the testing.

57. **Supplier Question**: Interface testing can the Port clearly explain the expectations.

    Port Response: The expectation is for the interfaces to work correctly as part of the upgrade. If errors are encountered, they must be remediated.

58. **Supplier Question**: Section II of the RFP states the Port has "1 external middle tier server" what is this external tier used for? Which module is being accessed from this tier?

    Port Response: The external middle tier server is used for external users outside of the Port's network. The EAM module (Enterprise Asset Management) has users external to the Port's network such as the airlines and other tenants at Oakland International Airport. They use EAM to file Work Requests.

59. **Supplier Question**: Are there any custom OAF pages or OAF personalization? If yes, please provide details.

    Port Response: Yes, the Port has custom OAF pages. An example of one custom OAF page is our "File Upload" page. It allows users to upload an interface file to Oracle. The Port also has OAF personalization throughout our current EBS environment. An example of one of our OAF personalization's is in Manager Self-Service. We needed to make one of the EIT (Extra Information Type) viewable in Manager Self-Service, and this was accomplished through OAF personalization.

60. **Supplier Question**: Are the UPK training materials built during initial implementation still valid and able to considered current? Or, are there any specific business areas that need to be documented? If to, please list this information.

    Port Response: The UPK training materials built during the initial implementation are no longer valid or current. We need documentation of new functionalities implemented. We especially need documentation in the Projects/Grants area.

61. **Supplier Question**: Regarding the consultants, we will mention the roles of the consultants like Architect, Sr. Oracle Apps Engineer etc. will this be acceptable response?

    Port Response: Yes, you may mention the roles of the consultant.

62. **Supplier Question**: Can the Port share with proposers the current Chart of Account structure used in R12.1.1? Does the Port currently capture the fund code in this string and does it back to requisitions, PO & contracts?

Port Response: The Port does not use fund accounting. It does capture the GL string when requisitions are submitted and when lease contracts are set up in Property Manager.

The Port has a 7-segment GL string capturing the following segments:

1. *Segment 1 = XX(2-Numeric) - Entity (only one entity)*
2. *Segment 2 = XXXXX(5-Character) - Department*
3. *Segment 3 = XXXXXX(6-Numeric) - Account*
4. *Segment 4 = XXXXXXX(7-Numeric) - Tenant*
5. *Segment 5 = XXXXXXX(7-Character) - Facility*
6. *Segment 6 = XXXX(4-Character) - Future1 [reserved for future use]*
7. *Segment 7 = XXXXXX(6-Character) - Future2 [reserved for future use]*

63. **Supplier Question**: What type of business generates revenue for the Port in the Utility line of business (refer to Interface Name Utilities Billing; RFP 16-17/17, Page 4 of 16)?

Port Response: The Port is a provider of utilities (gas and electricity) to its tenants. The Utility Star Gold system, based on meter readings, generates the utility invoices for our tenants. An interface file is passed to Oracle AR. Oracle AR handles receipts and collections process and posting to the GL.

64. **Supplier Question**: How many business groups does the Port have and how many payrolls does the Port run every pay period?

Port Response: We have one business group. We run one payroll every bi-weekly pay period. We are a single-org; we do not have multi-org enabled.

65. **Supplier Question**: Will the Port be able to provide end users for RICE (reports, interfaces, conversions, and enhancement) testing, validation, and sign-off (3 cycles of testing)? Does the Port have an automated testing tool?

Port Response: Yes, Port end users will be responsible for RICE testing, validation, and sign-off. No, the Port does not have an automated testing tool.

66. **Supplier Question**: Will the Port be able to provide functional test cases used in earlier upgrade processes?

Port Response: This is the Port's first upgrade since the initial implementation in 2010. No, the Port will not be able to provide test cases from the initial implementation because they are incomplete.

67. **Supplier Question**: Are the requested rates all-inclusive or are expenses provided for traveling consultants?

     Port Response: Please see the proposal worksheet (Attachment 4). In the worksheet you must break down all costs including travel expenses.

68. **Supplier Question**: Does the Port have a methodology or process for verifying the upgrade?

     Port Response: On page 6, III. Scope of Services, 1. Upgrade Objectives, c. Documentation and Training, we are asking for assistance in developing regression test scripts. As part of the upgrade, we need to do thorough testing.

Enclosure: Attachment A – OAK Assessment (must be downloaded separately)