ADDENDUM NUMBER 1  
DATED DECEMBER 23, 2019  
TO  
SPECIFICATIONS TO REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS #20-4000-HR-U  
FOR AN  
ENTERPRISE-WIDE INTEGRATED PLANNING, BUDGETING,  
AND FORECASTING TECHNOLOGY SOLUTION  
DATED DECEMBER 6, 2019

The above entitled specifications are hereby modified as follows and except as set forth herein otherwise remain unchanged and in full force and effect.

General Clarifications

The university is soliciting proposals for a product to meet the needs identified in the RFP not implementation partners at this time. After product selection a determination will be made on any implementation needs.

The university is not pre-disposed to cloud or on-premise, both platforms are being considered.

If you are not proposing a product that can meet the mandatories outlined in section 10 of the RFP there is no need to submit a response.

Duplicate questions or questions irrelevant to the goals and objectives of this RFP have been removed, including questions deemed to be implementation related.

Clarification Questions

1. You are currently licensed for 500 users. How many unique users do you need to access the system?

   The University’s plan is to allow up to 500 users.

2. How many full time/part time/student employees do you have?

   The University, excluding MU Health Care, has over 13,500 full-time employees, over 4,000 part-time employees, and over 9,000 student workers. The University currently uses pool positions to budget for part-time employees/workers such as adjuncts and student workers.

3. What was the reason for developing 5 separate Planning applications? I.e.: is there a business reason salary planning is in a separate application and not included in the expense planning application?

   There are functional, security, and operational reasons for having multiple Planning applications. Regarding the functional and security reasons, a separate reporting application allowed a large number of data consumers to access consolidated financial and salary budget and forecasting data without any security restrictions. The salary planning application (SALPLN) has different dimensionality and users (due to decentralization) than the financial planning application (FINPLN). Separating the salary
planning from the financial planning provided flexibility to design and build the cube structure and the security model in more efficient way. Some applications, like LRPPLN are used by a single campus only with specific design requirements. The FAPPLN also has different dimensionality structure (principally for the account dimension) than the FINPLN with very different security access, and the need for two or three plan types. Regarding the operational reasons, as the applications contain well-defined functionality and users’ access, then maintenance of artifacts and new developments can be done in one application without impacting other applications and user groups.

4. Does the University of Missouri have an objective of consolidating applications?

It is expected that during the redesign and implementation phase, decisions could be made to consolidate functionality within fewer applications or modules, however the proposed solution should be able to support at least the same number of applications currently in production.

5. What budgeting methodology is used by the University of Missouri? Incremental? RCM/Incentive? Zero based?

Due to the size of the University and decentralization of business operations, the University employees a variety of budget methodologies. A new solution will need to be versatile.

6. Per the “RFP 20-4000-HR-U-UnivMiss.docx”, “No links or attachments will be reviewed or considered.” However, the “20 4000 HR U ITSRQ.xlsx” states, “The vendor should provide security whitepapers, technical documents, or copies of policies as necessary to fully demonstrate compliance with the requirement. Failure to provide the necessary information to meet the requirements in this section could lead to disqualification.”

Questions:
   a) Can we use links and attachments for “20 4000 HR U ITSRQ.xlsx”?  
   b) Can we use links and attachments for “20 4000 HR U Exhibit A.xlsx”?

Please avoid using links in Exhibit A responses. Any attachments will need to fit within the 25 pages limitation. The ITSRQ response may contain links and attachments.

7. Is there a preferred start date for the beginning of the migration?

Contingent on the RFP process, the goal would be to begin fit-gap and design discussions by May 2020.

8. Is there a preferred go-live date for the beginning of the migration?

The University would like to prepare the FY 2022 year in a new product.

9. Will both the migration and application enhancements (i.e. LRP) both be part of the same start and/or go-live date? Or is there a desire to have a phased approach?

We assume there will be a phased approach but will not know that determination until we select a product.

10. Have you worked with a software vendor and/or consulting firm to date to prepare for this RFP? If so, which one(s)?

No.

11. Have you already had software vendors in to demo their product(s)? If so, which one(s)?

No.
12. What are your organization’s current hardware standards?
   
a) Operating system (Linux, Windows, UNIX, etc.)

   The current specs for the EPM system are based on what it is supported by the Hyperion software. Currently we have a hybrid Windows 2012 and Oracle Linux 6.

b) Processors

   The current EPM system is deployed in a multi-server environment. In the production environment the number of CPUs varies from 12 to 64 CPUs.

c) RAM

   The current EPM system is deployed in a multi-server environment. In the production environment the RAM size varies from 32GB to 252GB.

d) Anything else we should know?

   For future state, please see Exhibit A, tab 7-Technology Requirements.

13. What type of functionality is being utilized to directly access relational tables from Planning?

   The system uses the OutlineLoader Planning utility within automation scripts to directly access the relational tables and upload metadata and numeric-text combined data. Numeric data is directly uploaded from the relational tables to Essbase using load rules within the same automation scripts.

14. Does University of Missouri currently utilize Active Directory groups to provision users to Hyperion?

   No, all groups used within the security model are created in Hyperion Shared Services.

15. Does University of Missouri automate the user provisioning in any way from Active Directory into Hyperion? Or does an administrator manually add the user to a Hyperion security group? Note that this is not referring to authenticating user credentials.

   No, the users are added, changed, or removed manually.

16. Is ERPi/FDM/FDMEE utilized as part of the existing solution?

   None of these modules are being used in the current deployment.

17. How many environments (Prod/Test/etc.) are currently used?

   The currently deployment includes four environments: Production, Test and DR, Development, and a Sand-Box environment for validation and test of upgrades and patches.

18. Will anything be changing with the integration from the source systems to the staging table as part of this migration? Note that this excludes the Hyperion to staging table export mentioned in the RFP.

   No, this project does not include any integration changes in terms of the technical approach, however changes or updates in the ETL processes could be required to accomplish new metadata and data requirements.

19. How many years of data will be migrated to the cloud environment as part of this migration?

   The University is open to cloud or on-premise solutions. Regardless, the expectation is to migrate at least seven years of data composed of the last five years history of actuals and budget, the current year actuals, budget and forecast/projection, and the next year of budget working.
20. Is there a preference as to whether all applications stay as separate applications in the new environment versus some being consolidated into the same application?

There is no preference. The new arrangement of plan types must handle the security, functional, and performance requirements.

21. What version is Hyperion currently on? If it is not the most recent, are there any plans to upgrade prior to the migration to the cloud?

The current deployment has the latest Hyperion version 11.1.2.4 installed. This RFP will address the future state.

22. How many Financial Reporting Studio reports are expected to be migrated? Do these use the Planning or Essbase connections?

The expectation is to migrate all existing Financial Reporting reports. All of the current reports use Essbase connections.

23. Do any of the applications utilize EPMA, PSPB (with or without Decision Packages), or any of the other Hyperion out-of-the-box modules?

No, the current deployment does not use EPMA, or any of the Hyperion out-of-the-box planning modules.

24. Are there any plans to upgrade or migrate existing source systems of which Hyperion would be downstream?

No, there are no plans to upgrade or migrate any of the source systems as part of this RFP on the current roadmap.

25. Are any of the Hyperion Planning applications customized? This may include configurations of the Planning SQL repository or web-based validations.

No, all planning applications have the standard settings and validations that can be managed with the out-of-the-box functionality.

26. Are there any custom utilities integrated with Hyperion?

No, there are no custom utilities integrated with Hyperion. The current functionality and integration interfaces use out-of-the-box customizations and utilities.

27. Does the LRPPLN application contain any part of the mentioned five-year LRP enhancement?

No, the LRPPLN application does not include the five-year LRP functionality.

28. How often does data move between plan types within each application? Is this system and/or user driven?

There are different processes to move data between plan types within each application, some processes are system driven and move data once a day (nightly) or every six hours. Other processes are user driven and move data on save, or when the user explicitly triggers it.

29. Does data move between applications? If so, how frequent? Is this system and/or user driven?

Yes, there is data movement between applications. All data moved at this level is done by system driven processes, and there are different schedules as some data is moved once a day (nightly) or every six hours.

30. What is your motivation for making a change? What are your goals for a new solution?

Please see the RFP background section. In short, our current solution is not aligned with future needs.

31. What is working well and what is not working well with Hyperion?

Please see the RFP background section. In short, our current solution is not aligned with future needs.
32. Should we note any exceptions to terms and conditions or will that be discussed during contract negotiations with the successful bidder?
   Please note these in your RFP response.

33. Do you consider this project a migration from the current on-prem system to the cloud or are there additional requirements for the new system?
   The University will consider all options proposed, include on-prem and cloud options, so this project is considered as a migration from the current state to a next generation EPM system.

34. Are the current processes well documented, i.e. dimension import process, data import, data extract, business rules?
   Yes.

35. What tool is currently used for the ETL process?
   Informatica PowerCenter 10.1.

36. Do you plan to continue to use the current ETL process to load data, metadata, exported Budget data?
   Yes, based on what is known now, the University will continue to use the current ETL tool for all required transformations, extractions and loads of data related to the new EPM solution. If a product is delivered with alternative functionality, it will be considered.

37. Do you budget at the same level that you report Actuals?
   No, budget uses a rolled-up account tree with fewer detail accounts.

38. Do you want us to provide the end user training or just provide training to super users and they will train the rest of the users?
   It is expected that sufficient training would be available for product configuration and administration. End user training will be a part of the broader implementation.

39. What are “process control modifications” in the context of Req. ID#: 1, 18?
   File: 204000 HR U Exhibit A.xlsx; Sheet: 1 System Administration
   This is referring to the audit records logged by the system relating to updates on settings or status of the workflow process associated to the planning functions.

40. What is meant with "account data signs" in the context of Req. ID#: 3, 10?
    File: 204000 HR U Exhibit A.xlsx; Sheet: 1 System Administration
    It means the sign (positive or negative) of the numeric data that will be loaded to a specific account.

41. Please explain what is understood with Commitment Tracking (with an example) in Req. ID#: 3, 20.
    File: 204000 HR U Exhibit A.xlsx; Sheet: 1 System Administration
    The University is looking for a mechanism to set aside funds for a long-term financial obligations, similar to pre-encumbrances such as scholarship gifts earmarked for future cohorts, multi-year faculty start-up funds, etc.
    a) How are these monitored in relation to the GL level budget?
       Commitments could be considered similar to pre-encumbrances and are currently not monitored but the desire is to have a mechanism to handle these types of items in the future.
42. Please specify your definition of concurrent users. Please compare it to your definition of Named users.

Concurrent Users: Refers to the expected number of users that will have access to the system at the same time.
Named Users: Refers to the access definition for a single user. At a given time we are expecting to have a specific number of concurrent users (a subset of all named users defined) with access to the system.

43. Do you already have Essbase Plus licenses available? Or do we have to consider them in our offer?

No, currently the University has the Oracle Planning license for Essbase, so any need for Essbase licenses should be included in the offer.

44. Please specify the Cognos product? Especially the underlying data storage. Is it IBM Planning Analytics (formerly known as TM1)?

The University does not have TM1. See RFP Background narrative, Section 3 for Cognos information.

45. Scope – Can the University confirm this RFP covers the entire system (System Office and all Four Member Institutions) and will be deployed across the entire system at the same time? If this will not be deployed at the same time, can the University elaborate on the expected deployment schedule for the University across its members?

The University anticipates one deployment.

46. Scope – Can the University provide expected key dates for the RFP process after the response has been submitted regarding demonstration/presentation dates or weeks as well as expected contracting timeline?

The University’s goal is to hold demos during the 2nd and/or 3rd week of February, but this is subject to change depending on the number of responses received and the length of time it takes for that review.

47. Background Information – Does the current system incorporate any differences in how the System and various member institutions leverage the application or do all institutions leverage the applications the same way?

The current system delivery and usage is standard and uniform across all institutions.

48. Background Information – Is there a desire to change the way planning is performed or to incorporate differences in the way the System or member institutions would prefer to plan in the future? If so, can the University elaborate on these differences?

The desire is to evaluate the functionality provided by the next generation EPM tools and consider design options.

49. Background Information – Can the University detail the expectation and expected process this project if this project is expected to include any strategic funding request, budget requests and budget transfers in addition to the described position requests?

See Exhibit A, tab 3 Budgeting Process and tab 4 Long Range Planning.

50. Background Information – Given the Hyperion footprint and reference to LRPPLN, are/have there been any tools outside of Hyperion Planning such as Hyperion Strategic Finance being leveraged within the System?

Currently there are no additional Hyperion tools other than Planning in use.

51. Background Information – Does the University have any enterprise reporting or business intelligence tools that are owned or leveraged within the University and are these available to be leveraged as part of this project?

Yes, see Background Information Section 3: Cognos and Tableau.

52. Background Information – Can the University provide the expected total users and breakdown by users for the following types in order for us to best provide detailed licensing costs and understand the rollout?

The new solution users’ population is dependent on design and capabilities of the selected product, so the information provided here is related to the current system and is for reference only.
a) Administrator User
Current system has two (2) admin users assigned.

b) Frequent Input User (Daily/weekly read/write users)
The usage of the current system is dependent on the budgeting season. Within the budgeting season it is expected to have 300 concurrent users, out of the budgeting season the access will vary from a few users up to couple of hundreds at a given time.

c) Infrequent Input User (once per month for example)
This statistic is not currently available.

d) Reporting/View Only User
Read only (reporting users) 125 users.

53. Req ID 3.55 & 56: Is Grant budgeting a requirement in the initial phase?
No.

54. Evaluation and Criteria for Award of Proposal - Is the University willing to contract independently for software/subscriptions and professional services if a third party is expected to be leveraged for implementation, does the University desire to contract with only one party or is the University open to any arrangement that is in the best interests of the University.
This specific RFP is for product acquisition.

55. Evaluation and Criteria for Award of Proposal - Can the University provide the weighting criteria for which this response will be evaluated and related weights?
The evaluation criteria is outlined in section 11 of the RFP Word document. We are not disclosing weights for each of these criteria and they are not listed in any particular order.

56. Does the University System (“University) have an approved Budget for this RFP? If so, how much?
The University does not release budgetary information during an open RFP process.

57. Was there an RFI done in advance of this RFP release?
No.

58. Since Hyperion On Premise has been the University standard since FY14, what would preclude the University from moving to Oracle's Cloud products via this RFP?
If Oracle chooses to submit a response to this RFP, it will be evaluated the same as the other proposals.

59. Does the University plan on integrating security with LDAP/Active directory?
Yes.

60. Does the University plan on integrating security with Single Sign-On?
Yes.

61. Since the University appears to open to on-premises, SaaS, or hosted budgeting solutions, does the University have a current hosting environment (Azure, AWS, etc.) or onsite server environments with available storage for software?
No, the University is expecting the solution provider to include the preferred SaaS hosting provider as part of the proposal.

62. And does the University prefer how to consume the Budgeting software? Perpetual (Purchase with larger Year 1 Software spend and annual Maintenance at ~20% of Purchase price), SaaS (Software rental at fixed annual amount for a duration of time), Hosted (could do SaaS or Perpetual with 3rd party hosting) or Installed On Premise (supported by UM IT Servers)?
The University is open to options which should be included as part of your pricing proposal.

63. Does the University have an IT staff responsible for server/software uptime and software upgrades?
Yes, the current IT team is responsible for the operation, management and support of the current EPM system and will be available for the next generation EPM solution.
64. In a hosted software environment option, does the university have preference for a single-tenant hosted environment over a multi-tenant environment (colocation of software, so the limited system resources are provided to the most demanding “neighbor”)?
   The University prefers a single-tenant environment but is open to options depending on cost, security, other resource demands and performance comparisons.

65. In a hosted environment, does the University require a specific guaranteed uptime as it pertains to the cloud environment with service credits if the uptime isn’t met vs unaccountable SLAs?
   Yes.

66. In a Disaster scenario, would the University prefer “best efforts” to recover the data or specific stated objectives to the minute to ensure rapid and a stable operation?
   The University is open to evaluating all the options.

67. When the data is at rest (especially when handling sensitive Employee data), is data encryption preferred to other methods like “encoded” which leaves a higher security risk?
   The planning and budgeting process does not include sensitive data so the need for higher security is not anticipated.

68. How many power users (perform the tasks of basic end users, plus ability to perform model building tasks such as building new or modifying existing reports/dashboards, drivers, calculations, and metrics) or admins (full access to manage all aspects of the system) do you expect to have access to the software? Will the system be managed by the system budget office?
   Based on how the current system is being managed, the University is expecting to have about eight (8) power users managed by the centralized system budget office.

69. Is the long-range plan prepared by the central budget office, or decentralized? How does this long-range planning process differ from LRPPLN?
   Currently the long-range plan process is managed by the central office and completed at the business unit/institution with a couple of key finance staff at those locations. The future long-range plan design may be similar or may be more decentralized.
   LRPPLN: Is a three-year long-range planning application currently used by a single campus, which eventually will migrate its functionality to the system-wide long-range planning solution.

70. Did the University employ the services of an outside consult in the drafting of this RFP?
   a) If so, which one(s)?
   b) And are they precluded from responding to this RFP?
   The University did not employ the services of an outside consulting firm to draft the RFP.

71. Is the University anticipating that it will enter into contract negotiations once the vendor has been selected?
   Yes.

72. Do you currently use Hyperion PSPB (Public Sector Planning and Budgeting) module?
   No.

73. Is your expectation to purchase the software directly from the RFP responder or does the option exist for you to purchase the software directly from the selling brand (Oracle, IBM, OneStream etc.)?
   The intent of this RFP is to award a product that meets our requirements and is determined to be the “best fit” for the University.

74. What time buckets do you budget at (by month or by quarter)?
   The current budget process is by fiscal period (month) but other options might be considered with a new implementation.

75. Does the University forecast monthly, quarterly, or some other frequency?
   The current forecast process is updated monthly, with some units utilizing on a quarterly basis.
76. What version is PeopleSoft?

   Financials:
   - Application: 9.2
   - PeopleTools: 8.57

   Human Resources:
   - Application: 9.2
   - PeopleTools 8.57 (8.55 currently, but will be upgraded by the time of award)

   Campus Solutions:
   - Application: 9.2
   - PeopleTools 8.56

As a point of clarification, the version of the ERP system is not relevant as all data integrations to/from the next EPM solution will be done through ETL processes and staging tables in the data warehouse system that isolates the source and target systems related to the EPM system.

77. What is the University’s General Ledger (GL) Chart Fields (Funds, Accounts, Departments, etc.)?

This question appears to be focused on implementation details, and it is expected that the details related here are dependent on design and capabilities of the selected product, so the information provided here pertains to the current system is for reference only.

   a) Please provide a full count of members for each Chart Field.
   Please review Table 1 in the Exhibit A document to identify the potential number of chartfields by combining the number of members of the related dimensions.

   b) Is there one COA for both budgeting and actuals (GL) or are multiple COAs being used?
   The current system has a global COA definition and it is used at the same level for all data (Budget, Actuals, Forecast, etc.) stored in the EPM system. The COA definition (tree level, number of members, etc.) could be different between the GL source system and the EPM system, so Actual data between the two systems could be stored at different levels.

   c) Does the University use different COAs for different FY and budgeted years?
   The current system has a global COA definition, and each FY uses the COA needed.

   d) Do all campuses use the same COA?
   The current system has a global COA definition, and each campus uses the COA needed.

78. What GL segments and non-GL segments are used in budget development (such as funds, programs, projects and departments etc.)?

   Please see Section 3 Table 1 of the RFP.

79. Does the University currently use Budget Requests process to capture narrative descriptions of each program?
   Can you please provide a sample request form?

   No, this is not part of the current process.

80. How many years are planned for during budget development?

   The current process includes the plan for the next fiscal year, and for one campus a three-year long-range planning, however the future expectation is to implement the plan for the next year and budget/project for the next five years.

81. What calendar year does the University use (Fiscal Year or Calendar Year)?

   a) Is there any campus or department that is an exception to this (do all the University campuses/departments use the same year system? Is there a requirement for the solution to provide both Fiscal and Calendar year option?)

   As indicated in the RFP, the University uses the Fiscal Year Calendar (July 1st through June 30th), and it is standard for all system units.

82. When does the University start personnel Budgeting process?

   This process starts in late January, but this question appears to be focused on implementation details and this specific RFP is for product acquisition.
83. Does the University assume all existing and vacant position start dates are the first day of the Budget year?
   No, but this question appears to be focused on implementation details and this specific RFP is for product acquisition.

84. Does the University employ any pool or shared positions or are all the positions single encumbrance?
   Yes, the current process uses multiple pool positions to allocate specific costs.

85. Currently, does the University allocate position/employee cost to multi-fund, department, grants and/or projects?
   Yes, the current budgeting model includes a department/position/employee multi-fund and project model allocation.

86. Does the University currently use Commitment Control (PeopleSoft KK Ledger)?
   Yes. However, it is expected that the KK configuration will not impact the budget planning process as the integration of the EPM system will be done through an ETL process.

87. Is the KK ledger for PeopleSoft currently configured?
   Yes.

88. Does the University do any Capital Expense Planning?
   Yes, currently at a very high level.

89. Does the University do any planning or budgeting for Grants?
   Yes, currently at a very high level in PeopleSoft.

90. Do you expect to go through a reports rationalization process to lower the expected number of reports?
   Yes, the University is expecting to conduct this task as part of the implementation process.

91. Is Budget Book Creation process in scope?
   Yes, but this question appears to be focused on implementation details and this specific RFP is for product acquisition.

92. Does the University prefer to utilize our direct connection capability vs. loading via flat files?
   Yes, based on the frequency of the current processes and the size of the data involved it is in the University’s best interest to continue utilizing any direct connection capabilities provided out-of-the-box to access relational tables vs. using flat files. The current implementation does not use any flat files to upload metadata or import/export data.

93. Are there any other systems other than PS GL, CS and HCM that the proposed solution will need to integrate/interact with?
   No, current integration with external systems is done through the ETL system via staging relational tables, and the University is expecting to continue using the same approach.

94. Does the University expect onsite or offsite support services?
   The University is open to options for support services.

95. Does the University have an existing support desk that the vendor should integrate with or the University expects that the vendor can utilize its own support desk?
   Yes, end users have a mechanism for support internally that will continue. Administrators would need a mechanism to escalate issues to the vendor.

96. Does the University expect to have a full-time dedicated support manager?
   Yes.

97. Is an Oracle software combined solution up for consideration? Our solution requires Essbase, either using existing Essbase or upgrade to 19c
   The University is open to evaluate any on-prem or cloud solution that includes any multidimensional database system as a back-end infrastructure for data storage and calculation engine.
98. **What is your current version of Essbase and Planning?**
   Please refer to RFP.

99. **Do you have a standard web application server?**
   No, it depends on a software vendors’ specifications.

100. **Is this a subscription based or perpetual license opportunity?**
    The University is open to evaluate license options.

101. **What parts of your current planning system do you use?**
    a) Web Forms?
    b) Workflow?
    c) Task Lists?
    The University is currently using all of these.

102. **Is your current planning application built in classic or EPMA?**
    The current implementation does not include EPMA.

103. **What type of Data Management and Load functionality are you looking for?**
    The University is open to evaluating options.

104. **Are you looking for one vendor to provide this functionality out-of-the-box with configurable features or are you open to multiple vendors with a custom-built solution?**
    The University prefers a single vendor offering a product providing all the required functionality out-of-box and minimizing any custom-built solution as much as possible. However, the University may choose to award separate modules to multiple respondents.

105. **Will the University evaluate implementation partners separately?**
    Yes.

106. **In exhibit A requirement 3.08: “Does the Solution support multiple General Ledger account structures and reporting segments within the account” can you please provide an example?**
    An example would be an account tree structure that is more detailed for budgeting and a separate but related account tree structure at a higher level for long range planning.

107. **Does the University have a preference for excel interface vs web interface?**
    The University would like to have both as primary options to address a variety of users.

108. **Will you accept redlines or exceptions to the General Terms and Conditions of this RFP? If so, how can a bidder submit exceptions or redlines?**
    Redlines or exceptions noted to the General Terms and Conditions are fine and should be marked and included with the response.

109. **Page 10 says that all confidential information claimed to be exempt should be marked and cited. Page 19 states that confidential information exempt from disclosure should be submitted in a separate envelope. Which instruction should bidders follow for their confidential information exempt from disclosure?**
    Either way is acceptable. All documentation is subject to the open records laws once an award is made so the University’s General Counsel’s Office needs a way to easily identify what is considered to be exempt from all open records requests.
110. Can a bidder submit a copy of its Subscription Services Agreement for review? Or will the University not consider a bidder’s contract document?

If a separate Subscription Services Agreement is required to be executed, it should be submitted with the RFP response.

111. Are credit card payments required? Or will the University consider payment by check for invoices (if a final agreement is entered)?

The University can pay by check.

112. Are ink signatures required on the final submission? Or will the University accept a digital signature on the hard copy that is mailed for consideration?

A digital signature is acceptable.

113. Does University of Missouri System campuses currently practice position-based budgeting?

Yes.

114. Does the University of Missouri System currently budget fringe benefits by position? If so, what methodology is used?

Yes, the University budgets both a flat rate and a percent of salary for benefits.

115. Does each campus have a separate planning calendar/process, or is this driven by the System?

The System sets high level deadlines and expectations but each campus has its own deadlines within the master calendar.

116. Will the System Office manage the maintenance, administration and development of the solution?

Yes.

117. Will the System office manage the data integration for all campuses?

Yes.

118. Will the System office administer security for all campuses?

Yes, most likely.

119. Does each campus leverage the same hierarchies for the chart of accounts?

Yes.

120. Req ID 1.13: Does University of Missouri System require the import of security definition by user?

Yes.

121. Req ID 2.21: Please provide the use case for allocations. Does this only apply to the implementation of RCM, or does it apply to other solutions (planning processes)?

This is not related to RCM but rather the core capability of allocation by seasonality, year-total evenly by period, percentage based, etc.
122. **Req ID 3.02:** What level of GL Acct planning is required for projecting the balance sheet? Would this be required for the initial budgeting solution?

Yes, it would probably be needed with the initial implementation but at a rolled-up level of the GL accounts.

123. **Req ID 3.55 & 56:** Is Grant data currently tracked in the same ERP as GL data.

Yes.

---
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