GMU-1629-20, Process Improvement in the Financial Division

Date: 1/22/20

Responses in red.

1. Is there a desired project length (i.e., start and end date)? Are there any critical organizational milestones / deadlines that need to be met (e.g., board meetings)?

   GMU aspires that the consultants complete this effort within about 4 to 6 months; however, this is not a firm timeframe. We look to each respondent to illustrate their preferred scope and timeline, with justification.

2. Has budget been allocated for this project? What is the available budget?

   Funds are allocated for this effort. Consultants should provide budgets that are efficient and demonstrate respect for the consumption of Commonwealth resources.

3. Would Mason accept a fixed fee price for tasks 1-4 and a rate card for task 5?

   To quote the RFP: “For defined tasks (1 – 4) please provide hourly rates and final costs. Rates may be a blended hourly rate or broken down by level of expertise (Partner, Senior Executive, Junior Executive, etc.)”

   One fixed fee for tasks 1 through 4 is acceptable. Hourly rates, per above, are required.

4. We understand we will be working with UBC on this initiative. How involved will UBC and other stakeholders be in the project? How will George Mason University staff this effort? How many resources will be allocated to this initiative?

   University Business Consulting (UBC), Mason’s internal management consulting practice, will partner with the selected Firm for this effort. UBC further will serve as client leadership for this project, representing the sponsoring executives. The selected Firm is expected to engage UBC as such a partner and sponsor.

   As noted on page 4, UBC will facilitate consultants’ efforts, participating in key project efforts, such as regular project meetings, project updates, and review of findings. The vast majority of the work, such as data collection, analyses, and project management, however, is expected to be completed by the awarded Firm.

   Fiscal Services staff will be available for interviews and process reviews to facilitate completion of the project.

5. For the 6 general information requirements, are there any page limits for each section?

   There are no explicit page limits for the items in the General Information section. However, pithiness is both expected and appreciated. Lengthy responses are not.
6. What specific impetus, if any, is driving the specific need for process improvements? (e.g., planned structural changes to the University, specific issues/areas of concern, new partnerships, etc.)

George Mason University sees the opportunity to improve many of its core processes. This project is part of that effort. There are extensive manual forms and laborious processes with opportunities to streamline and automate.

7. As we plan for the process assessment, should we assume that we are looking only at key processes within the Finance Division or should we also assume that we are to review process inputs and other sub-processes that originate within the Colleges and Schools?

The primary focus is on processes within the Central Finance Division, including an inventory of key processes. However, many of these processes will intersect schools and units, and those interactions should be included if they are germane to the analyses and central processes, although all such contact would need to be planned through Fiscal Services leadership or UBC.

8. What is the timeline in which the University wants to implement recommendations from the engagement and ideally when would all of our work commence?

See question 1 above. Work would commence as soon as contracting can be completed. Projects will be prioritized based on available funding and resources.

9. Who will be the recipient of the recommendations and results of the engagement? (e.g., how will results be presented to leadership)

The sponsoring executive for this effort is Deb Dickenson, Vice President for Finance. Initial recommendations and results will be presented to Deb, the AVP for Business Services, Controller Sharon Heinle, and UBC. Final results and recommendations will be presented thereafter to Carol Kissal, Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration, among others.

10. Could you provide more details regarding the role of University Business Consulting? (e.g., will they assist with scheduling interviews and gathering documents, will there be regular check-ins, will they be attending meetings, is there prior work performed by UBC that will need to be incorporated or reviewed?)

See question #4 above.

11. We would like to get a sense of urgency on this project, so we can make proper recommendations for staffing and timeline(s). Is the Financial Division more interested in a continuous effort that spans over the course of weeks or months - improve processes one at a time or in small batches in order of priority, or is the Financial Division intending for a faster turnaround of the entire project that might require many processes being improved simultaneously?

See question 1 above for project timing. This project is about identifying, analyzing, and providing recommendations regarding key processes, some large and complex, others less so. Recommendations are expected to vary in length and complexity. We expect that the recommended efforts in their entirety may take significant time to implement. Consultants should organize and prioritize these improvement efforts as their expertise and understanding dictates.

12. Does GMU have any existing flowcharts or process narratives for the processes performed by the ten functional groups, or will the process-level maps referred to in the RFP need to be developed from scratch?

Some prior analyses do exist, but it is limited or may be somewhat out of date. Processes are expected to be developed by the consultants as necessary and appropriate.
13. Will the benchmarking referred to in the RFP be the first benchmarking performed by GMU? If not, when was the last benchmarking performed?

   The selected Firm is expected to perform the benchmarking requested.

14. Are there existing policies and procedures that can be shared?

   Please see George Mason University Fiscal Services website for policies, procedures and forms; the CAPP manual; and https://universitypolicy.gmu.edu/responsible-office/fiscal-services/

15. Have there been any internal or external audit reports that have resulted in recommendations to change existing processes or controls? If so, what were they and have such changes been implemented?

   Any applicable audit reports will be shared with the selected Firm as appropriate or necessary.

16. What reports or feedback does the UBC have in regards to the existing processes and underlying systems?

   UBC will share feedback and input to the selected Firm. Any applicable reports will be shared with the selected Firm as appropriate or necessary.

17. Does GMU have a data classification policy?

   GMU policies are available on our website: https://universitypolicy.gmu.edu/policies-by-category/

18. If GMU had to pick only one desired outcome on this project from two options listed below, which would GMU prefer? Cost savings; or Higher service levels from the groups.

   Efficiency and Effectiveness, resulting in a better working environment, risk reduction, and potential savings, achieved both directly and indirectly.

19. What types of software applications are used by each functional group?

   Our core finance system is Banner. Other software applications are used within Finance and across the university, including Commonwealth-oriented systems, such as Cardinal, TRS, eVA, and so forth. Applicable information will be shared with the selected Firm.

20. Would GMU be open to acquiring new systems as part of the recommendations from this project?

   We are not implementing a new ERP at this time. Other systems would be considered provided they maintain compatibility with current systems and do not create duplicative “shadow” systems. We are open to recommendations for opportunities to automate core process functionality (i.e., forms and ability to integrate into Banner and/or Cardinal).

   Consultants, however, should not view this project as a gateway to selling add-on Firm-connected technology solutions or related support services. Such recommendations, unless evidenced as an overwhelmingly clear and efficient solution to process inefficiencies as identified through this project, may not be perceived positively.

21. Are any operations off-shored or outsourced? If so, please provide the function and overview of any third-party provider services provided.

   No.
22. Have there been any recent software application implementations that have resulted in updates/changes to the functional groups and their respective processes? Are there any planned software implementations in conjunction with this RFP?

None of consequence. Some software enhancements are being contemplated, and this information will be shared with the selected Firm. However, please see the notation in question 20 above.

23. Since GMU is requesting recommendations for possible changes to the existing processes and structure, what “change management” activities are being deployed by GMU stakeholders as part of this RFP?

Such change management efforts would need to be determined based upon both the analyses and recommendations form this effort, as well as the implementation efforts selected.

24. Change management is not explicitly stated in the RFP; however, which areas does GMU leadership and the UBC believe will need the most “change management” attention?

See the answer to question 23 above.

25. What prompted the University to undertake the process improvement initiative in the Financial Division?

George Mason University has experienced significant growth over the past 10-15 years. As common among rapidly-growing organizations, business processes often are not re-evaluated or improved to keep up with such growth or technology advances. As a result, we see ample opportunity to make improvements in these areas.

26. What are the top priorities of the listed deliverables?

We are not sure that we understand this question. The RFP notes that consultants are to identify and recommend deliverables, which will be used to launch performance improvement efforts.

27. What are the timelines for the deliverables to be completed?

See questions 1 and 11 above.

28. Have there been previous attempts to complete the same initiative that were not successful?

Process reviews and analyses have been conducted in pocketed areas of the Finance Division in the past. An overarching approach like this one has not been completed previously.

29. How has staff been prepared for the review and interactive process?

Finance staff will be informed of this effort. It is expected that the consultants would assist in providing information, engagement, and other change management-related efforts as appropriate once this effort commences.

30. Does the initiative have the full support of the President’s Office?

Yes.

31. The terms “major process” and “process” can describe a wide range of activities with varying scopes. For example, the “core” process of Student Accounts may include the following “business processes”: Tuition and Fees Determination, Assessment, Billing, Payment, Accounts Receivable, Refunds, Deferrals, Service Charging, Payment Plans, Holds, Collections, etc. Does the scope of each of the 20 - 30 potential processes
GMU is referencing align with the description of a business process above? If not, would you please describe the scope of a process referenced above and provide some examples?

Yes and no. The 20-30 processes should not be too narrowly focused, as some of the above examples would be. However, “Student Accounts” does indeed include many processes, and would certainly be considered more than one process, but less than the 11 discrete items named above, as an example.

32. To what extent does any business process documentation already exist for the 20-30 processes to be selected for mapping and assessment, and to what extent does GMU anticipate that the vendor will be able to leverage any of these materials (if they do exist)?

See question 12 above.

33. Will the 20-30 processes selected for mapping (and potential improvement) be determined and confirmed by GMU prior to project launch, or is their selection expected to be an iterative process with the vendor?

We have some ideas of key areas of foci, but we would want to finalize the list of potential processes to pursue with the selected consultants.

34. What are GMU’s expectations around the vendor conducting benchmarking? As part of this project, is the vendor expected to conduct meetings, interviews, etc., with other institutions, particularly those Virginia Tier 3 universities?

Yes, as practicable. We recommend that the submitting Firms outline their expectation in this effort – perhaps in a few levels of potential benchmarking effort – in terms of breadth of research and the time required.

35. In addition to Banner, are there other systems or technologies that interface with and/or are significantly utilized by the Finance Division?

There are other supporting software applications in use in the Finance Division. Specifics will be discussed with the selected Firm. Also see question 19 above.

36. Will key stakeholders (i.e., process owners and power users) be made available within reasonable timeframes (1-2 business days) for initial and follow-up meetings as necessary to inform the vendor’s comprehensive process mapping efforts?

Yes, as practicable.

37. Is there an individual or group of individuals to whom deliverables will be presented? Does GMU anticipate that this person or group will serve as a project sponsor or as part of a Steering Committee? Does GMU have any other expectations around project governance, including regular formal check-ins or presentations with particular leadership or other constituency groups?

See questions 4 and 9 above. Project check-ins should be frequent and informative, specifics to be recommended by the selected Firm and coordinated with UBC.

38. Does GMU prefer a particular format (e.g., Microsoft Word, Visio, PowerPoint, or other) in which interim process maps / deliverables and final deliverables should be created and shared?

Process Maps should be in MS-Visio. MS-Word, MS-Excel, and MS-PowerPoint are preferred applications for deliverables.
39. Does GMU have an expected or anticipated budget in mind for this project?

See question 2 above.

40. What are George Mason University’s (GMU) overall goals for the contract for each of the performance years? Does GMU have certain areas that they have already identified as being a high priority for improvement?

See question 33 above.

41. Are the organization charts posted on GMU’s website current? What is the size and current organizational structure of University Business Consulting (UBC) and what is the approximate size of each of GMU’s Finance functional groups?

Most organizational charts are current. A new position, AVP and Controller, has been added and the related realignment is not yet reflected in the posted Fiscal Services org charts. Sizes of the varying finance units vary.

42. What are the specific project management deliverables requirements outside of the overall schedule (i.e. status reports, status meetings, regular schedule updates, etc.)?

It is expected that the selected Firm would maintain and apply a proven methodology and tools for project management, updates, and information exchange. That should be proposed.

43. Based on reviewing page 14 section M and page 15 section V of the sample contract, are contractors expected to use their own laptops and company email addresses to complete their work?

Yes.

44. What are the major applications/software/systems that are currently being used within each functional group in GMU’s Finance Division?

See question 35 above.

45. We are looking to pursue this opportunity but had a question around using GMU adjunct staff on the proposal. We have a staff member who is an adjunct professor in the university - can you please let us know if we are able to bid the staff person on our team? If it could potentially disqualify us, we would rather NOT make them as part of the team.

No, you cannot use a GMU adjunct staff member in providing these services.

46. What is the relationship between functional groups and process areas? Are the 20-30 processes across all the functional groups, or for each functional group? If in total, that would imply approximately 2 processes per functional group, is this correct?

See question 31 above.

47. Is there a level 1 map for each functional group, to identify the processes selected for improvement? Who will be performing this activity (e.g., Fiscal Services, contractor, etc.)?

See question 33 above. If necessary, the selected Firm would develop maps.

48. How long will it take to select the processes for further drill down and improvement?
There is no timetable for selection of which process improvement efforts are selected following this project. See question 11 above regarding timeline for potential implementation efforts.

49. What are your current Finance division IT systems (e.g., Banner, etc.), tools, etc.?

See question 35 above.

50. For the small business subcontracting plan (attachment B), will Mason consider allowing the bidder to identify the small business upon award?

No. This should be indicated in the response, as it is part of the scoring matrix.

51. For the 10 - 11 functional groups identified, what is the estimated total number of people involved?

Sizes of the varying finance units vary

52. Have stakeholders outside of Finance been made aware of this effort and the possibility of their inclusion in process mapping sessions?

Some have. Others will need to be informed should their involvement be relevant.

53. What is Mason’s desired timetable for this project?

See question 1 above.

54. What is the state of existing process documentation?

See question 28 above.

55. What level of involvement does Mason expect in the peer benchmarking? Does Mason have a preferred list of peer institutions? If yes, who are your peer institutions?

See questions 13 and 34 above. We can provide a list of peer institutions to the selected Firm.

56. Please provide an overview of Mason’s current IT systems environment for the University, including the names of specific systems in use.

See questions 35 and 20 above.

57. Please provide a list of technology tools currently used by Mason’s Finance Division.

See questions 35 and 20 above.

58. Are there any major system changes or updates/upgrades planned in the next 12 - 24 months?

See questions 35 and 20 above.

59. What is the current status of Mason’s transition to Banner 9, XE?

Mason is using Banner 9 as of September 2018. (XE was one of the “names” of Banner 9 previously).
60. Will there be reports on the Financial Division that can be shared with the successful firm?

Yes. Also see question 28 above.

61. Please provide more information on University Business Consulting (UBC). We were unable to find information on the UBC on Mason’s website or elsewhere.

See question 4 above.

62. Will Mason consider modifications to the Standard Terms and Conditions that are consistent with industry standards in connection with professional services agreements for the type of services contemplated? Such modifications would be identified as exceptions in our proposal, which would include, but not necessarily be limited to, requests for: inclusion of a limitation of liability; modification of the indemnification obligations, and clarification regarding responsibility for payment of attorneys’ fees.

Please refer to section IV of the RFP.

63. Please confirm that Section VIII (Small Business Subcontracting Plan) of the RFP only impacts Section XIV of the RFP (Initial Evaluation Criteria and Subsequent Award) if the prime bidder is a small, minority, or woman-owned business—in which case they receive up to five points. If this is not accurate, please clarify.

To receive the 5 points the firm submitting the proposal must be certified by Virginia SBSD at the time of proposal submission.

64. We are sending our proposal to you via FedEx. Do we use this address location: Suite 4200 of Alan and Sally Merten Hall (Merten Hall), Fairfax Campus? Please confirm or clarify the delivery address for FedEx/UPS. Is there a street address that we should include to ensure successful delivery?

Please refer to the RFP cover page.

65. If the addendum containing bidder questions and answers is not issued on Wednesday, 1/22 as anticipated, will Mason adjust the proposal due date accordingly?

Yes.

66. Do you have a budget estimate or not-to-exceed threshold for this project that you can share? If yes, please provide detail.

See question 2 above.

67. Has GMU contracted with any individual(s) or firm(s) in the past few years that has provided services similar to those services requested in this RFP? If so, please identify them and their relationship to this RFP, including if they can bid on this RFP.

See question 28 above. Moreover, in our view it is inappropriate for GMU to identify specific historic Firms, Firms bidding in this process, or their applicability to bid, outside of publicly-available information.

68. What is your budget for this project?

See question 2 above.
69. Does GMU currently use or possess license(s) to industry standard process mapping software (e.g., iGRAFx or Visio)? If so, will this software be available to the consultant? If not, will you consider purchasing or licensing this or similar software?

See question 38 above. Other software packages are possible, but not necessarily preferred. Moreover, they must be affordable, appropriate, and essential.

70. For the benchmarking research among higher education institutions (Task 2), are there any geographic or other restrictions to our choice of institutions to contact? If so, please identify.

See questions 13 and 34 above. We can provide a list of peer institutions to the selected Firm.

71. Does GMU currently use or license any task automation software, such as UiPath or Automation Anywhere? If so, please identify the software and how it is currently used. If not, would GMU consider such software if recommended by the consultant?

See question 38 above. Other software packages are possible, but not necessarily preferred. Moreover, they must be affordable, appropriate, and essential.

72. Please identify the major software systems/products and their current purpose that the Finance Division is currently using.

See questions 35 and 20 above.

73. What capability and/or expertise does GMU currently have with Lean and Six Sigma tools and methods? Will this be available to the consultant?

UBC maintains expertise in Lean and consulting methodologies. See question 4 above for UBC interaction with the selected Firm. In addition, if a proposing Firm is contemplating application of such methodologies, it is expected that the Firm possess such skills.

74. Is there an anticipated contract award date?

As soon as possible after the completion of the RFP process.

75. Are tasks 1-4 under Section XI (Statement of Needs) to be executed with in the first year base period, with Task 5 being reserved as an hourly support component for all subsequent option years (if exercised)? How does GMU envision the execution of the tasks within its stated contract period of performance (PoP)?

Tasks 1 to 4 should be executed based upon the timeline you propose. Applicability and timeframes for Task 5 have not been determined.

76. What software(s) are currently, and planned, for use with in the Finance Division relevant to this RFP? Can you list/describe what/which software(s) may be developed internally to GMU or are commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS)?

See questions 35 and 20 above.

77. Does GMU have a preference for the use of a particular process mapping software, including file type(s) for presentation/demonstration? For example, software(s) could include Microsoft Visio, Lucidchart, Cacoo, or a variety of others, with file types being reflective of Visio [.vsdx], Word [.docx], Adobe [.pdf], and others.
See question 71 above.

78. Does GMU use (and intend to use) an internal/enterprise shared drive, cloud solutions, or only localized machines for data and information storage for the resulting products of this contract?

   GMU maintains shared drives for information storage and exchange. However, consultants may propose alternate tools for information storage and exchange, if affordable, accessible, and practical.

79. Is there an incumbent currently or historically for financial analyses such as demonstrated within this RFP, or is this a new effort?

   See question 28 above.

80. Is there an expected overlap of contractor efforts between this RFP and the solicitation currently under review per GMU-1593-19? If there is overlap, can you please describe the intended nature and expectations of the operating circumstances, contractor engagements, and product relevance from contract to contract?

   No.

81. If relevant per question above (regarding GMU-1593-19), what is the anticipated contract award date for this Financial Consulting/Advisory Services contract (i.e., GMU-1593-19)?

   N/A.

82. Will GMU provide on-site working space for the contractor during site visits, as needed? Can you please advise how many seats may be available to the contractor during the performance of this contract? It is also assumed that the majority of the contract work will be performed off-site in contractor facilities. Can GMU also confirm that this is correct?

   GMU will provide working space for the consultants. Significant onsite time is expected, as the nature of this work requires frequent and ongoing interaction with Finance Division and UBC professionals.

83. Does GMU have a funding threshold for this contract, in particular for Tasks 1-4 for what is assumed to be accomplished entirely in the first/base year period?

   See question 2 above.

84. In Section XIII Proposal Preparation and Submission Subsection A.2 on page 6, Mason states that proposals should be bound in a single volume. Does Mason intend for that volume to also include fees, as well as Attachments A and B

   Yes.

85. In Section XIII Proposal Preparation and Submission Subsection B.3 on page 7, Mason states that Offerors must provide Overall timeline for completing the work for this engagement. Does Mason have any requirements regarding the presentation of this timeline?

   Other than clarity, no.

86. In Section XIII Proposal Preparation and Submission Subsection B.3 on page 7, Mason states that Offerors must provide Expected Staff for this engagement. Does Mason require that vendors provide resumes for their Expected Staff?
Demonstrated relevant capabilities and experience for expected key personnel is strongly recommended.

87. In Section XIII Proposal Preparation and Submission Subsection B.3 on page 7, Mason states page limits to Executive Summary and General firm background and information. Does Mason also require a page limit to the General Information or References and Engagements sections?

There are no explicit page limits for the items in the General Information section. However, pithiness is both expected and appreciated. Lengthy responses are not.

88. In Section XIII Proposal Preparation and Submission Subsection B.3 on page 7, Mason states that Offerors must provide References of three engagements. Does Mason require any specific information on those references, such as contract dollar amount, contract number, or point of contact (email, phone, address)?

At a minimum, please provide the reference’s institution, nature of the prior interactions/work, and point of contact.

89. In Section XIII Proposal Preparation and Submission Subsection B.3.e Expected Staff for this Engagement on Page 7, does Mason expect full resumes for each expected staff member working on the engagement or just the key personnel expected staff?

See question 86 above.

90. In Attachment C Sample Contract (beginning on page 12), Could Mason confirm this is provided for Offerors to review the General Terms & Conditions and not to complete or include Attachment C in their response?

Correct, you do not need to sign this sample contract. Also see section IV of the RFP.

91. The RFP states that 20-30 high level process maps are necessary. Is the stated process required for each of the divisions listed on page 4, section 10 or is it 20-30 total for all areas?

20 to 30 for all areas. Please also see question 31 above.

92. Regarding the International Tax and Compliance, is this done across multiple countries? If so, how many and which geographic regions?

International Tax Office provides assistance to all international students where additional information is available at our website. Sprintax non-resident tax preparation software is provided free to all international students. We are not filing international returns. https://fiscal.gmu.edu/internationaltax/

93. What role will University Business Consulting (UBC) occupy in relation to the contractor?

See question 4 above.

94. Is this a new contract or is there an incumbent?

New contract.

95. If there is an incumbent please provide their name.

N/A.
96. Regarding task 2 subpoint 1: Please elaborate on how some industry best practices would not be applicable with Commonwealth reporting and/or operation requirements?

As an agency of the Commonwealth of Virginia, there are statutory operational, reporting, and other requirements that necessitate certain business processes. These are varied across the institution. Such requirements will need to be considered in analyses and recommendation development for process improvements.

97. Do you have a current organizational chart for all staff members of the Finance Organization?

See question 41 above.

98. Please provide the number of people currently on staff in each department listed in Section X Background Page 4 of the RFP.

See question 41 above.

99. Are the line items in the RFP Page 4 section XI Statement of Needs Section expected to occur over the full one-year initial contract period (and subsequent one-year renewals) or should the RFP Statement of Needs Section be completed within a fraction of the first year?

See question 75 above.

100. Are the 20-30 processes (RFP Page 4 Section XI Statement of Needs Section) applicable per each functional group or should the 20-30 processes be divided amongst the full list of functional groups?

See question 91 above.

101. Please provide a list of your most utilized Information Technology software packages across departments (example: accounting systems, procurement systems, financial reporting systems)?

See questions 19 and 35 above.

102. Is there an incumbent company performing business process design services currently?

No.

103. What is the business case that is driving this solicitation for current release?

See question 25 above.

104. How often will onsite services be required (versus remote services) for Fairfax and other locations? (Reference Page 5 Section XII Cost of Services “…Travel expenses to other locations may be billed at cost…”)

See question 82 above.
105. Will SWaM or Small Business Certification be required for the prime contractor and the subcontractors or only the prime contractor? (Reference Page 3 Section VII SWaM Certification - Vendor agrees to fully support the Commonwealth of Virginia and Mason’s efforts related to SWaM goals. Upon contract execution, eligible vendors (as determined by Mason and the Department of Small Business and Supplier Diversity) shall submit all required documents necessary to achieve SWaM certification to the Department of Small Business and Supplier Diversity within 90 days.)

To receive the 5 points the vendor submitting the proposal must be certified at the time of submission.

106. Please explain Option #1 on Page 8 Section XVI Payment Terms / Method of Payment. Does the statement for Option #1 in the RFP mean that the vendor will need to establish a 2% discount per invoice for payments to be mailed within 10 days? (Reference Page 8 Section XVI Payment Terms / Method of Payment - Option #1- Payment to be mailed in 10 days-Mason will make payment to the vendor under 2%10 Net 30 payment terms. Invoices should be submitted via email to the designated Accounts Payable email address which is acctpay@gmu.edu.)

Yes.

107. There is an inconsistency with the RFP numbering on page 7 (Section XIII.B.3) where there are two sub-bullets with the letter ‘e’. Should the respondent assume that the second ‘e’ is an ‘f’?

Yes.

108. Can GMU specify the 20 to 30 processes within the 10 to 11 functional areas that they would like mapped? This will help us identify the best team for this project.

See questions 31 and 33 above.

109. Does the process mapping in Task One include only current state (i.e., no future state process mapping)?

Future state process mapping should be conducted as the consultant deems best. However, in our view, it seems most applicable to Task 3.

110. Can GMU clarify the anticipated role of the UBC in Tasks 0 to 4? Additionally, can GMU provide the level of effort and/or percent FTE that the UBC will support for the span of the project?

See question 4 above.

111. Can GMU provide an inventory of the systems they leverage to support financial processes at the University? Can GMU provide their current ERP system and release? Can GMU identify and provide an inventory of other software/technology that currently supports the 11 functional areas listed in the RFP outside of its ERP system?

See questions 19, 35, and 59 above.

112. Does GMU have an anticipated timeline for completion of this work?

See question 1 above.