

Finance Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Replacement & Analytics Upgrade RFP

Response to Vendor questions: September 4th, 2026

1) What has led to the replacement of ADP? Originally, this was slated for an integration phase 1, what areas are HPSJ unhappy with?

HPSJ is replacing the current HR/Payroll platform to meet modernization, integration, and automation goals required for ERP/FP&A transformation. The platform does not support deeply integrated HR/Payroll, Accounting, and analytics without significant workarounds. Key challenges include manual data entry and duplicate updates, manual leave monitoring and benefit eligibility checks, limited automation for hour-based premium logic, fragmented employee files and audit trails, and reporting/GL integration constraints. Stakeholder review determined full replacement in Phase 3 is needed to meet Attachment A objectives and reduce operational risk.

2) As HPSJ considers replacing ADP, which current HR and payroll processes are creating the greatest operational strain or risk? For example, are the biggest challenges related to manual data entry, leave tracking, benefits administration, payroll-to-GL processes, reporting, employee files, or recruiting and onboarding? Could you share a recent example of where the current process fell short?

Strain and risk areas include manual profile and compensation updates, manual leave and benefit eligibility monitoring, complex payroll-to-GL posting with minimal automation, limited real-time reporting on benefit and pay changes, recruiting and onboarding processes lacking duplicate detection and automated hiring flows, and limited employee self-service. For example, life-event benefit changes mid-cycle required manual intervention because eligibility checks were not automated. This caused retroactive premium deductions, GL corrections, employee escalations, and cross-team rework in HR, Payroll, and Finance.

3) With HR and payroll planned as Phase 3, what outcomes are most important for HPSJ to achieve through that phase? How will you measure success - greater payroll accuracy, faster processing, improved compliance, better employee self-service, reduced administrative effort, stronger reporting, or something else?

Important outcomes include full automation of HR and Payroll workflows, integrated benefits administration with real-time visibility, accurate and timely payroll and GL posting, improved employee experience via self-service, enhanced recruiting/onboarding automation, and smooth performance and compensation processes. Success is measured by a 90% reduction in manual touchpoints, 100% automation of eligibility and premium checks, <2% payroll error rate, no out-of-period GL corrections due to integration defects, same-day availability of pay/benefit change reporting, 80% adoption of self-service features, and 95%+ new-hire creation via applicant auto-population with strong duplicate-detection accuracy.

4) Do you have allocated budget or an annual spend you can share for the replacement of ADP?

We have an approved budget range for this initiative, but we're not sharing specific figures at this stage. We'd like to first understand your proposed solution, scope, and pricing structure to ensure alignment with our requirements.

5) Does HPSJ plan on replacing ADP for ATS/Recruiting, or is that expected to be an integration into the new HR/Payroll engine?

HPSJ prefers native or tightly integrated ATS capabilities within the new HR/Payroll/HCM platform. Certified partner ATS solutions are acceptable only if they meet all requirements such as duplicate detection, onboarding workflow, I-9 processing, resume parsing, and hire-profile auto-population without heavy custom integrations.

6) Regarding Attachment A, Item 8 (Employee Benefits), does HPSJ prefer a platform where talent acquisition capabilities - such as duplicate applicant detection, candidate onboarding, and resume parsing - are delivered natively within the core HCM engine, or are solutions utilizing certified partner applications within the platform's ecosystem acceptable to meet these specifications?

HPSJ prefers native HCM talent acquisition tools. Certified partner solutions are acceptable when they fully meet specifications out-of-the-box, are upgrade-safe, and require minimal custom workflow support.

7) Does HPSJ require a strictly unified, single-codebase architecture across ERP, FP&A, HR, and Payroll, or is a modular architecture using API-driven integrations between functional applications acceptable to fulfill the scope of services outlined in Attachment A, Item 6?

HPSJ does not require a single unified codebase. Modular architecture with strong APIs is acceptable if it provides reliable, real-time integration, supports disaster recovery, delivers financial and HR capabilities with minimal customization, and ensures long-term operational cohesion.

8) Regarding Attachment A, Items 7 and 8 (HR and Payroll Functional Requirements), what degree of complex logic for hour-based premium checks and benefit eligibility auto-enrollment is expected to be configurable standard out-of-the-box versus configured via custom workflows during implementation?

HPSJ expects these capabilities to be delivered out-of-the-box and fully configurable, including eligibility logic, life-event enrollment automation, premium adjustments, and effective-dating rules. Any additional logic should be handled via low-code/no-code configuration rather than custom development.

9) Regarding Attachment A, Item 8 (Automated Performance and Compensation Tools), does HPSJ require full position-based budget control - where compensation rules, job profiles, and position seats are managed as strict control objects independent of the individual employee - or is an employee-centric profile model sufficient to support compensation updates and evaluation dashboards?

HPSJ prefers position-based budget control for job profiles, compensation rules, and position seats managed independently of individuals. Employee-centric processes may supplement but not replace this core structure.

- 10) What is HPSJ's intended operational model for ongoing platform maintenance post-go-live? Specifically, is HPSJ aiming for a platform managed directly by internal functional teams, or is HPSJ prepared to support platforms requiring dedicated, specialized platform administrators?**

HPSJ intends for internal functional teams (HR, Payroll, Finance, FP&A) to manage operations supported by designated platform administrators responsible for configuration, integrations, reporting, and security. Vendors should provide role-based training.

- 11) What is HPSJ's post-implementation customer support model? Is this an important aspect of the project?**

Post-implementation customer support is highly important. HPSJ expects priority SLAs for payroll-critical issues, named vendor contacts, defined escalation paths, proactive release guidance, and 60–90 days of hypercare support including payroll cycle validation and GL reconciliation.

- 12) Regarding Attachment A, Item 12 (Implementation, Training & Vendor Standards), is there a target completion date or hard deadline for the go-live of Phase 3 (HR & Payroll Replacement) driven by current vendor contract expirations? Previous go-live was listed as 4/30/2027.**

HPSJ's target Phase 3 go-live date is June 30, 2027. Vendor timelines must include two parallel payroll cycles, benefits enrollment alignment, tax-year readiness, and complete data migration and validation.

- 13) Can you please clarify how many employees HPSJ has?**

~560 employees.