



STATE OF TENNESSEE
Secretary of State

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS # 30501-02620
UPDATED AMENDMENT # 4
FOR REPLACEMENT OF TENNESSEE BUSINESS
ENTITY AND ANNUAL REPORT (TN-BEAR) SYSTEM**

DATE: August 27, 2020

RFP # 30501-02620 IS AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

1. This RFP Schedule of Events updates and confirms scheduled RFP dates. Any event, time, or date containing revised or new text is highlighted.

EVENT	TIME (central time zone)	DATE
1. RFP Issued		July 13, 2020
2. Disability Accommodation Request Deadline	2:00 p.m.	July 16, 2020
3. Pre-response Conference	2:00 p.m.	July 21, 2020
4. Notice of Intent to Respond Deadline	2:00 p.m.	July 22, 2020
5. Written "Questions & Comments" Deadline	2:00 p.m.	July 29, 2020
6. State Response to Written "Questions & Comments"		August 24, 2020
7. Response Deadline	2:00 p.m.	September 3, 2020
8. Vendor Presentations (In-Person Nashville, TN)	To Be Scheduled	September 8, 9, 11, 2020
9. State Completion of Technical Response Evaluations		September 28, 2020
10. State Opening & Scoring of Cost Proposals	2:00 p.m.	October 1, 2020
11. State Notice of Intent to Award Released <u>and</u> RFP Files Opened for Public Inspection	2:00 p.m.	October 6, 2020
12. End of Open File Period		October 14, 2020
13. State sends contract to Contractor for signature		October 15, 2020
14. Contractor Signature Deadline	2:00 p.m.	October 21, 2020

2. State responses to questions and comments in the table below amend and clarify this RFP.

Any restatement of RFP text in the Question/Comment column shall NOT be construed as a change in the actual wording of the RFP document.

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
6.2 A.3	20	1 Would the State consider accepting compiled financials, with audited financials provided after the award but before the start of work?	Pursuant to Amendment # 3 of the RFP, the State has moved the audited financial statement requirement from the “Mandatory Requirements Section” section to the “General Qualifications & Experience Section”. Therefore, the submission of audited financial statements, a line of credit, or a lack thereof, will no longer be a “pass/fail” factor but will be a consideration in the overall score of the vendor’s General Qualifications & Experience. For the financial information to be considered as part of the General Qualifications and Experience, the vendor would need to submit it prior to the award.
6.2 A.3	20	2 Alternatively, Reduce the LOC requirement to something reasonable?	Pursuant to Amendment # 3 of the RFP, the State has moved the audited financial statement requirement from the “Mandatory Requirements Section” section to the “General Qualifications & Experience Section”. Therefore, the submission of audited financial statements, a line of credit, or a lack thereof, will no longer be a “pass/fail” factor but will be a consideration in the overall score of the vendor’s General Qualifications & Experience.
6.2 A.3	20	3 Alternatively, Move this requirement out of section A into a scored requirement?	Pursuant to Amendment # 3 of the RFP, the State has moved the audited financial statement requirement from the “Mandatory Requirements Section” section to the “General Qualifications & Experience Section”. Therefore, the submission of audited financial statements, a line of credit, or a lack thereof, will no longer be a “pass/fail” factor but will be a consideration in the overall score of the vendor’s General Qualifications & Experience.
6.2 A.3	20	4 We will provide sufficient financial information for risk evaluation, however, we do not have audited accounts and	Pursuant to Amendment # 2, this item has been moved from the “Mandatory Requirements” Section

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
		no not have a letter of credit we can furnish TN SOS. Will this impact your acceptance of our proposal?	to the "General Qualifications & Experience" Section. Therefore, the annual receipts collected requirement will no longer be a "pass/fail" factor but will be a consideration in the overall score of the vendor's General Qualifications & Experience.
6.2 A.6	21	5 Is this a mandatory requirement? If we cannot comply with this requirement are we automatically disqualified?	Pursuant to Amendment # 2, this item has been moved from the "Mandatory Requirements" Section to the "General Qualifications & Experience" Section. Therefore, the annual receipts collected requirement will no longer be a "pass/fail" factor but will be a consideration in the overall score of the vendor's General Qualifications & Experience.
6.2 C.6.1	29	6 With regard to the online account, please expand on the functionality intended to be available to the customers. For example, is the online account intended just allow customers to instantiate filings, or does the online account also allow customers to see complete filings they previously submitted and observe the status of submitted but not yet complete filings? Please elaborate.	The online account should allow customers to initiate filings, edit draft filings before submission or after rejection, see the status of filings once submitted, and retrieve the filing documents once approved.
6.2 C.6.5, C.14.5, C.14.21, and C.14.37	29 35-37	7 Item C.6.5 (SAML and Oauth), C.14.5 (Active Directory), C.14.21 (windows authentication) and C.14.37 (3rd party verification and authentication) Must the proposed solution adhere to all of these, are different types of users managed by different types of authentication, is one used now and the others planned for the future? Please expand.	Minimal SAML 2.0; C.6.5 and C.14.5 refer to internal users. C.14.21 refers to the webserver service account authenticating to a Microsoft SQL Server. C.14.37 is for external users trying to log into the web-portal outside the system (there because of mytn.gov).
6.2 C.11.6 and C.11.7	33	8 C.11.6 and C.11.7: one-to-one relationship between filings and entities. Possible conflict between C.11.6 and 7, with C.8.14 (one payment to multiple submissions), C.8.15 (associate multiple payments to one or more submissions).	Payments can have a 1 to many relationships. However, except for mergers, consolidations, share exchanges, and a notary, all other filings and images should have a 1:1 relationship.
6.2 C.11.8	33	9 Item C.11.8: do we "Identify"? Do we "Convert"? Do we "Compress" images" to PDF???	The vendor will work with the state to identify, convert, and compress images to PDF. These images are

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
			currently stored in multiple different image repositories.
6.2 C.13.2	34	10 What is the scanning software and output document format? (detailed PDF format). Is this item in compliance with C.11.8 (PDF Format)?	This requirement involves associating legacy images, which have been converted from microfilm to a digital pdf image, to an existing record in the database without creating a new filing record.
6.2 C.13.10	34	11 Would these also be PDF format images in compliance with C.11.8?	Yes, the color images would also be PDF format images in compliance with C.11.8.
6.2 C.13.12, C.13.21, C.13.23, C.13.24, C.13.25, C.13.26 and C.13.27	34-35	12 With regard to Redaction; Specifically, item C.13.26 indicates redaction be implemented in 'layers' of an image, but C.13.27 seems to indicate that a redacted copy of the file must be made available for public access. Does the Department of State prefer to maintain an unredacted copy (for internal users) and a redacted copy (for public access) or a 3rd type of redaction (layered redaction as in C.13.26)?	An unredacted copy must be maintained. In addition, for redaction purposes, the state prefers layered redaction based on access roles.
6.2 C.13.12	34	13 Redactions of PII: Would it be acceptable for the system to store 2 copies of the same document: 1 Redacted (public consumption) and 1 not redacted?)? If so, can a state employee be responsible for uploading the redacted version?	The state would prefer to store the single original document and for the redaction functionality to be layered based on access roles.
6.2 C.13.13	34	14 What is the volume of the existing digital microfilm images and what is the form of the metadata associated with these?	The state does require the vendor to migrate the 5.3 million TIFF images generated from microfilm that have metadata in folder and file naming conventions and are linked to entities in the database as well as migrate the 867,932 images born digital stored in a folder system and linked to entities in the database from the existing state solution to the vendor's proposed solution. The state does not require the vendor to migrate the 27 million images converted from microfilm to digital images from their existing location into the database. The intent of this requirement is for the vendor to provide functionality in their proposed solution which allows State staff to import, classify, and review the 27 million legacy images, which have been converted from microfilm to a digital image, and

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
			<p>attach to an existing record in the database without creating a new filing record. There are over 27 million TIFF images generated from microfilm with no metadata other than folder and file naming conventions. There is a separate file folder containing 5.3 million TIFF images generated from microfilm that have metadata in folder and file naming conventions and are linked to entities in the database. In addition, there are 867,932 TIFF images born digital stored in a folder system and linked to entities in the database.</p>
6.2 C.13.15	34	<p>15 Vendor would like clarification regarding this issue. Does the Department of State wish to clarify that each document should be stored as a single file linked to the entity or submission, or that all documents related to an entity should be stored as a single file and linked? C.13.15 (single file) may be in conflict with C.11.6 (relate multiple filings with single entity) and C.11.7 (1:1 relationship between filings and an entity).</p>	<p>Internal users should be able to generate and store an electronic version of the document without having to print and rescan a document into the system. Each document should be stored as a single file linked to the entity. Each filing for the entity would be related to it and appear in the entity's history.</p>
6.2 C.13.19	34	<p>16 If this is not an out of the box feature within a solution would TN SOS be open to achieving this through a custom integration with a 3rd party like Kofax, Adobe Scan, or perhaps ABBYY.</p>	<p>The respondent should propose a solution that is integrated with their system capabilities. If the respondent desires to include the use of a third party for optical scanning capabilities, an explanation must be included in the vendor's response submitted to the state and any pricing to do so would have to be included as part of the respondent's cost proposal based on the standard line items listed in the Cost Item Description. There should not be any other terms and conditions associated with the third party.</p>
6.2 C.13.19	34	<p>17 Can you please describe what kind of barcodes will be printed on documents for indexing purposes? Would the Department of State like to narrow down the standards for barcodes they would like to support?</p>	<p>Bar codes provide information regarding the document number, document type, document classification, as well as other information provided by the customer. Should the final product</p>

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
		QR codes, 2D, 3D, or other types of barcodes?	use barcodes, those would be generated by the system itself identifying the entity type and the particular filing with all of the related information entered by the customer on the form. The state does not envision the need to use QR codes.
6.2 C.13.23	35	18 C.13.23. (system must identify and redact certain data). This is similar to C.13.12 (Redact PII) and C.13.21 (redact scanned images), C.13.24 (automated redaction), C.13.25 (layered redaction) and C.13.27 (layered redaction). Can TN SOS please provide clarification as to which or all redaction methodologies they would prefer?	The state would prefer to store the single original document and for the redaction functionality to be layered based on access roles.
6.2 C.14.8	35	19 Separate the storage and management of external .vs internal user accounts. Our platform does not provide this functionality – is it a mandatory requirement?	The state prefers for storage and management of external vs internal user accounts to be maintained separately. This requirement is listed under the “Technical Qualifications, Experience, & Approach” section. The State desires this functionality, although it is not in the “Mandatory Requirements” section. The inability of a vendor to offer it will not automatically invalidate the entire vendor’s proposal. However, it will impact the maximum score the vendor can receive.
6.2 C.14.9	35	20 To eliminate any misunderstanding or ambiguity on the part of the proposer, please provide a direct reference to “TLS V.12” and “TLS 1.2” and the other codes within this item. Also “SHA-256” in item C.14.13.	It should be TLS V.1.2. https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc7525 TLS V.12 is a typo - it should be TLS 1.2. Connection encryption protocols are easily reviewed at the National Information Technology (NIST) Laboratory. Search for publication 800-52, the latest revision. The NIST also explains the hash standard SHA-256 at the Computer Security Resource Center (CSRC) csrc.nist.gov
6.2 C.14.10	36	21 Would an XML file upload or API call to your mainframe be an acceptable method of implementation for this requirement?	The State's response to this vendor question is based on requirement C.15.10 on page 38 "Proposed solution must include the ability to submit XML filings for UCC." Pursuant to the UCC XML documentation, the vendor should plan for an HTML post in an XML

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
			<p>structure that conforms closely to the International Association of Commercial Administrators (IACA) UCC XML Technical Specifications. The UCC XML specifications also will need minor modifications to conform to State of Tennessee UCC filing requirements.</p>
6.2 C.14.13	36	<p>22 Is this a mandatory requirement? We currently do not do programmatic checksum verification with a min SHA-256 through the application. This is functionality we would need to develop post initial implementation.</p>	<p>This requirement is listed under the “Technical Qualifications, Experience, & Approach” section. The State desires this functionality, although it is not in the “Mandatory Requirements” section. The inability of a vendor to offer it will not automatically invalidate the entire vendor’s proposal. However, it will impact the maximum score the vendor can receive. It is the state’s preference this functionality be included beginning with the initial implementation.</p>
6.2 C.14.39	37	<p>23 How is an "upload limit" determined? What does SOS consider a large file to be? Would email attachment submissions be considered alternative or are their also file size limitations on that system also?</p>	<p>The file upload limit for the State email system is 15 MB. Many of the files received by the Division of Charitable Solicitations are in excess of 20+ MB and approach approximately 25 MB. Therefore, an email attachment submission would not be considered an alternative.</p>
6.2 C.15.10	38	<p>24 Can the Department of State provide an example template for the “XML Filings for UCC”?</p>	<p>It is not an XML file. The request is sent to the web server in an XML data format. The data being sent is data captured on UCC filings with the exception of specific Indebtedness Tax language. The proposed vendor should include XML functionality as outlined in XML Technical Specifications 3.10 and 4.00 which can be found on the International Association of Commercial Administrators website at https://www.iaca.org/secured-transactions/xml-technical-specifications/. The UCC XML specifications also will need minor modifications to conform to State of Tennessee UCC filing requirements.</p>
6.2 C.16.8	38	<p>25 "Please clarify whether the Department of State wishes to search images/documents to determine whether a signature has been applied?</p>	<p>This requirement is listed under the “Technical Qualifications, Experience, & Approach” section. The State desires this functionality, although it is not in the “Mandatory</p>

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
		Is it a mandatory requirement to be able to provide the ability to store, images and search official signatures for authentications. "	Requirements" section. The inability of a vendor to offer it will not automatically invalidate the entire vendor's proposal. However, it will impact the maximum score the vendor can receive. The state wishes to be able to store images and search official signatures for authentications. The State wishes to search documents and match the signature on the document against a stored signature image of the authorized signer.
6.2 C.17.2	39	26 What is the issue tracking system the State intends to use? Would they be open to using the issue tracking system that our current customers utilize? (Atlassian Service Desk)	The state currently uses FogBugz as the issue tracking system. We are open to using a different issue tracking system.
6.6 ATCH. 3 1.8		27 Will TN SOS accept proposals for solutions which are hosted in Microsoft Government Azure Cloud? Or, are you only looking for a solution that can be hosted in a virtualized environment?	The state requires a solution that can be hosted on premise using Hyper-V and VMWare.
		28 Will the state acquire licenses for the proposed solution outside of this procurement or do the licenses need to be provided by the prime?	The State requires a solution that can be hosted on premise using Hyper-V and VMWare. In general, obtaining any required licenses is the responsibility of the vendor. If there are significant cost savings for the State to obtain the licenses, that should be disclosed to the State. If there are other licenses required to run the vendor software, the respondent in their proposal must outline the type(s) of software required. All pricing should only be listed in RFP Attachment 6.3 Cost Proposal & Scoring Guide. If the vendor is using a third party product(s), vendor in their cost proposal should include pricing for the software and notate the State may be able to obtain discounted pricing by acquiring the licenses outside of this procurement. The proposed solution and pricing must reflect the Total Operating Costs.
		29 Will the state provide laptops or desktops for contractors who access state systems directly (for security reasons)?	Contractors will only have access to state systems from their own devices using a VPN connection provided by the State.

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
		30 Why is the current system being replaced?	<p>The Department of State is transforming its business processes from a predominantly paper-based, manually driven model to an electronic paperless model in order to meet all legislative mandates and internal service delivery goals. The goals are to (1) streamline the registration process and (2) provide greater transactional efficiency and consistency with the storing and retrieval of the documents.</p> <p>Replacing the Tennessee Business Entity and Annual Reporting (TN-BEAR) System and the Charitable Solicitations and Gaming (CRM) and other existing systems with a modernized process and solution is a critical component in implementing this comprehensive improvement effort. Therefore, the successful bidder will present a comprehensive Solution designed to support an expanding electronic filing and document management system with the ultimate goal being full electronic integration.</p>
		31 Is the current vendor able to bid on the new system?	Yes, the current vendor can bid on the new system.
		32 Are there any goals established for the use of diversity businesses under this contract?	The vendor's commitment to diversity is evaluated by the factors enumerated in Section B. 15 of the RFP as part of the vendor's general qualifications and experience.
		33 Are you seeking a system that is more of a COTS or more Custom? Any preferred percentage that is true COTS?	The state is seeking a web-based Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS) integrated business registration and records management system solution. The less configuration and customization required the better.
		34 Regarding personnel for this project team, does TN require or desire that key personnel be solely dedicated to this project team while implementing the solution or can they be partially utilized and working on multiple projects?	The State would prefer the vendor provide dedicated staff for this project.

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
		35 How much onsite vs offsite work is allowed?	The majority of the work should be completed offsite. However, there are some instances where the vendor needs to be onsite. These instances include, but are not limited to, project kickoff, end-user training, and go-live.
		36 Can resources be working only in the USA or can we also utilize offshore resources?	Respondent must use resources in the United States of America. In addition, respondent must comply with all provisions of the contract including Section D.10 Prohibition of Illegal Immigrants.
		37 Will the state clean their existing data before migration	The state will make every effort to clean existing data before migration. However, respondent will have to work with state on any issues which arise as a result of data migration.
		38 Are their historical data on paper that will require image capture and made available thru the application?	The vast majority of historical data is already in an electronic format.
		39 IS OCM part of the scope of the project	For purposes of this explanation, the State defines OCM as Organizational Change Management. Yes, OCM is within the scope of this project.
		40 How many millions of records does the current applications have?	In the Division of Business Services, TN-BEAR database there are approximately 173 tables, which contain 1,982 columns, and 163,487,354 rows. In addition, there are approximately 20 million records with one image for each record. The Division of Charitable Solicitations database is in a proprietary customer relationship management (CRM) software with a complex data structure. Many of the tables in the database are metadata or are system configuration which will not need to be converted to the new system. Therefore, all tables are not included in this count; only those that are relevant to the actual conversion data. In the charitable database there are approximately 22 tables, which contain 2,650 columns, and 3,130,861 rows.
		41 Will there be interface with the General ledger system	Please review RFP Section C Technical Qualifications, Experience

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
			<p>& Approach Items, specifically Sections C.5 Audit, and C.8. Financial. There will need to be an interface with the State's General Ledger system.</p>
		<p>42 Is the state looking for an integrated solution (filing, UCC apostolic)?</p>	<p>Yes, the State is looking for an integrated solution. The system should be seamless for the end users both internal and external.</p>
		<p>43 How many filings does the current application have?</p>	<p>"The Division of Business Services has the following number of filing types: Corporate - 125; UCC-5; Notary -2; Summons - 1; Motor Vehicle Temporary Lien - 1; Apostilles & Authentications - 2. The Division of Charitable Solicitations has the following number of filing types: Athlete Agent - 3; Catastrophic Illness Trust - 3; Charitable Solicitations - 10; Gaming - 7; Fantasy Sports - 6; Professional Solicitations - 5.</p> <p>The Division of Business Services manages, on an annual basis, approximately 602, 000 annual transactions (excluding rejections), which includes approximately 314,000 active entities (including approximately 8,200 assumed names), and 630,000 non-active entities, processes approximately 250,000 annual reports, and has about 49,000 new filings (excluding rejections) per year.</p>
		<p>44 Is the state expecting most applications come through a portal or other method of applying will be acceptable?</p>	<p>Yes, the Department of State is transforming its business processes from a predominantly paper-based, manually driven model to an electronic paperless model in order to meet all legislative mandates and internal service delivery goals. The goals are to (1) streamline the registration process and (2) provide greater transactional efficiency and consistency with the storing and retrieval of the documents.</p> <p>Replacing the Tennessee Business Entity and Annual Reporting (TN-BEAR) System and the Charitable Solicitations and Gaming (CRM) and other existing systems with a modernized process and solution is a critical component in implementing</p>

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
			this comprehensive improvement effort. Therefore, the successful bidder will present a comprehensive Solution designed to support an expanding electronic filing and document management system with the ultimate goal being full electronic integration.
		45 When is the state busiest filing period and volume?	For the Division of Business Services, the busiest time of the year is Mid-February to the end of May. For the Division of Charitable Solicitations, the busiest time of the year is mid-May through the end of July, followed by being busy at the end of each quarter.
		46 How many staff will concurrently access the system?	Approximately 75 staff will concurrently access the system. However, respondent should also be aware there are a significant number of customers who will access the system since it will be a web-based Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS) system.
		47 Is ad-hoc printing capability required?	Yes, ad-hoc printing capability is required. For more detailed information see RFP Section C. Technical Response & Evaluation Guide specifically section C.12 Reporting.
		48 Does the State prefer an all in one implementation or a modularized phased go live?	The state prefers a modularized phase go live. The first module which needs to be developed, tested, and placed in production will be the module for Charitable Solicitations. As additional functionality is prioritized, developed and tested successfully, an agreed upon production deployment schedule should be executed.
6.2 C.11.2		49 Is the State looking for the vendor to migrate all existing data and file systems or does the State want the ability to do it themselves or is it a combination of the two?	The state is looking for the vendor, in partnership with the state, to migrate all existing data and file systems to the winning respondent's system.
		50 For further clarity on paper-based manually driven model and electronic paperless model, does the State plan on going fully paperless in the future?	The state plans for as many filings as possible to be completed in an electronic paperless environment. However, there will need to be a mechanism to allow customers to

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
			print off filings and mail them in with a check for payment.
		51 Does the State allow for a Series LLC company structure?	Yes, the state does allow for a Series LLC company structure. Under current Tennessee Law Series LLCs do not register or otherwise delineate the series from the LLC. There is currently no provision under Tennessee Law for Uniform Protected Series LLCs.
		52 Does the State use a "Model Registered Agent Act" law?	The State does not currently have a Model Registered Agent Act Law. However, the state does want the capability of allowing registered agents to make universal address changes which is part of the Model Registered Agent Act.
		53 Would the State be willing to post their current forms to potential vendors for solution proposal purposes?	Vendors can find current forms on the Department of State's websites which are as follows: Division of Business Services https://www.sos.tn.gov/business-services under the Categories Section Division of Charitable Solicitations https://www.sos.tn.gov/charitable
6.2		54 Can the State provide details for all API connections or integrations with other agencies/systems that they currently have and require.	State Agency: API connection going out and SOAP call to State Agency web service API . Third Party Payment Vendor: HTML Post received with a confirmation code (Postback). From Other State Agencies: API-Webservice: Rest Service accepting incoming API calls. From External Vendors API-XML – HTML Post of XML formatted data coming in. Third Party Address Verification Vendor -API flat file database with address matching module on the application. Third Party Payment Vendor Reconciliation File is a Flat File – File is downloaded from Third Party Payment Vendor and used to

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
			reconcile web payments with the pay transactions on the application.
6.2		55 Can the State provide some use case samples that help clarify the need to create, modify, and delete business rules.	<p>1. Currently a telephone number and email address are optional. Law and/or rule changes may make them a requirement in the future. The state should be able to go in and set those fields as required.</p> <p>2. Currently, officers names and addresses aren't collected on domestic entities but are collected on foreign entities. Law changes may allow for the collection of said data, and the state would like the ability to make that change.</p> <p>3. Filing type 'A' goes to a certain processing group and internal changes require a different group process that filing, the state would like the ability to make that change.</p>
6.2 C.13.12	34	56 Is the State open to 3rd party solutions to provide redactions of PII?	The state is open to a 3rd party solution to provide redactions of PII. However, the solution should be integrated as a part of the standard computer system processes.
6.2 C.13.21 - C.13.26	35	57 Is the State open to a 3rd party solution to provide redactions of scanned images?	The state is open to a 3rd party solution to provide redactions of PII. However, the solution should be integrated as a part of the standard computer system processes.
6.2 C.14.38	37	58 For clarity, are browser major builds included in this requirement or does the 2 previous builds requirement include minor builds? (For example, does IE 10,11 and IE Edge all need to be supported or just the last two minor builds in IE Edge/IE 11)	The current browser versions with backwards compatibility of 2 previous builds includes all builds (major and minor). Using the vendor's example, IE 10, 11 and IE Edge will all need to be supported. Other browsers would need to be supported as well, for example Chrome, Safari and Firefox.
		59 Due to travel restrictions, is the State open to a video conference presentation?	Unless circumstances drastically change, as determined by the State, the State requires vendor presentations to be made in person.
		60 For clarity, does the first year Support and Maintenance/warranty begin on the date the system goes live or 90 days after the system is live (as	Support and Maintenance / Warranty begins 90 days after the system is in production.

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
		per the acceptance period) or is the view of the State that the first year starts on a different date.	
6.2 C.1-C.3		61 Items C.1, C.2, and C.3 require offerors to demonstrate how they will meet the requirements within the "State project schedule". However, there is no State project schedule provided. Can the State provide their preferred implementation date?	The State desires the system to be developed and implemented in a module format. The first module would be the Charitable Solicitations module. The State and the proposed winning vendor will need to then agree on the project priorities thereafter to complete each of the remaining required module functionality.
6.6 ATCH. 3 1.1		62 Is the State open to accepting bids that include commercial cloud hosting, which will provide a COTS vendor with better ability to manage security, uptime and upgrades?	No, the state is looking for a solution that can be hosted on premise using Hyper-V and VMWare.
		63 Is there an existing database model and/or data dictionary? If so, can the State share this information?	In lieu of providing the database model and data dictionary, the state will provide proposing vendors with the number of tables, columns and records in the database. In the Division of Business Services, TN-BEAR database there are approximately 173 tables, which contain 1,982 columns, and 163,487,354 rows. In addition, there are approximately 20 million records with one image for each record. The Division of Charitable Solicitations database is in a proprietary customer relationship management (CRM) software with a complex data structure. Many of the tables in the database are metadata or are system configuration which will not need to be converted to the new system. Therefore, all tables are not included in this count; only those that are relevant to the actual conversion data. In the charitable database there are approximately 22 tables, which contain 2,650 columns, and 3,130,861 rows.
		64 For existing images, how are they stored (filesystem, BLOB, etc.) and what is their format (PDF, TIFF, etc.)?	Existing images are currently stored in either PDF or TIFF formats.

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
		<p>65 Which other systems does the proposed solution need to interface with and what is the interface mechanism for each (web service, flat file, etc.)?</p>	<p>State Agency: API connection going out and SOAP call to State Agency web service API .</p> <p>Third Party Payment Vendor: HTML Post received with a confirmation code (Postback).</p> <p>From Other State Agencies: API-Webservice: Rest Service accepting incoming API calls.</p> <p>From External Vendors API-XML – HTML Post of XML formatted data coming in.</p> <p>Third Party Address Verification Vendor -API flat file database with address matching module on the application.</p> <p>Third Party Payment Vendor Reconciliation File is a Flat File – File is downloaded from Third Party Payment Vendor and used to reconcile web payments with the pay transactions on the application.</p>
<p>6.2 A.9</p>	<p>22</p>	<p>66 The numbering in Section A.6 A.9, has two requirements numbered as #A.6.7 A.9.7. Can vendors renumber for a total of 16 requirements in Section A?</p>	<p>Please respond with A.9.7.(1) and A.9.7.(2).</p>
<p>6.2 C.7.7</p>	<p>30</p>	<p>67 What does the term "forms" reference in this context? Are there scenarios where blank physical forms are sent out to be filled in and returned, or does this refer the accepted forms and the notifications and correspondence that are generated as part of the filing?</p>	<p>The term “forms” references form letters which generate either a courtesy notice reminder, a notice of pending expiration, notice of dissolution, or notice of termination. There are some forms which are sent out to be filled in and returned. It also references language on notifications and correspondence that are generated as part of the filing.</p>
<p>6.2 C.9.5</p>	<p>31</p>	<p>68 Can State provide the scenarios where business day counts affect business rules? Annual report due dates? Document Expedite due dates?</p>	<p>For the Division of Business Services, there are no expedited filings. Annual report due dates are currently calculated based upon the end of the fiscal year of the business as disclosed by the business upon formation. If the report is not filed within 60 days of the due date, a letter is generated automatically and mailed. After 60 more days, the business is administratively dissolved. For the Division of</p>

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
			Charitable Solicitations pursuant to T.C.A. § 48-101-508, a determination must be made within 3 business days of a hearing.
6.2 C.11.8	33	69 What format are images stored in?	Images are currently stored in TIFF and PDF formats. In addition, the Division of Charitable Solicitations also has some FORM letters stored in DOC and DOCX formats.
6.2 C.13.9	34	70 Please clarify what is meant by "Subscribers". Are these users who are authenticated with credentials, or is there a subset that subscribe to some service?	Subscribers are both users who are authenticated with credentials as well as external customers who pay a fee to receive document images. Certain service companies obtain bulk data and/or filings through a subscription service which allows them access to the information. Currently, the public does not have access to images of filings without payment. We expect that, in a new system, users will be able to purchase copies of these images through their user account.
6.2 C.13.13	34	71 Is there an api or other interface to import the digital images, or is this a manual process of uploading files from an external system and establishing the link to the entity in the solution?	There is currently not an API or other interface to import the digital images. An interface and workflow should be developed for this purpose.
6.2 C.13.19	34	72 Does this refer to standardized bar codes corresponding to form/filing type that the solution will recognize, or does this refer bar codes generated by the system to later associated physical documents with electronic records?	This refers to standardized bar codes corresponding to form/filing type and in some cases, data entered electronically by the customer prior to printing the document and mailing it in along with the payment for a filing. The bar code also auto classifies what type of document and how many pages are in the document. Barcodes, if used, will be generated by the system. Scanning of those barcodes will pull up the information entered by the customer on the form and generate the electronic version of the form. Paper forms which are scanned will not be retained.
6.2 C.13.24	35	73 Does "automatically redacted" indicate the state's desire for an automated OCR and OCR redaction solution, given the long term strategy to move to a paperless office?	The state would prefer a solution that requires the least amount of configuration, customization, and manual processes to implement redaction.

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
6.2 C.13.28	35	74 Does this refer to logos such as the State or Agency Seal, which will display on certificates and in the headers of various outputs?	Yes, this refers to seals as well as Trademark Registration logos. It also refers to a "filed" stamp which will be generated by the system and affixed to filings.
6.2 C.14	35	75 Does the State intend to enforce filing authority or "Locking Down" an entity to only specific authorized filers?	Tennessee statutes prescribe if a document is submitted with all required information and a valid payment, then the state shall file it. Therefore, we will not be able to lockdown an entity to only authorized filers. However, all documents which are filed should be tied back to a specific filer through their user account. The state also wants to include the ability to lock all users from filing amendments on a specific entity when ordered by the court.
6.2 C.14.13	36	76 Is this specific to all PDF images stored by the system in the integrated file system?	This is specific to all document images filed in the system.
6.2 C.15.11	38	77 Is this meant to be applied to all entity types and filing forms, or specific to a set of entities/filing types? If limited, please specify entities/filings where applicable. Is the business need to acquire handwritten "wet ink" signatures/notarizations, or is it related to submission of physical payment for online filings?	This item is meant to be applied to all entity types and filing forms. The business need in certain cases is to acquire handwritten "wet ink" signatures/notarizations and in other cases it is related to submission of physical payment for online filings. Initially, all filings must have the capability of being printed and mailed with a check. Business rules may change to require certain types of filings to be submitted only by electronic means. Wet ink signatures and notarizations will not be required for business and UCC filings. Certain submissions, such as requests for apostilles and trademarks, or business mergers, may require attached documents that must be signed or notarized. We expect all system forms to be signed electronically then printed and mailed if so desired by the customer.
6.2		78 Will filings with a later effective display in the public record with separate filing and effective dates? Or will the filings be hidden from the public until the effective date is met?	Ideally, formation documents with a future effective date would not appear in our record until that future effective date arrives. This is because the entity does not actually

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
			<p>exist until the future effective date. On the other hand, documents for existing entities such as amendments or mergers could appear when filed with the future date noted. The system should refrain from making the changes from those documents until the future effective date. Then those changes should occur automatically.</p>
6.6		<p>79 Will amendments with later effective date appear in the filing record before the said date? Do the "Changes" made on said date include items like name changes, RA and principal updates, or is it limited to status changes that are not made until the effective date is reached?</p>	<p>Amendments with a delayed effective date should display in the public record with separate filing and effective dates. Changes made on said date are not limited to any specific type of change.</p>
6.6		<p>80 Would the State be amenable to adding a statement to indicate that acceptance criteria should be defined and agreed upon within the change order to ensure that the State and vendor are aligned earlier than the acceptance stage?</p>	<p>Upon signing of the contract, if the State requests a Change Order from the vendor, the State will work in conjunction with the vendor to develop acceptance criteria. However, there are instances where acceptance criteria may have to be further clarified upon deliverables provided from the vendor to the State. Ultimately, the State will be the sole judge of the acceptable completion of work and, upon such determination, shall provide the Contractor written approval.</p>
6.6		<p>81 Can the vendor assume that the definition of "addressed" may include communicating a plan of action in the given timeframes?</p>	<p>The purpose of this provision is to have all bugs and vulnerabilities repaired as accurately and quickly as possible upon their identification. Once the bug or vulnerability is identified by either the State or the Vendor, it is the responsibility to notify the other party through the agreed upon communication process. The communication process should continue in such a way as to accurately and quickly develop a plan to design, test, and implement a resolution that resolves the bug or vulnerability.</p>

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
6.6		82 Can the State elaborate on what notifications fall under the category of "mobile"?	The respondent's proposed solution should allow for reports and notification management to customers as well as to employee users based on criteria that will be outlined by the State. An example includes, but is not limited to, notifying a user of an upcoming event such as the status of a submitted filing, an upcoming annual report due date, notice of determination, or notice of administrative dissolution. The state would like to implement text notifications to external users.
6.6		83 Can the State provide the templates or layouts of the financial files referenced?	The state will provide templates and layouts of the financial files referenced to the winning vendor.
6.6		84 Does the State have a selected payment processing vendor to support this requirement? If so, can the State provide the name of the vendor?	The state does have a selected payment processing vendor to support this requirement. However, the respondent's proposed solution should be agnostic to which payment processing vendor is used as the current state vendor may change over time.
		85 What are the current Business data exchanges?	Current business data exchanges include other state agencies and third-party payment processors as well as any other outside vendors or stakeholders the State may decide to conduct data exchanges with.
		86 Is the State open to 1-2 additional payment points during the setup/configuration/installation process to cover the license fee and the vendor's costs during this portion of the project.	Yes, we are open to changing the payment milestones based on the proposed solution. In addition to the cost proposal, please provide a suggested milestone payment proposal. The total cost proposal and the milestone payment proposal costs must equal. This should be placed in the sealed cost proposal portion and not in the vendor response portion.
		87 As a provider of a COTS solution, we do not typically provide source code. Would the state be open to the selected vendor escrowing the source code instead?	Yes, the State is open to the selected vendor escrowing the source code. The state and the vendor will need to have a clear and agreed upon definition as to when

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
			the state can access the source code. Please provide sample escrow language, including the conditions upon which the source code can be accessed by the State.

3. **RFP Amendment Effective Date.** The revisions set forth herein shall be effective upon release. All other terms and conditions of this RFP not expressly amended herein shall remain in full force and effect.