



**REQUEST FOR INFORMATION 31701-03832
AMENDMENT 1
FOR VENDOR ASSISTANCE FOR SUPPLIER
ONBOARDING PROCESS IMPROVEMENT**

DATE: 03/13/2026

RFI # 31701-03832 IS AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

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

EVENT		TIME (Central Time Zone)	DATE (all dates are State business days)
1.	RFI Issued		02/20/2026
2.	Vendor Written Questions and Comments Deadline	2:00pm	03/04/2026
3.	State Response to Written Questions and Comments		03/13/2026
4.	RFI Response Deadline	2:00pm	03/31/2026

2. State responses to questions and comments in the table attached below.

QUESTION	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
1	Can you share your intended scope for the pilot (agencies, supplier types, transaction categories, etc.)? Also, will the pilot operate in live production, or will it be a simulated /controlled pilot?	Please refer to Section 2 and Section 6 of the RFI. The State anticipates a pilot for the AI Attendant for the Supplier Help Desk and/or Identity and Banking Verification enhancements. Vendors should propose a recommended pilot scope (e.g., supplier segments, channels, and agency/program participation) and whether a limited production or controlled pilot is most appropriate, including associated risks and mitigations. Integration with PeopleSoft Edison is expected to be read-only for the pilot.
2	What measurable criteria will determine pilot success?	Please refer to the Business Value targets in Section 2 of the RFI. Vendors should describe measurable success criteria and how they would track outcomes such as reduced manual follow-ups, reduced pending emails, increased direct deposit adoption, improved automated verification rates, cycle time reduction, and auditability.
3	If successful, is funding anticipated or allocated for enterprise rollout?	No funding allocation has been established at this stage. This is a Request for Information (RFI) for market research purposes. Vendors should describe costs for both a pilot and a future enterprise-scale deployment per Section 6: Cost Informational Form.
4	Should vendors assume a technology-agnostic approach, or is there a	The State is seeking the most secure and effective solution and remains technology agnostic at this stage.

	preferred technology solution?	Vendors should propose their recommended solution, architecture, and approach in alignment with the RFI.
5	Can you describe the current environment supporting supplier onboarding and maintenance, including the technologies in use, staffing model, and any recent operational or fraud-related challenges?	The RFI provides baseline volumes and challenges, including approximately 300,000 supplier records, ~18,000 new suppliers per year, >25,000 supplier changes per year, ~20,000 emails, and ~2,000 phone calls annually, as well as current limitations in automation and fraud controls. Additional current-state details (specific tools, staffing model, and operational constraints) are not provided in the RFI; vendors should describe their discovery approach and assumptions.
6	Can the State describe the technologies and service providers that are used today to support the current SRM process?	Please reference response to Question 5.
7	How many people today are supporting the process?	The RFI does not specify current staffing levels. Vendors should propose an operating model and identify any assumptions regarding State resources in their response.
8	The state mentions that they have a matrix of a 75% reduction of some tasks. How does the state want to track these metrics and where did the state come up with these goals?	Section 2 of the RFI outlines target Business Value outcomes (e.g., 75% reductions and verification adoption/automation targets). Vendors should describe how their solution would produce, track, and report these metrics, including dashboards and audit logging as described in Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 10.
9	Is this a budgeted project for 2026?	This RFI does not include budget appropriation details. No budget has been established as part of this RFI. Vendors should provide cost information in accordance with Section 6: Cost Informational Form.
10	Is the state going to schedule demonstrations of the solution that are proposed in this response? If so, is there a timeline for this?	The State may request clarifications, walkthroughs, or demonstrations at its discretion as part of market research. If requested, the State will communicate any schedule directly to participating vendors.
11	When does the state want to make a decision on selecting a vendor for a Supplier onboarding solution ?	This is a Request for Information (RFI) and is not a vendor selection process. A vendor selection date has not been established. Please refer to Section 4: RFI Schedule of Events for the current question-and-response timeline.
12	Can you further explain what the state sees as initial pilot and then future enterprise scale?	In the RFI, the initial pilot refers to a limited implementation of the AI Attendant for the Supplier Help Desk and/or Identity and Banking Verification enhancements, with PeopleSoft Edison integration read-only for the pilot. Future enterprise scale refers to expanding capabilities to support statewide volumes and broader onboarding/maintenance automation, reporting, and audit requirements.
13	Can the state give further information on what its definition of a AI attendant pilot?	Please refer to Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 5 (AI Attendant for Supplier Help Desk Capabilities). An AI Attendant pilot refers to a virtual agent capability supporting supplier help desk interactions across channels (e.g., web, email, chat, voice, SMS), including knowledge base management, confidence-based routing to staff, and human-in-the-loop features for review, override, and training.

14	Would the state consider starting with an Enterprise-wide solution instead of a pilot while leveraging responses from RFI 31701-03813 that is still under review?	The State is seeking recommendations through this RFI and has not determined an implementation approach or procurement strategy. Vendors may propose a pilot-first or broader approach, including rationale, risks, and dependencies, consistent with the RFI scope.
15	For Pricing, is the State wanting to have a price range submitted or is it looking for more of a formal proposal?	This is an RFI and not a formal proposal request. Please provide pricing information consistent with Section 6: Cost Informational Form (including typical pricing units, price ranges, and cost drivers).
16	What is the targeted completion date for the Pilot phase and the full-scale implementation? Are there specific legislative mandates or fiscal year deadlines driving these dates?	The RFI does not specify targeted completion dates for implementation. Vendors should propose an estimated implementation timeline and key milestones based on public-sector experience per Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 11 of the RFI.
17	Section 2 mentions an "AI Attendant for Supplier Help Desk pilot." Could the State clarify which specific functional areas are required for the Pilot phase versus those reserved for the full-scale rollout?	The RFI identifies the pilot scope as the AI Attendant for Supplier Help Desk and/or Identity and Banking Verification, with PeopleSoft Edison integration read-only for the pilot. Vendors should propose which functional capabilities they recommend for pilot versus enterprise scale, including how the solution scales and what additional capabilities would be added post-pilot.
18	Are the desired "To-Be" processes for supplier onboarding and management already defined and documented? Alternatively, is the scope of this engagement to analyze and re-engineer existing processes prior to implementation?	The RFI does not provide defined "to-be" process documentation. Vendors should describe their recommended approach to assessing, optimizing, and automating supplier onboarding and maintenance workflows, including process diagrams where possible (Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 7).
19	Beyond the integration with PeopleSoft (Edison), will the new supplier onboarding process/system replace any specific legacy software?	The RFI does not identify specific legacy applications that will be replaced. Vendors should describe integration and interoperability approaches and clearly state assumptions, dependencies, and constraints (Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 8 and Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 13).
20	Does the scope include the migration of historical transactional data (e.g., past supplier cases/requests) and existing Knowledge Base articles?	The RFI references alignment with data consolidation plans and potential supplier data sources (e.g., W-9s, SDDA forms, IRS TIN Match, and verification logs). The RFI does not mandate migration of historical transactional data or knowledge base content; vendors should propose their approach, including any migration assumptions, risks, and costs (see Cost Informational Form: Data Migration and Historical Data Use).
21	What channels will need to be supported by the new supplier onboarding process/system as part of Supplier Help Desk?	Please refer to Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 5 (AI Attendant for Supplier Help Desk Capabilities). Vendors should describe supported interaction channels (web, email, chat, voice, SMS, etc.) and their recommended approach. The RFI does not specify a

	Regarding the support for the "Voice" channel, which Computer Telephony Integration (CTI) platform or phone system does the State currently utilize? Is the State seeking a conversational IVR (Voicebot) that replaces or sits in front of the current phone system, or is this referring to agent-assist tools for live phone operators?	required CTI/telephony platform; vendors should state any assumptions and integration requirements.
22	To assist with accurate licensing and resource estimation, how many internal State agents and distinct agent groups will require access to the system to fulfill requests and manage cases?	The RFI does not specify the number of internal agents or agent groups. Vendors should describe licensing assumptions and administrative/user roles required for their proposed solution.
23	Which specific languages must be configured for the supplier-facing portal to meet the State's accessibility and user experience goals?	The RFI requests accessibility and multilingual support but does not specify required languages. Vendors should describe language support capabilities and how language configuration is managed (see Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 5).
24	Approximately how many distinct services or request types are currently available to suppliers in the supplier catalog?	This information is not provided in the RFI. Vendors may describe how their solution supports configuration of services/request types and a scalable supplier service catalog.
25	Does the State have specific expectations for onsite vendor presence during key project phases (e.g., Requirements Gathering, UAT, or Go-Live support)?	The RFI does not mandate onsite presence requirements. Vendors should describe their implementation approach, roles and responsibilities, and on-site/remote support model assumptions (Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 11).
26	Describe any mandated third-party verification services already in use? (e.g., IRS TIN Match, PNC logs, other banking verification sources mentioned in scope). Is the expectation that the new solution provides real-time, automated API integration with these specific third-party services, or is manual logging of verification sufficient?	The RFI references supplier data sources that may be part of data consolidation (including IRS TIN Match and PNC verification logs) and requests vendors describe bank account verification approaches and third-party verification integrations (Sections 6, 7, and 8). Vendors should propose their recommended level of automation and integration approach, including APIs and auditability.
27	What percentage of the annual 18,000 new	The RFI does not provide a defined percentage of high-risk suppliers. Vendors should describe risk scoring, fraud

	suppliers fall into high-risk categories?	detection methodologies, and how high-risk suppliers would be identified and handled (Section 6: Identity Verification and Fraud Prevention).
28	Does the State currently utilize a centralized Identity and Access Management (IAM) solution (such as Azure AD, Okta, or Keycloak) for external users/suppliers, or will the new solution be required to manage supplier credentials and authentication independently?	The RFI does not prescribe a specific IAM solution for suppliers. Vendors should describe authentication methods, role-based access controls, and identity/access management model for supplier self-service (Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 9), including any dependencies on external IAM platforms.
29	The RFI notes a diverse supplier base ranging from corporate entities to foster care providers. Does the State require distinct onboarding workflows and portal interfaces for these different supplier types, or will a single standardized workflow apply to all?	The RFI acknowledges a diverse supplier population and requests workflow automation and configurability. Vendors should describe whether and how their solution supports configurable workflows and experiences by supplier type, risk level, or program (Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 7).
30	To accurately estimate the effort for the AI Pilot, what is the current format and quality of the State's existing Knowledge Base? Are answers currently structured in a database, or do they exist primarily within unstructured documents (PDFs, Word docs) and email archives?	The RFI does not describe the current knowledge base format. Vendors should describe knowledge base management, including content creation, updates, governance, and how existing content (structured or unstructured) could be ingested and maintained (see Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 5).
31	Does the scope of Identity and Bank Account Verification apply only to new suppliers and change requests moving forward, or does the State intend to perform a retroactive batch verification (re-verification) of the existing ~300,000 supplier records?	The RFI does not mandate retroactive re-verification of all existing supplier records. Vendors should describe capabilities and recommended approaches for verification of new registrations and changes, and whether/how batch re-verification of existing records could be performed, including cost and operational considerations (Sections 6–7).
32	If the department greenlights a solicitation, what would be the estimated timeframe for procurement?	The State has not determined whether a solicitation will be issued or the associated procurement timeline. Please refer to Section 4: RFI Schedule of Events for the current RFI deadlines.
33	Does the department also have an estimated contract value for this solicitation?	Please reference response to Question 15.
34	Lastly, is there a current vendor providing this service? If so, could you	This information is not provided in the RFI. The State is conducting market research through this RFI and has not

	please provide the current contract documents/information?	included incumbent contract documentation as part of the RFI Q&A process.
35	Are there any notable concerns with the State's existing PeopleSoft Supplier portal and the self-service functionality that currently exists for suppliers? Do the existing applications function appropriately and deliver the desired user experience? What PUM image and PeopleTools release are currently in production?	Details regarding PeopleSoft Supplier Portal configuration (including PUM image and PeopleTools release) and current usability concerns are not provided in the RFI. Vendors should propose integration approaches and any assumptions related to supplier self-service and portal experience.
36	Page 2, under "Project Scope Includes", what Supplier Help Desk solution does the State currently use?	This information is not provided in the RFI. Vendors should describe how their solution would support the Supplier Help Desk functions and integrate with existing tools, if applicable.
37	What is the distribution of annual emails (20,000) and phone calls (2,000) by month and type (new setup, supplier changes (address/location/payment type/banking information), or transaction status(payment/RFP/etc.))?	The RFI provides annual totals (~20,000 emails and ~2,000 phone calls) but does not provide monthly distribution or categorization by inquiry type. Vendors should describe how their solution supports intake, triage, and reporting by category.
38	Are there current process flows detailing how phone calls and e-mails are addressed, or SOP's/Policy documents for how they are managed?	This information is not provided in the RFI. Vendors may describe their recommended approach to documenting current processes and developing standard operating procedures as part of implementation and change management.
39	Is there already a ticketing system in place where emails and phone calls requiring follow-up are tracked?	The RFI does not specify whether a ticketing/case management tool is currently in place. Vendors should describe ticketing/case management capabilities, integrations, and reporting features provided by their solution.
40	What level of human oversight is required for incoming emails and phone calls?	Please refer to Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 5 (AI Attendant for Supplier Help Desk Capabilities). Vendors should describe confidence thresholds, routing to staff, preservation of context, and human-in-the-loop oversight for inquiries that cannot be resolved automatically.
41	What level of change management (communication and training) will be required of the service provider? Will the State of TN participate in these activities?	Vendors should describe their change management and training approach, including roles expected of the vendor and the State (see Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 11 and Cost Informational Form, Item 13).
42	What identity and banking verification processes are	The RFI does not provide current verification success rates. The RFI includes target outcomes, including a 75%

	currently utilized and what is the success rate?	success rate in automated bank account and identity verifications. Vendors should describe their recommended verification approach and expected performance metrics (see Section 2 and Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 6).
43	What is the current staffing level and organization of the supplier support team?	Please reference response to Question 7.
44	What are the other request paths for new supplier onboarding/supplier changes? Is there a process flow for onboarding showing all the origination request points?	This information is not provided in the RFI. Vendors should describe their recommended discovery approach to identify request origination points and document end-to-end onboarding and maintenance process flows (Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 7 and Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 11).
45	What methods does the state currently use for validating supplier bank accounts and what are its shortcomings?	Specific current bank account validation methods and shortcomings are not detailed in the RFI. Vendors should propose bank account verification enhancements, including account ownership verification and monitoring approaches, and how false positives/negatives are handled (Section 6 and Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 7).
46	Does the state anticipate that sensitive information be stored in future state applications? Are there any special requirements to be followed for storing sensitive information?	Please refer to Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 9 of the RFI. Vendors should describe data storage, residency, retention/disposal, encryption (FIPS 140-2 or 140-3), privacy controls for PII/financial data, incident response, and any security/compliance requirements relevant to handling sensitive information.
47	How many agents does the state anticipate handling the supplier volume (300,000) described in the RFI?	The RFI does not specify anticipated agent staffing levels for future operations. Vendors should propose an operating model, including automation rates, staffing impacts, and roles/responsibilities for vendor and State (see Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 11).
48	Does the state anticipate vetting all existing vendors through the supplier validation process as part of the migration?	Please reference response to Question 31.
49	Does the state have an incumbent external facing platform that pairs with Edison? If yes, what is it?	This information is not provided in the RFI. The RFI identifies integration with PeopleSoft Edison and alignment with supplier data consolidation; vendors should describe integration assumptions and dependencies (Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 8).
50	What is the anticipated volume of Identify Checks?	The RFI provides baseline volumes of ~18,000 new suppliers per year and >25,000 changes to supplier files per year. Vendors should propose expected verification event volumes based on their approach and identify any assumptions used for sizing and pricing.
51	Is one vendor preferred for all functions, or can we bid solely on the ID Varication sections?	Vendors may respond to a single component (AI Attendant or Identity and Banking Verification) or both, as stated in Section 2 of the RFI.
52	Is there an incumbent solution that will be displaced? (if so, who?)	The RFI does not identify an incumbent solution that will be displaced. Vendors should describe how their solution integrates with PeopleSoft Edison and other systems and clearly state assumptions about any legacy tooling

		(Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 8 and Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 13).
53	Is the vision for this solution to have commodity management associated with supplier onboarding or just onboarding supplier profiles? The configuration and implementation timelines differ accordingly.	The RFI scope focuses on supplier onboarding and maintenance, help desk automation, identity verification, and bank account verification enhancements. Commodity management is not identified as an objective in this RFI. Vendors may describe additional capabilities separately and clearly identify scope impacts.
54	What is the anticipated number of total and concurrent supplier users and State users?	The RFI provides the scale of supplier records managed (~300,000) but does not specify the number of supplier portal users or concurrency requirements. Vendors should describe scalability patterns and how their solution supports enterprise scale (Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 12).
55	Are there mandatory standards or partners for bank verification (e.g., NACHA-compliant processes, specific banks or networks) that the State requires?	The RFI does not mandate specific banking partners or networks. Vendors should describe their bank account verification approach and any standards supported, including how routing/account validation and account ownership verification are performed (see Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 6).
56	Are FIPS 140-2 or 140-3 validated cryptographic modules required for in-transit and at-rest encryption across all components?	Yes. The RFI specifies encryption in transit and at rest utilizing FIPS 140-2 or 140-3 standards (Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 9). Vendors should describe how this requirement is met across all components.
57	Are there constraints on third-party verification services or data brokers the State will or will not allow?	The RFI does not specify prohibited third-party verification services. Vendors should disclose third-party dependencies and describe how all services meet State requirements for data security, privacy, auditability, and compliance (Sections 9 and 13).
58	What processes does the State operate today that are at a high risk for fraud?	The RFI identifies supplier onboarding and maintenance as key risk areas, including vulnerabilities related to changes in banking information and weak onboarding controls. Vendors should describe risk areas addressed by their solution and recommended controls (see Section 2 and Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 6).
59	Are there any examples of the most common fraudulent scenarios that the State encounters?	The RFI does not provide specific case examples of fraud scenarios encountered. Vendors should describe common public-sector supplier fraud scenarios their solution addresses and the controls/analytics used to prevent and detect them (see Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 6).
60	Are there specific fraud scenarios (e.g., banking change fraud, impersonation, duplicate vendors) the State considers highest risk and wants prioritized in the pilot?	The RFI does not prescribe specific fraud scenarios to prioritize. Vendors should propose a risk-based approach for pilot prioritization, including how scenarios such as banking change fraud, impersonation, duplicate entities, and anomalous behavior would be detected and handled (see Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 6).
61	What % of fraud happens in the onboarding of new suppliers, vs. what % of	This information is not provided in the RFI.

	fraud happens for suppliers that already exist in the system?	
62	Aside from bank, fraud, and ID verification, are there any other verifications the State does today for existing or new suppliers?	In addition to identity and banking verification, vendors should address validations such as W-9/W-8 validation, TIN matching, address validation, and verification of contact information (phone/email), as well as duplicate prevention controls (see Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 7).
63	What verification artifacts must be retained for audit (documents, screenshots, logs, timestamps), and for how long?	The RFI requires audit logging and requests vendors describe data retention, disposal, and retention practices, but does not prescribe specific retention periods. Vendors should describe what verification artifacts and logs are captured, how they are protected, and their recommended retention approach to support audits and investigations (see Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 9 and Item 10).
64	What does the State do with data for suppliers who are no longer active in the State? For example, is there an archival process?	The RFI requests controls for inactivation of supplier files due to lack of payment activity and automation of disabling user accounts due to inactivity. Vendors should describe archival, retention, and reactivation capabilities and recommended policies (see Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 7 and Item 9).
65	Is the proposed solution meant for new suppliers only or is it also applicable for existing suppliers?	The RFI scope includes both onboarding of new suppliers and maintenance/changes to existing supplier records. Vendors should describe how their solution supports both scenarios, including controls for changes to sensitive data (Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 7).
66	Is the State open to having a modernized portal that is more modern and LLM backed, than what exists today in the Supplier Portal experience?	The State is seeking recommendations through this RFI to enhance supplier self-service and transparency. Vendors may propose portal modernization approaches consistent with the RFI scope and State requirements for security, privacy, and accessibility.
67	Would the State expect the solution automatically enroll the supplier into a direct deposit program?	The RFI includes a target to achieve 60% direct deposit adoption among newly onboarded suppliers. Vendors should describe how their solution supports increasing direct deposit adoption, including supplier experience, required authorizations/consents, and any automation options.
68	Does the State require configurable workflows for different agencies or supplier types, or a single standardized workflow?	Please refer to Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 7 of the RFI. Vendors should describe workflow configurability versus hard-coded processes, including support for differences by agency, program, supplier type, or risk level, as applicable.
69	Does the State use any fraud prevention tools today? If so, what are they?	This information is not provided in the RFI.
70	What does the State's fraud prevention process entail?	Please reference response to Question 69.
71	Does the State use any account or ID verification tools today?	This information is not provided in the RFI.

72	What does the State's current account or ID verification process entail?	Please reference response to Question 71.
73	Does the State request Suppliers to use any 2 factor authentication tools or processes today?	The RFI does not specify current supplier MFA practices. Vendors should describe authentication methods supported for supplier self-service, including MFA options, and how user account creation and access controls are managed (see Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 7 and Item 9).
74	Does the State have existing automated approval processes today (e.g. approval of an invoice) or is there a human in the loop at all times? Is there a desire for automation of approval processes in the future?	The RFI focuses on onboarding, maintenance, verification, and help desk automation and does not define current invoice approval automation practices. Vendors should describe human-in-the-loop controls and how automation and exception handling are governed (see Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 5, Item 6, and Item 7).
75	What steps in the supplier onboarding or maintenance process cause the most bottlenecks and resolutions?	The RFI identifies current challenges including long cycle times, significant manual effort, and high volumes of follow-up communications. Vendors should describe how their solution reduces bottlenecks, including automation opportunities, exception handling, and improved supplier transparency (see Section 2 and Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 7).
76	What major supplier issues does the State intend to resolve through the following project goal: "Enhance supplier self-service and transparency"? At what points in the onboarding or management process do suppliers tend to get stuck?	Please refer to Section 2 of the RFI. The goal to enhance supplier self-service and transparency includes reducing "Request More Information" actions and pending emails, and improving supplier visibility into status and next steps. Vendors should describe how their supplier-facing experience supports these outcomes (see Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 5 and Item 7).
77	What historical data is available?	The RFI indicates alignment with data consolidation plans and identifies potential supplier data sources (e.g., W-9s, SDDA forms, IRS TIN Match, Supplier Update and Email Deposit Notification forms, PNC verification logs, and other independent sources). Vendors should describe how historical data could be ingested, validated, and used (Section 2 and Cost Informational Form: Data Migration and Historical Data Use).
78	Does the State have historical data regarding fraud detection (e.g. logs of previous fraud events)? If so, where is it stored?	The RFI does not describe existing fraud event logs. The RFI requires reporting, metrics, and audit logging in the proposed solution. Vendors should describe how fraud-related events and verification outcomes are logged, retained, and made available for audits and investigations (see Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 10).
79	What kind of audit trails does the State have today?	The RFI does not describe current audit trails. Vendors should describe audit logging available for supplier actions, State employee actions, and system decisions, as well as export/integration options (see Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 10).
80	Are the forms that are filled out by new suppliers checked against credible	Vendors should describe automated validations against authoritative sources (e.g., TIN matching, address validation, bank account verification, and document

	government and banking solutions today?	validation) and how results are audited and traceable (see Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 7).
81	Aside from Peoplesoft, where is your supplier data housed (E.g. in a database, or scattered?)	The RFI anticipates aligning to a consolidated supplier data strategy and identifies multiple potential data sources beyond PeopleSoft Edison (e.g., W-9s, SDDA forms, IRS TIN Match, Supplier Update and Email Deposit Notification forms, PNC verification logs, and other independent sources). Vendors should describe how their solution supports data consolidation, governance, and integration (see Section 2 and Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 8).
82	Is the State team able to support ML models, or is the State willing to hire additional personnel if needed?	The RFI does not specify State staffing capacity to support ML models. Vendors should describe their support model, operational requirements, and any assumptions regarding State-provided resources, including options for vendor-managed services (see Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 11 and Item 13).
83	What team within the State currently maintains the supplier portal?	This information is not provided in the RFI.
84	Where will the solution be hosted?	Vendors should describe their proposed deployment/hosting model (SaaS, PaaS, on-prem, or hybrid), hosting environment and cloud service provider (if applicable), and how the model meets State security and privacy requirements (see Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 4 and Item 9).
85	What tech stack is currently in place for the existing system?	This information is not provided in the RFI. Vendors should describe their integration approach and any technical assumptions required to interface with PeopleSoft Edison and other State systems (Section 6: Technical Informational Form, Item 8).
86	What, if any, technologies are considered out-of-bounds? 3rd parties?	The RFI does not identify specific out-of-bounds technologies. Vendors should identify any third-party products/services required, describe third-party dependencies and licensing limitations, and ensure proposed solutions meet State requirements for data security, privacy, accessibility, and auditability (Sections 9 and 13).

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