



STATE OF TENNESSEE
Commerce and Insurance

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS # 33501-262529
AMENDMENT # 1
FOR GOODS OR MANUFACTURED HOUSING
INSPECTION AND CODES ENFORCEMENT SYSTEM**

DATE: May, 18 2026

RFP # 33501-262529 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		April 15, 2026
2. Disability Accommodation Request Deadline	2:00 p.m.	April 20, 2026
3. Pre-response Conference	10:00 a.m.	April 23, 2026
4. Notice of Intent to Respond Deadline	2:00 p.m.	April 24 2026
5. Written "Questions & Comments" Deadline	2:00 p.m.	April 29, 2026
6. State Response to Written "Questions & Comments"		May 18, 2026
7. Round 2, Written "Questions & Comments" Deadline NOTE: Respondents may submit no more than five (5) questions to the State in the 2nd round of Written Questions and Comments.	2:00 p.m.	May 22, 2026
8. Round 2, State Response to Written "Questions & Comments"		June 9, 2026
9. Response Deadline	2:00 p.m.	June 17, 2026
10. State Completion of Technical Response Evaluations (Section B. and C. of RFP Attachment 6.2.)		July 1, 2026
11. State Schedules Respondent Oral Presentation		July 2 2026
12. Respondent Oral Presentation	8 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.	July 8-10, 2026
13. State Completion of Technical Response Evaluations (Section D. of RFP Attachment 6.2.)		July 15, 2026

14. State Opening & Scoring of Cost Proposals	2:00 p.m.	July 16, 2026
15. Negotiations	4:30 p.m.	July 17-23, 2026
16. State Notice of Intent to Award Released <u>and</u> RFP Files Opened for Public Inspection	2:00 p.m.	July 24, 2026
17. End of Protest Period		July 31, 2026
18. State sends contract to Contractor for signature		August 3, 2026
19. Contractor Signature Deadline	2:00 p.m.	August 5, 2026

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
		1. Could the State share background on the current operating environment and the primary drivers behind pursuing a new solution?	The State is currently using a combination of legacy systems including access databases, dynamic forms, etc. The State is pursuing a cohesive modern solution.
		2. Given the breadth of requirements, technical complexity, and the importance of assembling a thoughtful and competitive response that best serves the State's objectives, we respectfully request consideration of a three (3) week extension to the current proposal submission deadline. Kindly advise.	No, the State will not consider an extension to the current submission deadline.
		3. Could the State share the role of distribution across the 150 named users?	Yes — the State can share a clear role-based distribution across the 150 named users. Based on current inputs: The majority (~84%) are standard users, reflecting operational staff (inspectors, examiners, etc.) A small leadership layer exists (16%) (Managers, Supervisors, Directors). There is flexibility (50 users) to accommodate view-only access, external stakeholders, or future expansion.

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
		4. Could the State share a directional breakdown of the funded program budget across implementation, licenses, hosting, maintenance, and ongoing years?	No, the State will not share a directional breakdown.
		5. Will CORE API documentation or sandbox access be made available to respondents, and if so, when? Kindly suggest.	No, API documentation or sandbox access will not be made available to respondents.
		6. Could the State share any context on the designated Merchant Services Provider and preferred integration approach?	The State is asking for responses to provide their suggested approach; the State would like to see Respondents' recommended approaches.
		7. Could the State confirm preferences around Active Directory integration and authentication protocols?	<p>The System must integrate with the State's Active Directory for credential management and user authentication. It must support single sign-on (SSO) using industry-standard protocols such as:</p> <p>SAML</p> <p>OAuth 2.0 (minimum requirement)</p> <p>Additionally, the System must:</p> <p>Enforce role-based access control tied to user roles;</p> <p>Support secure, browser-based access across environments; and</p> <p>Align with State security policies and NIST-based controls.</p>
		8. Are there data residency or hosting location requirements respondents should reflect?	The Contractor shall ensure that all State Data is housed in the continental United States, inclusive of backup data. All State Data must remain in the United States, regardless of whether the data is processed, stored, in-transit, or at rest. Access to State Data shall be limited to US-based (onshore) resources only.
		9. Could the State share information on the volume, format, age, and quality of legacy data to be migrated, and whether	<p>MFH: Approximately 400 MB of data is stored electronically.</p> <p>Codes - All legacy data is digital. There are no files greater than 20 years old. File count is currently 2,975,111 with file size in the repository program servers at</p>

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
		sample data may be made available?	4,061,611 MB and DB servers at 66,732 MB for a total of 4,128,343 MB.
		10. Could the State share any background on prior vendor demonstrations, market research, or solutions previously evaluated?	The State conducted an RFI in 2023 for the Manufactured Housing section that can be made available through a public records request.
C.9		11. What are the roles and responsibilities of the personas (Manufactured Housing Inspectors, County Clerks, Code Enforcement Inspectors and Plans Examiners)?	<p>The Manufactured Housing Installation (MFH) program is responsible for overseeing installation compliance, inspection activities, and licensee accountability. The Installation Manager leads the program by tracking and managing weekly reports, past-due notices, POCA documentation, imminent safety hazards, licensee concerns, and complaints. Installation Inspectors ensure that manufactured homes are installed in accordance with state standards by conducting inspections, documenting approvals or rejections, and submitting required documentation to both licensees and the Department. Administrative staff support these efforts by preparing, recording, and distributing weekly inspection reports. Additionally, county clerks play a key role by selling and assigning decals to licensees, and by submitting monthly reports and payments to the State documenting all decals issued.</p> <p>Within the Codes program, responsibilities are divided across plan review, inspection, and administrative functions. Plans Examiners review building plans for compliance with applicable codes and participate in pre-construction meetings with designers. Inspectors conduct field inspections to ensure code compliance, provide consultations, investigate complaints, and perform licensing inspections. Administrative staff manage operational and reporting functions, including processing inspection requests from state agencies, handling plan review applications and revisions, managing revenue and billing, and processing complaints. They also generate performance and management reports—such as inspection and plan review volumes—and track key metrics like annual school inspections and other regulatory measures.</p>

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
C.16		12. How are regions defined and assigned to inspectors?	<p>Regions and assignments are structured differently across the Manufactured Housing (MFH) and Codes programs, based on the nature of their work and coverage needs.</p> <p>For the MFH program, inspectors are assigned to clearly defined geographic regions made up of specific groups of counties. The state is divided into six regions, and each inspector is responsible for all inspection activities within their assigned counties. This regional structure ensures consistent coverage and accountability, with oversight provided by the Installation Manager.</p> <p>In the Codes program, assignments are more flexible and are based on the type of work being performed. Plans Examiners are typically assigned by agency (such as UT, Tennessee Tech, or University of Memphis) or by occupancy type (e.g., daycares, rental cabins), allowing for specialization in specific project types. Inspectors, on the other hand, are generally assigned geographically by county or zip code (for example, Memphis), ensuring efficient scheduling and localized service delivery.</p>
C.16		13. Do Manufactured Housing Inspectors and Code Enforcement Inspectors have the same defined regions assigned?	No, each section has its own set of defined inspector territories.
C.17		14. Do Manufactured Housing Inspectors and Code Enforcement Inspectors both require route optimization	Yes, both Manufactured Housing Inspectors and Codes Inspectors require route optimization.
C.21		15. Will the CORE application used by Department of Commerce Insurance need to be integrated with the solution? If so, what system technology is CORE built on?	<p>The RFP indicates that the System must provide access to, or integrate with, the Department's existing permitting and licensing system (CORE), as referenced in the Technical Requirements.</p> <p>However, the RFP does not prescribe specific integration methods or technical details for CORE. Respondents should propose solutions capable of integrating with existing State systems using standard, secure integration approaches (e.g., APIs).</p> <p>Additional technical details regarding CORE may be provided during contract implementation, as needed.</p>

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
C.25		16. What technology or tools are currently used to generate decal numbers?	Currently, decal numbers are generated sequentially. When placing an order, we provide the next available serial number in the sequence along with the quantity of decals needed. Our third-party vendor then prints the decals in numerical order.
C.26		17. What tools are used for payment processing for remittance to the state for the County Clerk facing portal?	Currently, payments for the County Clerks are submitted by mail along with their monthly reports and are processed by the Department of Commerce and Insurance's Fiscal Department.
C.29		18. What is the volume of record data that will need to be stored within the system?	See response to question 9.
C.29		19. What is the volume of file data that will need to be stored in the system? (images, PDFs, scanned docs, etc)	See response to question 9.
C.29		20. Will data be regularly archived? If so, what type of data needs to be archived?	The Contractor is responsible for backing up data in accordance with the requirements in the <i>Pro Forma</i> contract.
		21. Are there downstream systems that need to contain replications of data from this new system?	There is a potential for downstream systems that need to contain replications of data from this new System. Once the solution is selected, that determination will be made.
C.30		22. What types of criteria will be used to identify duplicate records?	The State anticipates to migrate all data over to the new System, regardless of duplication.
C.30		23. What types of alternate data needs to be configured for database search?	The Codes enforcement section desires that geographical data be utilized in order to allow for location searches by coordinates.
C.30		24. How many tables are present that store data in the current database that would need to be migrated to the new system	Codes: 57 Tables, largest 77 columns MFH:7, largest 29 columns
C.30		25. Across these tables, what is the average table width (number of columns) that exist across the existing database	Codes: 11 MFH:10
D.2.b		26. How does the State report installation compliance to HUD and ANSI? What information is provided?	At this time no MFH installation data is shared with HUD unless a request is made. This typically occurs on an annual basis, and will be a compilation of number of installations, inspections, and inspectors.

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
D.2.b		27. How is the current solution connected to the TN state network for reporting purposes?	The State requires more information in order to provide an answer to this question.
D.2.d		28. What are the components of a POCA schedule for TDCI?	<p>Overall, a POCA schedule for TDCI includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Defined submission timelines (e.g., 30 days for MFH), Detailed corrective action documentation requirements, Multi-level review and approval (inspector and supervisor), Ongoing tracking and enforcement mechanisms, Escalation procedures for non-compliance, and Final verification and closure of the issue.
		29. How will change management activities (i.e., communication and training) be managed with end users and stakeholders?	<p>Change management activities for both MFH and Codes will focus on clear communication, hands-on training, and ongoing support to ensure successful adoption by all end users and stakeholders.</p> <p>For the MFH program, training will emphasize practical, user-focused learning. This includes system demonstrations, hands-on sessions, and step-by-step tutorials to help users become comfortable with entering data and applying new processes or system changes. Supporting materials—such as FAQs, user guides, and designated support contacts—will be provided to reinforce learning. Follow-up sessions and refresher materials will also be offered to address questions and ensure continued confidence over time.</p> <p>For the Codes program, Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) from Plans Examiners, Inspectors, and Administrative staff will play a key role throughout the development process. Their involvement ensures that system design aligns with real-world workflows and that they can effectively communicate updates and changes back to their respective teams. The vendor will be responsible for delivering comprehensive training—either online or in person—tailored to the different functional roles. In addition, the vendor will provide clear, written documentation to support day-to-day use.</p>

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
			Overall, this approach combines early stakeholder engagement, role-based training, accessible support resources, and continuous learning opportunities to promote smooth adoption and minimize disruption during implementation.
A.5		30. Does Contract Section A.5 mean that if the requirements change from the ones identified in the RFP, the Contractor will be allowed to submit a project change request to include the costs for these changes?	Section A.5 establishes that the System must be designed to accommodate changes in legal, regulatory, or business requirements; however, it does not address compensation for such changes. Compensation for additional work are governed by Sections A.12 (Configuration Support), A.14 (Software Maintenance), and A.15 (Change Orders). Based on these sections, changes that fall outside of standard maintenance and support may be submitted as a formal Change Order for State review and approval, with associated costs defined prior to execution.
A.8		31. Does Contract Section A.8. mean that the System must be hosted by the State and that Contractor cannot provide the hosted environment? Contractor provides SaaS solutions which would be hosted in our AWS environment.	No. Section A.8 does not require the System to be hosted by the State. As outlined in the RFP, the State is seeking a Software as a Service (SaaS) solution, and the Contractor is expected to provide and manage the cloud-hosted environment. Section A.8 requires that the System align with the State of Tennessee's information resources architecture policies and standards, including applicable security and integration requirements.
A.9.b		32. Does Contract Section A.9.b mean that if the Contractor provides a SaaS system based on number of users, that there cannot be any fees for additional SaaS licenses should the number of users increase after contract execution?	Yes, the contract requires the vendor to provide additional System user licenses to supplement the base license, and the State will not provide any additional payment other than maintenance.
A.13.a(6), ii. C.b		33. Contract Section A.14.a.(6).ii.C.b – Will the state consider reducing the percentage of the cap on Contractor compensation to the State for failure to conform with the SLAs to less than 100% of the monthly maintenance amount?	No, the State will not consider a reduction to the percentage of the cap on Contractor compensation to the State for failure to conform with the SLAs.

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
D.18		34. Contract Section D.18 – Will State consider changing the Contractor's liability to one (1) times the Maximum Liability?	No, the State will not consider changing the Contractor's liability limit under Section D.18 to one (1) times the Maximum Liability amount.
D.20		35. Contract Section D.20 – Will the State consider removing Contract Section D.20. regarding HIPAA Compliance if the System does not store PHI?	No, the State will not consider removing Contract Section D.20. regarding HIPAA Compliance. Note that the requirements of this Section only apply to the extent "applicable."
D.32		36. Contract Section D.32 – Will the State consider removing the stipulation that the State can require additional insurance coverage?	No, the State will not consider removing the stipulation that the State can require additional insurance coverage.
D.32		37. Contract Section D.32 – Will the State consider removing the stipulation that any deductible or self-insured retention over \$50,000 be approved by the State?	Yes, the State can agree to remove the requirement that any deductible or self-insured retention over \$50,000 be approved by the State.
D.32		38. Contract Section D.32 – Will the State consider removing the requirement to submit a COI 30-days prior to its expiration? Contractors do not receive individualized COIs until the new coverage period starts.	The State will consider revising this requirement so that it reads, "...and again upon the renewal or replacement of coverage."
D.32		39. Contract Section D.32 – Will the State consider removing the requirement to provide complete copies of all insurance policies? Contractor considers its insurance policies to be confidential.	The State will consider revising this requirement such that only COIs and copies of policy endorsements (or policy excerpts providing for the equivalent coverage) are required.
D.37. b.4		40. Contract Section D.37.b.4 – Will the State consider removing this section as it would not apply to a SaaS system? Any drives or media associated with the Contractor's AWS hosting would remain with the Contractor.	No, the State will not consider the proposed removal of Section D.37.b.4.

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
D.37.c		41. Contract Section D.37.c – Will the State consider removing this whole section? Contractor engages third-party vendors to conduct security audits and will provide the results of those audits to Tennessee. It is not necessary and it introduces security risk for the Tennessee Comptroller to perform information technology control audits.	No, the State will not consider the proposed removal of Section D.37.c.
E.8		42. Contract Section E.8. – Will the State consider making appropriate changes to the section to reflect the terms that are associated with SaaS Software? There will not be any Custom Developed Application Software, nor any Work Product created under this Contract. There will not be any perpetual non-exclusive licenses granted. All software will be provided as subscription licenses and will remain the intellectual property of Contractor.	No, the State will not consider making changes to Section E.8.
C.13		43. Please provide the model of iOS devices that will be used. Will any iOS devices include LTE-capable models?	<p>The team currently utilizes LTE-capable Apple iPhone 13 or newer devices, with inspectors using iPhone models up to the iPhone 16. All devices in use today support LTE connectivity.</p> <p>Going forward, there is a requirement to support both smartphones and tablets for inspection activities, including the use of LTE-capable iPads.</p>
C.13		44. Will PCs be used for offline use? If yes, please provide the PC specs the state plans to use.	No, PCs will not be used offline.
General		45. Please provide an approximate count of internal agency inspectors	There are approximately 80 inspectors and they are all internal.

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
		and external contractor inspectors.	
General		46. Please provide an approximate count of records the State has in the current database for each license type.	See response to question 9.
General		47. Are site visits, violations, and corrective actions are currently tracked within the Licensing platform? If yes, please describe the current process.	<p>For the Codes program, complaints are tracked within CORE; however, other inspection-related activities are managed through a combination of tools. These include spreadsheets, system workflows, databases, and automated processes to track inspections and related actions. Plan reviews are managed separately through a custom application. As a result, tracking is distributed across multiple systems rather than housed entirely within CORE.</p> <p>For the MFH program, site visits, violations, and corrective actions are not comprehensively tracked within CORE. The platform is primarily used to maintain licensee status. POCA (Plan of Corrective Action) information is only entered into CORE in limited circumstances—specifically when legal action is initiated or when a licensee’s status must be flagged or updated. All other inspection reports, violations, and POCA-related documentation are maintained outside of CORE.</p> <p>In summary, while CORE plays a role in tracking certain elements (primarily complaints in Codes and licensee status in MFH), the majority of site visit, violation, and corrective action tracking currently occurs across multiple external systems and processes.</p>
General		48. Please describe whether post-site visit workflows or a follow-up portal is required to manage corrective actions by the regulated entity, or if this will be handled through the Licensing online portal.	<p>A post-site visit workflow and follow-up portal will be required to effectively manage corrective actions for both MFH and Codes, with functionality integrated into or aligned with the Licensing online portal.</p> <p>For the MFH program, a structured post-site visit workflow within the portal is essential. Since inspection documentation will be housed in the new system—and current weekly reports are not maintained in CORE—the solution must support end-to-end tracking of corrective actions. This includes POCA submission, review, re-inspections, and final closure. Providing this functionality within the portal will ensure accurate</p>

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
			<p>tracking, improved visibility, and better management of compliance activities.</p> <p>For the Codes program, portal capabilities are also necessary but vary slightly by function. For plan reviews, a portal is needed to allow customers to submit revised plans. For inspections, the system must enable customers to submit POCAs and other follow-up documentation electronically. The exact workflow design may be refined by the vendor, but it should prioritize ease of submission, clear communication, and efficient review and tracking of corrective actions.</p> <p>Overall, both programs require a centralized, user-accessible portal that supports post-site visit workflows, facilitates document submission by regulated entities, and enables staff to track, review, and close out corrective actions efficiently.</p>
General		49. Please identify any inspection reports or enforcement-related documents that are currently generated and distributed through Versa.	Neither Codes Enforcement nor Manufactured Housing have any reports or enforcement related documents that are distributed through Versa.
General		50. Should the General Public have authenticated access, or is unauthenticated, read only access sufficient for public facing functions?	The State requires a combination of each level of access. Customers will need an authenticated approach and the general public should have the ability to view general data as outlined by the sections.
General		51. Please indicate whether there is a requirement to assign or manage site visits outside of the Licensing platform. If yes, please provide details.	Yes, there is a requirement that all inspection functions be completed outside of the licensing platform. The new cohesive solution should assign and manage all site related activities.
General		52. Please indicate if there are existing active regulatory sets in the Licensing platform for these license types.	Yes, the existing license platform has licenses for MFH installers, retailers, and manufactures. It's the State's desire that installers, and retailers will be able to utilize the proposed new System to purchase decals, submit reports, and complete POCAs. For Codes, Architects and Engineers will be utilizing the new System to submit plans and the State needs the ability to validate the current license status.
General		53. Are there are any e-signature requirements in the field?	Yes, e-signature functionality is required for both programs.

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
General		54. How many inspection types/ forms exist today for conducting inspections?	For MFH, there is currently one standardized form used to conduct inspections. For Codes, there are at least 15 different forms used across inspections, plan reviews, and administrative functions.
General		55. What percentage of inspections are: a Routine scheduled b complaint-based c Follow-up / re-inspections d. Ad hoc Inspections	a. MFH - 60%; Codes - 49% b. MFH - NA; Codes -1.5% c. MFH - 40%; Codes - 49% d. MFH - NA; Codes - 0.5%
General		56. Does the State have any SLA requirements for inspection completion?	The Codes Division has Interagency Agreements (IAs) that set for inspection requirements for certain types of inspections. Outside of the the IAs, there are Standard Operating Procedures that establish inspection requirements.
C.4 (Uptime Narrative — 99.5%), C.31.c (Performance Requirements — 99.9%), Pro Forma Section A.6.e (SLA Metrics)		57 Availability SLA Discrepancy C.4 asks Respondents to describe their plan for meeting a "99.5% Application availability threshold," while C.31.c states the System shall be "available 99.9% of the time except for scheduled maintenance." Pro Forma Section A.6.e defines SLA tiers at 99.9%, 99.5%, and 99.0% with corresponding service credits. a. Is the State's target availability SLA 99.5% or 99.9%? If both figures are intentional, does 99.5% represent the contractual minimum with service credit triggers, and 99.9% represent the aspirational performance target? b. Does "scheduled maintenance" (excluded from the 99.9% calculation in C.31.c) align with the maintenance window definitions in Pro Forma Section A.13, or are there additional exclusions?	a. The State expects the System to function at 99.9%, but the contractual SLA minimum is 99.5%. b. There are no additional exclusions.
General		58. What standard reports are required for inspections?	For MFH, there is one standard inspection report form currently in use. Additionally, a pre-populated reinspection report is needed, which carries forward previously identified violations. This can be achieved by linking the prior failed/rejected decal number to the new decal and associated POCA submitted by the licensee.

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
			<p>For the Codes program, there are seven standard inspection report types, including:</p> <p>General, Annual School, Complaint, Mobile Food Unit, Fireworks, Construction, and Consultation & Inspections.</p>
General		59. Please describe any additional reporting related to enforcement or inspection activities.	<p>For MFH, reports include inspection volumes and rates, decals purchased, regional totals, first inspection of the year per licensee, and overall compliance tracking.</p> <p>For Codes, reports focus on timeliness (plan reviews, submissions, inspections), annual school inspection reporting, percentage of on-time inspections, average completion time, and financial metrics such as plan review revenue, inspection billing, and processing timeliness.</p>
General		60. Will the State provide a definitive list of statutory timing and sequencing rules that the System must enforce?	Yes. The State will provide a definitive list of all statutory timing and sequencing rules, including relevant dates, for the System to enforce.
C.26 (Payment Processing), Pro Forma Section A.7		<p>61. Merchant Services Provider and Payment Integration</p> <p>Section A.7 states the System shall integrate with the "State's designated merchant services provider (State MSP)" and that "all transaction-based Portal fees shall be assessed, collected, and settled directly to the State." C.26 requires processing of credit cards, debit cards, and echecks.</p> <p>a. Can the State identify the current contracted merchant services provider and the integration method (API, redirect, iframe, hosted payment page)?</p> <p>b. Is the merchant services integration expected to be shared across all portals (county clerk, customer, and public), or are there separate payment configurations by portal?</p>	<p>a. Under Tenn. Code Ann. §10-7-504(i) vendor identity or a description of the goods or services provided by the vendor shall be confidential.</p> <p>b. The State expects the System to utilize the same merchant service. While the functions of the merchant service are not expected to be mirrored in each of the programs, it is expected to maintain one merchant service.</p>

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
C.9 (Division User Specific Role Based Access), C.15 (Staff Facing Portal), C.21 (Plans Examiner Work Queue), C.27 (Building Project Public Profiles)		<p>62. Codes Enforcement Scope and Volume</p> <p>The RFP establishes the Codes Enforcement Division as a co-equal program alongside Manufactured Housing, with its own user roles (inspectors, plans examiners, customers, exempt jurisdictions, contractors, daycares), work queues, and public-facing portal functions. To appropriately size and configure the Codes Enforcement module, can the State provide the following?</p> <p>a. Approximate annual volume of plan review submissions and codes enforcement inspections currently handled by the Division.</p> <p>b. The number of plans examiners and codes enforcement inspectors who will use the System.</p> <p>c. Whether the Codes Enforcement Division currently uses any electronic system (or is fully paper/manual), and if so, whether data from that system is in scope for migration under C.30.</p>	<p>a. The Codes Enforcement Division currently handles approximately 3,000 Plan review submissions and 20,000 inspections annually.</p> <p>b. 17 Plans Examiners, 68 Inspectors, 1 Director, and 3 Admins will use the System.</p> <p>c. Codes Enforcement is currently all electronic. All data to be migrated is digital.</p>
Pro Forma Section A.6.a.(1), C.29 (Data Warehouse and Reporting)		<p>63. OLAP / Data Warehouse Access Model</p> <p>Section A.6.a.(1) states that designated users shall have backend access to an "online analytical processing (OLAP) reporting or other agreed upon database" and shall be able to "create and manage their own schema(s) and database objects."</p> <p>C.29 asks for a narrative on data warehouse and reporting but does not repeat the OLAP-specific language.</p> <p>a. Is the State's expectation that a separate OLAP or replica database be provisioned with direct SQL or schema-level access for State analysts, or would a reporting layer with ad-hoc query tools and data export capabilities (e.g., configurable dashboards, scheduled reports, CSV/Excel export) satisfy this requirement?</p> <p>b. Is the State willing to build upon the existing CORE datamart for</p>	<p>a. Yes, it's the State's desire to have a replica database.</p> <p>b. Depending on technical details and the selected vendor, it may be able to be built upon, however there is no certainty.</p> <p>c. It is the expectation that no more than 10 application administrators for the State will be provided direct backend database access.</p>

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
		<p>reporting needs, or is a new standalone datamart required for this RFP?</p> <p>c. How many State users are anticipated to need direct backend database access versus report-consumer access?</p>	
<p>C.25 (Issue Decals), C.26 (Payment Processing), D.2.a (User Story 1: County Clerk Assignment), D.2.b (User Story 2: Licensee Self-Reporting)</p>		<p>64. Decal Issuance Workflow and County Clerk Role</p> <p>The oral presentation user stories describe a workflow where the county clerk assigns an installation request to a licensee (D.2.a) and the licensee then self-reports installation details (D.2.b). To properly configure the county clerk portal and decal issuance workflow:</p> <p>a. Are manufactured housing decals currently physical items tracked by inventory (serial number, batch, issuance count), or are they electronic records generated by the System upon completion of the issuance workflow?</p> <p>b. Does the county clerk initiate the decal request, or does the licensee/installer initiate it and the county clerk approves? The user stories suggest the clerk assigns to a licensee, but clarification on the trigger event would help define the portal workflow.</p> <p>c. Are all 95 Tennessee counties expected to use the county clerk portal at go-live, or will there be a phased rollout?</p>	<p>a. Manufactured Housing decals are physical items. Before issuance, their inventory is maintained manually by the admin in an Excel spreadsheet that tracks the date, decal number, county assignment, and quantity. Once the decals are mailed and officially assigned to a county, they are then entered into our Access database. So while the initial tracking is manual, the decals are technically tracked within a system after issuance.</p> <p>b. The county clerk initiates the decal request. When their inventory is running low, the clerk emails or faxes a request to the Department. We then fulfill the order by assigning the next available decal sequence to that county and mailing the decals to them. After receiving the decals, the installer or retailer goes to the county clerk to purchase the number of labels they need.</p> <p>c. It is the State's desire that all 95 county clerks will have access to the county clerk portal at go-live.</p>
<p>C.18.b, C.18.f, C.21.b, C.21.g, C.28.d</p>		<p>65. TFM Number Assignment and Lifecycle</p> <p>The Tennessee Fire Marshal (TFM) number is referenced across inspector work queues, plans examiner work queues, and the public searchable database, but the RFP does not describe the TFM assignment rules or lifecycle.</p> <p>a. Is the TFM number auto-generated by the System upon a triggering event (e.g., installation report submission, plan review</p>	<p>a. The TFM number is automatically generated, but the ability to manually override is needed.</p> <p>b. The TFM number is only used by Codes.</p> <p>c. The number is sequential, but there are special schemes used for campuses.</p>

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
		<p>application), or is it manually assigned by State staff?</p> <p>b. Does a single TFM number apply to both Manufactured Housing and Codes Enforcement records, or are the numbering schemes separate by division?</p> <p>c. Are there any formatting or sequencing rules for TFM numbers (e.g., prefix by year, county, or division)?</p>	
<p>.19 (Statutory Compliance), C.20 (Notifications), D.2.d (User Story 4: POCA Management)</p>		<p>66. POCA Lifecycle and Statutory Deadlines</p> <p>The oral presentation (D.2.d) requires demonstration of ISH POCA and regular POCA tracking, automatic flagging of late items, POCA Past Due notices, and escalation into formal complaints. To configure the POCA workflow and notification rules:</p> <p>a. Can the State provide the specific statutory or regulatory citations that define POCA response deadlines, extension allowances, and escalation triggers? The RFP references "statute, rule, regulation, and policy" but does not enumerate the specific timeframes.</p> <p>b. Is there a distinction between ISH POCA and regular POCA in terms of lifecycle stages, or only in terms of deadline duration?</p> <p>c. When a POCA escalates into a formal complaint (as described in D.2.d), does that complaint follow an existing DCI complaint/enforcement workflow, or should the System manage the full complaint lifecycle as well?</p>	<p>a. For the Manufactured Housing Division - (30) Day POCA Deadline- Non ISH-Tenn. Code Ann. § 68-126-410(b)(1)(A) states, "The commissioner shall notify the installer, in writing, of the violation or violations and direct the installer to correct the violation or violations within thirty (30) days of the date of the letter...The installer shall respond to the commissioner, in writing, and confirm that corrections have been made and outline the steps taken to correct the violation or violations." Imminent Safety Hazard ("ISH") 24-hour notification from the date of the inspection - Tenn. Code Ann. § 68-126-410(b)(2)(A) states, "The commissioner shall notify the installer immediately, in writing, of the violation or violations and direct the installer to correct the violation or violations immediately...The installer shall respond to the commissioner, in writing, within (24) hours of receiving notification of the violation or violations and provide a plan of corrective action outlining the steps that will be taken to correct the violation or violations." Extension Requests- T.C.A. § 68-126-410 (A). After an initial extension is granted, all requests for subsequent extensions will be granted only upon a showing of good cause, and at the discretion of the Section.</p> <p>For the Codes Enforcement Division, there are no statutory or regulatory citations for</p>

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
			<p>POCAs. We do have standard operating procedures that establish POCA criteria.</p> <p>b. For Manufactured Housing - Non ISH POCA Deadline- Licensee has (30) Days to submit a POCA with all supporting documentation; Imminent Safety Hazard ("ISH") 24-hour notification from the date of the inspection. Licensee must notify the section within (24) hours from the date of inspection with an ISH acknowledgement/POCA. For the Codes Division, there is a different lifecycle for ISH POCAs and those requirements are set out in the state's operating procedures.</p> <p>c. MFH- An option to formally file any complaints against a licensee for violation of statute should be manually initiated by supervisor/director after administrative review. This is due to varying circumstances that may have bearing on the complaint filing. For the Codes Division, the complaint precedes the POCA.</p>
<p>.30 (Migration & System Configuration), Pro Forma Section A.3 Phase 3 (Data Conversion), Phase 4 (Document Migration)</p>		<p>67. Existing Codes Enforcement Data for Migration</p> <p>The migration requirements in C.30 and Phases 3-4 reference converting data from "the current system used by the State." The current system (CORE) serves the Manufactured Housing Division. For Codes Enforcement:</p> <p>a. Does the Codes Enforcement Division have existing electronic data (plan reviews, inspection records, building project histories) in a separate system that is also in scope for migration?</p> <p>b. If Codes Enforcement data exists in a different system, can the State identify that system and provide an approximate data volume?</p> <p>c. If Codes Enforcement is currently managed through paper or manual processes, should the</p>	<p>a. Yes. Codes uses stores the referenced items in a separate system. Under Tenn. Code Ann. §10-7-504(i) vendor identity or a description of the goods or services provided by the vendor shall be confidential.</p> <p>b. See response to question 9.</p> <p>c. There are no paper records.</p>

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
		System support a one-time bulk data entry or import of historical records at go-live?	
Pro Forma Attachment B, Section 1, Item 3 (Security Certifications)		<p>68. Security Certification Acceptability Attachment B, Section 1, Item 3 contains a placeholder: "The Contractor shall maintain, obtain, or undergo the following third-party information security [TBD from RFP proposal: certification(s), authorization(s), or examination(s)]..." The Gap Analysis (Section 9) references FIPS 140-2/3, SOC 2 Type II, FedRAMP/GovRAMP, ISO 27001, and PCI-DSS.</p> <p>a. Since the certification requirement is marked TBD, is the State requesting that Respondents propose their current certifications for evaluation, or does the State have a minimum required set?</p> <p>b. Would SOC 2 Type II plus FIPS 140-2/3 encryption and PCI-DSS compliance satisfy the State's security requirements, or is FedRAMP/GovRAMP authorization specifically required?</p>	<p>a. Respondents must demonstrate they can meet at least one of the options listed in D.37 of the contract.</p> <p>b. Pursuant to the language of the contract, the State will require at least one of the options listed in D.37 of the contract.</p> <p>Also, refer to RFP Attachment 6.2. – Section A – Mandatory Requirement Items – A.7. AND RFP Attachment 6.2. – Section B – General Qualifications & Experience Items – B.17.</p>
C.9		69. Can the State provide the typical process flow for each identified user type within both the Manufactured Housing and Codes Enforcement portals?	<p>MFH- Management and administrative will need full program/access privileges. Inspectors need to only have the ability to populate data on inspection forms and have the ability to submit to licensee. Licensees are to be provided notification upon inspection completion with a report generated in a user friendly format recognized on all devices.</p> <p>Codes - Yes. Process flows for Codes Enforcement will be provided to the vendor awarded the contract.</p>
C.11		70. Is email address and/or destination location validation required when submitting forms?	<p>The RFP requires that the System support submission of forms to email addresses and/or other designated locations.</p> <p>The RFP does not prescribe specific validation requirements for these destinations. Respondents should describe their approach to ensuring accurate and reliable form delivery,</p>

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
			including any validation or error-handling capabilities included in their solution.
C.15.b		71. Can the State clarify the scope of what the Manufactured Housing Division regulates as it pertains to this RFP?	The Tennessee Manufactured Housing Division regulates the licensing, inspection, installation, safety, and enforcement activities related to HUD-labeled manufactured homes and the businesses that manufacture, sell, and install them.
C.15.c		72. How is the appropriate subset of transactional data identified and associated with each report type?	The State requires more information in order to respond to this question.
C.15.d		73. What information is required to interface with the financial institution when processing a refund?	<p>The RFP requires that the System support payment processing and refund functionality through the State's designated merchant services provider, in compliance with applicable laws and security standards.</p> <p>The RFP does not prescribe specific data elements required for refund processing. Respondents should assume that standard transaction data necessary to support payment reconciliation and refund processing will be required and should describe their approach to integrating with external payment systems.</p>
C.15.e		74. How does the State define "journal entries" in this context?	Journal entries are a process used for accounting for revenue for Codes Enforcement.
C.18.b		75. How does a Tennessee Fire Marshal Number (TFM) become associated with a building or building project? Is the TFM associated only with complaints identified during inspections, or does it apply more broadly?	A TFM number is a unique number assigned to a building. Any building that has a plan review or that is inspected is assigned a TFM number.
C.18.c		76. Which user roles should have online access to these files (e.g., public, specific authorized parties)? Additionally, what types of requests are customers expected to submit?	Codes - Customers that should have access to Plan Review Files are Architects, Contractors, building owners, etc. The general public should have information about Plan Review projects, such as the address, status, occupancy type, etc. Customers will submit requests for construction inspections and requests for licensing inspections.
C.18.e		77. Can the State provide the complete list of desired project statuses for the inspector work queue?	For the Manufactured Housing Division, the inspector work queue will be categorized using the following statuses: Pending, Past Statute, First Inspection, Headquarters Request, and Homeowner Request. Date parameters for each

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
			<p>category will be defined based on applicable statutes and internal program policies.</p> <p>Separately, for Codes, project statuses apply to Plan Submissions and are not related to the inspector work queue. These project statuses represent general information that should be accessible to both internal staff and external customers.</p>
C.19		78. What specific statutory requirements govern the scheduling and assignment of inspections for compliance purposes?	<p>For the Manufactured Housing Division, Tenn. Code Ann. § 68-126-406(e) provides: “The commissioner shall ensure that at least five percent (5%) of manufactured homes installed in the state each year are inspected; provided, however, that there shall be at least one (1) inspection of a home installed by each installer each year. Inspection shall occur within twenty (20) business days after the commissioner’s receipt of the installer’s report. Each installer shall submit a report to the commissioner on at least a weekly basis describing the homes installed by the installer that week. Such report shall include, at a minimum, the name and address of the retailer and the location of each home installed.”</p> <p>For the Codes Enforcement Division, interagency agreements require inspections to be completed within the time frame set by the agreement. These agreements typically require thirty (30) days from the inspection request. Other inspection deadlines are set out in the state’s standard operating procedures. For complaints received, codes enforcement inspectors are required to perform inspection within fifteen (15) days of receiving the complaint. However, if the complaint involves an ISH, the inspection must be conducted within three (3) business days of receipt.</p>
C.20		79. Can the State provide the specific rules governing deadlines for each category (statute, rule, regulation, and policy)? Is there a preferred notification method (e.g., individual email alerts, consolidated reports, in-system dashboard notifications)?	<p>Yes. The State can provide the rules governing deadlines, which are primarily defined through statutes, regulations, policies, Interagency Agreements, and Codes SOPs, with additional details outlined in prior responses.</p> <p>For MFH, deadlines will be tied to specific requirements, and the system should support automated flags/alerts at pre-determined intervals. It would also be beneficial for management or administrators to have the ability to configure and adjust these date-based rules within the system.</p>

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
			<p>For Codes, deadlines are established through standard operating procedures (SOPs).</p> <p>Regarding notifications, the State prefers a combination approach, including:</p> <p>Email alerts, System-generated reports, and In-system dashboard notifications.</p> <p>This ensures timely awareness, flexibility, and visibility across users and roles. The State seeks best approach from the vendor.</p>
C.21.a		80. Can the State describe the process and staff roles involved in managing requests for new buildings or building projects?	Requests for inspections are currently received via email. 60% of them are processed by automation into a file storage solution work queues with an Admin processing the remainder manually. New Plan Review submissions and Plan Review revisions are submitted on our Plan Review Portal. An Admin processes new submissions into a Plans Examiner's work queue. Plan Review revisions are processed by an automation into Plans Examiner work queues.
C.21.e		81. Can the State provide the complete list of expected statuses for the plan's examiner work queue?	Yes: (1) Pending; (2) Project Submitted-Awaiting Review; (3) Incomplete; (4) Removed; (5) Processed; (6) On hold; (7) Not Approved; (8) Approved; (9) Approved with Stipulation; (10) No Review Letter Issued; (11) Transfer to Inspector; (12) Project Cancelled; (13) Request Reassignment; (14) Project Completed.
C.21.f		82. Which external user types require notification during the plans review process? Are there any service level agreements (SLAs) associated with notification timeliness?	The customer, when submitting an application, will provide the owner, architect, and contractor information. Those individuals should receive notification of statuses. There are no SLAs and no statutory requirements for these notifications.
C.22		83. Can a single user be associated with multiple user types simultaneously (e.g., both a Contractor and a Licensee)?	The State requires more information in order to respond to this question.

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
C.25		84. Can the State describe the business process for county clerk involvement in the issuance of manufactured housing decals?	The county clerk issues manufactured housing decals to the licensee, records the decals assigned to each licensee, and submits a monthly report and corresponding payment to the State.
General		85. Is the system expected to fully replace the current CORE system, or operate alongside it long term?	<p>The RFP does not state that the proposed System will replace the Department's existing CORE system.</p> <p>As outlined in the RFP, the System is expected to support and integrate with existing State systems, including those referenced in the Technical Requirements. Respondents should assume the proposed solution will operate alongside existing systems and support necessary integrations.</p>

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.