



STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS # 34716-20221
AMENDMENT 4
IMAGING, DATA CAPTURE AND REMITTANCE SYSTEM**

DATE: December 22, 2022

RFP # 34716-20221 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 | | October 10, 2022 |
| 2. Disability Accommodation Request Deadline | 2:00 p.m. | October 13, 2022 |
| 3. Pre-response Conference | 10:30 a.m. | October 14, 2022 |
| 4. Notice of Intent to Respond Deadline | 2:00 p.m. | October 17, 2022 |
| 5. Written "Questions & Comments" Deadline | 2:00 p.m. | October 21, 2022 |
| 6. State Response to Written "Questions & Comments" | | December 9, 2022 |
| 7. Second Round Written "Questions & Comments" Deadline | 2:00 p.m. | December 16, 2022 |
| 8. Second Round State Response to Written "Questions & Comments" | | December 22, 2022 |
| 9. Response Deadline | 2:00 p.m. | January 9, 2023 |
| 10. State Completion of Technical Response Evaluations | | January 20, 2023 |
| 11. State Schedules Respondent Oral Presentation | | January 24, 2023 |
| 12. Respondent Oral Presentation or Field Test | 8:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m. | January 30 – February 3, 2023 |
| 13. State Opening & Scoring of Cost Proposals | 2:00 p.m. | February 6, 2023 |
| 14. Negotiations | 4:30 p.m. | February 8 – 10, 2023 |

| | | |
|--|-----------|-------------------|
| 15. State Notice of Intent to Award Released <u>and</u> RFP Files Opened for Public Inspection | | February 15, 2023 |
| 16. End of Open File Period | 4:30 p.m. | February 22, 2023 |
| 17. State sends contract to Contractor for signature | | February 27, 2022 |
| 18. Contractor Signature Deadline | 2:00 p.m. | March 1, 2023 |

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 |
|-------------|--------|---|--|
| Amd. 3 | | 1. Amendment 3 suggests that vendors are to provide desktop scanners that have three (3) pockets, however the most stackers that a desktop scanner may have is two (2). This will provide the State the ability to sort checks to one pocket and all other forms to the second pocket. Can the State confirm that this is number of pockets for the desktop scanners is adequate? | The State desired the ability to have three (3) pockets, one for checks, one for documents and one for rejects/errors. If the most stackers that a desktop scanner may have is two then the State will accept two pockets as adequate for this solution. Please explain in the response, the process for items that error or reject while being scanned. |
| Amd. 3 | | 2. Amendment 3 indicates the vendor is to provide a cashiering system. Can the State confirm that this would be an over the counter cashiering solution that will be used in offices where taxpayers may arrive in person to pay their taxes? | The state does not currently plan to use this cashiering system for over the counter or walk-in customers. The State would like to be able to use the cannon 550 check readers to insert an individual transaction into the deposit workflow as needed. The State has a requirement that payments be processed within twenty-four hours, so as part of the disaster plan cashiering was previously mentioned. However, cashiering is not our ideal choice as a disaster recovery plan. It would be preferable to have a large volume solution. Please fully define your disaster recovery plan for this solution. (Referenced in 1.1.2.i.) |

| RFP SECTION | PAGE # | QUESTION / COMMENT | STATE RESPONSE |
|------------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| Amd. 3 | | 3. Is the vendor to provide cashiering peripheral hardware such as cash drawer and receipt printer for the cashiering system? If so, how many cashiering workstations are needed? | See response for question 2 |
| Amd. 3 | Pg. 14 | 4. Amendment 3 pg. 14 requires processing of images and data from iNovah, however, pg. 13 Interface inventory does not include any information for iNovah. Please provide integration details for iNovah. There are 3 Cashiering interfaces listed: iNovah: No interface TNState: Flat File TR3: Flat File | The State desires to not integrate iNovah with this system and to take any remaining payment functions currently used in iNovah and move them to the new solution. |
| Amd. 3 – Item 3 Amd. 3 – Item 8 | Pg. 8 Pg. 11 | 5. Amendment 3 pg. 8 Section 3.e and pg. 11 Section 8: “The solution shall be hosted in the State’s cloud tenant, with services being co-managed by the State and vendor” a) Can the State provide the type of hosting environment the solution will be hosted in? Such as AWS, Azure... and can the State clarify the vendor’s responsibilities for “co-managing” the services with the State? b) If the vendor is to co-manage the environment, will the State provide the tools necessary along with the access to the State’s hosted environment? c) Will the State provide the necessary connections and required bandwidth to the State’s cloud environment? | The Contractor will not be required to manage the cloud environment. They will be granted secure access to develop application within the state cloud environment. They will be required to maintain the required security access and management of application within the secure state cloud environment. The State will provide necessary connections and required bandwidth to the State’s cloud environment to the vendor for the development and management of the approved application. |
| Amd. 3 – Item 4 | | 6. Amendment 3 pg. 8 Section 4: “Delete RFP Attachment 6.2 – | This was a typo. “Delete RFP Attachment 6.2 – Section D in its entirety and insert the following in |

| RFP SECTION | PAGE # | QUESTION / COMMENT | STATE RESPONSE |
|------------------------|--------|--|---|
| | | <p>Section D in its entirety and insert the following in its place”</p> <p>The table below Section 4 refers to Section C (Technical Qualifications, Experience & Approach Items) and not Section D (Oral Presentation Items).</p> | <p>its place” should read as “Delete RFP Attachment 6.2 – Section C in its entirety and insert the following in its place”.</p> |
| | | <p>7. For the portal requirement, is the State’s requirement that when another agency needs to approve their payments prior to deposit, does this process need to have them review each transaction and associated payment? Or do they simply review the deposit total being made for that agency? When a payment is rejected, is it returned to the agency or taxpayer?</p> <p>Does the total amount of the deposit require review and approval?</p> | <p>The requirement would be that the agency could see transaction level data. This includes the payment image, document images, and all data entered. Approval/rejection would be at the transaction level and not the deposit level. Rejected items could be returned to either the agency or taxpayer depending on the agency’s preferences. The total amount of deposit does not require review.</p> |
| RFP Schedule of Events | | <p>8. The current proposal deadline is Monday, January 9th. The state’s answers to the 2nd round of questions are scheduled to be posted December 29th. In sight of the New Year’s Holiday being recognized on Monday, January 2nd, we will have very few days to update our proposal to responsively address the answers posted on the 29th. We respectfully ask if you can extend the proposal deadline by two weeks, to January 23rd.</p> | <p>The schedule was drafted with all holidays considered.</p> <p>The State will not be extending the response deadline unless deemed necessary for the successful completion of the solicitation.</p> <p>However, the schedule has been updated to reflect an earlier release for the Second Round State Response to Written “Questions & Comments”. The revised schedule gives the Contractors 17 calendar days to reply to responses.</p> |
| | | <p>9. Can you clarify the type of handwritten material that needs to be processed? For instance, hand filled check boxes? Constrained hand printed fields, such as a Tax ID Number? Free form handwritten comments?</p> | <p>The State desires to capture as much material as possible, both printed and handwritten, from the scanning process with less user keyed data entry. Verification of scanner captured data at specified thresholds of certainty is also preferable where possible to user keyed data entry. Payments,</p> |

| RFP SECTION | PAGE # | QUESTION / COMMENT | STATE RESPONSE |
|-------------|--------|--|--|
| | | | returns, applications, and correspondence will vary by type with the largest volume of data being constrained hand printed fields, there is a lower volume of forms with hand checked boxes, and a very small portion of free form comments that would be processed into captured and searchable data. |
| | | 10. Which applications are expected to call the business rules engine? For instance, is integration expected as a part of the document capture process, during field level validation? Is integration expected as a part of BPM/workflow after the capture process has been completed? | Yes, integration of the business rules engine is expected for data captured from the scanners at field level validation. Integration is expected across the solution in business process management, decision in flows, user data verifications, data entry, exceptions handling, corrections, and payment processing. |
| | | 11. Based on requirement to run solution in Cloud, what part of solution is expected to run in cloud? For instance, do you expect all of the capture software to be cloud based, or can some of that architecture be installed on client workstations? | We expect the solution to operate exclusively in the cloud. The flexibility to operate from a workstation during critical outages will be necessary as part of the Disaster Recovery required and defined in (section of contract). |
| | | 12. Are there specific standards a business rules engine is expected to follow? | At minimum, the business rules engine should meet the States security standards (reference A.4.g.(2).) and function well within a cloud environment. The business rules engine should be able to handle both simple and complex business rules. An example of a simple business rule would be a field with specific date format expectation. An example of a complex business rule would be for a form type, for a specific filing year, within this date field, a within this date range consider the form received as timely, this date range end is pushed if it falls over a non-business day to the next business day, and all other dates after this range are considered late. Please fully define the business rules |

| RFP SECTION | PAGE # | QUESTION / COMMENT | STATE RESPONSE |
|-------------|--------|--------------------|--|
| | | | engine standards you plan to incorporate within this solution. |

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.