State of Nevada
Department of Administration
Purchasing Division
515 E. Musser Street, Suite 300
Carson City, NV 89701

Brian Sandoval
Governor

Jeffrey Haag
Administrator

SUBJECT:	Amendment 1 to Request for Proposal 3221
RFP TITLE:	Child Support Collections and Disbursements Software
DATE OF AMENDMENT:	March 17, 2016
DATE OF RFP RELEASE:	February 18, 2016
OPENING DATE:	April 18, 2016
OPENING TIME:	2:00 PM
CONTACT:	Marcy Troescher, Procurement Staff Member

Deleted: April 4, 2016

The following shall be a part of RFP ***3221.*** If a vendor has already returned a proposal and any of the information provided below changes that proposal, please submit the changes along with this amendment. You need not re-submit an entire proposal prior to the opening date and time.

Section 10 of RFP 3221 includes the project timeline. The original timeline for RFP 3221 is hereby amended as follows:

Task	Date/Time
Deadline for submitting questions	3/04/2016 @ 5:00 PM
Answers posted to website	On or about 3/17/2016
Deadline for submittal of Reference Questionnaires	No later than 4:30 PM on 4/12/2016
Deadline for submission and opening of proposals	No later than 2:00 PM on 4/18/2016
Evaluation period (approximate time frame)	4/14/2016 – 4/27/2016
Vendor Presentations (approximate time frame)	5/12/2016 – 5/13/2016
Selection of vendor	On or about 5/16/2016
Anticipated BOE approval	7/12/2016
Contract start date (contingent upon BOE approval)	7/13/2016

Deleted: 3/14/2016

Deleted: 4/01/2016

Deleted: 4/04/2016

Deleted: 4/05/2016 – 4/18/2016

Deleted: 5/03/2016 – 5/05/2016

Deleted: 5/06/2016

1. I cannot find the duration of the contract in the solicitation document. What is the term and extension options for this contract?

   The initial contract term will be for two years. Potential for extensions will be negotiated as part of the contract.

2. RFP Section 10 page 43

   a. The RFP Timeline has answers to questions posted 3/14/2016, which is exactly 3 weeks until the proposal is due. With one week necessary to print, assemble, QA, and ship the proposal with an ETA of at least 1 day prior to the due date, that leaves only two weeks to refine the proposal after answers have been received. Would the State of Nevada be willing to extend the due date by two weeks to allow vendors to update the responses based on answers to questions?

      See the amended timeline at the beginning of this amendment.

   b. The RFP timeline also has as an approximate time frame, Vendor Presentations 5/03/2016 – 5/05/2016. This is overlapping with the ERICSA Conference scheduled for 3/1/2016 through 3/5/2016 and we ask that you consider moving that time frame back one week, if presentations will be requested.

      See the amended timeline at the beginning of this amendment.

3. RFP Section 1.1.1 and RFP Section 5.5.2.6

   a. Where is the State's main computing facility located?

      See the amended timeline at the beginning of this amendment.

   b. Is the preference of the State to have the modern SaaS hosted by the vendor outside of the State's main computing facility; or that it be hosted in the State's main computing facility with the State maintaining the infrastructure?

      It could be hosted in either the State's computing facility or hosted elsewhere by the vendor. Either is acceptable.

   c. If vendor can support both options, does the State wish to receive pricing for both options? If yes, how should the vendor do so in order to be compliant with the RFP?

      Yes. Submitting both price options would be acceptable.

   d. If the State is seeking a vendor to host the solution outside of State facility, do we need a State-approved security plan before submitting proposal, or will our security plan be expected to be approved during the implementation process?

      The submitted security plan will be approved by the State during the implementation process.

4. RFP Section 3.1, RFP Section 4.3.2 and RFP Section 13.3.2.1

The Nevada State Collection and Disbursement Unit (SCaDU) intends to replace the current CDS application, however the RFP is not explicit regarding the scanning hardware or the IBM Datacap Software or the FileNet Content Engine (referenced in §4.3.2).

a. Is the replacement of the scanning hardware within the scope of this RFP? If NOT, please provide information on scanning hardware in use today. Please provide their model numbers, how many of each, and when their warranty/maintenance expires.

No, the replacement of the scanning hardware is not within the scope of this RFP. The maintenance contracts have expired on all 3 Fujitsu 5900C scanners.

b. Is the replacement of the IBM Datacap Imaging Software within the scope of the RFP? If not, please provide the licenses and version number and costs associated.

Replacement of the IBM Datacap Imaging Software does not have to be within the scope of the RFP, but the image must eventually end up in the Agencies FileNet repository. The images stored in FileNet must be retrieval by the state using by indexed values (receipt number and UPI).

c. If the State is NOT anticipating the replacement of the scanning Hardware and Software, is the proposed replacement of them an acceptable alternative, in light of the fact that our solution is an end-to-end turnkey solution?

Yes, this would be acceptable.

d. Is new mail opening/scanning, or just new scanning hardware prohibited under Section 13.3.2.1?

The cost of the hardware should be included in your proposal, not as an additional cost to the Agency.

5. RFP Section 3.4.1 and RFP Section 4.3.1

If the State is seeking an SaaS solution, why must all proposed software used in the design, development, testing and implementation?

If the solution is hosted by the vendor, it does not. If the solution is hosted by the State, then this is required.

6. RFP Section 3.4.3, RFP Sections 7.1.2 through and including RFP Section 7.1.4 and RFP Section 13.3.2.1

a. Does the State intend for the solution to be housed in the State facility?

a.1 If YES, please confirm that the State will procure, install, and maintain all the hardware and software infrastructure (e.g. application and web servers, routers, switches, operating system, database software etc.) as prescribed by vendor solution.

No, the State does not intend for the solution to be housed in the State facility, but that may be acceptable if proposed.

a. 2 Is this infrastructure cost (RFP Section 7.12 through RFP Section 7.1.4) to be included in the cost proposal for reference only and will not be evaluated as the pricing will most likely be cheaper when acquired through the State's procurement process?

All costs must be included and accounted for.

b. If a vendor hosted SaaS is proposed, it is assumed the State would not have any additional costs to procure, install, and maintain any necessary hardware and software infrastructure as these costs would be included in the SaaS licensing agreement. Is this an accurate interpretation of your RFP requirements?

Yes

c. What hardware and software is prohibited under RFP Section 13.3.2.1?

"The vendor shall not propose an alternative that would require the State to acquire hardware or software or change processes in order to function properly on the vendor's system unless vendor included a clear description of such proposed alternatives and clearly mark any descriptive material to show the proposed alternative."

This means that the vendor's proposal should not require the State to have to acquire new hardware and/or software to implement the vendor's solution, unless the vendor's proposal is to have the State host the application.

7. RFP Section 3.4.4

Is it acceptable that the proposed solution require seat licenses?

Yes, if that is the vendor's business model.

8. RFP Section 4.3.1

Our proposed modern SaaS turnkey solution will fully replace the State's existing CDS solution. In order to allow users to continue to access the existing FileNet images within a single application, would the State want the new images to be sent to FileNet or would the State allow a solution to have the old images be pulled into our web based image archive that does not require a proprietary viewer or seat licenses?

The State wants the image, or a copy thereof, to end up in the Agency's FileNet repository.

9. RFP Section 4.3.2

a. Please provide the extract file format and data dictionary for the data elements currently included in the extract.

The file format of the export file created by CDS is a plain text file with a .dat extension. This file should be padded fixed-width fields in the rows. It also contains

file header, batch header, detail, batch trailer, and file trailer records. The attached excel sheet contains the file layout for each record type within the file.

CDS_Export_File.xls
x

b. Our SaaS solution currently includes an image archive with the ability to simultaneously extract any correspondence documents received within the processing flow, to the appropriate case related repository in FileNet. Is FileNet the case related image archive of record?

Yes.

c. All of our customers keep the SDU image archive separate from the case related repository. Please provide the volume in number of pages and size of storage required to store in Terabytes so that we can estimate the storage cost.

Assuming that the scan type and size stay the same (b/w, TIFF, 300dpi), each image is approximately 25kB. Assuming 2500 receipts per day (on average), 5 days per week, 52 weeks per year: 25kB * 2500 * 5 * 52 = 16250000kB per year, or ~16.64GB per year. Therefore, 1 TB would be more than sufficient.

10. RFP Section 4.4.1 through and including all of 4.4.4

The workflow summarized in subsections 4.4.1 through 4.4.4 describe the current AS IS workflow created by the scanning HW, IBM Data Cap, CDS and FileNet applications. As long as our solution meets all of the State's requirements, is it acceptable that the workflow could be slightly different (e.g. less steps) than specified?

Yes.

11. RFP Section 4.4.5 (all)

Please provide the specifications for the real-time data exchange with NOMADS, including the daily extract of payments from the SCaDU and the participant/case data file from NOMADS to the SCaDU; and any other data exchanges that occur.

- ***Datacap is the existing application that is used for scanning checks. Once SCaDU has processed the image in Datacap, the receipt information is exported to the CDS receipt tables and the image is exported to the FileNet content store.***

- ***In the existing CDS application, the real-time data exchange is with the FileNet content store to view the image associated with a receipt (one image per receipt, which may be a multi-page tiff). The unique ID used by FileNet is also stored in the CDS Receipt Header table. When a user opens the image it is displayed in FileNet's Deja Viewer.***

- ***The extract of payments from CDS to NOMADS is currently a daily function that runs in CDS every evening. The export feature selects receipts that have been identified and deposited. It then takes the receipt information and creates a flat file that is saved to the server where our mainframe FTP job can pick up the file and process it. Those receipts***

are updated in CDS to reflect that they have been exported. The nightly export process also creates a report summarizing the receipts that were exported. In the new system, this extract of receipts should remain a daily process.

- ***The import process of participant/case data from NOMADS is currently ran once a week, If possible, this process could be converted to a real-time data exchange with NOMADS (DB2 tables) or remain an import process. The current import process uses a flat file created by NOMADS to populate a table within CDS that stores the NCP and case data information. The extract from NOMADS, queries 6 different DB2 tables to obtain participants and case data. In the new application, SCaDU should be able to run online searches against NOMADS using either the UPI or SSN.***

12. RFP Section 4.5.2 and RFP Section 4.5.3

    What is the State's standard or preferred method and strength of encryption?

    IRS and CMS both specify that it needs to be FIPS 140-2 compliant. That generally means SHA-2 or better hashes, AES-128 or better block cyphers, RSA digital signature key length of at least 2048 bits, and TLS 1.2 or better for encryption in transit. More is better.

    There is list of FIPS 140-2 certified encryption modules at http://csrc.nist.gov/groups/STM/cmvp/documents/140-1/140val-all.htm. The overall specs for encryption are in NIST SP 800-131A, rev 1.

13. RFP Section 5.1 (all)

    a. With regards to the five (5) page response limit per task, please clarify the State's definition of "task." Is it determined by the Section level? For example the 3rd Section #.#.# level or the 4th Section #.#.#.# level beginning with 5.4.2 or 5.4.2.1?

       Each task is delineated by the second digit in the section number, i.e., all of Section 5.4 is a single task; all of section 5.5 is another task; etc.

    b. If appendices, samples and/or exhibits are used, are they to be submitted at the very end of the document or within the section immediately following the response?

       Appendices included within the section immediately following the response would appear to provide the most clarity in the submission; however, consistency within the submission is more important.

14. RFP Section 5.4.2.1

    a. Does the State have a preference for the SCaDU Software implementation timeline?

       Implementation is hoped for as soon as possible after the effective date of the contract.

    b. Is there a date/target to have the implementation complete due to the termination of existing CDS solution component licensing or maintenance costs?

       No.

15. RFP Section 6.1.11 and RFP Section 12.1.6

a. Please confirm that the only financial information required to be provided is the Vendor's Dun and Bradstreet Number and Federal Tax Identification Number?

Yes.

b. If so, could the State please advise as to how the Vendor will be evaluated for Financial stability on a Pass/Fail basis, per the Note in Section 12.1.6?

This information is confidential.

16. RFP Section 7.0

For 3rd party costs can Vendor provide estimated price at time of contract and then pass through actual cost to the State or does the State want the Vendor to estimate the price of the 3rd party cost and then either fund or keep any dollars due to price change?

Proposing vendors are expected to estimate costs and include a 'not to exceed" clause.

17. RFP Section 7.1

Please provide specifics regarding the information required for the "detailed backup" that must be provided for all cost schedules completed.

Vendors are expected to provide details in their proposals to back up proposed costs.

18. RFP Section 7.1.7.1

For 3rd party costs can the Vendor provide estimated price at time of contract and then pass through actual cost to the State or does the State want the Vendor to estimate the price of the 3rd party cost and then either fund or keep any dollars due to price change?

See the answer to question #16.

19. RFP Section 11.2.3.11 and RFP Section 14

There is a conflict with Section 11.2.3.11 Tab XI and what is labeled as Tab XI on Page 68, Section 14 Submission Checklist. Please clarify.

11.2.3.11 Tab XI – Other Informational Material is correct.

20. RFP Section 13.3.12.1

Please confirm this would not include preexisting Software provided by under this contract.

This is correct.

21. RFP Section 13.3.13.1

Vendor may not have access to 3rd party software source code used to develop/install the proposed child and support disbursements software environment. Could you provide direction on how the state would like us to proceed with this situation?

The State does not understand this question. Below is what the RFP states:

"The State shall have unlimited rights to use, disclose or duplicate, for any purpose whatsoever, all information and data developed, derived, documented, installed, improved or furnished by the contractor under this contract."

22. RFP Section 13.3.4, Subsections 13.3.4.1 through 13.3.4.3

a. When working on client premises, project staff have been able to complete work with limited needs other than power and connection to the internet. What is the purpose of the requirement for installing communication lines, and EITS Data Communications?

This will only be required if it is necessary for the project.

b. If the solution is maintained at the State's main data facility, our technical team will require VPN access to support the application remotely.

b.1 Is this acceptable using multifactor VPN authentication?

Yes, if the solution is hosted by the State and the VPN account is provided by the State.

b.2 And is this the purpose of the communication line(s) you are referring to?

No. This section refers to any additional data communication lines that would be required for this project.

23. Ref 3.1: Is it the States intention to utilize IBM's Datacap to scan checks?

Not necessarily to begin with, but eventually, the image, or copy thereof, needs to end up in the Agency's FileNet repository.

24. Ref 3.1: Are checks scanned at one centralized location? If not how many locations are there and where?

Yes, checks are scanned at one centralized location in Las Vegas, Nevada.

25. Ref 3.1: How does the State of Nevada received the OCR now? Do they provide payment coupons to non-custodial parents?

Case information is manually entered into the current system during indexing using what is hand-written or typed on checks, money orders, or cashier's checks. The State does not provide payment coupons to non-custodial parents. The OCR functionality in Datacap currently uses a MICR reader only to pick up the check, routing, and account number.

26. Ref 3.1: Incoming payments that can be converted to an EFT; are these payments taken over the phone?

No, this refers only to hard-copy media – checks, money orders, and cashier's checks.

27. Ref 4.3.2: Can we view the index data (OCR) templates to determine how the control number is populated into our system?

The current system uses no OCR templates. The "control number" is assumed to be the receipt number, a distinct 12-digit number created by melding the current year and a sequencer value obtained from the DB2 database on the system of record (i.e. 201601100235). These numbers are assigned to each receipt (not image) and follow the receipt into the NOMADS system in the nightly export. Receipts may contain multiple images and are stored as multi-page TIFF files on the FileNet content store.

Counter receipts differ in that the beginning of the receipt number is the current year plus a "7" plus the sequencer value, but still in a 12-digit format (i.e. 201670000234).

28. Ref 4.4.1.3 #6: How is this done today?

The NSF list is reviewed from the State's bank daily. Only payments that have repeated returns are placed on hold on the NSF list in CDS which is found in the Main Menu/File Maintenance/Modify NSF List. The information needed when placing a payment on the NSF list is the SSN of the person the payment is for, UPI, Employer name if being paid by the employer, NCP's last name, checking account #, check #, and date the payment was received. Prior to DataCap, in the CDS system the user posting payments would receive an alert message stating "NSF payment" for payments that has been deposited and is on the NSF list. Once this message was received the user would place the payment on the suspend list to be reviewed by a supervisor. Currently with the DataCap system, the payment is placed on the suspend list. It remains on the list until reviewed, approved, and posted by a supervisor who then removes the information from the Modify NSF List.

29. Ref 4.4.1.3 #7: How is this done today?

Remote deposit is not used today but the State would like the option to utilize it in the future.

30. Ref 4.4.4: Please define what your current EFT transactions consist of.

The State's EFT transactions consist of payments in two formats: CCD+, which is preferred, and CTX820. Both formats contain an electronic addenda record as outlined by the National Automated Clearing House Association (NACHA).

31. Is there a deadline for the software to be in production specific to any fiscal restrictions or government regulations?

The State's fiscal limitation is 06/30/17.

32. If you do not have a deadline for implementation, is there a preferred date for the software to go live in production?

The State would like to go live as soon as possible after the effective date of the contract.

33. Do you already have a high level implementation schedule that encompasses the project phases such as requirements, developing, testing and training?

No. The selected vendor will provide this.

34. The RFP states that the preference is for a SaaS solution, what is the planned contractual duration for providing the solution on a software-as-a-service basis?

See the response to question #1.

35. If there is no planned or defined duration, what is the minimum number of years the SaaS contract would cover?

See the response to question #1.

36. What are the "known defects" and "manual workarounds" with CDS that you are trying to mitigate?

The State is interested in obtaining a modern SaaS system but is unable to provide proprietary information.

37. Does CDS only handle checks or is it linked to your credit/debit card payment processor? Is it safe to assume you would like the new solution to handle card payments as well?

The current CDS system only handles hard-copy media (checks, money orders, and cashier's checks) and is not linked to the State's card processor. Although vendors should not assume the new solution would handle card payments, the State is interested in seeing how a new solution could do so.

ALL ELSE REMAINS THE SAME FOR RFP 3221.

Vendor must sign and return this amendment with proposal submitted.

Vendor Name: Columbia Ultimate, Inc. dba RevQ

Authorized Signature: Jim Adamson

Title: CFO Date: 4/6/2016

This document must be submitted in the "State Documents" section/tab of vendors' technical proposal.