

## RFP Questions and Clarifications Memorandum

---

**To:** Vendors Responding to RFP Number 3830 for the Mississippi Department of Revenue (MDOR)

**From:** Craig P. Orgeron, Ph.D.

**Date:** November 23, 2015

**Subject:** Responses to Questions Submitted and Clarifications to Specifications

**Contact Name:** Donna Hamilton

**Contact Phone Number:** 601-432-8114

**Contact E-mail Address:** Donna.Hamilton@its.ms.gov

---

The following questions were submitted to ITS and are being presented as they were submitted, except to remove any reference to a specific vendor. This information should assist you in formulating your response.

**Question 1: Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 18 Training:** Item 18.1.2 states “Vendor must provide onsite train-the-trainer sessions for up to 225 users”, can you please clarify if MDOR is expecting 225 users to be trainers or if 225 is the number of end users to be trained?

**Response:** There are 225 trainers to be trained.

**Question 2:** Section 5, paragraph 5.4 references a provision mandating at least two current platform engagements experience. Will a vendor remain under consideration if their implementation partner or sub-contractor can exhibit this experience per the requirements?

The state shall also consider that we believe only one stand-alone potential vendor can meet the experience requirement as it stands in the RFP. We believe this causes significant risk to the state in several ways. Primarily, it dissuades innovative firms from creating and implementing bespoke solutions poised to resolve the unique demands and processes of the state of Mississippi and its constituents. Second, the state will have limited proposal response options, thus limiting competition for the bid and potentially making the bid process uncompetitive. It is our hope that the current stipulation be modified to include those potential applicants/bidders who have otherwise exhibited subject matter expertise. Is this a consideration the state is willing to make?

**Response:** The mandatory requirement will not change. A Vendor will only be considered if the software package being proposed has already been implemented in at least two states. MDOR believes there is a considerable reduction in the risk associated with a project of this size when the software has already been proven to be adaptable to the specific laws and processes required in multiple sites.

**Question 3:** Section VII, Item 7.4.31

Does MDOR currently provide for electronic liens and titles? If so, what vendors are involved and what interfaces are required?

**Response:** MDOR currently offer electronic liens through Computerized Vehicle Registration, Inc. MDOR does not provide electronic titles.

**Question 4:** Section VII, Item 9.2.7

Will the new system support a single user interface for Dealer Software or will the new system need to accommodate multiple interfaces?

**Response:** The system should provide for one single interface to which dealers must adhere.

**Question 5:** Section VII, Item 9.2.8

How many title loan companies must be interfaced with? Does MDOR require a single interface to which title lenders must adhere?

**Response:** There are currently 559 locations with capability to enter title information. The system should provide for one single interface to which title lenders must adhere.

**Question 6:** Section VII, Item 9.2.10

Does MDOR require a single interface for county registration systems, if not, how many interfaces are required?

**Response:** Yes, the system should provide for one interface for county registration systems.

**Question 7:** Section VII, Item 9.2.10

Does MDOR know approximately how many counties will process registrations on the new MDOR Titling & Registration system?

**Response:** 82 counties with 109 total offices will process registrations.

**Question 8:** Section IV

Will MDOR accept a \$5,000,000 Performance Bond renewable on an annual basis instead of the required \$25,000,000 Performance Bond?

**Response:** No. However the final amount of the performance bond may be decided during contract negotiations.

**Question 9: General**

Better define 'COTS'– There are no true COTS T&R systems on the market. We've determined that T&R systems require significant customization (50%) to move from one jurisdiction to the next. Would a demonstrable T&R system framework with all of the operational components be considered COTS?

**Response: Yes.**

**Question 10: General**

If there is only one vendor that responds to this RFP will the state reconsider the mandatory requirements threshold and send to re-bid?

**Response: No, if one Vendor response received meets all the mandatory requirements.**

**Question 11: General**

Will the State consider a yearly performance bond for a prorated amount over the 6.5 years of the project in the amount of 3,846,154 per year?

**Response: The project implementation is expected to last 1.5 years. The performance bond could be prorated over that time period.**

**Question 12: General**

Will the State consider a vendor that has one implementation of a tag and title system if it can be implemented in MS for a better price with better quality?

**Response: No. It does not meet the mandatory requirements.**

RFP responses are due December 9, 2015, at 3:00 p.m. (Central Time).

If you have any questions concerning the information above or if we can be of further assistance, please contact Donna Hamilton at 601-432-8114 or via email at Donna.Hamilton@its.ms.gov.

cc: ITS Project File Number 42048