



**REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS # 31701-03136
AMENDMENT # 3
FOR ENTERPRISE PORTAL SERVICES**

DATE: March 15, 2016

RFQ # 31701-03136 IS AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

1. This RFQ Schedule of Events updates and confirms scheduled RFQ 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)	UPDATED/CONFIRMED
1.	RFQ Issued		1/27/2016	CONFIRMED
2.	Disability Accommodation Request Deadline	2:00 p.m.	2/1/2016	CONFIRMED
3.	Notice of Intent to Respond Deadline	2:00 p.m.	2/3/2016	CONFIRMED
4.	Enterprise Portal Information Repository (EPIR) Review		2/8/2016 - 2/19/2016	CONFIRMED
5.	Written "Questions & Comments" Deadline	2:00 p.m.	2/24/2016	CONFIRMED
6.	State response to written "Questions & Comments"		3/15/2016	CONFIRMED
7.	RFQ Technical Response Deadline	2:00 p.m.	3/29/2016	UPDATED
8.	State Schedules respondent Oral Presentations (ONLY Respondents who pass Mandatory Requirements)		4/1/2016	UPDATED
9.	Respondent Oral Presentations		4/11/2016 - 4/15/2016	CONFIRMED
10.	State Notice of Qualified Respondents Released		4/22/2016	CONFIRMED
11.	RFQ Cost Proposal Deadline (ONLY for Qualified Respondents)	2:00 p.m.	4/29/2016	CONFIRMED
12.	State Evaluation Notice Released		5/4/2016	CONFIRMED
13.	Solicitation Files Opened for Public Inspection		5/5/2016	CONFIRMED
14.	Contract Negotiations		5/17/2016 - 5/23/2016	CONFIRMED
15.	Respondent Contract Signature Deadline		5/24/2016	CONFIRMED
16.	Anticipated Contract Start Date (anticipated date for contract to be fully executed and vendor to begin work)		6/2/2016	CONFIRMED

2. State responses to questions and comments in the table below amend and clarify this RFQ.

Any restatement of RFQ text in the Question/Comment column shall NOT be construed as a change in the actual wording of the RFQ document.

QUESTION/COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
<p>1. In the Acceptable Vendors Products list distributed by the State on 2/12/16, we note that the list excludes many of the “Leaders” in either the WCM or Horizontal Portal Magic quadrants, including several solutions that appear in both magic quadrants such as Microsoft (Leader in Horizontal Portal and Niche in WCM) and Drupal/Acquia (Leader in WCM and Challenger in Horizontal Portal). Based on the guidance provided in the RFQ in Section A.6 that the solution be a Leader in either Magic Quadrant, Vendor would like the State to consider including all defined Leaders in at least one of the required magic quadrants to give vendors the flexibility to propose the best solution for the state that meets the requirement.</p>	<p>RFQ Attachment A, Item A.6 and the referenced products list were amended on February 23, 2016. Please see revised list on the following website: http://tn.gov/finance/topic/sts-current-procurements</p>
<p>2. There is what we believe a contradiction in the RFQ that may stop any Microsoft based solution from bidding. I have included the references from the RFQ that seem to contradict themselves. From the RFQ: In order to respond to this RFQ, the EPP/CMS product proposed and the product’s <u>vendor/publisher</u> must be a Leader in either Gartner’s Magic Quadrant research notes, “Magic Quadrant for Horizontal Portals,” or “Magic Quadrant for Web Content Management.” The State shall freeze the list of allowable products and product vendors/publishers, as defined above, as of the “RFQ Issued” date (see RFQ Section 2). The State has published this list on the following website: http://tn.gov/finance/topic/sts-current-procurements Other products and product vendors/publishers will not be allowed after the freeze date; nor will products or product vendors/publishers be removed after this date. The respondents’ offerings must comply with the list as it stands on this date. Provide written confirmation that, as of the “RFQ Issued” date, the EPP/CMS product proposed and the product’s vendor/publisher appear on the allowable products and product vendors/publishers list, as published on the “RFQ Issued” date. Here is the referenced chart: http://tn.gov/assets/entities/finance/oir/attachments/Acceptable-Vendors-Products.pdf The chart mentions 2015 dates for the products listed in the Gartner report. The RFQ mentions RFQ issue date of 1/2016. SharePoint is in the Horizontal Portal MQ for that reference.</p>	<p>See State’s response to Item 1 above.</p>
<p>3. Is there a shortlist of the cloud environments that the</p>	<p>The State has no preference for specific cloud</p>

QUESTION/COMMENT		STATE RESPONSE
	State of Tennessee would like the selected vendor to utilize?	environments, as long as the vendor fully complies with all requirements stated in the RFQ, including the provisions of RFQ Attachments I and J, EPIS and EPPH contracts. As a part of the evaluation process, the State will evaluate and confirm that the vendor meets all requirements.
4.	Is the migration for the apps expected to be “as is” until they are migrated or will it include enhancement on the architecture / security / application servers?	See EPIS Contract Sections A.8.c and A.42 for requirements to transition maintenance and support of complex applications to EPIS contractor. Also, see EPIS Contract Attachment K, Section C; the Action During Transition-In column of this table identifies any changes required to transition support of each complex application from the incumbent vendor to the EPIS contractor. If the State opts to host some or all complex applications with the EPPH contractor during the contract period, all platform security, technical, and performance requirements in the EPIS and EPPH contract must be met.
5.	[a] What is the intended involvement of the internal state teams with the build of the new environment? [b] Will the security / network are going to help for the build effort or just validate the architecture?	[a] The state teams will be responsible for review and approval of the design and developed environment. [b] They will be involved but mostly to validate the architecture.
6.	Are there dependencies for the application remaining in the State Data center while the applications are being moved to the cloud (i.e., sftp servers / Email server / Web Services / Databases)?	Yes, it is possible some dependencies would remain if the application uses services that are currently located and remain at the data center (e.g., sftp, email, databases, web services). Dependencies are based on application functionality.
7.	One of the documents provided during the review stated that the JREs on all the application servers are going to be updated to java 7 by February 2016. Was this update completed?	This project is still on-going and scheduled to be complete by 3/31/2016.
8.	Does the State plan to keep the Applications running on a Jboss6 or upgrade them anytime soon?	All JBoss will be upgraded to the latest version by the contract start date. The state will continue to upgrade, patch and keep JBoss current.
9.	Is the current Environment PCI compliant? Is the new environment expected to be PCI compliant if the old one is not?	To the best of the State’s knowledge, the current environment is PCI compliant. The new environment must be PCI compliant.
10.	Liquidated damages of \$20,000 per day are mentioned if the transition-in deadline is not met for any reason other than solely due to the actions or inactions of the State or solely due to a Force Majeure event. How will the state access fault and is the deadline negotiable? Are the liquidated damages negotiable?	In the event of a delay, the burden of proof shall be on the Contractor to establish that the delay is solely due to actions or inactions of the State or solely due to a Force Majeure event. The deadline and liquidated damages are not negotiable at this time; however, the State has modified the liquidated damages requirements: see the State’s response to Item 40 below.
11.	Will the state accept a bid where two vendors have partnered to provide services in a Prime-Sub relationship where the vendors will be working together on both contracts?	Yes, this is acceptable. However, in this case, on each of the two contracts (EPIS and EPPH), the State shall execute the Contract with the “prime” contractor. The subcontractor in this case shall not be a party to the contract between the State and the Prime contractor.
12.	Where there is a Prime-Sub relationship or	The introduction to RFQ Attachment B states the

QUESTION/COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
<p>partnership between two (or more) vendors will the state accept a combination of references from the various partners?</p>	<p>following:</p> <p>“With regard to the references required by Attachment B, item B.17, the respondent shall assure that each Team Member provides the required number of references. For example, if there were two Team Members, the respondent should submit ten (10) reference forms, five for each Team Member.”</p> <p>The State considers prime contractors and subcontractors to be Team Members; therefore, the State expects five references from the prime and five references from the sub(s). The same is true of partners.</p>
<p>13. In the applications matrix some of the applications that need modifications/updates say “[INCUMBENT VENDOR] dependent”. Please define what exactly that means. We understand most of the modifications are around payment processing and the [INCUMBENT VENDOR] messaging service but it is not clear what [INCUMBENT VENDOR] dependent is.</p>	<p>See Attachment K in the RFQ for Action During Transition-In for the Transition Project. This matrix identifies the applications that currently use the incumbent vendor’s merchant servicer for payment processing. During the Transition project, the EPIS contractor must develop new interfaces to the State’s merchant servicer to meet RFQ requirements.</p> <p>The Incumbent Vendor is named in RFQ Attachment Q, Definitions and Abbreviations, as amended. Please see RFQ Amendment # 3.</p> <p>Attachment K in the most recently amended version of the RFQ supersedes any other application list that identifies modifications/updates.</p>
<p>14. Is the ABC application still on track to be retired by May 2016? If not, what happens to this application and who is responsible for it?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>15. The Q&A responses aren’t schedule to come back until 1 week before the final delivery date. Given that the answers could have a sizeable impact on the final proposal, we would request that either the Q&A responses come back sooner or the final delivery date is pushed out later. In either case, it would be helpful to have at least another week between getting the Q&A’s and when the final proposal is due.</p>	<p>The State agrees to extend the Technical Proposal deadline by three (3) business days.</p> <p>Please see RFQ Amendment # 3, RFQ Section 2.</p>
<p>16. Who owns current software licenses: government or incumbent?</p>	<p>The State owns the following products for production, test and DR environments: Infrastructure Software (includes: Red Hat JBoss Enterprise Application Platform (EAP), Elasticsearch for AD SheildSecurity Plugin, Oracle, Java, VMware).</p> <p>The State owns licenses for Expression Engine. The State utilizes FormStack as Software as a Service (SaaS). The State owns licenses to some third-party add-ons for Expression Engine.</p>
<p>17. Are blackout dates change moratoriums across the</p>	<p>The blackout dates are for specific applications. The</p>

QUESTION/COMMENT		STATE RESPONSE
	board for all ePortal applications, or only for affected applications?	EPIS Contractor must consider these blackout dates in building their transition schedule and for implementing changes to these applications.
18.	Are web standards documented in Microsoft Word or PDF document? Did not see actual standards document in EPIR (just some screenshots of web page examples).	Web Standards are part of the Web Publishing Guide, which was present in the EPIR, in .pdf format. In addition, there is an internal website which provides more detailed information on these web standards. There is also a HTML/CSS/PHP file which outlines the specifications. This information will be available to the successful vendor.
19.	What does AESP stand for?	This acronym is an error. The State has amended the RFQ to remove all references to "AESP." Please see RFQ Amendment # 3.
20.	During the EPIR in Nashville, the contract awarded to Link2Gov to handle all of the payment processing aspects in the Enterprise Portal shows a Period Of Performance from 5/26/15 – 5/25/20. Does this mean that the State of TN intends to have whichever new Contractor is awarded this new EPP/CMS contract to interface and work with only Link2Gov all the way to May of 2020? Or does the State of TN anticipate awarding both a new EPP/CMS Contractor and a new Payment Processing Contractor and then the State of TN will transition the existing Link2Gov out during the same initial transition period as the new EPIS awardee?	The state is under contract with Link2Gov Corp (an affiliate of Fidelity Information Services, LLC ["FIS"]) until May 2020 and intends to utilize this contract until it expires.
21.	During the EPIR in Nashville, it was noted that, in 2005, State of TN Portal was ranked 2nd nationally by CDG, and that the State Portal is no longer recognized as a Top 5 portal nationally. a. How is the State of TN Portal currently ranked nationally, and does the State of TN intend/desire to return to its previous Top 5 portal nationally?	The State may or may not decide to participate in the Center for Digital Government ranking in the future.
22.	During the EPIR in Nashville, it was noted that the current Contractor is compensated at \$15K per month for up to 8,500 customer service / help desk contacts per month; however, no compensation was allowed for any customer contacts per month over 8,500. a. Will the State of TN provide the last three (3) years worth of traffic analysis showing how many monthly customer contacts were coming into the existing customer service / help desk to support the Enterprise Portal and all of the associated payment systems and apps?	The incumbent vendor estimated 9,000 hours per year or 750 hours a month are spent to provide Customer Support under the existing contract. This includes Customer Support Team responses to phone calls, emails, and live chats, as well as ticket management.
23.	During the EPIR in Nashville, it was noted that the Moving Vehicle On-Line Request (MVOR)	Below are volumes for the MVOR application for State Fiscal Years 2013 – 2015:

QUESTION/COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
<p>application had the following approximate annual transactions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data on # of MVOR annual transactions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2008 ~ 2 M ○ 2009 ~ 2 M ○ 2010 ~ 1 M b. Will the State of TN provide the last three (3) years worth of data on the average # of MVOR annual transactions? 	<p>2013 – 1.8 million 2014 – 2 million 2015 - 2 million</p>
<p>24. What does “must further pass all mandatory requirements” mean exactly? We are assuming the mandatory requirements specifically posed as questions in the RFQ.</p> <p>[This question also included an excerpt from the “Potentially Acceptable EPP/CMS Products” list, which was revised on February 23, 2016, and published on the following website:</p> <p>http://tn.gov/finance/topic/sts-current-procurements</p> <p>The excerpt contained the final sentence of the introduction and the first of the two tables.]</p>	<p>To qualify as a responsive and responsible proposal, the Respondent’s proposal must meet all Mandatory Requirements specified in RFQ Attachment A, Mandatory Requirement Items. In addition, see RFQ section 4.8 for the State’s Right of Rejection.</p>
<p>25. Page 127 & 204 - What version of Adobe LiveCycle is currently in use? (NOTE: LiveCycle ES4 supports Microsoft SharePoint connector)</p>	<p>The State has several versions of Adobe LiveCycle throughout the State. The State’s goal is to consolidate and migrate to a single, current version of Adobe LiveCycle.</p>
<p>26. Pg. 204 - What is meant by "State owned BI tools"</p>	<p>This means, the BI tools that are currently being used by the State. This includes: Microsoft SQL Server, Microsoft SSRS, Microsoft SSIS, Microsoft SSAS. This may include other BI tools the State is considering (e.g., MySQL, Mongo, Hadoop, Tableau, Weave).</p>
<p>27. Pg. 204 - What is meant by "Legacy Systems"</p>	<p>“Legacy Systems” refer to applications, software, and application support and development tools currently in use with the State’s existing Enterprise Portal solution.</p>
<p>28. Pg. 252 - In the Presentation Agenda > End User Set Up/Experience section, there is a section on user log on. Is multi-factor authentication required for logging into EPP/CMS?</p>	<p>Since the State’s requirement is for “Different user access based on their security roles,” the State expects the vendor to demonstrate user authentication, to include dual factor.</p>
<p>29. Does the State have representatives that take credit card or ACH payments through chat? If so, is there a requirement for the end user to type their own credit card information in, in an encrypted manner, so the state representative is unable to see the credit card number?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>30. Does the State have representatives that take credit card or ACH payments over the phone?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>31. Item A.46 states that "No PCI Data on State Computers or Network. The Contractor shall assure that absolutely no PCI information is held within, or traverses, the State’s computers or</p>	<p>The State has revised the State’s requirements with regard to PCI information storage and transport.</p> <p>Please see RFQ Attachments I and J, EPIS Contract</p>

QUESTION/COMMENT		STATE RESPONSE
	network". Please clarify, does this mean that all payments would necessarily go through a process hosted either in the cloud or another hosted environment.	Section A.46 and EPPH Contract Section A.30.
32.	What e-mail system does the state use for its standard e-mail system?	Microsoft Outlook
33.	Item A.19 & A.20 discusses secure file sharing. Is the requirement to encrypt during transit and at rest with role based security access, or is the requirement to restrict access to a person level.	The Contractor must provide user authentication and encrypt all data at rest and in transit.
34.	Item A.17 discusses the ability to track the path used by the customer to access a site and the page the customer last accessed before leaving the site. Is the requirement to provide batch reporting and analytics on the data or real-time analytics on the data?	The State requires Real Time Analytics.
35.	Would the State prefer hosting the application in the State data center?	The EPPH Contractor will operate the EPP/CMS solution off premise, on a cloud-based infrastructure and platform (see EPPH Contract A.2.d. and A.7.b.). See EPIS Contract Sections A.8.c.ii. and A.42 regarding options for hosting Complex Applications. The State currently hosts all Complex Applications at the State data center. The State does not intend to migrate Complex Applications to a different hosting environment at this time. The contract is written to allow flexibility if the State determines that migration of one or more Complex Applications is in its best interest in the future.
36.	Would the State prefer hosting the application in a cloud environment?	The EPPH Contractor will operate the EPP/CMS solution off premise, on a cloud-based infrastructure and platform (see EPPH Contract A.2.d. and A.7.b.). See EPIS Contract Sections A.8.c.ii. and A.42 regarding options for hosting Complex Applications. The State currently hosts all Complex Applications at the State data center. The State does not intend to migrate Complex Applications to a different hosting environment at this time. The contract is written to allow flexibility if the State determines that migration of one or more Complex Applications is in its best interest in the future.
37.	Would the State prefer hosting the application in a hybrid manner with some applications hosted in the state data center?	The EPPH Contractor will operate the EPP/CMS solution off premise, on a cloud-based infrastructure and platform (see EPPH Contract A.2.d. and A.7.b.). See EPIS Contract Sections A.8.c.ii. and A.42 regarding options for hosting Complex Applications. The State currently hosts all Complex Applications at the State data center. The State does not intend to migrate Complex Applications to a different hosting environment at this time. The contract is written to allow flexibility if the State determines that migration of one or more Complex Applications is in its best interest in the future.
38.	If all or part of the solution is hosted in the State data center, is the contractor to quote and provide hardware for the solution, or will the State procure	The EPP/CMS will be hosted by the EPPH Contractor in the cloud.

QUESTION/COMMENT		STATE RESPONSE
	hardware for that portion of the solution based upon contractor provided specifications.	Complex applications are currently hosted at the State's data center on State hardware. The State will procure all additional hardware needed for the State Data Center, if any.
39.	If a cloud infrastructure is leveraged and it includes geographically dispersed load balancing is the disaster recovery site still a requirement?	No, as long as the Contractor has at least two geographically dispersed data centers and complies with the requirement for seamless transition from one location to the other(s).
40.	<p>Page 3, 1.1.1</p> <p>The RFP states: "The State expects the EPIS and EPPH Contractors to complete the transition and Support responsibilities of all websites and applications and other transition work no later than six months from the contract start date."</p> <p>The initial analysis, planning and implementation of the new portal platform will lay the foundation for success for eGovernment in Tennessee for many years. Based upon the currently---available information, it would be difficult for any bidder to state with certainty that the migration can be completed within the required six---month period. As such, we encourage the State to consider extending the CMS implementation/transition period beyond 6 months to include an additional discovery and negotiation period post---award to properly plan a seamless and successful migration that is acceptable to the State.</p>	<p>The State requires that all Complex Applications be transitioned within 6 months so that the current contract can be terminated.</p> <p>While the state believes that six months is an adequate amount of time to transition Simple Applications and Websites, the Simple Applications/Websites may be transitioned over a 60 day period following the completion of the migration of the Complex Applications.</p> <p>The liquidated damages provisions in Attachments I and J, EPIS Contract Section A.10 and EPPH Contract Section A.32, have been revised to reflect the deadlines described above, and to reduce the Liquidated Damages assessment amount from \$20,000 to \$5,000 per day.</p>
41.	<p>Page 20, Attachment A – A.5</p> <p>RFP states: "Provide an official document or letter from an accredited credit bureau, verified and dated within the last three (3) months and indicating a positive credit rating for the Respondent."</p> <p>Please confirm that a Dun & Bradstreet short---form report, verified and dated within the last three (3) months and indicating a positive credit rating for the Respondent will meet this requirement.</p>	A Dun & Bradstreet short form report, verified and dated within the last three (3) months and indicating a positive credit rating for the Respondent will meet this requirement.
42.	<p>Page 23, Attachment A – A.33</p> <p>RFP states: "Provide written confirmation that the all EPIS Contractor staff resources assigned to develop and/or maintain Complex Applications shall have the following qualifications, at a minimum: 1. Two (2) years' experience with developing payment---based applications; and 2. Two (2) years' experience with mobile application development.</p> <p>Industry best practice calls for staffing strategies which utilize individuals specializing in specific areas</p>	<p>RFQ Attachment A, Item Ref. A.33 has been amended to reflect this change.</p> <p>Please see RFQ Amendment # 3, RFQ Attachment A, Item A.33.</p>

QUESTION/COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
<p>of expertise. We encourage the state to require all developers have two years' experience in either payment –based service development or mobile application development.</p>	
<p>43. Page 63, EPIS Contract, A,8.f, A.8.g, A.8.h</p> <p>RFP states: “A.8.f. Transition TN.GOV External Websites (Internet) to the EPP/CMS.</p> <p>A.8.g. Transition KidCentral Website from Proprietary CMS to the EPP/CMS.</p> <p>A.8.h. Develop the Internal Website Environment and Transition the Content of the State Internal Websites (Intranet) to the EPP/CMS.</p> <p>Bidder reviewed the EPIR data image several times and was unable to locate detailed information about the internal and external sites that are part of the migration. To assist bidders in putting together a reasonable migration approach, we ask for the following information.</p> <p>What are the number of pages, broken down by organizational units, in each of the internal and external sites?</p> <p>Please list current integrations of internal websites (Intranet) that must be migrated during transition In period.</p>	<p>The State cannot provide the number of pages for external websites. However, there are currently 16,000 database entries which make up the current CMS environment to produce the TN.Gov website. There are not multiple sites; TN.Gov is one site.</p> <p>The State cannot provide the number of pages for internal websites. However, the estimated number of database entries for the internal environment is 1,717; this is for three internal websites that have been re-designed to date.</p> <p>Currently, there are no integrations for internal websites.</p>
<p>44. Page 64, EPIS Contract, A,8.f, A.8.g, A.8.h.</p> <p>RFP states: “A.8.g. Transition KidCentral Website from Proprietary CMS to the EPP/CMS.</p> <p>What CMS is the KidCentral site hosted in?</p>	<p>A proprietary CMS, which is PHP based.</p>
<p>45. Page 236+, Current Portal Applications</p> <p>Current table has Lines of Code blank</p> <p>What is the size (in source code/fields) of each of the simple applications or in lines of code in total?</p>	<p>This information is not available. The size varies depending on the form.</p> <p>However, for each form there are 19 available field choices. Currently, forms are generated using a Software as a Service product called Formstack. These forms are basic intake informational forms, which are developed using a drag and drop application that is conducive to use by non-technical users. This same functionality needs to be provided in the new EPCMS.</p>
<p>46. What is the average monthly bandwidth of all external portal websites, internal websites, and complex applications combined?</p>	<p>The average monthly bandwidth for 2015 was 491 GB.</p>
<p>47. What is the average monthly pageviews of all external portal websites, internal websites, and complex applications combined?</p>	<p>The average monthly pageviews are estimated below: External - 4.5 million Internal - 47.5 thousand Complex Applications - 6.5 million</p>

QUESTION/COMMENT		STATE RESPONSE
		These statistics are based on current metrics and population information.
48.	What percentage of external portal website, internal website, and complex application pageviews are served anonymously (not requiring a user to be logged in)?	<p>37.3% of complex applications do not require user to login to view data</p> <p>TN.gov External environments do not require a login at this time. However, the KidCentral website requires login.</p> <p>Internal environments require an Active Directory (AD) login to connect to the internal network.</p>
49.	<p>Page 3, Part 1.1.2: FY17 Budget</p> <p>Is there an identified budget for variable services and is \$6.4 million only for specifically stated requirements for Year 1?</p>	<p>Yes, \$1.27 million is the estimated annual cost for variable service projects.</p> <p>\$6.4 million was estimated for EPIS and EPPH contract costs for State Fiscal Year 2017 (July 2016 – June 2017). The \$6.4 million does not include estimated annual cost for variable service projects of \$1.27 million.</p>
50.	<p>Page 8, 2.4: EPIR Review</p> <p>In reference to the Enterprise Portal Information Repository site visit information and the current web portal contract; will the State provide the current web portal contract rate card for resources?</p>	<p>The State assumes that the vendor is referring to the service rates that appear in the current Enterprise Portal Services contract. If so, the State has published the Payment Methodology section from the current contract on the following website:</p> <p>http://tn.gov/finance/topic/sts-current-procurements</p> <p>See RFQ Amendment # 3.</p>
51.	<p>Page 8, 2.4: EPIR Review</p> <p>Will the State consider offering more time for Respondents to schedule time in the Enterprise Portal Information Repository?</p>	<p>No. The current timeline for the Enterprise Portal Services project will not accommodate additional EPIR review time.</p> <p>The State offered two weeks of documentation library review during the RFI process and two additional weeks as a part of the RFQ process. The State believes that this should have been sufficient time.</p>
52.	<p>Page 8, 2: RFQ Schedule of Events</p> <p>Since the Technical Response deadline is only nine days after the State anticipates issuing responses to written questions and comments, we request the State grant Respondents a 3 week extension to allow sufficient time to incorporate answers into their Response or can we get answers sooner than 3/15/16?</p>	See State's response to Item 15 above.
53.	<p>Page 16, 5.2 Qualifications of Technical Responses</p> <p>Our understanding is a maximum of 3 respondents will be qualified for cost proposal based on the criteria detailed in section 5.2. In evaluating the cost proposal, will the State consider evaluating proposals based on a Best Value evaluation methodology in the 2nd (cost) evaluation stage employing a trade-off approach between price and</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>The State believes that the use of the evaluation thresholds expressed in RFQ Section 5.2, Phase II, in conjunction with the "10 point range" threshold, will ensure that only thoroughly qualified responses pass on to the Cost Proposal evaluation phase.</p> <p>Once the State has ensured that the responses are thoroughly qualified, it is in the State's best interest</p>

QUESTION/COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
<p>non-price factors as used in federal procurements (see FAR 15.101-1) in order to arrive at a best value award determination for the State. This best value and trade-off approach affords the State the ability to evaluate (or consider) the benefits of a superior technical offering, the benefits of which may merit a variance in price.</p>	<p>to contract for the least expensive offering.</p> <p>The State believes that the current approach does provide the best value to the State.</p>
<p>54. Page 21, A.11: Minimum Hits per Hour</p> <p>[a] Will the State provide a breakdown of the number of sites that make up the 200,000 hits per hour? Are they concentrated on a few sites?</p> <p>[b] If so, how much of the content on those pages is dynamic vs. static?</p>	<p>[a] There are not multiple sites; TN.Gov is one site.</p> <p>[b] Since the State does not know the vendor's definition of dynamic vs. static, the State cannot answer this question.</p>
<p>55. Page 22, A.19: Section A-Mandatory Requirement Items</p> <p>[a] Please provide additional clarification in the form of use cases or example scenarios of expected behavior for providing secure file sharing to external environment.</p> <p>[b] Who would be sharing (employees, citizens)?</p> <p>[c] What type of content would be shared (web pages, Word docs, PDFs, images, graphics, etc.)?</p> <p>[d] How is sharing supposed to work and for what business situation?</p>	<p>[a] Use cases and example scenarios of expected behavior are not currently available.</p> <p>[b] All potential users would be sharing files both external and internal.</p> <p>[c] All types of content would be shared. Role-based security will be required for shared access.</p> <p>[d] Business situations will vary but can range between vendor to state interactions, business to business interactions, work group interactions, and employees to state officials.</p>
<p>56. Page 22, A.23: Mass E-Mails</p> <p>[a] Please provide additional clarification in the form of use cases or example scenarios for mass / bulk email.</p> <p>[b] Is there a need to fax or print items as well?</p> <p>[c] What is State's primary email system?</p> <p>[d] What is expected annual volume of mass/bulk email?</p>	<p>[a] Use cases are not currently available. Future use cases may include communications between departments and employees and/or from the Governor's office to State employees. A high volume example would be the need to send reminder emails to State citizens for driver's licenses renewals or to communicate tax deadlines.</p> <p>[b] Yes</p> <p>[c] Microsoft Outlook</p> <p>[d] The State's initial estimate is 6.5 million per month</p>
<p>57. Page 23, A.25, E-Commerce Functionality</p> <p>What are the ecommerce functionalities in the existing Complex applications listed on Page 238 of the RFQ?</p>	<p>E-Commerce functionality varies between each application. However, the State's goal is a unified approach to process monetary transactions, with billing information and reports for any and all departments.</p>
<p>58. Page 25, Attachment B: Technical Response and Evaluation Guide Intro</p> <p>Can the State confirm, are Respondents to provide 10 Reference letters if their proposal is for both EPIS and EPHH services?</p>	<p>As stated in the last paragraph of the introduction to RFQ Attachment B, each Team Member shall provide five (5) references. If the same Team Member is providing both EPIS and EPPH services, then that Team Member should submit ten (10) references, five (5) pertaining to the EPIS contract</p>

QUESTION/COMMENT		STATE RESPONSE
		<p>services and five (5) pertaining to the EPPH contract services.</p> <p>See also the State's response to Item 12 above.</p>
59.	<p>Page 55, General</p> <p>Is it the State's desire to have the solution managed externally to the State's Data Center or in the State's Data Center?</p>	<p>The reference to page 55 makes this question unclear. The State does not intend to provide work space for Contractor staff inside State facilities [see EPIS Contract A.8.a.ii]. Also, per EPIS Contract A.7.a.iii, the EPIS Contractor is required to use application monitoring tools that the State currently uses, but to purchase its own licenses to use them. This implies that the State will not share existing monitoring facilities with the Contractor. For EPPH (the platform), A.7.a.i(7), the Contractor is required to implement and operate its own tools and give the State access to them.</p>
60.	<p>Page 55, A.5.f: State requested EPIS Variable Services</p> <p>Please provide the page count for all sites, both external sites and internal sites.</p>	<p>Refer to State's response to Item 43 above.</p>
61.	<p>Page 56, A.7.a.4 General Baseline Services</p> <p>Can the State confirm that the only Respondent employees that are deemed key personnel are the Portal Program Manager and the Lead Application Operation and Maintenance Technician(s).</p>	<p>The State has amended the roles in RFQ Attachment I, EPIS Contract Section A.7.a.i(4). Please see RFQ Amendment # 3.</p> <p>With regard to Baseline Services, the State considers the Portal Program Manager and Senior Technical Lead to be key personnel.</p> <p>In addition to the above two roles, during the Transition-In Project, the State also considers the Senior Project Manager to be key personnel. Upon the completion of the Transition-In Project, the Senior Project Manager shall no longer be considered key personnel. See EPIS Contract Section A.16.b.i.</p>
62.	<p>Page 57, A.7.a.ii: Provide Disaster Recovery Services</p> <p>Can you provide details on the current disaster recovery plan, including where the DR environment is hosted? What is your current service level for Disaster Recovery?</p>	<p>State TCA 10-7-504 precludes the disclosure of any vulnerability information, such as the location of the current DR environment.</p> <p>Disaster Recovery service levels for the new Enterprise Portal Services project are found in RFQ Attachments I and J, in the following Contract Sections:</p> <p>EPIS Contract Section A.8.b.v(4) EPIS Contract Attachment 2, Section 2.2.d EPPH Contract Attachment 2, Sections 2.3.c and 2.3.d</p>
63.	<p>Page 64, A.8.e: Migrate Simple Apps</p> <p>What happens when the current FormStack forms are submitted? Is there a database that collects the information, is the form information emailed to</p>	<p>Currently, there are two options for the forms to collect data:</p> <p>(1) Information is collected in a cloud database and/or email sent to the user(s).</p>

QUESTION/COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
<p>someone else or is there a workflow? Please describe the back-end processing of forms and form data, any pre-populated forms behaviors, and the number of forms that need data extracted from the form fields.</p>	<p>(2) There are also forms which have workflows built into them for approval and denials, which send notifications to the form filler and approver.</p> <p>If back-end processing is required, the State will work with the new vendor to configure the processing, in the context of the vendor's software.</p> <p>Currently, there are over 400 forms created.</p>
<p>64. Page 73, A.13: Variable Service Requests</p> <p>Will the State provide a break down on user interactions for the 47,500 concurrent users' sessions (i.e., are these logged in users browsing the website, logged in users performing transactions, (filling out forms, etc.) or are they anonymous users browsing)? How long is a session?</p>	<p>There are a variety of different users with different tasks. Usage depends upon the browsing and services the user is trying to access.</p>
<p>65. Page 87, A.33: Non-Disclosure Agreement with Incumbent Vendor</p> <p>In connection with Contract Section A.33, what information will the awardee need from the incumbent relative to transition that is not already publicly available information?</p>	<p>The State is not aware of specific instances to which the A.33 provision would apply. However, it is prudent to provide for this occasion should it arise.</p>
<p>66. Page 129, 3: EPIS Functionality-Application Development and Maintenance</p> <p>How many Mobile apps does the State currently offer?</p>	<p>Fewer than 20.</p>
<p>67. Page 172, A.17. Transfer/Assignment of Third-Party Agreements to the State</p> <p>[a] Please confirm this provision's applicability to Contractor where Contractor is the Licensor of the software being provided? [b] Also, will Contractor be required to assign its vendor agreements with AWS to the State?</p>	<p>[a] The provisions of EPPH Contract Section A.17 apply to third-party agreements.</p> <p>[b] The State may request that third-party agreements be transferred.</p>
<p>68. Page 173, A.20. EPP/CMS Transition-Out and Closeout Plan</p> <p>RFQ states: "a. Protection of Enterprise Portal Network Operations during Transition-Out....</p> <p>ii. The Enterprise Portal created under this procurement shall remain operational during the Transition-Out period. In the event that a different EPPH contractor is awarded the subsequent contract, the EPPH Contractor shall provide continuing services as the State transitions itself to receive such services from the new EPPH</p>	<p>See EPPH Contract Section A.20.e for method of payment for Transition-Out and Closeout Plan.</p>

QUESTION/COMMENT		STATE RESPONSE
	contractor.” Question: Will the Respondent be required to provide transition services at no additional cost?	
69.	Page 175, A.25: Cloud (CSP) Please confirm whether FedRAMP, ISO27001, SOC-2 Type 2 controls are sufficient and that Tennessee Enterprise Information Policy will not be required of AWS.	Since the State does not know the vendor’s concerns, the State cannot confirm this assertion. However, typically the Tennessee Enterprise Information Policy is mandated as the minimum level of compliance.
70.	Page 175, A.26: Encryption Please confirm whether this requirement is mandatory for data at rest.	Yes, encryption is mandatory for all data at rest and in transit.
71.	Page 197, 2.2: Service Level Agreement What are your current SLA’s? Can you provide us with SLA reports for the past six months?	The requested information is not relevant to the preparation of a vendor proposal submitted in response to this RFQ.
72.	Page 204, 2.3: Functionality-Workflow [a] How many existing workflows are there in the current system? [b] Can you provide a breakdown of interactive versus non-interactive workflows?	[a] There is currently only one workflow with editor and publisher roles. Workflows on the TN.Gov environment revolve around the approval of content. The majority of workflow functionality occurs within FormStack. [b] There is insufficient information for the State to respond to the second question.
73.	Page 205, 5.1: Functionality-Mobile Where are mobile apps hosted and managed today and where do envision them in the future?	Currently, mobile applications are native. Code is managed by the department that owns the application. For the future, the State envisions centralized development and hosting for all mobile applications.
74.	Page 206, 6.3: Integrate Business Intelligence Can you provide use cases or business scenarios that describes the behavior and interaction of the BI tool to the EPP/CMS. What type of information would be displayed? It is unclear the meaning of the sentence "The EPP/CMS shall support the input of information from BI tools though a database connection".	No, use cases and business scenarios are not currently available. However, the State expects the EPIS contractor to develop use cases. The EPIS Contractor shall work with the State to define the format and content of these use cases with final approval by the State. With regard to the meaning of the sentence, an example of the use of BI tools would be to provide more robust and innovative ways to approach the Transparent Tennessee area of TN.Gov. Data for the state will be more transparent to the customer and accessed from a central location and can be used in multiple applications and integrations.
75.	Page 208, 6.5: CRM Tools Are there are other CRM-related tools other than Microsoft Dynamic CRM that the website or the complex apps integrate with? Is the EPIS vendor responsible for maintaining and/or supporting these CRM tools?	There are currently several different CRM tools in the State. The State’s goal is to have a centralized CRM tool that will be utilized throughout the enterprise. We do not currently integrate with Microsoft Dynamic CRM. We expect the vendor to provider a CRM solution or CRM-like solution and support this tool through integration or built in capabilities within the

QUESTION/COMMENT		STATE RESPONSE														
		enterprise.														
76.	<p>Page 257, Attachment O / Enterprise User License Scenario</p> <p>For the User License Scenario, how many total users will the State want to have access to the CMS/Portal? The scenario mentions 10 Super Admins, 210 Admins and 420 Editors. Are some of these "editors" also accounted for in the "Admin" count? Is the total count of users 640 (10+210+420) or 420 (total "editors")?</p>	<p>An estimated 7.5 million citizens and 47,500 State employees will be users of the EPP/CMS.</p> <p>No, editors are not also accounted for in the Admin count. Currently, the estimated number of total admin users is 640.</p>														
77.	<p>Page 284, Attachment R / Current Web Environment Specifications</p> <p>Can the state confirm if the 8 CPU (Core processors), 8GB is total production hardware or if this is the standard specification of one of your production servers. If it is the standard specification, how many such production servers do you currently host in a clustered mode?</p>	<p>The compute resources specified in Attachment R are virtual servers. The external site runs on one VM with 8 vCPUs and 8 GB RAM. The internal site(s) run on two VMs, each having 4 vCPUs and 8 GB RAM.</p>														
78.	<p>Page 284, Attachment R / Current Web Environment Specifications</p> <p>Can the State provide details regarding the number of web servers, application servers and database servers in production?</p>	<p><u>Internal and External Websites</u></p> <table> <tr><td>Internal Environment</td><td>8</td></tr> <tr><td>External Environment</td><td>8</td></tr> <tr><td>TeamTN.gov</td><td>3</td></tr> <tr><td>Redis Caching Servers</td><td>3</td></tr> </table> <p><u>Complex Applications and Share TN.gov</u></p> <table> <tr><td>Web Servers</td><td>3</td></tr> <tr><td>App Servers</td><td>11</td></tr> <tr><td>DB Server</td><td>1</td></tr> </table> <p><u>Note:</u> These numbers do not include the additional utility servers.</p>	Internal Environment	8	External Environment	8	TeamTN.gov	3	Redis Caching Servers	3	Web Servers	3	App Servers	11	DB Server	1
Internal Environment	8															
External Environment	8															
TeamTN.gov	3															
Redis Caching Servers	3															
Web Servers	3															
App Servers	11															
DB Server	1															
79.	<p>What is the number of concurrent users to the content authoring environment?</p>	<p>Currently, the State has 500 concurrent users and growth is expected over the contract period</p>														
80.	<p>Is the author distributed in different geographic locations, or centralized, if distributed which regions?</p>	<p>The author is distributed throughout the State of Tennessee. Authors must have the capability to make changes from anywhere with proper credentials.</p>														
81.	<p>What is the number of digital assets by type (images, video, PDF, etc.)? Please provide number of assets per site if available.</p>	<table> <tr><td>TN.gov</td><td>64,307</td></tr> <tr><td>TeamTN</td><td>5,755</td></tr> </table>	TN.gov	64,307	TeamTN	5,755										
TN.gov	64,307															
TeamTN	5,755															
82.	<p>What is the average size of digital assets by type?</p>	<p>5 MB</p>														
83.	<p>What is the total number of revisions to the digital assets on a monthly basis?</p>	<p>Approximately 5,000+</p>														
84.	<p>What are the number of new assets per month?</p>	<p>Approximately 200+</p>														
85.	<p>What is the number of users per day?</p>	<p>The State estimates:</p> <p>Approximately 500 web developers using/uploading to the portal per day, with growth expected during contract period.</p> <p>Approximately 200 thousand users viewing per hour</p>														

QUESTION/COMMENT		STATE RESPONSE
		<p>Approximately 4 million unique visitors hit the ePortal website annually</p> <p>Approximately 1.5 million unique visitors hit the internal/external environments annually</p>
86.	Does content publishing workflow need to be real-time or a scheduled batch replication process?	Real time
87.	What is the number of page requests per day broken down by each major site(s)?	Approximately 200 thousand per hour – one site
88.	What are the daily, weekly, monthly, quarterly and annual expected peaks of page requests (volume)?	Approximately 200 thousand per hour. Requests vary on promotional items, program items, governor announcements, and other communications that may be sent through offices of all departments.
89.	What is the expected level of page complexity (High is personalized targeted content, Low is mostly static content)?	High
90.	Regarding form volumes; how many are rendered on average per hour or day and how many are submitted on average per hour or day?	There is insufficient information to respond to this question. It is not clear what is meant by “rendered.” Each form varies regarding usage and the information being gathered by the form.
91.	How many video streams per month does the site receive?	This is unknown. The majority of videos are held on YouTube. Training videos are housed on the server and uploaded various times throughout the month and are used by various internal and external users.
92.	How many electronic signatures does the State expect to see on an annual basis?	<p>Varies on the usage of the forms and future developments. Some general assumptions for electronic signatures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Every citizen needs to sign electronic tax forms every year. b. Every citizen needs to electronically sign some type of State form once a month. <p>There are approximately 7.5 million citizens in the State of TN.</p>
93.	How many digital signatures does the State expect to see on an annual basis?	Usage of digital signatures is expected to be less than electronic. A general assumption for digital signatures is that every citizen will need to digitally sign one form each month. There are approximately 7.5 million citizens in the State of TN.
94.	How many profiles are in the marketing database that the State communicated to during the past 12 months via any channel (email, direct mail, SMS, mobile push, call center, social)?	<p>Profiles vary by department. Most departments have their own database. For example, the range of profile information can range between 2 thousand for an email to 5 million for driver’s license communication.</p> <p>In the future, the State plans to centralize this in one database.</p>
95.	What are the preferred/needed channels for messaging? Options include: email, direct mail, sms, mobile push, call center, social media.	The State wants the capability to use email, direct mail, sms, mobile push, call center and social media.
96.	How many emails are delivered monthly/yearly?	Varies between different programs. The vendor can assume one email for each citizen per month.

QUESTION/COMMENT		STATE RESPONSE
97.	Does the State process transactional emails? If so, how many on a monthly basis?	There is insufficient information for the State to respond to this question. The State does not know what the vendor means specifically by "transactional" email?
98.	Can the CMS portal solution interact with the State's merchant services provider to fulfill the credit card payment processing?	The new EPP/CMS should provide the capability to interface with the State's merchant servicer for payment processing.
99.	How many staff do you have currently supporting the current solution (both in-house and out of house)?	The incumbent portal contractor estimated approximately 18,000 hours are spent per year by their staff to provide application and infrastructure management. This includes staff for: infrastructure/configuration management and consulting; issue research and resolution; production support; quality assurance/testing; user interface development; and portal content management. In House: See RFQ Attachment I, EPIS Contract Section A.16.a for State FTE's
100.	[a] Is Serena PVCS TEAMTRACK release management (ALM) used for all platforms? [b] Is MS team foundation server used for ALM for .Net apart from version controlling?	[a] No. [b] No. The EPIS Contractor shall provide, free of charge or open source, a source code control system to be implemented and housed on State servers or, if housed at EPIS contractor's facility, the source code control system must be replicated back to the State including all source code and all stored artifacts. This replication must be real-time.
101.	On average, how many tickets are received each month by priority for each of the 74 applications?	In 2015, average service requests received per month by category: a. Portal deployments = 26 b. Portal maintenance (work orders or service-based, most relating to infrastructure) = 42 c. Portal services (incidents or break-fix) = 5
102.	Does the incumbent contractor have warranty obligations that extend beyond the end of its contract term such that it will perform certain warranty work in parallel with the awardees performance?	In accordance with RFQ Attachment I, EPIS Contract Section A.37 and RFQ Attachment J, EPPH Contract Section A.21, the Contractor's Warranty obligations shall extend "for a period of twelve (12) months, or until the end of the Contract Term, whichever period of time is longer, from acceptance or placement into production of the final system software deliverable." Therefore, it is possible that the Contractor will be required to provide Warranty services in parallel with a subsequent new portal contractor. (See EPIS Contract Section A.37; and EPPH Contract Section A.21.)
103.	Please provide copies of all performance standards, service level agreements (SLAs) and liquidated damages provisions that are in place between the	The requested information is not relevant to the preparation of a vendor proposal submitted in response to this RFQ.

QUESTION/COMMENT		STATE RESPONSE
	incumbent and the State.	
104.	Are there any performance standards, SLAs or liquidated damage provisions that are not public information and if they are not public information, why not?	Yes, there are a number of requirements that are not public information, due to the necessity to protect the security of the State's information technology infrastructure. However, the State made reasonable efforts to make these requirements available to the vendors through the Enterprise Portal Information Repository (EPIR) review process described in RFQ attachment P.
105.	If the contract is awarded to a new vendor, can the State please provide a detailed description of the current vendor's responsibilities in transitioning out of its current role?	<p>These details are not available at this time. Such details will be jointly developed by the State and the Incumbent Vendor approximately twelve months prior to the end of the current contract.</p> <p>The current vendor's primary responsibility will be to provide staff for knowledge transfer. This knowledge transfer will allow the State and the new vendor to assume responsibilities, which will include, but not be limited to: maintenance and support for Complex Applications; development of new interfaces between some Complex applications and the State's Merchant Servicer; and Customer Service.</p>
106.	Which applications are dependent/still running on [INCUMBENT VENDOR] or other 3rd party hardware/infrastructure?	None
107.	Are all applications currently hosted at the State of Tennessee's data center?	Yes
108.	<p>Page 2, 1.1.2 #2 The long-term intent for the project is as follows:</p> <p>RFQ states "Intuitive platform design which will allow a non-technical user to update and publish content without extra assistance, to access pre-written code for additional functionality and with option for the State to request the development of new features, as needs arise."</p> <p>Can the State elaborate on expectations for the capability to "access pre-written code for additional functionality"? Is this a requirement for functions or features within the EPP/CMS?</p>	For example, with the current platform, a non-technical user can access an area on the branding site called a "widget." These widgets are comprised of snips of HTML code. A non-technical user can copy and paste the HTML code into a WYSIWYG editor to create functionality/features such as accordions or slide shows.
109.	<p>Page 3, 1.1.2</p> <p>RFQ states: "The current contract for the Enterprise Portal Services, which was entered into in April 2011, has a contract value of \$22,226,307."</p> <p>Did the incumbent vendor have any other sources of revenue on this contract? For example, did they collect additional convenience fees or transaction fees?</p>	<p>The revenue sources provided to the Incumbent Vendor under the existing Enterprise Portal Sources are provided in the current Portal contract, which was available to prospective respondents in the Enterprise Portal Information Repository. Vendors had an opportunity to review this Repository during the RFQ process.</p> <p>Under the current contract, the Incumbent Vendor collects customer option and subscription fees, which were not included within the stated</p>

QUESTION/COMMENT		STATE RESPONSE
		<p>Contract value.</p> <p>However, the fee/revenue structure is significantly different under the new EPIS and EPPH Contracts. Please refer to RFQ Amendment # 3, Attachments I and J, as amended.</p>
110.	<p>Page 3, 1.1.2</p> <p>RFQ states: “The budget for this project for fiscal year 2017 is \$6,400,000. Note that this figure only represents budgeted compensation for the Contractor(s) under the contract(s) awarded as a result of this RFQ. This figure does not include the budgets for State resources, the incumbent vendor, or the State’s Merchant Servicer.”</p> <p>Does the \$6.4M budgeted in 2017 represent the States anticipated annual budget for the EPIS and EPPH contractors?</p>	No
111.	<p>Page 23, Attachment A. A.32 – Mandatory Requirement Items</p> <p>RFQ states: “Provide written confirmation that the all EPIS Contractor staff resources assigned to develop and/or maintain Complex Applications shall be based in the Continental United States.”</p> <p>Can the State verify that non-US based resources are acceptable for Simple Applications?</p>	<p>The State has amended Attachment A, Item A.32 to clarify that direct employees of the Contractor performing maintenance and development tasks must be located within the Continental United States.</p> <p>Subcontractor development and maintenance staff may be located outside of the Continental United States.</p> <p>Please see RFQ Amendment # 3, Attachment A, Item A.32, as amended.</p>
112.	<p>Page 54, Attachment I, A.6.d – Scope – Variable Services</p> <p>RFQ states: “It is the intention of the State to use the State’s Merchant Servicer for settling transactions for all payment processing applications.”</p> <p>Can the State share the designated State's Merchant Services vendor?</p>	<p>Link2Gov Corp (an affiliate of Fidelity Information Services, LLC [“FIS”]). The State’s Merchant Services vendor is referred to in RFQ Attachment I, EPIS Contract, Section A.35.a as “FIS.”</p> <p>The State has added a definition for FIS to RFQ Attachment Q. Please see RFQ Amendment # 3.</p>
113.	<p>Page 54, Attachment I, A.6.d – Scope – Variable Services</p> <p>RFQ states: “It is the intention of the State to use the State’s Merchant Servicer for settling transactions for all payment processing applications.”</p> <p>Can the State share the designated State's Merchant Services vendor?</p>	See State’s response to Item 112 above.
114.	<p>Page 63, Attachment I, A.8.d Scope - Oversee the Installation and Configuration of the New EPP/CMS</p> <p>RFQ states: “The EPIS Contractor will work with the</p>	<p>EPIS Contract Section A.8.d refers to licensing the COTS, out-of-the-box EPP/CMS software only. Custom coding, if required, is acceptable in concept. The State actually expects the solution to be hosted in a single tenant environment to allow flexibility for</p>

QUESTION/COMMENT		STATE RESPONSE
	<p>EPPH Contractor to ensure the new EPP/CMS is acquired and licensed for the State as Software as a Service (SaaS), supported by appropriate Platform as a Service (PaaS) and Infrastructure as a Service (IaaS)."</p> <p>Can the State clarify the SaaS expectations for the EPP/CMS? Since some custom coding may be required, the As-a-Service model may not fully equate to a SaaS offering. Is that acceptable to the State?</p>	<p>customization and control over base package upgrades.</p> <p>Note that the State expects to approve custom coding on a case-by-case basis, via the Variable Services Requests processes described in RFQ Attachments I and J, EPIS Contract Section A.13 and EPPH Contract Section A.10.</p>
115.	<p>Page 64, Attachment I / Scope, A.8 Transition-In Project – Detailed Obligations</p> <p>RFQ states: "A.8.e. Migrate Simple Applications to the EPP/CMS."</p> <p>Does System Test Case and/or User Acceptance Test Cases exist for the Simple Application (Simple Application based on FormStack)? If so, how many System Test Cases and/or User Acceptance Test Cases Exist?</p>	No
116.	<p>Page 65, Attachment I / Scope, A.8 Transition-In Project – Detailed Obligations</p> <p>RFQ states: "A.8.f. Transition TN.GOV External Websites (Internet) to the EPP/CMS."</p> <p>Does System Test Case and/or User Acceptance Test Cases exist for the TN.GOV External Websites (Internet)? If so, how many System Test Cases and/or User Acceptance Test Cases Exist?</p>	No
117.	<p>Page 65, Attachment I / Scope, A.8 Transition-In Project – Detailed Obligations</p> <p>RFQ states: "A.8.g. Transition KidCentral Website from Proprietary CMS to the EPP/CMS."</p> <p>Does System Test Case and/or User Acceptance Test Cases exist for the KidCentral Website? If so, how many System Test Cases and/or User Acceptance Test Cases Exist?</p>	No
118.	<p>Page 66, Attachment I / Scope, A.8 Transition-In Project – Detailed Obligations</p> <p>RFQ states: "A.8.h. Develop the Internal Website Environment and Transition the Content of the State Internal Websites (Intranet) to the EPP/CMS."</p> <p>Does System Test Case and/or User Acceptance Test Cases exist for the Internal Website Environment? If so, how many System Test Cases and/or User Acceptance Test Cases Exist?</p>	No
119.	<p>Page 66, Attachment I / Scope, A.8 Transition-In Project – Detailed Obligations</p>	The State cannot provide the number of pages for internal/external websites. However, there are

	QUESTION/COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
	<p>RFQ states: "i. The EPIS Contractor shall transition the Internal Websites (Intranet) to the EPP/CMS in accordance with the State-approved project schedule. The Contractor shall develop this project schedule at the beginning of the Transition-In Project; the State will review the schedule and provide written approval, if it is acceptable. There are approximately forty-two (42) Intranets in the State Organizational Units."</p> <p>For the 42 intranets/internal websites, what are the total pages/screens per intranet/internal website?</p>	<p>currently 16,000 database entries which make up the current CMS environment to produce the TN.Gov website. There are not multiple sites; TN.Gov is one site.</p>
120.	<p>Page 77, Attachment I, A.17.a, Scope - Portal Software Environments/Standards</p> <p>RFQ states: "The State, with the assistance of the EPIS Contractor, shall establish separate Development, Testing, Disaster Recovery, and Production environments. Test and Production will be located at the State's Data Center."</p> <p>Can the State clarify this requirement? Do these environments currently exist? Are there known deficiencies with the environments? Is the State looking for the EPIS Contractor to support the environments at the application layer and above? Any additional details regarding the environments for the Complex applications would be appreciated.</p>	<p>Yes. All of these exist. The Test, Production and DR environments exist already at the State. The EPIS contractor will support the systems at the application layer and above. Depending on the hosting approach for complex applications, the State may support the hardware, O/S, JBoss, Java, Oracle Databases for Test, Production and DR.</p> <p>The development environment will be maintained in its entirety by the EPIS contractor but will stay within scope of the Enterprise Security Policy for data, patches, user security and other security related items.</p> <p>The EPIS contractor will maintain the same O/S, JBoss, Java, Database and all other components as Test, Production and DR. This includes patches, upgrades and bug fixes.</p>
121.	<p>Page 89, Attachment I, A.42, Scope - Transition for Optional Complex Application Cloud Hosting</p> <p>RFQ states: "At the State's sole option, the State may request that the EPIS Contractor support hosting of any or all Complex Applications off-premise, with the hosting provider named in the separate EPPH Contract. The EPIS Contractor will perform all tasks necessary to successfully transition the application from the State's On-Premise Hosting platform to the EPPH Contract Hosting provider's platform."</p> <p>Can the State further elaborate on this requirement? It appears as though the State would like an option to migrate Complex applications to the EPP/CMS platform provided by the EPPH vendor. Given the diverse range of function and complexity of the Complex Applications, a one-size option for that migration is not viable. How would the State like the vendor to respond given that there will be significant exceptions?</p>	<p>The activities associated with Complex Application transition and hosting are spread across two contracts and several contractual sections, each having its own compensation methodology. Relevant sections include the following: RFQ Attachment I, EPIS Contract Section A.8.c; RFQ Attachment I, EPIS Contract Section A.42; and RFQ Attachment J, EPPH Contract A.7.c.</p> <p>Therefore the State believes that there is sufficient flexibility within the current payment methodologies to accommodate the migration to Optional Cloud Hosting.</p> <p>In the event that the new vendor encounters significant additional expense that is not accommodated within the compensation mechanisms described above, the State has the option to compensate the vendor using the Variable Services processes in RFQ Attachments I and J, EPIS Contract Section A.13 and EPPH Contract Section A.10.</p>
122.	<p>Page 93, Attachment I, C.3.b.i(1), Payment Methodology - Baseline Services</p>	<p>RFQ Amendment # 1, revised the number of allotted hours per month from 2,000 to 1,500.</p>

	QUESTION/COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
	<p>RFQ states: “The allotted number of hours for Baseline Services in a given month is two thousand (2,000). The EPIS Contactor shall invoice the State for the allotted hours, in arrears, following the completion of the invoice month in question.”</p> <p>Can the State clarify the allotted number of hours for Baseline Services in a given month? How did the Stat arrive at 2,000?</p>	<p>RFQ Attachment I, EPIS Contract Section C.3.b.i.(2)(a) states: “The allotted number of hours for Allotted-Hours Baseline Services in a given month is One Thousand, Five Hundred (1,500).”</p> <p>This is the estimated number of hours required to provide maintenance and support per month.</p>
123.	<p>Page 117, Contract Attachment 2 – A.2, Daily Operations Service Level Agreements - Service Level Unit (Credit or Debit)</p> <p>RFQ states: “Each Service Level Unit (Credit) is a cost reduction of the Baseline Services Adjustment Amount for the affected application. The credit will be applied for each application not meeting the acceptable uptime target during the measurement interval. Service Level Credit Units (if any) will be assessed against the monthly invoice during the billing cycle following outage.”</p> <p>Can the State elaborate on how the Service Level Credits or Debits would be applied? It appears to be on an application-by-application basis; is that correct? Should the EPIS Vendor provide pricing on an application-by-application basis? An example of how individual</p>	<p>Note that this entire SLA has been revised since the initial release of the RFQ. The Service Level Units have been changed from a reduction in billing to an increase in allowed Baseline Services hours. The State believes that this change simplifies and clarifies calculation and application of the Service Level Units.</p> <p>Service Level Units are still applied based on individual application downtime. Acceptable unscheduled downtime is calculated in minutes per month as 1% of (43,800 - scheduled downtime). The actual downtime in minutes is accumulated for every unscheduled application outage during the month. At the end of the month, all unscheduled downtime during the month is summed per application. Excessive downtime (greater than the acceptable unscheduled downtime) for each application is accumulated for all applications for the month. The sum is rounded to the nearest one-half hour. The sum is then added to the following month’s Baseline Services allotted hours.</p> <p>Please see RFQ Amendment # 3.</p>
124.	<p>Page 176, C.3 Methodology Payment, Goods and Services Description</p> <p>The EPPH Payment Table specifies a per user pricing model or a SaaS type of pricing model. Is the state open to other pricing models ie: IaaS and PaaS, or is SaaS Per User Pricing a Hard Requirement for Bid Compliance. Section A.4 – A.5. – A.6 outlines another good pricing model: Baseline Services, Transition, and Variable Services.</p>	<p>No, the State is not open to pricing models other than those detailed in RFQ Attachment F, Cost Proposal & Evaluation Guide. The Cost Proposal must be prepared in accordance with the instructions given in RFQ Attachment F and RFQ Section 3.1.4, which states, in part: “the Cost Proposal must be recorded on an exact duplicate of RFQ Attachment F, Cost Proposal & Evaluation Guide. Any response that does not follow the instructions included in RFQ Attachment F may be deemed nonresponsive” and “A Respondent must only record the proposed cost exactly as required by the RFQ Attachment F, Cost Proposal & Evaluation Guide and must NOT record any other rates, amounts, or information.”</p>
125.	<p>Page 156, Section A Scope # A.2.b</p> <p>RFQ states: “The present Contract, the EPPH Contract, addresses the acquisition, implementation, and on-going maintenance of the Enterprise Portal Platform (EPP), Content Management System</p>	<p>[a] The State has revised the language in question, to replace “Customer Services” with “Tier 3 customer support.” See RFQ Amendment # 3, RFQ Attachment J, EPPH Contract Section A.2.b, as amended.</p>

QUESTION/COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
<p>(CMS), and related services, such as hosting, disaster recovery, customer services, and the establishment of analytics capabilities.”</p> <p>[a] We would like to ask the state to expand on customer services as defined in this section or point to a specific section or sections in this RFP that define custom services?</p> <p>[b] What type of analytic capabilities are required by EPPH?</p>	<p>[b] Analytical data that is pertaining specifically to the platform environments that includes, but is not limited to, the websites, demographic information based on the users, geographic information based on the users, key word and campaign building data, heat maps, and document open rate analytics for the environments.</p>
<p>126. Page 156, Section A Scope # A.2.f</p> <p>RFQ states: “The content management solution will facilitate easy, rapid and consistent creation of web content. The portal solution will host an external (public facing) environment, an Internal (employee facing) environment, and an environment for selected applications. The solution will interface with internal enterprise systems and external services as required to provide a rich visitor experience and facilitate customer self-service. The solution also will provide collaboration tools and social media features.”</p> <p>The State has referenced the type of environments required to be built as a part of EPPH responsibilities: 1- Public, 1- Private, 1- Mobile, and 1-Simple Applications. What does each environment listed in this RFP consist of: Dev – Test- Production? So is there a total of 12-Actual sub-environment builds, 3 for each environment? Is each Dev-Test- and Production Environment equal in size, compute, and storage?</p>	<p>This will be based on the vendor’s recommendation for best practices for each solution and shall require State approval.</p>
<p>127. Page 158, A.7 Baseline Services – Detailed Obligations #A.7.a</p> <p>RFQ states: “A.7.a. Perform Operations and Support for the Enterprise Portal Platform and Content Management System (EPP/CMS).”</p> <p>[a] Given the volume of daily and monthly storage, would the state consider archiving storage for long-term data warehousing?</p> <p>[b] Archiving does not appear to be called out in this RFP, please define if it is a requirement or should be considered as a part of this bid.</p>	<p>[a] Yes, the State requires document management capabilities for archiving.</p> <p>[b] Yes, this is a requirement, as stated above. The State has added requirements for this functionality to RFQ Attachment J, EPPH Contract, as Contract Section A.8.b.xiii.</p> <p>Please see RFQ Amendment # 3.</p>
<p>128. Page 158, A.7 Baseline Services – Detailed Obligations #A.7.V.1</p> <p>RFQ states: “v. The EPPH Contractor shall ensure that the State’s EPP/CMS instance(s) always runs at the software vendor’s current release level, contingent upon:</p>	<p>The intent of EPPH Contract requirement A.7.a.v. Is to control or avoid a potential domino effect driven by a new release of the EPP/CMS package. The existing hosting infrastructure is what the installed release of the EPP/CMS is running on currently. Any new release of the EPP/CMS should be evaluated for impacts on the infrastructure and existing</p>

QUESTION/COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
<p>(1) Compatibility with the existing hosting infrastructure”</p> <p>State requests in this section compatibility with the existing hosting infrastructure. Please further define compatibility. Is the State requiring infrastructure components to be vendor specific? Can the state provide a topology example of an existing infrastructure environment ie: switches, storage, compute, etc?</p>	<p>content. Any impacts should be addressed before deployment of a new release.</p>
<p>129. Page 159, A.7 Baseline Services – Detailed Obligations #A.7.V.2</p> <p>RFQ states: “(2) Compatibility with existing State content, applications, and third party integrations (e.g., the State’s Merchant Servicer).”</p> <p>[a] Please further define third party integration requirements, [b] what is the specific requirement for compatibility between existing applications and third party integrations.</p>	<p>[a] 3rd party integrations can be provided through API’s developed and maintained by the vendor. Also, the EPIS Contractor may create new API’s to promote the usage of data sources and other displaying mechanisms of content or other tools.</p> <p>[b] The intent of this requirement is to mitigate the risk of an EPP/CMS upgrade breaking the State’s websites and web applications. The State expects that all compatibility issues between the initially installed release of the EPP/CMS and state content, applications, and 3rd party integrations will be resolved during Transition-In. During Baseline Services (Operations), the State expects that the timing of EPP/CMS upgrades will be contingent upon an evaluation of what, if any, impacts there will be on the as-built environment(s).</p>
<p>130. Page 160, A.7.b Provide Hosting for EPP/ CMS # iv 1-5</p> <p>RFQ states: “</p> <p>iv. The EPPH Contractor shall provide continuous real-time security monitoring and response for the hosting service and EPP/CMS.</p> <p>(1) The EPPH Contractor shall implement and operate defensive tools including, but not limited to, Intrusion Prevention Systems (IPS) and a Web Application Firewall (WAF).</p> <p>(2) The EPPH Contractor shall provide denial of service (DOS) prevention and remediation.</p> <p>(3) The EPPH Contractor shall monitor site traffic continuously for malicious activity and respond immediately to mitigate or remediate such activity’s effects bringing all reasonable resources to bear. The EPPH Contractor shall cooperate fully with any State activity to mitigate or remediate damage.</p> <p>(4) The EPPH Contractor shall report any detected malicious activity to the State immediately upon detection. The EPPH Contractor shall keep the State informed of status during the event.</p> <p>(5) Following an event, the EPPH Contractor shall investigate the event and produce a report covering the exploit/vulnerability used, the response activity,</p>	<p>The State is not sure of the vendor’s specific question, and therefore cannot respond.</p>

QUESTION/COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
<p>and recommendations to prevent this type of breach in the future. The EPPH Contractor shall cooperate with and assist the State in any subsequent investigation.”</p> <p>Is the state requiring Intrusion Detection Service (IDS)/ Intrusion Prevention Service (IPS), Denial-of-Service (DOS), Web Application Firewall (WAF), Vulnerability Scanning protection specific and isolated to the states applications and infrastructure? Cloud Hosting Provider offers IPS-DOS-WAF for each data center but is for protection as overall cloud provider. Please clarify.</p>	
<p>131. Page 160, A.7.b Provide Hosting for EPP/ CMS # v</p> <p>RFQ states: “v. The EPPH Contractor shall perform ongoing capacity evaluation and recommend long term capacity upgrades. The EPPH Contractor shall monitor site utilization, identify growth trends, and present estimates for additional capacity needed to the State. Upon State approval, the EPPH Contractor shall acquire or allocate the approved additional capacity.”</p> <p>Is web acceleration and content data caching a requirement. If so please specify.</p>	<p>Yes, the State does have requirements for web acceleration and data caching. The State has added these requirements to the RFQ.</p> <p>Please see RFQ Amendment # 3, RFQ Attachment J, EPPH Contract Attachment 3, Item 1.8.</p>
<p>132. Page 160, Disaster Recovery #1</p> <p>EPPH contractor is required to participate in minimum of (1) disaster recovery event per year for all environments. Is this for production environments or all Dev, Test, and Prod. Please specify and also answer question above request total number of sub-environments.</p>	<p>See the State’s response to Item 39 above. If the Contractor can demonstrate compliance with the seamless transition requirements expressed in the response to Item 39, then the Contractor will not have to participate in a yearly test.</p>
<p>133. Page 161, A7.d # ii Licensure for Incremental Roll Out</p> <p>RFQ states: “ii. Licensure for Incremental Roll Out. The State intends to transition State Organizational Units’ web-presence to the new Enterprise Portal in a phased manner, with two (2) blocks of eleven (11) State Organizational Units in each block, and two (2) blocks of ten (10) State Organizational Units in each block, for a total of forty-two (42) Organizational Units. Upon the State’s written approval, for each group of seven (7) Organizational Units that is transitioned, the Contractor may invoice the State for additional User License and Hosting fees, in accordance with EPPH Contract Section A.7.d.iii below.”</p> <p>Is this roll-out effectively the transition pricing table listed in the pricing methodology section? The incremental roll-out and pricing table seems to</p>	<p>There is no table in RFQ Attachment J, EPPH Contract specifically labeled as “the transition pricing table.” Therefore, it is unclear to which pricing methodology component the vendor is referring.</p> <p>The payment methodologies in RFQ Attachment I, EPIS Contract Section C.3.b apply to the services required to effect the transition of the Organizational Units’ web presences to the new environment. The payment methodologies in RFQ Attachment J, EPPH Contract Section C.3.b are used to “scale up” the user license counts and hosting resources as additional Organizational Units are transitioned.</p> <p>The State’s intent is that the State will pay only for Organizational Unit web presences that have been successfully transitioned to the new environment. Therefore, upon the completion of the transition for a given Organizational Unit, the Contractor may invoice the State for services pertaining to that</p>

QUESTION/COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
<p>conflict. Please clarify.</p>	<p>Organizational Unit, as follows:</p> <p>a. The State will compensate the vendor for EPIS Contract services to effect the transition of the web presences using the rates given in EPIS Contract Section C.3.b.ii Transition-In Project.</p> <p>b. The State will compensate the Contractor for additional User Licenses and Hosting Resources required by each additional Organizational Unit transition using the rates in EPPH Contract C.3.b.ii through C.3.b.vii, as applicable.</p>
<p>134. Page 162, A.8.a Licensing SaaS</p> <p>RFQ states: "License EPP/CMS Software as a Service (SaaS). The Contractor shall license the EPP/CMS to the State as Software as a Services (SaaS)."</p> <p>Is SaaS a hard requirement or is the state interested in other types of pricing models ie: Platform as a Service?</p>	<p>The State's understanding is that Platform as a Service is the middle tier in a cloud computing stack. The State considers the EPP/CMS software to reside at the top tier (SaaS). Thus, the State does not understand how a Platform as a Service offering would include the EPP/CMS software.</p> <p>Nevertheless, respondents' proposals must conform exactly to the State's cost proposal format in RFQ Attachment F. Cost Proposal & Evaluation Guide.</p> <p>Furthermore, the State has revised RFQ Attachment J, EPPH Contract section A.8.a to clarify the State's intent. Please see RFQ Amendment # 3.</p>
<p>135. Page 164, A.8.b # xi</p> <p>RFQ states: "</p> <p>xi. Automation and DevOps Enablement. The EPPH Contractor shall provide an EPP/CMS environment with the following capabilities:</p> <p>(1) No maintenance windows that result in the network ("control plane") or API being unavailable. (2) Monitoring tools have the capability to issue alerts to the State's IT Service Desk."</p> <p>Reference to State Ticketing System, please clarify vendor and version to confirm compatibility integrations.</p>	<p>The State will be implementing Service Now, Geneva, in Summer/Fall 2016.</p>
<p>136. Page 169 – 170, A.12 System Infrastructure and Hosting Approach # a-e</p> <p>RFQ states: "System Infrastructure and Hosting Approach. The EPPH Contractor's approach to hosting the application types that compose the EPP/CMS are as follows:</p> <p>a. General System Infrastructure. The EPPH Contractor will provide the CMS software and hosting of the CMS software for the EPPH. The EPPH Contractor will configure setup, maintain, and upgrade the hosting and software when applicable.</p> <p>b. Simple Applications. The EPPH Contractor will</p>	<p>The intent of EPPH Contract requirement A.12, System Infrastructure and Hosting Approach is that the EPPH Contractor is responsible for all COTS software including development environments for the types of websites and applications defined in EPPH Contract section A.12, paragraphs b.-e. The EPIS Contractor or the State (as agreed) is responsible for the development and maintenance of the types of websites and applications identified above.</p>

QUESTION/COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
<p>host and provide needed software to produce Simple Applications and the hosting environment in which internal and external users of the environments can access and use them.</p> <p>c. Mobile Applications. The EPPH Contractor will host and provide needed software to produce Mobile Applications and the hosting environment in which internal and external users of the environments can access and use them.</p> <p>d. External (Internet). The EPPH Contractor will host and provide needed software to produce External facing (Internet) websites and the hosting environment in which internal and external users of the environments can access and use them.</p> <p>e. Internal (Intranet). The EPPH Contractor will host and provide needed software to produce Internal facing (Intranet) websites and the hosting environment in which internal and external users of the environments can access and use them.”</p> <p>Is EPPH contractor responsible for all middleware and infrastructure pricing to be included in pricing model and EPIS contractor is responsible for all application pricing to be included. Please clarify.</p>	
<p>137. What data analytical services are required on the platform</p>	<p>Analytical data that is pertaining specifically to the platform environments that includes, but is not limited to, the websites, demographic information based on the users, geographic information based on the users, key word and campaign building data, heat maps, and document open rate analytics for the environments.</p>
<p>138. Workloads Do you plan to lift and shift exiting workloads to the cloud?</p>	<p>The State assumes this question refers to Optional Complex Application Hosting described in EPPH Contract section A.7.c. The State has no plan to migrate any Complex Applications at this time, but the Contract allows flexibility to do so in the future. If the State determines that migration is in its best interest, the migrated Complex Application workloads would certainly lift and shift to the cloud.</p>
<p>139. Workloads Do use cases include compute intensive, high volume transaction processing?</p>	<p>Such use cases are not documented at this time. If these use cases become a need during the contract, the State would expect to handle them through either Variable Services, the EPPH Contractor service catalog, or both.</p>
<p>140. Workloads Are there hybrid cloud use cases where cloud based systems need to access on-prem legacy systems of record?</p>	<p>Such use cases are not documented at this time. Some Complex Applications do access on premise legacy systems of record. These currently are also hosted on premise. Modifications may be needed if the State decides to use the Optional Complex Application Cloud Hosting defined in EPIS Contract A.42 and EPPH Contract A.7.c. In this case, the State expects to handle the transition(s) under EPIS</p>

QUESTION/COMMENT		STATE RESPONSE
		Contract Section C.3.b.iv and operations under EPPH Contract Section C.3.b.vii.
141.	<p>Workloads</p> <p>A.31</p> <p>How much will state charge EPPH per VPN connection?</p>	The current charge is \$8.17 per VPN connection per month. This charge is subject to increases in the future. This same rate also applies to RFQ Attachment I, EPIS Contract Section A.8.a.
142.	<p>Workloads</p> <p>What is the maximum CPU rate you prefer for servers?</p>	This question is unclear. There are several possible interpretations of the term "CPU rate." Therefore, the State cannot respond.
143.	<p>EPS Ecosystem, State/Internal</p> <p>Pg 126 – 1.2</p> <p>The EPIS Contractor shall have the ability to help transfer external sites built on proprietary CMS software into the EPP/CMS throughout the duration of the contract, if requested by the State through a Statement of Work Process.</p> <p>What is the proprietary CMS vendor name?</p>	There are various proprietary CMS vendor products currently in use in the State. When migration of an existing proprietary CMS is planned to the new EPP/CMS, the existing proprietary CMS software will be evaluated at that time.
144.	<p>SDLC</p> <p>Pg 126 – 1.4</p> <p>[a] For CMS SaaS, do you have a preference on the number of content staging environment (e.g. authoring, preview, staging, production, etc)?</p> <p>[b] Can you estimate the average number of CMS content approval flows required for the Simple Application/KidCentral/TN.GOV External/Internal Website)?</p>	<p>[a] The State does not have a preference. Currently, there are only three stages for content. This can either be expanded or limited depending on the solution and the need for additional or less staging environments. Content approvals currently do not go beyond one Editor or Publisher. There is a current feature in place to send a link to various other users for the review before it is submitted to publisher if needed.</p> <p>Any changes to current procedures defined above must be approved by the State.</p> <p>[b] Currently, simple applications do not have a maximum limit. Currently, we have no more than 4 approval chains, before final approval for simple applications. Any changes to current procedures defined above must be approved by the State.</p>
145.	<p>Governane [sic]</p> <p>Pg 126 – 1.6</p> <p>1.7: Please review and ensure comprehensive list (in addition to vendor's collation from RFQ and EPIR) FOR: Jurisdictional compliance (federal, state); PAC levels of access; industry standard compliance; adherence to CIO association architecture aligned with TOGAF; State Branding/Site Creation Standards documents</p>	The State has made a reasonable effort to compile a comprehensive list of compliance requirements during RFQ development. These requirements are incorporated in the EPIR and various sections of the RFQ. The State can provide no guarantee that other compliance requirements do not exist and will not emerge during the course of the project.
146.	<p>CMS, Web (multi-page) Forms</p>	Pre-approval time for new master templates varies.

QUESTION/COMMENT		STATE RESPONSE
	<p>Pg 127 – 2.5 - In conjunction with State Organizational Units, the EPIS Contractor shall customize Master templates for the State’s content. These master templates shall comply with the State’s digital branding standards and must be pre-approved by the State. The templates will allow users to choose a basic, consistent look and feel as an aid in keying their Organizational Unit information. The EPIS Contractor shall provide examples of existing templates.</p> <p>How long does it take to obtain state pre-approval for templates?</p>	<p>It may take up to 2 months, if PAC approval is required. In most cases pre-approval will go through the Portal Innovations Solutions team and will take less than a week.</p>
147.	<p>Integration</p> <p>Pg 127 – 3.12 - The EPIS Contractor shall provide the capability to integrate new applications with Customer Relationship Management tools.</p> <p>Please confirm the Customer Relationship Management tool(s)?</p>	<p>Currently, there are many CRM tools used within the state.</p> <p>The State is planning to consolidate into one CRM tool, based on recommendations from the successful respondent. The recommended solution could be integration with an existing State CRM tool, or the use of a CRM tool that comes packaged with the vendor’s EPP/CMS solution.</p> <p>The State shall have the final approval over the selected solution.</p>
148.	<p>Accessibility</p> <p>Pg 129 – 10.x</p> <p>Does State have web standards compliance document to use? Other dependencies; different levels of accessibility</p>	<p>Currently, the State must comply with web standards and 508 rules, as documented in the Web Publishing Guide in the EPIR. Levels of access vary, based on the content and users.</p>
149.	<p>Pg 201 - 4.1b - Key Performance Indicators: Enterprise Portal Platform and Content Management System Operations and</p> <p>What level of reporting is required?</p>	<p>This question is unclear. The State does not understand whether the question refers to the report on the KPI performance or the report(s) being monitored for timely delivery.</p>
150.	<p>CONTRACT ATTACHMENT 3</p> <p>Pg 204 - 2.2 - The EPP/CMS shall provide the capability for multiple-level approval streams within a workflow.</p> <p>How many multiple-level approval streams?</p>	<p>The number of required approvals varies. In the current environment using Formstack, there is not a limit for multiple-level approval streams.</p>
151.	<p>Page 204</p> <p>Pg 204 - 2.3 - The EPP/CMS shall provide a Workflow Management feature that enables an authorized, non-technical user to build custom workflows and to easily change the workflow, as needed.</p> <p>Can you elaborate on the customised work flows?</p>	<p>As an example, a non-technical user must have the capability to create an intake form with customized fields and build customized workflows that may require one or multiple levels of approval.</p>
152.	<p>Page 205</p>	<p>Yes</p>

QUESTION/COMMENT		STATE RESPONSE
	<p>Pg 205 - 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 - The EPP/CMS shall provide an e-commerce functionality for current applications, as well as new applications developed during the contract period.</p> <p>Is e-Commerce part of the installation</p>	
153.	<p>CMS</p> <p>[a] How many content items are expected in the web content management system? [b] Are all expected to be migrated to the new system as part of the initial six month time frame?</p>	<p>[a] There are currently 16,000 database entries which make up the current CMS environment to produce the TN.Gov website. There are not multiple sites; TN.Gov is one site.</p> <p>[b] Yes.</p>
154.	<p>CMS</p> <p>What is the average size of the pieces of web content?</p>	<p>Currently, text data is no larger than 56KB. Images are no larger than 500KB. PDF and documents vary by department. However, the majority of file sizes do not exceed 20MBs.</p>
155.	<p>CMS - SDLC promotion</p> <p>Will you perform web content syndication during active times or during off hours?</p>	<p>Active times</p>
156.	<p>Authorization</p> <p>Will SSL be used at every integration / connection point both internally and externally?</p>	<p>The current PCI compliance standard is TLS 1.2.</p> <p>The State is not mandating TLS throughout, however the State is mandating encryption of all data in transit and at rest. Therefore if the vendor does not use TLS, the vendor must use some other compliant encryption method. Regardless, the client to the web tier must be browser-based, therefore the State assumes it will be TLS.</p>
157.	<p>Authorization</p> <p>Can you share historical analytic data on number of requests/page hits for Simple Application/TN.GOV/KidCentral/Internal Website?</p>	<p>The State currently does not have consistent analytic data. Reports from Departments are not due until May of 2016; these reports will provide more accurate data.</p> <p>The State will provide this information to the successful vendor.</p>
158.	<p>Authorization</p> <p>Can you share historical analytic data on how long user pause before requesting a new page view? This is known as "Think Time". (Example: 30 Seconds)</p>	<p>Yes, for some portions of the web site this analytical data is available. This limited information can be provided to the winning contractor.</p> <p>However, in most cases, the data is not currently available.</p>
159.	<p>Authorization</p> <p>What percent of Portal active users (including registered and anonymous users) during peak hour will be using browser-based Instant Messaging? (Example: 10%)</p>	<p>The State cannot provide the requested information. Instant messaging is currently not used on the site.</p>
160.	<p>What is the average size of the buddy list for each of these users? (Example: 5)</p>	<p>The State does not use this feature and cannot provide the information requested.</p>

QUESTION/COMMENT		STATE RESPONSE
161.	Social Integration What is the total number of Social Software users?	The State cannot provide the requested information. The number of Social Software users is expected to grow over time, as new social media outlets are created. Currently, the State utilizes up to 13 different types of social media.
162.	Social Integration How many users are expected to use social components of the solution such as blogging / activity streams / wikis / file sharing / communities / etc?	The State expects all users to use social components of the solution.
163.	Social Integration How many internal users of the social capabilities / How many external users of the social capabilities?	The State has 47,500 internal users of social capabilities. The State has 7.5M external users of social capabilities
164.	Social Integration What percentage of users will access Social Software components during peak hour?	This is unknown, as it varies by Organizational Unit.
165.	CMS, Web (multi-page) Forms How many eForms will need to be processed or viewed during peak hour?	All eForms need to be processed during peak hours.
166.	CMS, Web (multi-page) Forms How many pages are in the average or most commonly used form?	Three.
167.	CMS, Web (multi-page) Forms What is the average amount of time required to fill out an eForm? (in minutes)	The average amount of time required to fill out an eForm ranges from 30 seconds to 5 minutes to 1 hour. One type of potential form can be a contract, in which a user may partially complete the form, log out, and later log back in to finish the form.
168.	CMS, Web (multi-page) Forms [a] What percentage of forms submitted during peak hour will contain attachments? [b] multiple eForms are used, please provide the number of items in the most commonly used eForm.	a. 20% b. There is insufficient information for the State to respond to this question. It is unknown what is meant by "items."
169.	Source doc Integration (PDFs, 3rd party forms) If attachments are used, what is the average size in kilobytes (KB) of attachments?	This information is not currently available. However, currently, the maximum number of attachments can be set by the State and stored in a cloud database. The State has the capability to make changes to the allowable maximum.
170.	NFR-Electronic Signature What percentage of eForms submitted during peak hour will contain signatures?	20%
171.	Common What percentage of eForms submitted during peak hour will be printed to PDF?	If a truly electronic environment, 0% of eForms will be printed to PDF. If used in a transaction of some type, 100% of eForms are expected to be printed to PDF, to allow a copy of the transaction to be saved

QUESTION/COMMENT		STATE RESPONSE
		by the user and/or sent via email.
172.	Common Can existing Wikis be supported as link from new web portal pages? Is that content being migrated, integrated or only linked?	Currently, the State does not have any Wikis. However, the State has some FAQ's and Wiki-like environments, which should be migrated and not held in separate locations.
173.	What database services are required; SQL, DB, No SQL	There is insufficient information for the State to respond to this question.

3. **INFORMATIONAL NOTE:** Respondents are strongly encouraged to pay careful attention to the instructional notes that appear before the Cost Proposal tables in RFQ Attachment F. This will help to ensure that the Respondents do not misunderstand the quantities associated with the amounts bid. This is especially important for items such as EPIS Cost Proposal Table B, Notes 5, 6, 7, and 8: the notes specify the cases in which the Respondent is to propose a cost to migrate one application, as opposed to a single fixed cost to migrate all applications/websites that make up the environment in question.
4. Delete RFQ # 31701-03136, in its entirety, and replace it with RFQ # 31701-03136, RELEASE # 3, which is found on the following website (Any sentence or paragraph containing revised or new text is highlighted):

<http://tn.gov/finance/topic/sts-current-procurements>
5. Delete RFQ # 31701-03136, Cost Proposal Workbook, in its entirety, and replace it with the Cost Proposal Workbook, published on March 15, 2016, that appears on the following website (Any sentence or paragraph containing revised or new text is highlighted):

<http://tn.gov/finance/topic/sts-current-procurements>
6. Add the document entitled “Current Portal Contract – Payment Methodology” to the following website:

<http://tn.gov/finance/topic/sts-current-procurements>
7. **RFQ Amendment Effective Date.** The revisions set forth herein shall be effective upon release. All other terms and conditions of this RFQ not expressly amended herein shall remain in full force and effect.