

RFP 23RFP8724 – South Dakota Motor Vehicle Replacement System**Offeror Questions and Answers**

1. Can the state please clarify its expectation regarding discussing proprietary content with explanations, in two locations within the response? In section 1.12, the state indicates this information should be included in the executive summary, which is part of the total page count, while Appendix O is excluded from the page count. RFP pg. 4, section 1.12 - Offerors must clearly identify in the Executive Summary and mark in the body of the proposal any specific proprietary information they are requesting to be protected. The Executive Summary must contain specific justification explaining why the information is to be protected. Appendix O, section 1.4.9, Proprietary Information - Offeror shall identify pages and content which it believes is proprietary along with an explanation and defense of its proprietary nature.
 - A. The RFP has been modified to clarify that submission instructions as stated in Appendix O are to be followed for Proprietary Content.
2. Considering the scope of the response, we request to extend the submission due date by four weeks.
 - A. The due date for Offeror responses will not be modified.
3. Please provide a concise overview of the cloud hosting and configuration requirements. The cost may differ depending on the server configurations, and the number of environments offered by vendors. How will the State compare hosting costs?
 - A. All requirements are as noted within the RFP and relevant Appendices. Appendix M - Cost Proposal includes all necessary instructions for completion and is meant to be all-inclusive of Offeror costs.
4. The scope is to train approx. 5875 users. Is it acceptable to the State if we provide classroom training to internal users (train the trainers), and video content for training a large audience?
 - A. Offerors may propose the solution that they feel best meets the requirements as outlined in the RFP and Appendices.
5. We request the State to provide the implementation period of this project.
 - A. The State requests Offerors to propose the implementation period based on Offeror knowledge of similar implementations.
6. We request the State consider the experience of a sub-contractor/project partner company.
 - A. Offeror's may include experience of sub-contractors if Offerors distinguish clearly which experience pertains to Offerors and which experience pertains to sub-contractors.
7. Will the State please provide a list of companies who submitted a Letter of Intent to Bid on 23RFP8724?
 - A. The State will not provide this information.

8. There is a requirement in this section that states, "Printing on demand all plates, stickers, decals, titles and permits". Is vendor required to provide equipment for printing decals, etc. at authorized locations? If so, what is the quantity of equipment that must be provided and should cost of equipment be included in Maintenance and Support in Cost Proposal?
 - A. Offeror's solution does not need to include hardware for this requirement. Please see Appendix J - Interface Inventory for additional information regarding ITI interfaces.
9. Is the vendor required to use the State's payment processing contract/vendor or will the vendor be able to use their own payment processing solution?
 - A. The State currently has a payment processing solution, but Offerors are free to propose alternate solutions.
10. Will vendor be invoicing the State or passing credit card and/or banking fees along to customers?
 - A. At present, fees are passed to customers and it is expected that that model will continue.
11. The Offering More Capabilities Online Subsection in Appendix A has a requirement that states, "Providing the ability to view the DOR website in other languages" and the Multi-Lingual support requirement in Appendix E, Section 1.1 states that "The System shall support default language is English, but shall also support other language translation for Spanish, French and others", what is the requirement for the word "others"?
 - A. The system is only required to support English and Spanish.
12. These appendices appear to be informational only. Does Vendor need to acknowledge these Appendices? If so, where should Vendors include such acknowledgement?
 - A. Appendices A, L and P are information only.
13. Is the Data Warehouse owned/managed by DOR or the vendor?
 - A. The State prefers an Offeror-managed Data Warehouse. As always, the State owns all data.
14. What is the current participation rate in the state's ELT program?
 - A. The current participation rate is about 60%.
15. Does the agency anticipate further statutory changes will be necessary before the proposed modernization can be brought live?
 - A. The State is welcoming of process changes and recognizes that such changes may require statutory change to occur.
16. As part of the modernization detailed in this RFP, will the agency require county treasurers to use the new electronic submission and transaction capabilities, or will they still have the option to continue to use a paper process?
 - A. The State is welcoming of process changes and recognizes that such changes may require stakeholders to change their processes as well.

17. Once the modernization has been completed, will enterprise users (dealers, lenders, and insurance carriers and/or their insurance carrier providers) be required to submit titling transactions electronically?
 - A. The State is welcoming of process changes and recognizes that such changes may require stakeholders to change their processes as well.
18. Must the successful bidder be able to develop and provide an e-odometer solution as required by 49 CFR Part 580?
 - A. The State is welcoming of process changes and recognizes that such changes may require stakeholders to change their processes as well.
19. Are Vendors required to respond to each requirement separately, or just overall to the requirements contained within? If required to respond to each requirement, can the State please provide a copy of Appendix C in an editable format such as Microsoft Excel or Word?
 - A. Per Appendix O "Offerors are not required to acknowledge and commit to delivering each individual requirement in the RFP and Appendices but must identify any requirements which they cannot or propose to not meet. Any requirement not identified as unmet will be considered to be included in the Offeror's proposal."
20. Does the state have any restrictions for its own infrastructure/systems or for contracted vendor's systems regarding the use of cloud computing?
 - A. Requirements are included in appropriate Appendices.
21. Does the DMV have a timeline for implementing the solutions? Are there any legislative mandates?
 - A. The State requests Offerors to provide the implementation period based on Offeror knowledge of similar implementations. There are no current legislative mandates.
22. Would the state consider a transaction-based cost model?
 - A. The State does not currently employ a transaction-based cost model. Offerors may propose their model within the structure of Appendix M - Cost Proposal.
23. Would the state consider a hybrid cost model (upfront payment/transaction-based payment to support and maintain system in subsequent years)?
 - A. Offerors may propose their model within the structure of Appendix M - Cost Proposal.
24. Will costs be renegotiated should vendor be awarded a 5-year renewal term after the first 10-year term?
 - A. It is anticipated that renewal terms will involve renegotiation.
25. Can you provide greater detail regarding the Evaluation Criteria from Appendix N, Section 1.1 Basis of Evaluation which refers to section 6.1.5 in the RFP Document: 6.1.5 Familiarity with the project locale?
 - A. Per SDCL 5-18D-18, this criterion must be included in all procurements. Because the scope of the solution sought by the State is digital, Offerors are advised to answer to the best of their ability and to be aware that that specific criterion will be given minimal consideration.

26. This Section states that "Offeror shall describe the information being included to satisfy the requested internal controls assessment for similar hosting services in the Service Organization's Internal Control Assessment section above followed by the actual assessment documents and findings. As the 'section above' couldn't be located, can the State confirm what is being requested here, and if this refers to the requirements in section 1.3 of Appendix K? Would a control assessment for the hosting provider meet this requirement, such as a publicly available SOC3?
- A.** Confirmed - the information requested here refers to the description defined in Appendix K, Section 1.3.
27. Can the State clarify whether Appendix R is excluded from the 150-page limit?
- A.** Appendix R is excluded from the page limit.