

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

A PROJECT TO PROVIDE A CUSTOMER SERVICE CENTER AND BACK OFFICE SYSTEM FOR RIVERLINK'S OHIO RIVER BRIDGES

ISSUED September 30, 2020

A Project of
Indiana Finance Authority
One North Capitol Avenue, Suite 900
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Form M Submitted Questions and Responses

November 4, 2020

Key Dates

<u>EVENT</u>	<u>DATE</u>
Industry Forum	September 1, 2020
One-on-One Proposer Meetings	September 2-8, 2020
Mandatory Pre-bid Meeting	October 14, 2020
Last date for Proposer submittal of questions regarding the RFP	November 2, 2020
Last date for IFA responses to timely submitted questions regarding the RFP (if necessary)	November 23, 2020
Proposal due date	December 14, 2020
Notification of initial short-list of Proposers	January 8, 2021
Notification of final short-list of Proposers	February 5, 2021
Proof of Concept by final short-list of Proposers	April, 2021
Due date for Best and Final Offer by final short-list of Proposers	May 14, 2021
Anticipated notification of Preferred Proposer	May 31, 2021
Completion of negotiations	June 30, 2021
Execution of Contract and other Execution Documents by Preferred Proposer	July 1, 2021

Unless specifically addressed below, all other provisions and clauses of the RFP remain unchanged.

The Joint Board anticipates publishing an Addendum incorporating the answers provided to the questions at the end of the question and answer period.

The responses herein provided by the Joint Board Authorized Representatives are intended to provide more clarity to the RFP’s requirements in response to the submitted questions. As noted in Section 5.1.4.1 of the RFP, such responses are not considered part of the Contract Documents, nor are such responses relevant in interpreting the Contract Documents, except as expressly set forth in the Contract Documents. Any official changes to any RFP requirement or provision to the Contract will only be made through an Addendum issued by the Joint Board.

Capitalized Terms not otherwise defined in the responses provided by the Joint Board Authorized Representatives shall have the meanings set forth in the RFP and RFP Documents.

No.	Date Received	Date Responded	Document and Section Number	Category	Comment(s)	Reserved for Joint Board Representative Response
106	10/23/2020	11/4/2020	Answer to Form M (10/20/2020) question #36	Form G Pricing	<p>The answer to bidder question #36 (Form M released 10/20/2020) states, “No total pricing summary tab will be provided.” It is also noted that Tab 3 variable operations does not contain evaluation volumes. For consistency of evaluating vendor proposals, would the Joint Board please provide the evaluation volumes it will be using to determine the annual Variable Operations pricing? This is also necessary to determine the required annual performance bond estimates.</p>	<p>The evaluation volumes will not be provided.</p> <p>Noting that the monthly operational quantities related to the Variable Operations Costs elements of pricing (see Table 3 in Form G) are unknown at this time and that the referenced required Performance Bond is not a Pass-Through Cost Item, Proposers should estimate and use “worst-case” quantities for these elements to help determine the amount of the Performance Bond.</p> <p>A total pricing summary tab will not be provided.</p>

No.	Date Received	Date Responded	Document and Section Number	Category	Comment(s)	Reserved for Joint Board Representative Response
					We also kindly request that a summary tab be added for overall price evaluation.	
107	10/23/2020	11/4/2020	RFP Vol.1, Forms B-1, B-2 and B-3	Required licenses and certifications	The Forms B-1, B-2 and B-3 requirements ask bidders to “list all Indiana licenses and Certificates of Qualification held by Proposer and any Equity Member” and “Attach copies of all Indiana and Kentucky licenses.” In each form and elsewhere in the proposal, licenses and certifications are indicated as “if applicable,” but there are no criteria to help us assess applicability. Would the Joint Board please clarify the <i>specific</i> required licenses and certifications which are relevant to the project and must be provided by bidders?	No licenses or certifications are required.
108	10/23/2020	11/4/2020	RFP Vol.1, Form R	Form R signature requirement	Form R requires signature by the Project Director. All other signature documents are required to be signed by the authorized proposer signatory. Is this correct, or does Form R require signature by our authorized proposer signatory and representative? Or is Form R a post-award requirement?	Form R should be signed by the Proposer’s Authorized Representative and be submitted with the Proposal. An updated Form R will be included in an upcoming Addendum.

No.	Date Received	Date Responded	Document and Section Number	Category	Comment(s)	Reserved for Joint Board Representative Response
109	10/26/2020	11/4/2020	Vol. II. Exhibit 2 Back Office System Key Performance Indicators Table Item 4 (page 161 of Volume II)	Technical	<p>Item # 4 of the Table provided on page 161 of Volume II states that: The Image Processing OCR quality KPI requirement is ninety nine-point nine five percent (99.95%) accuracy through auto-pass. There is also a note that says, "... auto-pass percentage to be agreed upon in workshop prior to Revenue Service Date." Will IFA consider a proposer's response to be compliant to the above requirement if we state that we can meet the RFP's OCR KPI requirement at a specific yield rate provided that the transaction imagery submitted to the OCR meets specific defined and quantifiable image quality requirements at least 99% of the time? Through our experience, we recognize that the transaction images captured in the lanes must meet specific fundamental image quality requirements for such high license plate read accuracies to be consistently achieved. There is no description in the RFP indicating what levels of</p>	<p>The referenced KPI related to OCR quality (Item #4 – image processing) is intended to be applicable only to the auto-passed data, not all OCR data. That is, regardless of the to-be-determined OCR confidence percentage threshold that is used for auto-pass (i.e., automatically used without additional image review), the data that is auto-passed must be at least 99.95% accurate. Therefore, if the transaction imagery from the RTCS submitted to the OCR falls below expectations, the quantity of transactions that are auto-passed would fall but the accuracy of the data auto-passed should not. "Poor image quality" will be defined in the workshop(s) with TSP2.</p>

No.	Date Received	Date Responded	Document and Section Number	Category	Comment(s)	Reserved for Joint Board Representative Response
					<p>image quality RFP responders should expect from the ORB image capture system. Specifically,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Req. ALR-010 requires the BOS to monitor and generate alerts for "poor image quality automatically." 2. Req. IMP-022: The BOS IR System shall ... accommodate image resolutions of 2048 x 2048, at a minimum. <p>"Poor" image quality is not defined in the RFP.</p>	
110	10/21/2020	11/4/2020	Exhibit B – Stipend Agreement	Admin	Please clarify if Form O - Stipend Agreement should be included with the proposal submission or upon notification of being shortlisted and within the time limit specified.	Form O should be included with the Proposal.
111	10/21/2020	11/4/2020	Exhibits B & C (Page limits)	Admin	If the page count exceeds the maximum for a particular section, can the overage be absorbed into a related section where the number of pages fall short of the limit?	No.
112	10/21/2020	11/4/2020	Vol. 1, Section 1.5.1 Project Schedule, P.9/117	Admin	As there are several industry RFPs currently in procurement cycle and to ensure compelling,	No.

No.	Date Received	Date Responded	Document and Section Number	Category	Comment(s)	Reserved for Joint Board Representative Response
					competitive, and compliant responses, will the IFA consider an extension to January for proposal submissions?	
113	10/21/2020	11/4/2020	Vol. 1, Section 5.1.3.1, Rules of Contact (27/117)	Admin	To ensure we do not violate procurement protocol due to the cone of silence, please provide the names of the evaluation committee members and their respective states.	Each State will have an have an equal number of members on the evaluation committee.
114	10/27/2020	11/4/2020	Vol. 1, Section 5.1.4.1, Questions and Responses Regarding the RFP (31/117)	Admin	Will the IFA remove the page limitation allowing bidders to ask all pertinent questions to ensure compliant bids?	There is no page limitation for questions, only the number of total questions by vendor.
115	10/27/2020	11/4/2020	2.2 Proposal Format	Admin	Will the states allow technical diagrams and screen shots to be placed in an Appendix and reference them in the technical sections to free up space/page count?	Technical diagrams and screen shots can be placed in an Appendix which will be counted in the total page count.
116	10/27/2020	11/4/2020	2.2 Proposal Format	Admin	Per the RFP, PART 1.C Financial Information is to be packaged separately for each separate entity. Do the states desire to have PART 1.C Financial Information separated as well in the electronic copies on USB?	Proposers can submit financial information for individual entity(ies) in its own separate, clearly indicated sub-folder on the USB to satisfy the entities' financial information requirement.

No.	Date Received	Date Responded	Document and Section Number	Category	Comment(s)	Reserved for Joint Board Representative Response
117	10/27/2020	11/4/2020	Exhibit A	Technical	Could the states please confirm that the self-service website does not include updating the home page and informational pages of the current site.	The RiverLink homepage and Information page is managed by others.
118	10/28/2020	11/4/2020	RFP Volume I, Exhibit B, Part 1, Section C. Financial Information		Question: If proposer has a Guarantor that is a parent/affiliate, will that same party fill the role of Financially Responsible Party?	Yes, in that scenario, the parent/affiliate serving as a Guarantor would also be considered a Financially Responsible Party.
119	10/28/2020	11/4/2020	Volume II, Sections 17.1.1 and 17.1.2		Contract Sections 17.1.1 and 17.1.2 say that Delay Liquidated Damages, Performance Liquidated Damages and Performance Stipulated Damages, as applicable, assessed against and paid by TSP2 will be credited towards the respective cap amounts. Question: Please confirm that these damages are capped at the amounts listed in clause (a) of each section.	Liquidated Damages are capped at the listed amounts.
120	10/28/2020	11/4/2020	Volume II, Sections 17.1.1 and 17.1.2		Contract Sections 17.1.1 and 17.1.2 both say they are further limited by Sections 4.6.8 and 4.8.4, but those sections are not in the contract. We have noticed additional missed section references in Section 4.3.2,	Corrected references will be updated and included in an upcoming addendum.

No.	Date Received	Date Responded	Document and Section Number	Category	Comment(s)	Reserved for Joint Board Representative Response
					<p>Section 5.1.5.1, and Section 5.1.5.2.</p> <p>Question: Please provide correct references.</p>	
121	10/28/2020	11/4/2020	RFP Volume I, Section 4.5.1		<p>RFP Section 4.5.1 – the third bullet requires Surety letter committing to provide Performance and Payment Bonds “in an amount equal to 100% of the Contract price. This is different than Contract Section 8.1.1, which requires bonds in the amount of “Initial Costs”.</p> <p>Question: Please confirm that the amount in the Surety letter should refer to the Initial Costs rather than the full contract price.</p>	<p>Confirmed, the amount in the Surety letter should refer to the Initial Costs.</p> <p>This section will be updated and included in an upcoming addendum.</p>
122	10/28/2020	11/4/2020	Volume II, Section 2.3.3		<p>Contract Section 2.3.3 requires TSP2 to continue to provide the Bonds and Insurance during any Software Maintenance Option Period, but also says that pricing would be determined based on Change Order pricing methodology. However, Change Order pricing presupposes the existence of an underlying contract which already takes into account general</p>	<p>Section 2.3.3 of the Contract is in regards to compliance with applicable law.</p> <p>Assume the intent of the question was to refer to Section 2.2.3.</p> <p>The Joint Board does not anticipate there being any Pass-Through Costs other than what are listed in Exhibit 6 of the Contract.</p>

No.	Date Received	Date Responded	Document and Section Number	Category	Comment(s)	Reserved for Joint Board Representative Response
					<p>expenses like Bonds and Insurance.</p> <p>Question: Will the Joint Board agree that these additional expenses may exist as a pass through in addition to the expenses related to the actual work being performed during these Software Maintenance Option Periods?</p>	
123	10/28/2020	11/4/2020	RFP Volume I, Section 5.1.12		<p>Proposers may submit Exceptions to the Proposal on Form P. However, Section 5.1.12 of Volume I states "A Proposal may not include any assumptions, qualifications, conditions, exceptions to or deviations from the requirements of the RFP."</p> <p>Question: If there are exceptions, are they to be inserted on Form P and attached to the Proposal?</p>	<p>Any and all exceptions should be included in Form P. A clarifying sentence will be added to Section 5.1.12 of the RFP to make clear that, but for any Exceptions submitted with a Proposal using Form P, a Proposal should not include assumptions, qualifications, conditions, exceptions, etc.</p> <p>An update to Volume 1, Section 5.1.12 will be included in an upcoming addendum.</p>

No.	Date Received	Date Responded	Document and Section Number	Category	Comment(s)	Reserved for Joint Board Representative Response
124	10/28/2020	11/4/2020			<p>Section 5.1.4 provides “TSP2’s obligation to pay Performance Liquidated Damages for failure to meet Guaranteed Key Performance Indicators shall be deferred for a period of time following the Go-Live date in which to allow the system and operations to stabilize. This period of allowable time is anticipated to be sixty (60) days”.</p> <p>Question: Please advise whether “in which” refers to anything or if it should be deleted.</p>	Section 5.1.4 “in which” statement refers to the period of time following the Go-Live date that allows the system and operations to stabilize.
125	10/28/2020	11/4/2020	Form L		<p>Form L – Guarantor Commitment Letter references Exhibit Z.</p> <p>Question: Should this be a reference to Exhibit 10 to the Contract, or something else?</p>	Form L will be updated and included in an upcoming addendum.
126	10/28/2020	11/4/2020	Volume II, Exhibit 10, Section 1		<p>The extent of guaranteed obligations is very broad.</p> <p>Question: Will the Joint Board revise consistently with general Guaranty practice and limit to “all the obligations of Toll System Providing arising out of or under the Contract, as may be</p>	The Joint Board is currently not considering revising the language in Volume II, Section 1 of the Form of Guaranty at this time.

No.	Date Received	Date Responded	Document and Section Number	Category	Comment(s)	Reserved for Joint Board Representative Response
					amended or modified from time to time, including the obligation to pay liquidated or other damages...”	
127	10/28/2020	11/4/2020	Volume II, Exhibit 10, Section 2		<p>The Guaranty does not allow for a minimum grace period to Guarantor’s payment obligations under the Guaranty. In line with common market practice and taking into account that payment by Guarantor may require (international) wire transfers, such grace period should be included.</p> <p>Question: Would the Joint Board revise to add language to the effect that “Guarantor shall not be in default hereunder with respect to a payment due by Toll Service Provider under the Contract If such amount owing is paid within ten (10) business days of the date on which notice is given by the Joint Board in writing to Guarantor specifying the failure by Toll Service Provider to make such payment (provided that if such notice is prohibited by law or court order, Guarantor shall be immediately obligated to pay any amounts due by Toll Service Provider</p>	The Joint Board is not at this time considering adding in a minimum grace period to the Guaranty and believes the “ ... full and prompt payment and performance when due ...” is sufficient language”

No.	Date Received	Date Responded	Document and Section Number	Category	Comment(s)	Reserved for Joint Board Representative Response
					to IFA upon any such failure to pay, but Guarantor shall not be, nor be deemed to be, in default under this Guaranty until ten (10) business days after Guarantor first becomes aware of such failure to pay or ten (10) business days after receiving notice from the Joint Board).”	
128	10/28/2020	11/4/2020	Volume II, Exhibit 10, Section 3		Exhibit 10, Section 3 – Unfortunately the drafting of the form of Guaranty is not entirely clear as to the extent of the Guarantor’s liability under the Guaranty, as compared with the Toll Service Providers’ liability in relation to the Guaranteed Obligations. For example: - the form is ambiguous as to whether the Guarantor could incur liability in excess of what Toll Service Provider can incur under the Contract. Indeed, Section 2, penultimate para only provides that “it is the intention of the Parties that the monetary amounts of Guarantor’s liability for the Guaranteed Obligations shall be limited to the maximum amounts set forth in the Contract that are applicable to the Toll System Provider”.	This comment will be handled in an amendment to the procurement documents.

No.	Date Received	Date Responded	Document and Section Number	Category	Comment(s)	Reserved for Joint Board Representative Response
					<p>- the form is ambiguous as to the extent to which the expiry of statute of limitation with respect to a Guaranteed Obligation also benefits the Guarantor. Section 2 (d) suggests this is the case, but Section 3 (d) (iv) suggests the contrary.</p> <p>- the form does not clearly provide that Guarantor is only liable for Guaranteed Obligations to the extent the same have not been performed or paid in accordance with the Contract. These ambiguities need to be clarified.</p> <p>Will the Joint Board revise this section to add certain standard protections and limitations to the Guaranty, e.g. that “Notwithstanding any other provision of this Guaranty to the contrary:</p> <p>(i) in no event shall the aggregate liability of Guarantor under this Guaranty exceed the maximum aggregate liability of Toll Service Provider and shall be subject to the same limitations of liability as set out in the Contract;</p> <p>(ii) in determining</p>	

No.	Date Received	Date Responded	Document and Section Number	Category	Comment(s)	Reserved for Joint Board Representative Response
					<p>Guarantor's liability under this Guaranty, Guarantor shall, subject to Section 2, paragraph 1, with the exception of litt (b), (c), (d) and (g) of this Guaranty, have the benefit of all (but no greater) rights, remedies, defenses and limitations Toll Service Provider is or would have been entitled to assert under the Contract if an obligation that is unenforceable, invalid or illegal, were enforceable, valid or legal;</p> <p>(iii) Guarantor shall be liable for the Guaranteed Obligations only to the extent such obligations have not otherwise been paid or performed in accordance with the terms of the Contract; where a Guaranteed Obligation has become unenforceable due to the expiry of applicable statutes of limitations, the Guarantor's liability under this Guaranty</p>	

No.	Date Received	Date Responded	Document and Section Number	Category	Comment(s)	Reserved for Joint Board Representative Response
					shall be determined as if the Guarantor had the benefit of the same limitation periods that the Toll Service Provider would be entitled to assert under the Contract and applicable law.”	
129	10/28/2020	11/4/2020	Volume II, Section 12.5 and Volume II, Exhibit 2		<p>Section 12.5 of the Contract provides “all amounts payable to TSP2 shall be less the monthly deductions for any Performance Liquidated Damages and Key Performance Stipulated Damages owed by TSP2 under Section 4.” The condition for Performance Liquidated Damages is failure to meet “certain of the Key Performance Indicators” (Exhibit 1), whereas the condition for Performance Stipulated Damages is “failure to meet the Guaranteed Key Performance Indicators” (Sec. 5.1.5.2(a)). Exhibit 2, however, does not specify which KPIs are considered “Guaranteed KPIs.”</p> <p>Question: Do the Performance Liquidated Damages and the Performance Stipulated Damages “share” certain KPIs? If so, which Key</p>	Damages that trigger multiple KPIs will only be assessed via the KPI associated with the largest dollar amount to most reasonably approximate the Joint Board’s damages from TSP2s failure to meet the KPIs, without charging for multiple KPIs.

No.	Date Received	Date Responded	Document and Section Number	Category	Comment(s)	Reserved for Joint Board Representative Response
					<p>Performance Indicators are considered “Guaranteed Key Performance Indicators”?</p> <p>Question: Can the Performance Liquidated Damages and the Performance Stipulated Damages be assessed at the same time, or, as with the LDs under Exhibit 2, is the most penal type of damage assessed?</p>	
130	10/28/2020	11/4/2020	ORB Volume II, 2.1.3.6, pg. 13	Prevailing Wage	<p>“TSP2 shall pay or cause to be paid to all workers employed by it or its Subcontractors to perform the Initial Work not less than the highest prescribed prevailing rates of wages, as provided in the statutes and regulations applicable to public construction projects and public work contracts, including KRS § 337.505 et seq., to the extent provided in Federal Requirements, the Davis-Bacon Act and statutory common wage law(s) applicable to the Project.”</p> <p>Does Davis Bacon, Service Contract Act, or some other prevailing wage statute apply to CSC roles? If so, which</p>	As noted in Section 2.1.3.6, TSP2 should be aware of and abide by any prevailing wage laws including the Federal Requirements, David-Bacon Act and statutory common wage law(s) applicable to the Project.

No.	Date Received	Date Responded	Document and Section Number	Category	Comment(s)	Reserved for Joint Board Representative Response
					applies as Davis Bacon only outlines wages for construction roles.	
131	10/29/2020	11/4/2020	Vol 1 Section 1.0/pg 3	Location	The RFP notes the current CSC location as Muncie, IN. Please describe the operations and maintenance functions that are performed from this location.	The Muncie, IN CSC is the primary location for all call center staff. It contains some hardware but is primarily used for call center employees.
132	10/29/2020	11/4/2020	Vol 2 Pg 13	Wage	Please clarify if any positions necessary for the completion of work on this project requiring prevailing wage.	As noted in Section 2.1.3.6, TSP2 should be aware of and abide by any prevailing wage laws including the Federal Requirements, David-Bacon Act and statutory common wage law(s) applicable to the Project.
133	10/29/2020	11/4/2020	Form K Cam-004	Traffic transactions	This requirement for detailed Traffic Transaction mentions "including images and video of each crossing". Are these images required for all transactions, including transponder-based posted tolls?	All transactions have images taken by the Roadside System which are sent to the BOS.
134	10/29/2020	11/4/2020	n/a	Call history	Please provide additional details regarding call history such as total calls offered, calls resolved in the IVR (if applicable), and abandoned calls, average call time	Additional call history will be provided in an upcoming addendum.

No.	Date Received	Date Responded	Document and Section Number	Category	Comment(s)	Reserved for Joint Board Representative Response
135	10/29/2020	11/4/2020	n/a	Volumes	Please provide transactional payment volumes by card type, ACH, cash, others and locations where such payments occur (e.g. web, IVR, POS, etc)	Additional transactional payment volumes will be provided in an upcoming addendum.
136	10/29/2020	11/4/2020	Vol1 Section 1.6. Point of Contacts for the Project and Proposals	Point of Contacts for the Project and Proposals	The Joint Board has established two Authorized Representatives or purposes of this procurement and Contract, however section 1.6.1 seems to list only one person. Please confirm whether is one or two person and provide the appropriate contact information should it be two contacts.	Volume 1, Section 1.6.1, establishes the single contact for RFP questions and delivery of Proposals.
137	10/29/2020	11/4/2020	n/a	Solution	Is the Joint Board allowing cloud-base solutions?	Yes.
138	10/29/2020	11/4/2020	n/a	Integration	List the entities and/or applications that would require some level of integration with the BOS that are not party to this contract other than the services under TSP1.	Please refer to Form K for these interfaces.
139	10/29/2020	11/4/2020	Form K Cam-006	requirement	This requirement mentions the ability to schedule recurring payments. Please clarify if this is for post-paid account, pre-paid accounts, or both?	Requirement CAM-006 is for Pre-Paid accounts.

No.	Date Received	Date Responded	Document and Section Number	Category	Comment(s)	Reserved for Joint Board Representative Response
140	10/29/2020	11/4/2020	Form K Cam-008	requirement	Please elaborate on the characteristics of a "temporary/anonymous" account type?	Customers can purchase transponders from retail locations to use in their personal vehicles. These transponder accounts do not include all of the customer information as those established by calling RiverLink, but still function the same way with a pre-paid balance applied to the account that is collected on at the POS. Customers can then post transactions against this balance until they have exhausted their pre-paid funds. Customers can then either add more funds via a "replenishment card" sold with the transponder, or simply purchase a new transponder.
141	10/29/2020	11/4/2020	Form K Cam – 017	requirement	This requirement mentions allowing a customer to create an account over the telephone. Is this currently done and how are terms and conditions presented and agreed to by the customer prior to the creation of the account?	Customers can open an account over the phone. Terms and conditions will be based upon TSP2 proposed process.
142	10/29/2020	11/4/2020	Form K CSC-119	requirement	Regarding the return of transponders to the manufacturer, please confirm that any related shipping costs will be either paid by the Joint Board directly or billed as a pass-through.	Confirmed return of the transponders will be paid directly by the Join Board.
143	10/29/2020	11/4/2020	ORB_VOLUME III, Section 10: CSC Data, pg.93	WFM	Average Handle Time is 2 – 3 minutes higher than Average Talk time, what is driving that?	That information is currently unavailable.

No.	Date Received	Date Responded	Document and Section Number	Category	Comment(s)	Reserved for Joint Board Representative Response
144	10/29/2020	11/4/2020	Form K, Requirement INT-052	CSAT	Can Proposer provide the customer survey service?	The selected vendor is required to conduct and deliver customer survey responses.
145	10/29/2020	11/4/2020	Form K, Requirement CSC-005	WFM	Please elaborate on marketing events requirement. Please explain the not to exceed 480 hours total over the course of one (1) calendar year portion of this requirement and is TSP2 required to hire temporary CSR's for marketing events, or provide additional hours from existing CSR's to help with these events?	CSC-005 requirement's intent is to have dedicated hours for Project events throughout the year that TSP2 will attend on behalf of the Joint Board. For example, attending the State Fairs. The TSP2 will be required to decide how to staff those events.
146	10/29/2020	11/4/2020	Form K, Requirement CSC-033	WFM	Specialized and dedicated CSR's are required to manage and administer customers requiring specialized and dedicated help (e.g., large trucking companies) – approximately how many of these roles exist today and what is the CSC staff count by functional area (specialized, general voice/email CSR, mail processing, image review, transponder fulfillment, etc.)?	Additional CSC data will be provided.
147	10/29/2020	11/4/2020	ORB_VOLUME II, Exhibit 2, pgs. 163 – 160	KPI	Can historical LD and Incentives incurred for BOS and CSC be provided for reference?	No.

No.	Date Received	Date Responded	Document and Section Number	Category	Comment(s)	Reserved for Joint Board Representative Response
148	10/29/2020	11/4/2020	ORB_VOLUME III, Section 10, Received Correspondence	WFM	Can email and paper correspondence processing time be provided?	No
149	10/29/2020	11/4/2020	ORB volume II, section III pg. 165	Customer Service Center Key Performance Indicators and Liquidated Damages	Customer Service Center Key Performance Indicators and Liquidated Damages: In reference to ABA% (calls not considered abandoned if less than (45) seconds after entering the queue). Is this waived if we are over delivered % to forecast (greater than 100%)?	No.
150	10/29/2020	11/4/2020	ORB volume II, section III pg. 164	Service Center Key Performance Indicators and Liquidated Damages	Customer Service Center Key Performance Indicators and Liquidated Damages: In reference to Max Hold (Wait time its referred to on page pg 164 VII) states minimum performance is ten minutes "Hold" time. Is this calculated cumulatively for each call or is it a continuous 10 min hold? It states per event we can get a penalty. It also stated a \$500 reward for no calls having 10 minute of wait (Hold).	The Maximum Hold Time is calculated as a continuous 10-minute hold.
151	10/29/2020	11/4/2020	ORB volume II, section III pg. 165	Customer Service Monitoring	It states, "One percent (1%) of total customer interaction monitored each month with every CSR having a minimum of two (2) customer	A total of 1% of customer interactions need to be monitored each month. This needs to be a combination of all agents, and not just a few.

No.	Date Received	Date Responded	Document and Section Number	Category	Comment(s)	Reserved for Joint Board Representative Response
					interaction monitored per month". For clarification, is the requirement 1% of the overall volume to be recorded and 2 calls/emails monitored per agent per month?	
152	10/30/2020	11/4/2020	Chapter 5 of Volume 3	Technical	<p>"The Toll Zone Controller depending on the transaction conditions will capture one or more (typically three) images of the vehicle that need to be transferred to the BOS."</p> <p>In order to obtain accurate quotations for ocr engines, we need vehicle images characteristics received in BOS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximum Number of Images/transaction • Medium size of vehicle images <p>Time retention in BOS System</p>	<p>The current RTCS provides up to 4 images per transaction as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 front (approx. 200KB avg. file size; 2048 X 1582; 96 dpi X 96 dpi) • 1 rear (approx. 200KB avg. file size; 2048 X 1582; 96 dpi X 96 dpi) • 1 overview (approx. 490KB avg. file size; 1920 X 1246; 96 dpi X 96 dpi) • 1 ROI image (approx. 1KB avg. file size) <p>Image retention should be based upon the States' data retention policy and future updated business rules.</p>
153	10/30/2020	11/4/2020	Chapter 1.3 of Volume I	Technical	"The purpose of this Project procurement is to provide RiverLink with a robust and scalable solution capable of handling a minimum of 130,000 traffic transactions per day and meeting RiverLink's customer service needs."	See Volume III for provided traffic volumes and traffic and revenue information.

No.	Date Received	Date Responded	Document and Section Number	Category	Comment(s)	Reserved for Joint Board Representative Response
					What is the maximum number of traffic transactions per day?	
154	10/30/2020	11/4/2020	Volume 3 – Section 9	Technical	<p>“Business Rules”</p> <p>Business Rules link does not work. Please we need business rules for BOS System, especially the reasons for sending transactions to manual validations / unusable reasons / Watch List.</p>	<p>The link (provided in Section 9 of Volume III) to the current RiverLink business rules has been confirmed and is as follows:</p> <p>https://riverlink.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/2018-12-18-RiverLink-Business-Rules.pdf</p>
155	10/30/2020	11/4/2020	Volume 3 – Section 6	Technical	<p>Is using any of the existing BOS expected or necessary? Is it possible to have technical details about this system?</p>	<p>This procurement is for a new BOS and CSC. Using any of the existing BOS is not expected.</p>
156	10/30/2020	11/4/2020	Volume I – Exhibit A	Technical	<p>“Image Processing and Image Review: o Image processing and image review workflows o Image processing and image review accuracy reports”</p> <p>Will the Proof of Concept include all the functionality of OCR & Manual Validation Modules?</p>	<p>The intent of the Proof of Concept is to see the aspects of the Proposer’s system that are operational today and see how they function in a controlled environment.</p>

No.	Date Received	Date Responded	Document and Section Number	Category	Comment(s)	Reserved for Joint Board Representative Response
157	10/30/2020	11/4/2020	Volume I – Exhibit C – K-2	Technical	“K-2 Approach to Data Migration” Will the current BOS and new BOS coexist during a time period during migration? If yes, what is the estimated duration of this time period?	Confirmed that the current BOS and TSP2’s BOS will coexist for a period of time based on the approved Data Cleansing and Migration Plan.
158	10/30/2020	11/4/2020	Volume 3- Point 6.7	Technical	What are the details on how/when the tag lists (full/incremental) are sent from agencies to the RiverLink BOS?	The BOS should adhere to the most current IAG requirements regarding CSC file exchanging between
159	10/30/2020	11/4/2020	Volume 3- Section 8	Technical	“Proposed Transaction Flow” Is it possible to obtain details about Other state Connections and 3rd party lookup?	The referenced “other state connections” and “3rd party lookup” refers to sources of Vehicle Registration Information (VRI). See Form K - Technical Requirements Conformance Matrix for details regarding VRI, especially Section 4 - Vehicle Registration Information (VRI).
160	10/30/2020	11/4/2020	Procurement Information – Page 24	Technical	“Exempt List: A list of license plates managed by TSP2 and utilized by the BOS that qualify for exempt status and are treated accordingly based on the Business Rules.” Is possible to obtain details about this type of list?	Business rule details such as this will be discussed during workshops.
161	10/30/2020	11/4/2020	Volume II – Page 147	Technical	“License Plate Validation List (LVL)” Is it possible to obtain details about this type of list?	LVL files are not currently used. Please refer to the IAG specifications for current details.

No.	Date Received	Date Responded	Document and Section Number	Category	Comment(s)	Reserved for Joint Board Representative Response
162	10/30/2020	11/4/2020	Volume I, section 1	Data Migration	When will the database data model of the current BOS and BI systems be provided?	The current BOS data model will be provided after NTP through discussions with the Joint Board Representatives and TSP1.
163	10/30/2020	11/4/2020	Form K req FIN-036	Reconciliation with bank	Must the bank deposit information be imported manually or automatically? If automatically, what is the procedure?	The RFP does not specifically require that the bank deposit be imported automatically, however, the RFP does require interface(s) to the bank(s) (see Form K – Interface with Bank(s), and does also require that the bank deposits be balanced and reconciled on a daily and monthly basis (see Form K – Reconciliation with Bank).
164	10/30/2020	11/4/2020	Form K – 16. Reporting	Technical – Reports	We would like to know , with examples, what it's your understanding about a simple report, medium report and difficult report	Report designs will be based upon TSP2's system and design. They will be developed in conjunction with the selected vendor and completed early in the development process through workshops.
165	10/30/2020	11/4/2020	Form K – 16. Reporting	Technical – Reports	How many reports will be required during development? The Form K refers to 75 reports, is this quantity correct?	The RFP requests up to 75 reports.
166	10/30/2020	11/4/2020	Form K – 16. Reporting	Technical – Reports	Is there any estimate about how many reports of each difficulty will be developed?	Report designs will be based upon TSP2's system and design. They will be developed in conjunction with the selected vendor and completed early in the development process through workshops.
167	10/30/2020	11/4/2020	Form K – 16. Reporting	Technical - Reports-Style	Do you have a convention style about the reports: Colors, fonts, size, style, most used filters, renamed fields...?	Report designs will be developed in conjunction with the selected vendor and completed early in the development process through workshops.

No.	Date Received	Date Responded	Document and Section Number	Category	Comment(s)	Reserved for Joint Board Representative Response
168	10/30/2020	11/4/2020	Form K – 16. Reporting	Technical - Reports - Style	What is the defined resolution for reports? Perhaps you usually use screens with the same resolution or you will consume the reports at an equivalent screen with the same resolution. For example, laptops use 1920x1080 pixels.	Report designs will be developed in conjunction with the selected vendor and completed early in the development process through workshops.
169	10/30/2020	11/4/2020	Form K – 16. Reporting	Technical	Which is the refresh rate for data? Once a day? How many times per day?	Technical aspects of reporting will be developed in conjunction with the selected vendor and completed early in the development process through workshops.
170	10/30/2020	11/4/2020	Form K – 16. Reporting	Technical	Do you need real time reports?	Technical aspects of reporting will be developed in conjunction with the selected vendor and completed early in the development process through workshops.
171	10/30/2020	11/4/2020	Form K – 16. Reporting	Technical - Tests	Will you need a mobile version of the reports? If yes, with what resolution? Vertical orientation or horizontal?	Technical aspects of reporting will be developed in conjunction with the selected vendor and completed early in the development process through workshops.
172	10/30/2020	11/4/2020	Form K – 16. Reporting	Technical – Reports	In RPT 014 and RPT 022, are talking about create a separate schema /database and consume the data with reports? How many reports? Are these reports defined? Does RPT-14 only refer to data in the BOS and not to archived data?	Technical aspects of reporting will be developed in conjunction with the selected vendor and completed early in the development process through workshops.

No.	Date Received	Date Responded	Document and Section Number	Category	Comment(s)	Reserved for Joint Board Representative Response
173	10/30/2020	11/4/2020	Form K – 16. Reporting	Technical	What is the allowed time period to extract data from the legacy sources?	The time period for Data Migration from TSP1 will be addressed through discussions with the Joint Board Representatives and TSP1.
174	10/30/2020	11/4/2020	Volume III, Roadside System to Back Office ICD, Section 5 JPEG Image Files, page 78		Question: Can you please provide the average image size for each transaction, assuming three images per vehicle as stated in the RFP?	The current RTCS provides up to 4 images per transaction as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 front (approx. 200KB avg. file size; 2048 X 1582; 96 dpi X 96 dpi) • 1 rear (approx. 200KB avg. file size; 2048 X 1582; 96 dpi X 96 dpi) • 1 overview (approx. 490KB avg. file size; 1920 X 1246; 96 dpi X 96 dpi) • 1 ROI image (approx. 1KB avg. file size)
175	10/30/2020	11/4/2020	Volume I, Exhibit D, Form G. Price Tables, page 66		Question: Please advise the number of existing images/document sizes that will need to be migrated to the new BOS? Are the images to be migrated included in the six (6) years of data/information to be migrated at a current estimated database size of 4.5TB?	Proposers should provide their approach and recommendations for Data Migration. The Future Updated Business Rules will be developed in conjunction with the selected vendor and completed early in the development process through workshops.
176	10/30/2020	11/4/2020	Volume III, Section 12 Retention Policies, page 145		Question: If a transaction has reached to terminal status, how long should the corresponding images/documents be available in the online storage system?	Retention of transaction images and documents should follow the State's retention policy. Proposers should provide their approach and recommendations. The Future Updated Business Rules will be developed in conjunction with the selected vendor and completed early in the development process through workshops.

No.	Date Received	Date Responded	Document and Section Number	Category	Comment(s)	Reserved for Joint Board Representative Response
177	10/30/2020	11/4/2020	Volume III, Section 12 Retention Policies, page 145		Question: Once images/documents are moved to an offline storage system; how long should they be available there before they can be purged?	Retention of transaction images and documents should follow the State's retention policy. Proposers should provide their approach and recommendations. The Future Updated Business Rules will be developed in conjunction with the selected vendor and completed early in the development process through workshops.