



STATE OF TENNESSEE  
 TREASURY DEPARTMENT  
 OFFICE OF THE STATE ARCHITECT

**REQUEST FOR INFORMATION # 30901-59724  
 AMENDMENT # 1  
 FOR VENDOR DATABASE AND REGISTRATION  
 SYSTEM FOR OFFICE OF THE STATE ARCHITECT**

**DATE: May 6, 2024**

**RFI # 30901-59724 IS AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:**

1. This RFI Schedule of Events updates and confirms scheduled RFP 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)
1.	RFI Issued		April 8, 2024
2.	Notice of Intent to Respond		April 15, 2024
3.	Written Questions and Comments Deadline	4:00p.m.	April 29, 2024
4.	State response to Written Questions and Comments		May 6, 2024
5.	RFI Response Deadline	1:00p.m.	May 20, 2024
6.	Scheduling of Optional Oral Presentations (if determined to be beneficial by the Office)		June 17, 2024
7.	Optional Oral Presentations (if determined to be beneficial by the Office)		June 24-July 8, 2024

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

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

QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
1 Whether companies from Outside USA can apply for this?  (like, from India or Canada)	Because this is an RFI and not an RFP, proposers are not applying or bidding on these services through responses to this RFI. Should an RFP be issued for these services, companies with a principal

QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
	place of business located outside of the US could submit a proposal.
2 Whether we need to come over there for meetings?	With regard to this RFI, no in-person meetings are required. The Office would appreciate responses that address how your proposed solution is best delivered.
3 Can we perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside USA?  (like, from India or Canada)	Related RFP tasks are beyond the scope of this RFI.
4 Can we submit the proposals via email?	RFI responses may be submitted by email. See Section 3.1 of the RFI for instructions on how to submit a response to the RFI.
5 Is a front-facing portal needed for Registrants/Designers to upload and submit information to the Office?	Yes. The State is seeking a solution that will enable Registrants from outside firms to input and upload information to the proposed system.
6 Is it a requirement for the solution to integrate with the Tennessee SOS and Department of Commerce and Insurance database or system?	Yes. See Section 2 of the RFI.
7 What are the # of registrants you expect per month, quarter, or year?	The expected average number of registrants per year is approximately 250.  Months with the highest levels of activity are December, January & July.
8 What are the number of internal users you are expecting to utilize this platform?	The number of internal users (users with administrative privileges) is expected to be approximately 2-4.  The number of internal state stakeholders who may reference information in this system could be up to 100 and located across the State.
9 What is the timeframe you would need a new solution to be set up?	The State is seeking to understand the expected timeframes for various solutions meeting the needs described in the RFI without compromise to the quality of the delivered solution. The State would welcome information on the pros and cons of a phased delivery approach.
10 Approximately how many building contractors and project service entities outside of Registrants does the office engage with per year?	The Office engages with up to 300 design service entities and up to 150 building contractors per year.
11 In reviewing the RFI requirements, we have identified integrations with the Secretary of	Yes, your understanding is correct.

QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
<p>State's system, the Department of Commerce and Insurance's system, and a possible electronic signature system. Could you please validate if our understanding is correct?</p> <p>Is there currently an electronic signature system in place that could be integrated into the new system development, or should we propose one as part of our solution?</p>	<p>There is no current electronic signature system in place. The State is seeking system integration solutions which provide the most value to its users and welcome information which propose integrated solutions implement existing electronic signature utilities or custom electronic signature utilities.</p>
<p>12 How many total users would be fulfilling requests in the system? Not requestors or registrants, but a "fulfiller" who has full admin, developer, or usage rights within a purchased offering, including creating, editing, or deleting any record in the system.</p>	<p>See the response to Question 8.</p>
<p>13 How many total users will have the "Business Stakeholder" role in ServiceNow, which is defined as someone who has the authority to approve requests, view/read records across the organization, and view reports?</p>	<p>See the response to Question 8.</p>
<p>14 Will there be a need for data migration? If so, could you specify the format of the existing data?</p>	<p>Data migration from the existing system to the new system will not be required. The State is seeking information inclusive of functional requirements which support data uploading which may include all Microsoft Word, Microsoft Excel, Adobe PDF and scanned image file types (i.e., jpg, png).</p>
<p>15 How many administrators will be managing the system?</p>	<p>See the response to Question 8.</p>
<p>16 How many internal employees will be accessing the system?</p>	<p>See the response to Question 8.</p>
<p>17 How many external personnel, to the organization, will be accessing the system?</p>	<p>See the response to Question 10.</p>
<p>18 How many of each will be utilizing the system: Office personnel, Registrants, SPAs, SBC Members and SBC Staff?</p>	<p>Office Personnel: Approximately 2-4, Registrants: Approximately 250, SPAs: Approximately 50-70, SBC Members: Approximately 10, SBC Staff: Approximately 20. See also the response to Question 8.</p>
<p>19 How many average annual registrants does the organization receive?</p>	<p>See the responses to Questions 7 and 10.</p>
<p>20 Are there any security requirements to protect sensitive data?</p>	<p>The proposed solution should have data security in alignment with all information contained therein.</p>

QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
<p>21 Will there be compliance requirements and what are they?</p>	<p>Compliance requirements are described in Section 2 of the RFI as “validation requirements” via integration with the TN Secretary of State’s office and registration with the TN Office of Commerce and Insurance.</p>
<p>22 Will the system need to be FedRAMP certified and if so, at what level?</p>	<p>We are not aware of a FedRAMP certification requirement at this time.</p>
<p>23 Will special consideration be given to small businesses responding to this requirement?</p>	<p>Consideration will be given to respondents to the RFI in accordance with all applicable laws, policies, and guidelines.</p>
<p>24 Comments:</p> <p>Contractor recommends a Software as a Service (SaaS) tools because it provides better value to the government for several reasons, namely: lower upfront cost, scalability, accessibility and collaboration, automatic updates and maintenance, and meeting security and compliance requirements. The main differences between a Web-based OTS and a SaaS system are the following: SaaS is a software delivery model where software is hosted on a cloud platform and accessed via the internet. With SaaS, users subscribe to the software on a recurring basis, typically paying a monthly or annual fee. The software provider is responsible for hosting, maintaining, and updating the software, as well as providing customer support.</p>	<p>The State will be seeking a cost-effective solution that is responsive to the requirements of this RFI. Recommendations within this domain will be considered and are appreciated.</p>
<p>25 What are the States/ SBC's existing systems, methodologies, and current workflow being used for below events:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sourcing</li> <li>• Solicitations</li> <li>• Contracting</li> <li>• Buying</li> <li>• Invoicing</li> <li>• Supplier Rating &amp; Performance</li> </ul>	<p>Sourcing: N/A</p> <p>Solicitations: Web based postings</p> <p>Contracting: N/A</p> <p>Buying/Purchasing: N/A</p> <p>Invoicing: N/A</p> <p>Supplier Rating &amp; Performance: OSA team evaluation program for designers and contractors using fillable forms.</p>
<p>26 Is the State/ SBC desiring to source, solicit, and execute contracts through proposed solution?</p>	<p>It is not expected that the State will initially use the program for contracts.</p>
<p>27 How many users will be needed in the below entitlements for each system listed above in question #26:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative / Superuser</li> </ul>	<p>See response to Question 18.</p>

QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Read-only/ Approval only rights</li> </ul>	
28 What is the current ERP system/systems that are currently integrated into the procurement process for the State/ SBC?	The State utilizes different ERP solutions but no integration with this system is anticipated.
29 How many sourcing events will be run annually?	The State could solicit approximately 250 designers and 80 contractors annually.
30 Is the State/ SBC currently tracking contract compliance? If so, is that being done toward the vendor or directly to the contract?	This system is not expected to track contract compliance.
31 How is the State/ SBC currently tracking contract compliance when subs are involved?	See the response to Question 30.
32 Is the State/ SBC releasing an affiliated RFP within 2024? If so, does the State/ SBC have an optimal "Go-Live" date in mind?	See the response to Question 9.
33 What tools are currently used for integration with the existing systems?	None, this is performed manually.
34 Could you please provide your current system landscape architecture for our better understanding?	The proposed solution will replace the existing, outdated system.
35 Could you provide details on existing systems with which the new solution needs to integrate?	See the response to Question 6.
36 Are there any specific functionalities or data that should be shared between the new solution and other systems of State/ SBC?	Data requirements are as described in Section 2 of the RFI. No "data sharing" is anticipated at this time.
37 How do you envision the new solution integrating with existing financial systems for budget tracking and management?	Not envisioned.
38 What types of data (financial, operational, etc.) do you expect the new solution to manage or interact with?	See Section 2 of the RFI.
39 Could you provide a detailed inventory of all the data types currently stored in your existing systems that need to be migrated to the new solution?	See response to Question 14.
40 How many contracts are currently stored in your systems, and what is the total volume of data these contracts represent?	None
41 How many contracts that are still active?	None

QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
42 What are the common issues you face with your current vendor management process?	The system is unable to validate user “on-boarding” data provided by the Registrants. As a result, it is not possible to validate information with the TN Secretary of State’s “Business information Search” system and the TN Dept. of Commerce and Insurance’s “Verify - License Search” system.
43 How many active vendors exist?	See the response to Question 7.
44 How is contract & vendor information recorded and tracked in the current system and other internal systems?	<p>Contract information is not currently recorded and tracked in the current system.</p> <p>Vendor information is provided by vendor, self-reported profile creation or “user on-boarding” and is updated annually.</p> <p>There are no additional internal systems that record or track this information.</p>
45 How does the County handle contract management and renewal processes after the initial execution?	This will be a state system that will require no contract management functionality.
46 Do you follow any digital signature feature currently?	No. See response to Question 11.
47 Do you create value-based contract or Quantity based contract or both?	N/A. See response to Question 26.
48 Is the state and or SBC currently utilizing a Managed Service Provider to assist with sourcing of vendors/ labor and if so, does the SBC desire for MSP partner to have access to the system?	The new system will not require that an existing MSP have access the system.
49 On what criteria/ grading will the State/ SBC be evaluating these proposals and considerations for verbal presentations?	The State is seeking information from potential vendors which are responsive to the system requirements as described in Section 2 of the RFI. See Section 3 of the RFI regarding presentations. Verbal presentations will only be requested if additional information is determined to be helpful to the Office.
50 Will email communications be sent within the new system application or will emails be sent through an external application, such as Microsoft Outlook? If an external application will be used, what is the application?	The State is seeking information relating to system solutions which provide the most value to its users and welcome information regarding potential integrated solutions implementing email applications including but limited to, Microsoft Outlook.
51 What is the source of data for reporting? Will all of the reporting data reside within this new application or will external data need to be included in the reports?	The source for data reporting is anticipated to reside in the system. There is not an anticipated need to source data for reporting purposes externally however respondent information which provides solutions to this potential need would not be considered superfluous.

QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
52 What type of project information need to be tracked?	See Section 2 of the RFI.
53 What security controls need to be in place when storing performance evaluation information?	See the response to Question 20.
54 How many administrators for the current system would need to also be administrators in the new system?	See the response to Question 8.
55 How many different personas (segregated by workflows they would be executing) would need to be supported? How many users within each persona type?	See the response to Question 8.
56 How will change management activities (i.e., communication and training) be managed with end users and stakeholders?	The Office welcomes respondent information regarding change management communication and training for end users and stakeholders.
57 How many forms will need to be made available to Registrants in total?	The number of forms to made available to Registrants is not known at this time.
58 In what format will the referenced “State projects for the last 10 years” be stored and prepared for migration.	This data is stored in a Microsoft Excel-compatible format. The Office is amenable to suggestions as to the most effective and efficient format for which to migrate any existing information to a proposed system.
59 How many systems will need to be accessed to validate the information requested of the Registrant by the Agency?	See the response to Question 11.
60 Does the Agency already utilize a middleware solution that can be leveraged for this application?	No.
61 What is the total volume of accounts in the current system?	See the response to Question 7.
62 Is there a minimal viable product that can be operational within the 90-day requirement or is the agency expecting all elements of the application to be implemented and fully operational within 90 days?	See the response to Question 9.
63 How many data tables and what data volume will need to be migrated to the new system? Where is the data currently stored?	No data will be migrated from the existing system to the new system. It is expected that less than 10 data tables may need to be uploaded to the new system.
64 Please provide additional detail on the workflow involved in the requirement to “track workload/projects assigned to	At a minimum, project number, title, total fee, total project cost. However, this information may be desired to be expanded and the Office is amenable to suggestions on how this could be accomplished.

QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
Registrants.” What level of detail will be tracked?	
65 What method of dissemination of electronic content is desired?	The Office seeks respondent information which considers the most efficient means of electronic information dissemination. Information to Registrants is currently disseminated via email.
66 How many of each user type will need access to the system?	See the response to Question 18.
67 How long does data need to be retained for the audit log?	A minimum of 5 years of actively utilized files but ideally as long as possible. An ability to download data for storage or archive data in the system will be necessary. The Office is amenable to suggestions on how this could be accomplished.
68 Please provide additional detail on the workflow of the requirement to “allow for electronic solicitation for work by the State.”	<p>Allowing designers to submit proposals into the system in response to a RFQ and potentially allowing contractors to respond to an RFP or submit a bid.</p> <p>The Office is amenable to suggestions on how this could be accomplished.</p>
69 What are the different document formats that are to be considered? (PDF,docx, jpg, etc.)	The Office seeks respondent information which considers a system capable of management all common document format types while offering insight where such capabilities might be limited. In general, respondents might consider all Microsoft Word-compatible, Microsoft Excel-compatible formats as well as PDF and scanned image format types such as jpg or png.
70 What's the format in which any current data is available and needs to be imported into the solution (hand written/scanned)?	The majority of the data that needs to be imported into the solution is formatted in Microsoft Excel. The Office is amenable to responses which address a capability to import data which is formatted as PDF, as well as written and/or scanned.
71 Will translation be a part of scope? If yes, Please provide an exhaustive list of languages that need to taken into consideration	No translation functionality is anticipated. The Office is amenable to responses which articulate a general capability to address translation needs and information as to where this functionality may be justifiable.
72 Are there any data stored anywhere that has to be imported into the new solution? If yes, where is it currently stored?	Any data such as team evaluation data referenced in Section 2 of the RFI, which is to be imported into the new solution would be provided as discrete files. Respondents should not expect to be granted access to files directly as they are currently stored and should consider this constraint when articulating a response to this RFI.
73 What is the volume of documents/information (pages) that is	The current system does not contain documents that would need to be migrated to a new system. Respondents are encouraged to articulate



QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
currently available with the State on all the design professionals	responses identifying a means within a new system, to enable users to upload documents to the system.
74 Is there any PII or healthcare data that needs to be redacted?	No uploading of PII is currently anticipated. The Office is amenable to responses which articulate a general capability to address secure ways to store or redact this information from documents.
75 What are the expected number of users who would be accessing/registering on the state's website on a daily basis?	The maximum expected number of users who would be registering on the state's website on a daily basis is approximately 75. The average expected number of users who would be registering on the state's website on a daily basis is approximately 0-9. See also the response to Question 7.
76 What are the different user personas and their corresponding access levels? (read, write, delete, edit, etc.)	See the response to Question 8.
77 What is the peak estimated number of documents processed/uploaded per day?	The current system is not capable of document upload. We would be interested in respondent information that describes document processing/uploading volume capabilities.
78 Please specify the rules that will be used for automatically validating information provided by the Registrant, such as i)the Registrant's legal name and entity status through the website of the Tennessee Secretary of State , ii) licensure information through the Department of Commerce and Insurance	The Office is seeking responses which articulate a capacity to validate Registrant information via data queries to the databases referenced in the RFI. Such queries are not currently known to be constrained by any particular rules. Information provided by respondents to the RFI which demonstrate a capacity to define such rules resulting in consistent and accurate data validation would be highly valued.
79 How do you want to store the data collected through the webforms? Do you have a particular schema that has to be followed?	The Office expects to store data that is collected through webforms on internal servers. No schema has been established at this time.
80 Do you require a classification pipeline? If yes, what are the different classifications you require?	The Office is not aware of a classification pipeline or related classification requirements but welcomes responses that address these where applicable.
81 What all features do you require for the search functionality? (full text search, semantic search, etc.)	The Office has not made a determination as to the type of search functionality required for the system and welcomes responses which address the benefits of these types of searches.
82 What are the different metadata that needs to be extracted from the documents?	The Office welcome responses which provide insight into the benefits of metadata extraction as related to expanded search functionality and other functions.
83 List out the filters required for the search & retrieval ( the business legal name, business entity status, number of employees dedicated to projects, etc. ) for each registrant details?	It is currently presumed that search filter functionality pertaining to Registrants will remain the same across all Registrants. The number of search filters should include all parameters for which a Registrant self-reports during profile creation or vendor "on-boarding".

QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
Do they remain same across all registrants?	
84 What are the parameters used for generating the reports?	This is to be determined based on the functionality of the system. Information provided by respondents to the RFI which demonstrate the ability to create a variety of reports from the available data and potential customization options would be highly valued.
85 What is the level of access controls that you would require over the documents?	The Office is seeking respondent information articulating system development which includes a flexible measure document access control sufficient to maintain fidelity, security and which can be managed at the administrative user level.
86 Are there any integrations with the current systems needed? If yes, can you please provide more details about the same	No integrations with the current system are expected.
87 Do you have any security concerns/constraints on any kind of deployment?	The State has specific security policies that a vendor would be required to satisfy as part of any potential system deployment.
88 Are you fine with using third party applications for enhancement of the uploaded documents?	Yes.
89 Do you need complete resources working on the project to be onshore (US) or would you be fine with all resources offshore?	See response to Questions 1 and 3.

3. **RFP Amendment Effective Date.** The revisions set forth herein shall be effective upon release. All other terms and conditions of this RFP not expressly amended herein shall remain in full force and effect.